

Office of Chemical Safety and Pollution Prevention

Risk Evaluation for Trichloroethylene

Systematic Review Supplemental File:

Data Quality Evaluation of Environmental Hazard Studies

CASRN: 79-01-6



February 2020

Table of Contents

| HERO ID | Data Type | Reference | 1 |
|------------|----------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| 7508 | Acute (0-96 hour); Aquatic; Inver- tebrates | Leblanc, G. A 1980. Acute toxicity of priority pollutants to water flea (Daph- nia magna). Bulletin of Environmental Contamination and Toxicology 24:684- 691 | 1 |
| 18050 | Other; Aquatic; Fish | Barrows, M. E., Petrocelli, S. R., Macek, K. J., Carroll, J. J. 1980. Bioconcen- tration and elimination of selected water pollutants by bluegill sunfish (Lepomis macrochirus). | 5 |
| 18064 | Acute (0-96 hour); Aquatic; Fish | Buccafusco, R. J.,Ells, S. J.,Leblanc, G. A., 1981. Acute toxicity of priority pollutants to bluegill (Lepomis macrochirus). Bulletin of Environmental Contamination and Toxicology 26:446-452 | 9 |
| 32169 | Acute (0-96 hour); Aquatic; Fish | Geiger, D. L.,Northcott, C. E.,Call, D. J.,Brooke, L. T. eds. 1985. Acute toxicities of organic chemicals to fathead minnows (Pimephales promelas): volume II. | 12 |
| 58126 | Acute (0-96 hour); Aquatic; Fish static | Alexander, H. C.,McCarty, W. M.,Bartlett, E. A 1978. Toxicity of per- chloroethylene, trichloroethylene, 1,1,1-trichloroethane, and methylene chloride to fathead minnows. Bulletin of Environmental Contamination and Toxicology 20:344-352 | 17 |
| 58126 | Acute (0-96 hour); Aquatic; Fish flow-through | Alexander, H. C.,McCarty, W. M.,Bartlett, E. A 1978. Toxicity of per- chloroethylene, trichloroethylene, 1,1,1-trichloroethane, and methylene chloride to fathead minnows. Bulletin of Environmental Contamination and Toxicology 20:344-352 | 19 |
| 68271 | Other; Aquatic; other South African clawed frog | Fort, D. J., Stover, E. L., Rayburn, J. R., Hull, M., Bantle, J. A.: 1993. Evaluation of the developmental toxicity of trichloroethylene and detoxification metabolites using Xenopus. Birth Defects Research, Part B: Developmental and Reproduc- tive Toxicology 13:35-45 | 21 |
| 200570 | Acute (0-96 hour); Aquatic; Inver- tebrates | Sanchez-Fortun, S.,Sanz, F.,Santa-Maria, A.,Ros, J. M.,De Vicente, M. L.,Encinas, M. T.,Vinagre, E.,Barahona, M. V 1997. Acute sensitivity of three age classes of Artemia salina larvae to seven chlorinated solvents. Bulletin of Environmental Contamination and Toxicology 59:445-451 | 26 |
| 660790 | Acute (0-96 hour); Aquatic; Plants | Brack, W.,Frank, H 1998. Chlorophyll a fluorescence: A tool for the inves- tigation of toxic effects in the photosynthetic apparatus. Ecotoxicology and Environmental Safety 40:34-41 | 29 |
| 661061 | Acute (0-96 hour); Aquatic; Plants | Brack, W.,Rottler, H. 1994. Toxicity testing of highly volatile chemicals with green algae: A new assay. 1:223-228 | 33 |

| 676758 | Acute (0-96 hour); Aquatic; Inver- tebrates | Yoshioka, Y.,Ose, Y.,Sato, T.: 1985. Testing for the toxicity of chemicals with Tetrahymena pyriformis. Science of the Total Environment 43:149-157 | 37 |
|---------|------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| 700434 | Other; Aquatic; other amphibian - wood frog and green frog | McDaniel, T.,Martin, P.,Ross, N.,Brown, S.,Lesage, S.,Pauli, B 2004. Effects of chlorinated solvents on four species of North American amphibians. Archives of Environmental Contamination and Toxicology 47:101-109 | 40 |
| 700434 | Other; Aquatic; other amphibian - american toad | McDaniel, T.,Martin, P.,Ross, N.,Brown, S.,Lesage, S.,Pauli, B 2004. Effects of chlorinated solvents on four species of North American amphibians. Archives of Environmental Contamination and Toxicology 47:101-109 | 47 |
| 700434 | Other; Aquatic; other amphibian - spotted salamder | McDaniel, T.,Martin, P.,Ross, N.,Brown, S.,Lesage, S.,Pauli, B 2004. Effects of chlorinated solvents on four species of North American amphibians. Archives of Environmental Contamination and Toxicology 47:101-109 | 54 |
| 701994 | Other; Aquatic; other amphibian - frog | Fort, D.,Rayburn, J.,Deyoung, D.,Bantle, J.: 1991. Assessing the efficacy of an Aroclor 1254-induced exogenous metabolic activation system for FETAX. Drug and Chemical Toxicology 14:143-160 | 62 |
| 701995 | Other; Aquatic; other amphibian - frog | Fort, D.,Rogers, R.,Stover, E.,Finch, R 2001. Optimization of an exogenous metabolic activation system for FETAX. I. Post-isolation rat liver microsome mixtures. Drug and Chemical Toxicology 24:103-115 | 68 |
| 707209 | Acute (0-96 hour); Aquatic; Inver- tebrates | Niederlehner, B., Cairns, J., Smith, E. 1998. Modeling acute and chronic toxi- city of nonpolar narcotic chemicals and mixtures to Ceriodaphnia dubia. Eco- toxicology and Environmental Safety 39:136-146 | 72 |
| 707209 | Other; Aquatic; Invertebrates | Niederlehner, B., Cairns, J., Smith, E. 1998. Modeling acute and chronic toxi- city of nonpolar narcotic chemicals and mixtures to Ceriodaphnia dubia. Eco- toxicology and Environmental Safety 39:136-146 | 76 |
| 1059985 | Acute (0-96 hour); Aquatic; Plants | Labra, M.,Mattia, F.,Bernasconi, M.,Bertacchi, D.,Grassi, F.,Bruni, I.,Citterio, S 2010. The Combined Toxic and Genotoxic Effects of Chromium and Volatile Organic Contaminants to Pseudokirchneriella subcapitata. Water, Air, and Soil Pollution 213:57-70 | 81 |
| 1486051 | Acute (0-96 hour); Aquatic; Inver- tebrates | Abernethy, S.,Bobra, A. M.,Shiu, W. Y.,Wells, P. G.,Mackay, D.: 1986. ACUTE LETHAL TOXICITY OF HYDROCARBONS AND CHLORINATED HY- DROCARBONS TO TWO PLANKTONIC CRUSTACEANS THE KEY ROLE OF ORGANISM-WATER PARTITIONING. Aquatic Toxicology | 84 |
| 1745587 | Other; Aquatic; Fish | . 1987. ASSESSMENTS OF THE FEASIBILITY AND EVIDENCE OF TEST METHODS OF LEVELS I AND II OF THE CHEMICALS ACT ON THIOUREA. | 87 |
| 1745587 | Acute (0-96 hour); Aquatic; Plants | . 1987. ASSESSMENTS OF THE FEASIBILITY AND EVIDENCE OF TEST METHODS OF LEVELS I AND II OF THE CHEMICALS ACT ON THIOUREA. | 91 |

| 2127844 | Acute (0-96 hour); Aquatic; Plants | Bacsi, I., Toeroek, T., B-Beres, V., Toeroek, P., Tothmeresz, B., Nagy, A. S., Vasas, G 2013. Laboratory and microcosm experiments testing the toxicity of chlorinated hydrocarbons on a cyanobacterium strain (Synechococcus PCC 6301) and on natural phytoplankton assemblages. Hydrobiologia 710:189-203 | 95 |
|---------|------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| 2127941 | Acute (0-96 hour); Aquatic; Inver- tebrates | Dobaradaran, S.,Mahvi, A. H.,Nabizadeh, R.,Ramavandi, B.,Nazmara, S.,Zarei, S. 2012. BIOASSAY COMPARISON OF TRICHLOROETHYLENE (TCE) TOXICITY ON DAPHNIA MAGNA (D. MAGNA) BEFORE AND AFTER ULTRASOUND AND PHOTOLYSIS PROCESSES. Fresenius Environmental Bulletin 21:1533-1538 | 98 |
| 2128165 | Acute (0-96 hour); Aquatic; Plants | Lukavsky, J., Furnadzhieva, S., Dittrt, F.: 2011. Toxicity of Trichloroethylene (TCE) on Some Algae and Cyanobacteria. Bulletin of Environmental Contamination and Toxicology 86:226-231 | 101 |
| 2298399 | Acute (0-96 hour); Aquatic; Fish static | Smith, A. D.,Bharath, A.,Mallard, C.,Orr, D.,Smith, K.,Sutton, J. A.,Vukmanich, J.,McCarty, L. S.,Ozburn, G. W 1991. The acute and chronic toxicity of 10 chlorinated organic-compounds to the american flagfish (jordanella-floridae). Archives of Environmental Contamination and Toxicology 20:94-102 | 105 |
| 2298399 | Acute (0-96 hour); Aquatic; Fish flow-through | Smith, A. D.,Bharath, A.,Mallard, C.,Orr, D.,Smith, K.,Sutton, J. A.,Vukmanich, J.,McCarty, L. S.,Ozburn, G. W 1991. The acute and chronic toxicity of 10 chlorinated organic-compounds to the american flagfish (jordanella-floridae). Archives of Environmental Contamination and Toxicology 20:94-102 | 108 |
| 2298399 | Chronic (>21 days); Aquatic; Fish | Smith, A. D.,Bharath, A.,Mallard, C.,Orr, D.,Smith, K.,Sutton, J. A.,Vukmanich, J.,McCarty, L. S.,Ozburn, G. W 1991. The acute and chronic toxicity of 10 chlorinated organic-compounds to the american flagfish (jordanella-floridae). Archives of Environmental Contamination and Toxicology 20:94-102 | 111 |
| 2307041 | Other; Aquatic; other | Rayburn, D. J. Deyoung, J. A. Bantle, D. J. Fort, R. Mcnew. 1991. Altered developmental toxicity caused by three carrier solvents. Journal of Applied Toxicology 11:253-260 | 114 |
| 2800252 | Other; Aquatic; Fish | Hayashi, M.,Ueda, T.,Uyeno, K.,Wada, K.,Kinae, N.,Saotome, K.,Tanaka, N.,Takai, A.,Sasaki, Y. F.,Asano, N.,Sofuni, T.,Ojima, Y 1998. Development of genotoxicity assay systems that use aquatic organisms. Mutation Research 399:125-133 | 118 |
| 2801609 | Acute (0-96 hour); Aquatic; Plants | Ward, G. S., Tolmsoff, A. J., Petrocelli, S. R. 1986. ACUTE TOXICITY OF TRICHLOROETHYLENE TO SALTWATER ORGANISMS. Bulletin of Envi- ronmental Contamination and Toxicology 37:830-836 | 121 |
| 2801609 | Acute (0-96 hour); Aquatic; Fish | Ward, G. S., Tolmsoff, A. J., Petrocelli, S. R. 1986. ACUTE TOXICITY OF TRICHLOROETHYLENE TO SALTWATER ORGANISMS. Bulletin of Envi- ronmental Contamination and Toxicology 37:830-836 | 124 |

| 2801609 | Acute (0-96 hour); Aquatic; Invertebrates | Ward, G. S., Tolmsoff, A. J., Petrocelli, S. R 1986. ACUTE TOXICITY OF TRICHLOROETHYLENE TO SALTWATER ORGANISMS. Bulletin of Envi- ronmental Contamination and Toxicology 37:830-836 | 127 |
|---------|-------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| 2803221 | Acute (0-96 hour); Aquatic; Fish | Dierickx, P. J 1993. Comparison between fish lethality data and the in vitro cytotoxicity of lipophilic solvents to cultured fish cells in a two-compartment model. Chemosphere 27:1511-1518 | 130 |
| 3298076 | Acute (0-96 hour); Aquatic; Plants | Bacsi, I.,Gonda, S.,B-Beres, V.,Novak, Z.,Nagy, S. A.,Vasas, G. 2015. Alter- ations of phytoplankton assemblages treated with chlorinated hydrocarbons: ef- fects of dominant species sensitivity and initial diversity. Ecotoxicology 24:823- 834 | 134 |
| 3502953 | Other; Aquatic; Invertebrates | Houde, M.,Douville, M.,Gagnon, P.,Sproull, J.,Cloutier, F. 2015. Exposure of Daphnia magna to trichloroethylene (TCE) and vinyl chloride (VC): evaluation of gene transcription, cellular activity, and life-history parameters. Ecotoxicol- ogy and Environmental Safety 116 | 138 |
| 3546158 | Other; Aquatic; Invertebrates | Vidal, M.,Bassères, A.,Narbonne, J 2001. Potential biomarkers of trichloroethylene and toluene exposure in Corbicula fluminea. Environmental Toxicology and Pharmacology 9:87-97 | 142 |
| 3617103 | Other; Aquatic; Plants | Ando, T.,Otsuka, S.,Nishiyama, M.,Senoo, K.,Watanabe, M. M.,Matsumoto, S 2003. Toxic Effects of Dichloromethane and Trichloroethylene on the Growth of Planktonic Green Algae, Chlorella vulgaris NIES227, Selenastrum capricor- nutum NIES35, and Volvulina steinii NIES545. 18:43-46 | 146 |
| 3617749 | Other; Aquatic; Invertebrates | Yoshioka, Y.,Ose, Y.,Sato, T 1986. Correlation of the Five Test Methods to Assess Chemical Toxicity and Relation to Physical Properties. 12:15-21 | 149 |
| 3617749 | Acute (0-96 hour); Aquatic; Fish | Yoshioka, Y.,Ose, Y.,Sato, T. 1986. Correlation of the Five Test Methods to Assess Chemical Toxicity and Relation to Physical Properties. 12:15-21 | 153 |
| 3617749 | Acute (0-96 hour); Aquatic; Invertebrates | Yoshioka, Y.,Ose, Y.,Sato, T. 1986. Correlation of the Five Test Methods to Assess Chemical Toxicity and Relation to Physical Properties. 12:15-21 | 156 |
| 3617867 | Acute (0-96 hour); Aquatic; Plants | Tsai, K. P., Chen, C. Y 2007. An Algal Toxicity Database of Organic Toxi- cants Derived by a Closed-System Technique. Environmental Toxicology and Chemistry 26:1931-1939 | 159 |
| 3625489 | Other; Aquatic; Fish | Schell, J. D. J 1987. Interactions of Halogenated Hydrocarbon Mixtures in the Embryo of the Japanese Medaka (Oryzias latipes). | 162 |
| 3665276 | Acute (0-96 hour); Aquatic; Fish | Broderius, S. J.,Kahl, M. D.,Elonen, G. E.,Hammermeister, D. E.,Hoglund, M. D 2005. A Comparison of the Lethal and Sublethal Toxicity of Organic Chemical Mixtures to the Fathead Minnow (Pimphales promelas). 24:3117-3127 | 165 |

| 3665276 | Chronic (>21 days); Aquatic; Fish | Broderius, S. J.,Kahl, M. D.,Elonen, G. E.,Hammermeister, D. E.,Hoglund, M. D 2005. A Comparison of the Lethal and Sublethal Toxicity of Organic Chemical Mixtures to the Fathead Minnow (Pimphales promelas). 24:3117-3127 | 170 |
|---------|--------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| 3683110 | Chronic (>21 days); Aquatic; Invertebrates | Leblanc, G. A., Surprenant, D. C 1980. The Chronic Toxicity of 8 of the 65 Priority Pollutants to the Water Flea (Daphnia magna). | 176 |

| Study Citation: | n: Leblanc, G. A., 1980. Acute toxicity of priority pollutants to water flea (Daphnia magna). Bulletin of Environmental Contamination and Toxicology 24:684-601 | | | | | | |
|------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------|-------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|
| Data Type: Hero ID: | Acute (0-96 7508 | 5 hour); Aquatic; Invertebrates | | | | | |
| Domain | | Metric | $\operatorname{Rating}^{\dagger}$ | MWF^{\star} | Score | $Comments^{\dagger\dagger}$ | |
| Domain 1: Test S | Substance | | | | | | |
| | Metric 1: | Test Substance Identity | High | $\times 2$ | 2 | Chemical is identified by name. | |
| | Metric 2: | Test Substance Source | Low | $\times 1$ | 3 | All chemicals tested were purchased from commer- cial chemical suppliers, but the study does not spec- ify what supplier provided TCE. | |
| | Metric 3: | Test Substance Purity | Low | × 1 | 3 | Study reports a minimum purity of 80 percent for all chemicals tested, but does not specify what the purity is for TCE. | |
| Demein 9. Tret I |): | | | | | | |
| Domain 2: Test I | Metric 4: | Negative Controls | High | $\times 2$ | 2 | Negative control consisted of the same dilution wa- ter, test conditions, and test organisms, but contain- ing no test substance of co-solvent. When appropri- ate a solvent control was also used. | |
| | Metric 5: | Negative Control Response | High | $\times 1$ | 1 | Mortality among water flea control populations never exceeded 10 percent in any test. | |
| | Metric 6: | Randomized Allocation | High | $\times 1$ | 1 | Five daphnids were randomly placed in each 150 mL test solution within 30 minutes of the solution preparation. | |
| Damain 9. Erman | Classes t | | | | | | |
| Domain 3: Expos | Metric 7: | Experimental System/Test Media Prepara- tion | Low | × 2 | 6 | It appears the volatility of TCE might have been taken into account in the test methods, but it's un- clear. The study reports that, generally, "The tests were also conducted in unreplicated 500 mL solu- tions containing 15 daphnids if dividing the solution into triplicate test vessels presented a risk of the loss of the test substance through volatilization or if va- pors of the substance posed a high health risk to the investigators. In addition, these vessels were covered with plastic wrap secured with an elastic band." | |
| | Metric 8: | Consistency of Exposure Administration | Medium | $\times 1$ | 2 | Only minor uncertainties | |
| | Metric 9: | Measurement of Test Substance Concentra- tion | Low | $\times 2$ | 6 | Measurements were not reported and the test sub- stance is volatile. | |
| | | Continued on next page | | | | | |

| Study Citation: Leblanc, G. A. 1980. Acute toxicity of priority pollutants to water flea (Daphnia magna). Bulletin of Environmental Contamination and Toxicology 24.684 601 | | | | | | | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------|-------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|
| Data Type: Hero ID: | Acute (0-96 hour); Aquatic; Invertebrates 7508 | | | | | | |
| Domain | | Metric | $\operatorname{Rating}^{\dagger}$ | MWF^{\star} | Score | $Comments^{\dagger\dagger}$ | |
| | Metric 10: | Exposure Duration and Frequency | High | × 1 | 1 | Exposure duration is 48 hours which is OECD TG 202 recommended. Only one dose for the 48 hour period as this is an acute study. | |
| | Metric 11: | Number of Exposure Groups/Spacing of Exposure Levels | Medium | $\times 1$ | 2 | 5-8 exposure groups were used for each chemical. No range finding was conducted to determine an appro- priate exposure, but it appears they were appropri- ate enough to establish an LD50. | |
| | Metric 12: | Testing at or Below Solubility Limit | High | $\times 1$ | 1 | | |
| Domain 4: Test (| Drganism | | | | | | |
| 2011011 11 1000 0 | Metric 13: | Test Organism Characteristics | High | $\times 2$ | 2 | Daphnia magna less than 24 hours old were used in these toxicity tests from laboratory stocks cultured at EG&G, Bionomics. | |
| | Metric 14: | Acclimitization and Pretreatment Conditions | Low | $\times 1$ | 3 | Study didn't report whether test organisms were ac- climatized. | |
| | Metric 15: | Number of Organisms and Replicates per Group | Low | × 1 | 3 | It appears there were 15 daphnia in each test con- centration for TCE and no replicates to avoid losing TCE to vitalization. OECD TG 202 recommends at least 20 and separated into 4 different vessels. | |
| | Metric 16: | Adequacy of Test Conditions | High | × 1 | 1 | Ph, dissolved O2, temp, and 2ml per organism were all appropriate for daphnia magna according to OECD TG 202. | |
| Domain 5: Outco | me Assessme | ent | | | | | |
| Loman of Catto | Metric 17: | Outcome Assessment Methodology | High | $\times 2$ | 2 | Mortality data from these toxicity tests were used to calculate a median lethal concentration and its 95 percent confidence limits based on nominal con- centrations | |
| | Metric 18: | Consistency of Outcome Assessment | High | $\times 1$ | 1 | | |
| Domain 6: Confo | Domain 6: Confounding / Variable Control | | | | | | |
| | Metric 19: | Confounding Variables in Test Design and Procedures | High | $\times 2$ | 2 | | |
| | Metric 20: | Outcomes Unrelated to Exposure | High | $\times 1$ | 1 | | |
| Domain 7: Data | Presentation | and Analysis | | | | | |
| | | Continued on next page | | | | | |

| and Toxicology 24:684-691 | Leblanc, G. A. 1980. Acute toxicity of priority pollutants to water flea (Daphnia magna). Bulletin of Environmental Contamination and Toxicology 24:684-691 | | | | | | |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Data Type: Acute (0-96 hour); Aquatic; Invertebrates Hero ID: 7508 | | | | | | | |
| Domain Metric $Rating^{\dagger}$ MWF [*] Score | $\mathrm{Comments}^{\dagger\dagger}$ | | | | | | |
| Metric 21: Statistical Methods High $\times 1$ 1 The LC50's and 95 calculated utilizing a (Stephan, personal of With the the movin nominal test concent arithms and the cortise to angles. Each was then averaged a linear interpolation trations whose avera When test data did requirem by probit analysis. Final probit analysis, the most appropriate above for the calculating it is a constrained of the calculating and the nor appropriate and spectrum of the did to regarise the most appropriate and spectrum of the calculating it is a nominal concentration of the calculating and the nominal concentration of the calculating and spectrum of the calculating the most appropriate and spectrum of the calculating the nominal concentration and 95 percent confirmed on 2 signific mode for control mo | percent confidence limits were a moving average angle method communication) when possible. ng average angle method, the rations were transformed to log- responding percentage mortali- group of three successive angles and the LC50 was estimated by between the successive concen- age angles bracketed 45 degrees. not meet the moving average an- ents, the LC50's were estimated y converting the concentrations ercentage mortalities to probits g a least squares linear regres- ly, if the data did not permit a a binomial probability analysis ese data. Calculations were per- ett-Packard Hodel 9815A calcu- scan the data base and to select e of the three methods described ation of an LC50. If no mortal- vater flea populations exposed to tion of approximately 500 mg/ centrations were tested and the to be greater than the highest on tested (>530 mg/L). LC50's dence limits were reported after cant figures. No correction was rtality. | | | | | | |
| Metric 22: Reporting of Data $Medium \times 2$ 4 Data for most but n were reported but th tations are unlikely results. | ot all outcomes by study group nese minor uncertainties or limi- to have a substantial impact on | | | | | | |
| Metric 23: Explanation of Unexpected Outcomes High × 1 1 No unexplained outcomes | comes reported | | | | | | |
| Overall Quality Determination [‡] High 1.6 | | | | | | | |
| Extracted Yes | | | | | | | |
| Continued on next page | | | | | | | |

| Study Citation: | Leblanc, G. A. 1980. Acute toxicity of priority pollu and Toxicology 24:684-691 | tants to water flea (Daphnia magna). Bu | lletin of Environmental Contamination |
|------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| Data Type: Hero ID: | Acute (0-96 hour); Aquatic; Invertebrates 7508 | | |
| Domain | Metric | $Rating^{\dagger}$ MWF [*] Score | $Comments^{\dagger\dagger}$ |

* MWF = Metric Weighting Factor

[†] High = 1; Medium = 2; Low = 3; Unacceptable = 4; N/A has no value.

[‡] The overall rating is calculated as necessary. EPA may not always provide a comment for a metric that has been categorized as High.

$$Overall rating = \begin{cases} 4 & \text{if any metric is Unacceptable} \\ \left\lfloor \sum_{i} \left(\text{Metric Score}_{i} \times \text{MWF}_{i} \right) / \sum_{j} \text{MWF}_{j} \right\rceil_{0.1} & \text{(round to the nearest tenth) otherwise} \end{cases}$$

,

where High: ≥ 1 to < 1.7; Medium: ≥ 1.7 to < 2.3; Low: ≥ 2.3 to ≤ 3 . If the reviewer determines that the overall rating needs adjustment, the original rating is crossed out and an arrow points to the new rating.

| Study Citation: | Barrows, M. E., Petrocelli, S. R., Macek, K. J., Carroll, J. J. 1980. Bioconcentration and elimination of selected water pollutants by bluegill sunfish (Lepomis macrochirus). | | | | | |
|------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------|------------------------|-------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Data Type: Hero ID: | Other; Aqu 18050 | atic; Fish | | | | |
| Domain | | Metric | $\operatorname{Rating}^\dagger$ | MWF^{\star} | Score | $Comments^{\dagger\dagger}$ |
| Domain 1: Test S | Substance | | | | | |
| | Metric 1: | Test Substance Identity | High | $\times 2$ | 2 | Chemical identified as 1,1,2-trichloroethylene |
| | Metric 2: | Test Substance Source | High | × 1 | 1 | Each compound was received in individual, sealed vials from, New England Nuclear, Boston, Mas- sachusetts, and held under refrigerated conditions until used. |
| | Metric 3: | Test Substance Purity | Low | × 1 | 3 | No purity of test chemical was reported. Liquid gas chromatography was preformed during the experi- ment and purity of the chemical could be determined then, but it wasn't reported in the paper. |
| Domain 2: Test I | Design | | | | | |
| | Metric 4: | Negative Controls | High | $\times 2$ | 2 | |
| | Metric 5: | Negative Control Response | High | $\times 1$ | 1 | Concentrations of TCE in fish tissue were measured in controls and compared to test species. |
| | Metric 6: | Randomized Allocation | Low | $\times 1$ | 3 | Method for allocation was not reported. |
| Domain 3: Expos | sure Charact | erization | | | | |
| | Metric 7: | Experimental System/Test Media Prepara- tion | High | × 2 | 2 | "Steps were taken to minimize vitalization. Each test aquaria was a closed system for the volatile organics. Each fish was wrapped in Para film" at each sampling to minimize the volatilization of each chemical from thefish tissue during the combustion process." |
| | Metric 8: | Consistency of Exposure Administration | High | $\times 1$ | 1 | |
| | | Continued on next page | | | | |

| Study Citation: | tion: Barrows, M. E., Petrocelli, S. R., Macek, K. J., Carroll, J. J. 1980. Bioconcentration and elimination of selected water pollutants by bluegill sunfish (Lepomis macrochirus). | | | | | |
|------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------|-------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Data Type: Hero ID: | Other; Aqu 18050 | atic; Fish | | | | |
| Domain | | Metric | $\operatorname{Rating}^{\dagger}$ | MWF^{\star} | Score | $Comments^{\dagger\dagger}$ |
| | Metric 9: | Measurement of Test Substance Concentra- tion | High | × 2 | 2 | Half-life was defined as the period of time required for one-half of the mean chemical residues measured in fish tissues at equilibrium or at the end of the exposure period to be eliminated following termina- tion of exposure. The specific activity of e 1ch car- bon 14-hibeled stock solution was measured radio- metrically prior to test initiation. During each test exposure, representative water and fish samples, in- cluding samples from control aquaria, were collected 011 days 0, I, 2, 4, 7, 10, 14, 21 and 28 (if exposure continued for the entire 28 days) and analyzed for 14 (-residues or metal concentrations as appropri- ate. Fish were sampled on days 1, 2, 4 and 7 to estimate the half-life of chemical residues in tissues. |
| | Metric 10: | Exposure Duration and Frequency | High | × 1 | 1 | Exposure was for 14 days. OECD recommends 28 but shorter is ok if it takes less time for the fish residues to reach a steady state in relation to the chemical in the water. Authors mentioned that this was the case. Study used a continuous flow through system for the 14 days. |
| | Metric 11: | Number of Exposure Groups/Spacing of Exposure Levels | High | $\times 1$ | 1 | "The levels of exposure were selected on the basis of acute toxicity datagenerated at Bionomics and were intended to be sublethal during the continuous expo- sure period." |
| | Metric 12: | Testing at or Below Solubility Limit | High | $\times 1$ | 1 | Sure period. |
| Domain 4. Tost (| Iragniem | | | | | |
| | Metric 13: | Test Organism Characteristics | Medium | × 2 | 4 | Minor reservations about the source of fish. Three populations of bluegill sunfish (Lepomis macrochirus) were obtained from a commercial fish farmer in Connecticut. May not all be the same age, but length and weight was documented, and age may not be a big factor in determining BCF. |
| | Metric 14: | Acclimitization and Pretreatment Conditions | Medium | $\times 1$ | 2 | Fish were maintained in the holding facilities for a minimum of 30 days prior to the initiation of the study. Minor uncertainties in the details provided. |
| | Metric 15: | Number of Organisms and Replicates per Group | Medium | $\times 1$ | 2 | Study started with 100 organisms per exposure group, and took fish out 5 fish on each sampling day. OECD recommends having enough to remove at least 4. Unsure the number of replicates. |
| | | Continued on next page | | | | |

| Study Citation: | ion: Barrows, M. E., Petrocelli, S. R., Macek, K. J., Carroll, J. J. 1980. Bioconcentration and elimination of selected water pollutants by bluegill sunfish (Lepomis macrochirus). | | | | | |
|------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------|-------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Data Type: Hero ID: | Other; Aqu 18050 | atic; Fish | | | | |
| Domain | | Metric | $\operatorname{Rating}^{\dagger}$ | MWF^{\star} | Score | $Comments^{\dagger\dagger}$ |
| | Metric 16: | Adequacy of Test Conditions | Low | × 1 | 3 | Recommended temp for blue gill is 20-25 degrees C and this study was conducted at 16 degrees C which could have lowered metabolism in fish. |
| Domain 5: Outco | ome Assessme | ent | | | | |
| | Metric 17: | Outcome Assessment Methodology | Unacceptable | × 2 | 8 | BCFs, which measure bioconcentration, were out of scope for the environmental hazard assessment por- tion of the risk evaluation. These were assessed else- where in the risk evaluation. Also, in this study BCFs and half-lives were reported for each of the chemi- cals. Assessment was not as sensitive as it should be for calculating a BCF - OECD recommends not- ing if both sexes are used, differences in growth and lipid content between sexes should be documented to be non-significant before the start of the exposure, in particular if it is anticipated that pooling of male and female fish will be necessary to ensure detectable substance concentrations and/or lipid content. This was not noted. |
| | Metric 18: | Consistency of Outcome Assessment | Medium | $\times 1$ | 2 | Incomplete reporting of minor details of outcome as- sessment protocol execution. |
| Domain 6: Confe | ounding / Va | riable Control | | | | |
| Domain of Come | Metric 19: | Confounding Variables in Test Design and Procedures | Low | × 2 | 6 | OECD recommends noting If both sexes are used, differences in growth and lipid content between sexes should be documented to be non-significant before the start of the exposure, in particular if it is antic- ipated that pooling of male and female fish will be necessary to ensure detectable substance concentra- tions and/or lipid content. This was not noted. |
| | Metric 20: | Outcomes Unrelated to Exposure | Medium | $\times 1$ | 2 | Data on attrition and health outcomes unrelated to exposure were not reported for each study group. |
| Domain 7: Data | Presentation | and Analysis | | | | |
| | Metric 21: | Statistical Methods | High | × 1 | 1 | A steady-state bioconcentration factor (BCF) was calculated as the quotient of the mean chemical con- centration measured in fish tissues during equilib- rium divided by the mean measured chemical con- centration in water during the entire exposure period (Table III). |
| | | Continued on next page | | | | |

-1

| Study Citation: | Barrows, M bluegill sun | I. E.,Petrocelli, S. R.,Macek, K. J.,Carroll, J. fish (Lepomis macrochirus). | . J 1980. Biocon | centratio | n and e | limination of selected water pollutants by |
|-------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------|---------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Data Type: | Other; Aqu | atic; Fish | | | | |
| Hero ID: | 18050 | | | | | |
| Domain | | Metric | $\operatorname{Rating}^{\dagger}$ | MWF^{\star} | Score | $Comments^{\dagger\dagger}$ |
| | Metric 22: | Reporting of Data | Medium | $\times 2$ | 4 | Not all regressions, lipid content, and weights were reported, but BCFs and half lives were reported for all chemicals. |
| | Metric 23: | Explanation of Unexpected Outcomes | High | $\times 1$ | 1 | No unexplained outcomes. |
| | | | | | | |
| Overall Quality I | Determination | n [‡] | Unacceptable | | 4.0 | |
| Extracted | | | Yes | | | |

** Consistent with our Application of Systematic Review in TSCARisk Evaluations document, if a metric for a data source receives a score of Unacceptable (score = 4), EPA will determine the study to be unacceptable. In this case, one of the metrics were rated as unacceptable. As such, the study is considered unacceptable and the score is presented solely to increase transparency.

* MWF = Metric Weighting Factor

[†] High = 1; Medium = 2; Low = 3; Unacceptable = 4; N/A has no value.

[‡] The overall rating is calculated as necessary. EPA may not always provide a comment for a metric that has been categorized as High.

$$\text{Overall rating} = \begin{cases} 4 \\ \left\lfloor \sum_{i} \left(\text{Metric Score}_{i} \times \text{MWF}_{i} \right) / \sum_{j} \right\rbrace$$

if any metric is Unacceptable

 $MWF_j\Big|_{0.1}$ (round to the nearest tenth) otherwise

where High: ≥ 1 to < 1.7; Medium: ≥ 1.7 to < 2.3; Low: ≥ 2.3 to ≤ 3 . If the reviewer determines that the overall rating needs adjustment, the original rating is crossed out and an arrow points to the new rating.

| Study Citation: | Buccafusco, Environmen | , R. J.,Ells, S. J.,Leblanc, G. A. 1981. Acute to ntal Contamination and Toxicology 26:446-452 | oxicity of p | riority po | ollutants | s to bluegill (Lepomis macrochirus). Bulletin of |
|------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------|------------------------|-----------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Data Type: Hero ID: | Acute (0-96 18064 | 5 hour); Aquatic; Fish | | | | |
| Domain | | Metric | Rating^\dagger | MWF^{\star} | Score | $Comments^{\dagger\dagger}$ |
| Domain 1: Test S | Substance | | | | | |
| | Metric 1: | Test Substance Identity | High | $\times 2$ | 2 | |
| | Metric 2: | Test Substance Source | Low | $\times 1$ | 3 | The study says all chemicals tested were purchased from commercial chemical suppliers, but does not specify where TCE came from. |
| | Metric 3: | Test Substance Purity | Low | × 1 | 3 | Study reports a minimum purity of 80 percent for all chemicals tested, but does not specify what the purity is for TCE. |
| Domain 2: Test I | Design | | | | | |
| | Metric 4: | Negative Controls | High | $\times 2$ | 2 | Both negative and solvent controls were used. |
| | Metric 5: | Negative Control Response | Low | $\times 1$ | 3 | There were many chemicals tested and do not give details about negative control response, although it says control mortality was recorded. |
| | Metric 6: | Randomized Allocation | High | $\times 1$ | 1 | "Ten fish were randomly selected from a test popu- lation and added to each test jar within 30 min after the addition of the test chemical or stock solution." |
| Domain 3: Expos | sure Characte | erization | | | | |
| Domain of Expo | Metric 7: | Experimental System/Test Media Prepara- tion | Medium | $\times 2$ | 4 | Volatile chemicals were capped, but it is unclear whether headspace was minimized in the jars and with the jars capped could have had low DO con- tent. |
| | Metric 8: | Consistency of Exposure Administration | High | $\times 1$ | 1 | |
| | Metric 9: | Measurement of Test Substance Concentra- tion | Low | $\times 2$ | 6 | Nominal concentrations were used and were not measured. TCE is volatile. |
| | Metric 10: | Exposure Duration and Frequency | High | $\times 1$ | 1 | Exposure is 96 hours which is OECD TG 203 recommended. |
| | Metric 11: | Number of Exposure Groups/Spacing of Exposure Levels | Low | × 1 | 3 | Study says that the test was conducted according to EPA's "Methods for acute toxicity tests with fish, macroinvertebrates, and amphibians" which says for static tests you must have 10 organisms in each treatment divided into at least two test chambers; not sure how they got the exposure concentrations used of what the exposure concentrations were. |
| | | Continued on next page | | | | |

| Study Citation: | Buccafusco | , R. J.,Ells, S. J.,Leblanc, G. A., 1981. Acute to | oxicity of p | riority po | ollutants | s to bluegill (Lepomis macrochirus). Bulletin of |
|-----------------|--------------|--------------------------------------------------------|--------------------|---------------|-----------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Data Trinai | A cuto (0.06 | tal Contamination and Toxicology 26:446-452 | | | | |
| Hero ID: | 18064 |) nour), Aquatic, Fish | | | | |
| | 10004 | | | | | |
| Domain | | Metric | $Rating^{\dagger}$ | MWF^{\star} | Score | Comments ^{††} |
| | Metric 12: | Testing at or Below Solubility Limit | Low | × 1 | 3 | Test substance concentration was not reported, and it was reported that some concentration there was undessolved chemical. |
| Domain 4: Test | Organism | | | | | |
| | Metric 13: | Test Organism Characteristics | Medium | $\times 2$ | 4 | Test animals utilized were young of the year bluegill (L. macrochirus) obtained from commercial fish sup- pliers within the continental United States. |
| | Metric 14: | Acclimitization and Pretreatment Conditions | Medium | × 1 | 2 | While it was reported that there was a 48 hour time where fish were observed and not used if had >3 percent mortality, it was not reported whether they were held for 12 days in the lab before they are used for testing. |
| | Metric 15: | Number of Organisms and Replicates per Group | Medium | $\times 1$ | 2 | Minor uncertainties around number of organisms used. |
| | Metric 16: | Adequacy of Test Conditions | Medium | $\times 1$ | 2 | Minor uncertainties around housing conditions (headspace in jar, DO concs). |
| Domain 5: Outo | mo Assossm | nnt. | | | | |
| Domain 5. Outco | Metric 17. | Outcome Assessment Methodology | High | × 2 | 2 | 24 and 96 hour LC50s |
| | Metric 18: | Consistency of Outcome Assessment | High | $\times 1$ | 1 | 21 and 50 hour Leoos |
| Domain 6: Confe | ounding / Va | riable Control | | | | |
| | Metric 19: | Confounding Variables in Test Design and Procedures | Low | $\times 2$ | 6 | Study did not provide enough information to allow a comparison of environmental conditions. |
| | Metric 20: | Outcomes Unrelated to Exposure | Low | $\times 1$ | 3 | Study did not provide enough information about health outcomes of each study group. |
| Domain 7: Data | Presentation | and Analysis | | | | |

Continued on next page ...

| Study Citation: Data Type: Hero ID: | Buccafusco Environmen Acute (0-96 18064 | , R. J.,Ells, S. J.,Leblanc, G. A., 1981. Acute atal Contamination and Toxicology 26:446-45: 5 hour); Aquatic; Fish | e toxicity of pr 2 | riority po | ollutants | s to bluegill (Lepomis macrochirus). Bulletin of |
|-------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------|---------------|-----------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Domain | | Metric | Rating^\dagger | MWF^{\star} | Score | $Comments^{\dagger\dagger}$ |
| | Metric 21: | Statistical Methods | Medium | × 1 | 2 | Not clear what method was used for TCE: "The LC50s and 95 percent confidence intervals were cal- culated, where possible, by the moving average an- gle method (HARRIS 1959). The nominal test con- centrations were transformed to logarithms and cor- responding percentage mortalities to angles. Each group of these successive angles was then averaged and the LC50 was estimated by linear interpolation between the successive concentrations whole aver- age angles bracketed 45". When the test data did not meet Harris' method requirements, the LC50s were calculated by the log probit method, a modifi- cation of the LITCHFIELD + WILCOXON (1949) method." |
| | Metric 22: | Reporting of Data | Low | $\times 2$ | 6 | The data for the static test were not presented in full, and no information was reported for controls. |
| | Metric 23: | Explanation of Unexpected Outcomes | High | × 1 | 1 | There were no unexpected outcomes for TCE in this paper. |
| Overall Quality I | Determination | n‡ | Medium | | 2.0 | |
| Extracted | | | Yes | | | |
| | | | | | | |

... continued from previous page

* MWF = Metric Weighting Factor

[†] High = 1; Medium = 2; Low = 3; Unacceptable = 4; N/A has no value.

[‡] The overall rating is calculated as necessary. EPA may not always provide a comment for a metric that has been categorized as High.

$$\text{Overall rating} = \begin{cases} 4 & \text{if any metric is Unacceptable} \\ \\ \left\lfloor \sum_{i} \left(\text{Metric Score}_{i} \times \text{MWF}_{i} \right) / \sum_{j} \text{MWF}_{j} \right\rceil_{0.1} & \text{(round to the nearest tenth) otherwise} \end{cases}$$

,

where High: ≥ 1 to < 1.7; Medium: ≥ 1.7 to < 2.3; Low: ≥ 2.3 to ≤ 3 . If the reviewer determines that the overall rating needs adjustment, the original rating is crossed out and an arrow points to the new rating.

| Hero ID: | Acute (0-96 32169 | 5 hour); Aquatic; Fish | | | | |
|------------------|------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|--------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Domain | | Metric | Rating^\dagger | MWF^{\star} | Score | $Comments^{\dagger\dagger}$ |
| Domain 1: Test S | Substance | | | | | |
| | Metric 1: | Test Substance Identity | High | $\times 2$ | 2 | Trichloroethylene identified by name, CAS, formul and molecular weight. |
| | Metric 2: | Test Substance Source | High | $\times 1$ | 1 | Aldrich Chemical Co |
| | Metric 3: | Test Substance Purity | Medium | × 1 | 2 | Purity reported at 98 percent, no mention of what impurities were. |
| Domain 2: Test I | Design | | | | | |
| | Metric 4: | Negative Controls | Medium | $\times 2$ | 4 | Two controls reported. Unsure what kind (water solvent?) |
| | Metric 5: | Negative Control Response | High | $\times 1$ | 1 | Response of control was reported. |
| | Metric 6: | Randomized Allocation | High | $\times 1$ | 1 | At the start of a test, individual fish were remove from the common pool of fish with a net and di tributed at random among the exposure chambers |
| Domain 3: Expos | sure Charact | erization | | | | |
| | Metric 7: | Experimental System/Test Media Prepara- | Low | $\times 2$ | 6 | Flow through system used using cycling proportion |
| | | tion | | | | diluters with duplicate tanks for each test conc. It unclear exactly what system was used for TCE b cause the description at the beginning of the pap is non-specific. It seems like the following syste was used: The electronic diluter was used for e pensive and volatile chemicals or when acute toxici was very close to water solubility. Another form a liquid-liquid equilibrator was constructed from 2.8 L culture flask atop a magnetic stirrer. A pur forced lake water into this closed system which co- tained a layer of the chemical. |
| | Metric 8: | tion Consistency of Exposure Administration | Medium | × 1 | 2 | diluters with duplicate tanks for each test conc. It unclear exactly what system was used for TCE b cause the description at the beginning of the pap is non-specific. It seems like the following syste was used: The electronic diluter was used for e pensive and volatile chemicals or when acute toxici was very close to water solubility. Another form a liquid-liquid equilibrator was constructed from 2.8 L culture flask atop a magnetic stirrer. A pun forced lake water into this closed system which co tained a layer of the chemical. Details of exposure administration was reported b it's unclear what type of administration applies what chemicals. |
| | Metric 8: Metric 9: | tion Consistency of Exposure Administration Measurement of Test Substance Concentra- tion | Medium High | $\times 1$ $\times 2$ | 2 2 | diluters with duplicate tanks for each test conc. If unclear exactly what system was used for TCE b cause the description at the beginning of the pap is non-specific. It seems like the following syste was used: The electronic diluter was used for e pensive and volatile chemicals or when acute toxici was very close to water solubility. Another form a liquid-liquid equilibrator was constructed from 2.8 L culture flask atop a magnetic stirrer. A pun forced lake water into this closed system which co tained a layer of the chemical. Details of exposure administration was reported b it's unclear what type of administration applies what chemicals. Test concentrations were measured by gas-liqu chromatography. |

| Study Citation: | Geiger, D. I promelas): | ,Northcott, C. E.,Call, D. J.,Brooke, L. T. eds. volume II. | 1985. Acut | e toxiciti | es of org | anic chemicals to fathead minnows (Pimephales |
|------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------|------------|-----------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Data Type: | Acute (0-96 | hour); Aquatic; Fish | | | | |
| Hero ID: | 32169 | | | | | |
| Domain | | Metric | Rating^\dagger | MWF^* | Score | $Comments^{\dagger\dagger}$ |
| | Metric 11: | Number of Exposure Groups/Spacing of Exposure Levels | Medium | × 1 | 2 | Five exposure concentrations were used, and measured concentrations were used, but it's unclear how exactly an appropriate conc was determined. No limit test is mentioned, only that test mean concentrations were usually >60 percent of saturation. The toxicant concentrations were 100, 80, 60, 40, and 20 percent of the toxicant stock. In cases where test chemical quantities were limited, toxicant concentrations were condensed to 100, 66, and 33 percent of the toxicant stock. |
| | Metric 12: | Testing at or Below Solubility Limit | High | $\times 1$ | 1 | Measured conc were reported and are below solubil- ity. |
| Domain 4: Test (| Irconicm | | | | | |
| Domain 4. Test C | Metric 13: | Test Organism Characteristics | High | $\times 2$ | 2 | Fathead minnows used in this test. |
| | | Continued on next page | | | | |

| Study Citation: | Geiger, D. I promelas): | .,Northcott, C. E.,Call, D. J.,Brooke, L. T. eds. volume II. | 1985. Acut | e toxiciti | es of org | anic chemicals to fathead minnows (Pimephales |
|------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|------------|-----------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Data Type: Hero ID: | Acute (0-96 32169 | hour); Aquatic; Fish | | | | |
| Domain | | Metric | $\operatorname{Rating}^{\dagger}$ | MWF^* | Score | $Comments^{\dagger\dagger}$ |
| | Metric 14: | Acclimitization and Pretreatment Conditions | Medium | × 1 | 2 | Only minor uncertainties. Study reports, "Fathead minnows used in the tests were cultured at the U.S. EPA Environmental Research Laboratory-Duluth and the University of Wisconsin-Superior campus. Adults were held at 25"C in flowing water with a 16 hr light-controlled photo-period and fed frozen adult brine shrimp (Artemia sp.). They were provided with asbestos pipes (cut in half longitudinally) as spawning substrates, where naturally spawned and fertilized embryos attached to the underside. The substrates, with intact embryos, were removed daily and placed in another 25C bath where hatching occurred; however the spawning substrates were removed just prior to hatching at the UW-Superior culture unit, then placed in a rearing bath. For tests conducted in 1977-1982, newly hatched larvae from the stock culture unit were reared in a system similar to the exposure systems at a temperature of 25C. Tests conducted following 1982 used fish that had been reared in flow-through tanks in the lab 1s culture unit. Larvae were fed 40-48 hr old brine shrimp nauplii (Bio-Marine Research, Inc., Hawthorne, CA) in excess two times daily (once on week-end days). Embryos and larvae were cultured in water from the same source as used in the exposures sto the test chemicals. Fish that were approximately 28-34 days old were used in the toxicity tests." Note, it is acceptable to use asbestos pipes for spawning purposes. |
| | Metric 15: | Number of Organisms and Replicates per Group | Low | $\times 1$ | 3 | Number of test organisms was not reported for stud- ies prior to 1982. The TCE test was in 1979. |
| | Metric 16: | Adequacy of Test Conditions | Medium | × 1 | 2 | Only minor uncertainties. The temperature is appropriate for fathead minnows according to OECD guidelines (OECD TG 203). |
| Domain 5: Outco | me Assessme | nt | | | | |
| Domain 5. Outee | Metric 17: | Outcome Assessment Methodology | High | $\times 2$ | 2 | An LC50 was derived. |
| | Metric 18: | Consistency of Outcome Assessment | High | $\times 1$ | 1 | Consistent assessment for outcomes in each study group. |
| | | | | | | |
| | | Continued on next page | | | | |

... continued from previous page

| Study Citation: | Geiger, D. L | .,Northcott, C. E.,Call, D. J.,Brooke, L. T. eds. | 1985. Acut | e toxiciti | es of org | ganic chemicals to fathead minnows (Pimephales |
|-------------------|---------------|--------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------|------------------------|-----------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Data Type: | Acute (0-96 | hour); Aquatic; Fish | | | | |
| Hero ID: | 32169 | | | | | |
| Domain | | Metric | Rating^\dagger | MWF^{\star} | Score | $\mathrm{Comments}^{\dagger\dagger}$ |
| Domain 6: Confo | ounding / Var | iable Control | | | | |
| | Metric 19: | Confounding Variables in Test Design and Procedures | High | $\times 2$ | 2 | No reported differences between study groups. |
| | Metric 20: | Outcomes Unrelated to Exposure | Medium | × 1 | 2 | Data on attrition or health impacts unrelated to exposure were not reported for each study group, because only substantial differences among groups were noted. |
| Domain 7: Data | Presentation | and Analysis | | | | |
| | Metric 21: | Statistical Methods | High | × 1 | 1 | The estimated LC50 (lethal concentration causing 50 percent mortality of thefish) and EC50 (effect concentration causing 50 percent of the fish to show aneffect) with corresponding 95 percent confidence intervals were calculated using the corrected aver- ages of the analyzed tank concentrations and the Trimmed Spearman-Karber Method (Hamilton et al., 1977). In cases of duplicate exposures, the effect and mortaHty data were pooled, resulting in a sin- gle estimate of LC50 and EC50 per test. The EC50s are based upon loss of equilib.rium manifested by the fish's inability to maintain an upright position when swimming. Calculations were made for 96 hr of exposure and also for intermediate exposure times. The mean toxicant concentrations used in the cal- culations were corrected for analytical recoveries of spiked water samples. Some LC50 data may vary slightly from previously published literature due to the inclusion of a spike recovery factor in this vol- ume. |
| | Metric 22: | Reporting of Data | High | $\times 2$ | 2 | Each exposure group results were reported. |
| | Metric 23: | Explanation of Unexpected Outcomes | High | × 1 | 1 | No unexpected outcomes were reported. |
| Overall Quality I | Determination | ţ | High | | 1.5 | |
| Extracted | | | Yes | | | |
| | | Continued on next page | | | | |

... continued from previous page

| Study Citation: | Geiger, D. L.,Northcott, C. E.,Call, D. J.,Brooke, L. T. | eds. 1985. Acute toxicities of organic chemi | icals to fathead minnows (Pimephales |
|-----------------|----------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| | promelas): volume II. | | |
| Data Type: | Acute (0-96 hour); Aquatic; Fish | | |
| Hero ID: | 32169 | | |
| Domain | Metric | $Rating^{\dagger}$ MWF [*] Score | $Comments^{\dagger\dagger}$ |

... continued from previous page

* MWF = Metric Weighting Factor

[†] High = 1; Medium = 2; Low = 3; Unacceptable = 4; N/A has no value.

[‡] The overall rating is calculated as necessary. EPA may not always provide a comment for a metric that has been categorized as High.

$$Overall rating = \begin{cases} 4 & \text{if any metric is Unacceptable} \\ \left\lfloor \sum_{i} (Metric \ Score_{i} \times MWF_{i}) / \sum_{j} MWF_{j} \right\rfloor_{0,1} & (round to the nearest tenth) otherwise \end{cases}$$

,

where High: ≥ 1 to < 1.7; Medium: ≥ 1.7 to < 2.3; Low: ≥ 2.3 to ≤ 3 . If the reviewer determines that the overall rating needs adjustment, the original rating is crossed out and an arrow points to the new rating.

| Data Type: Hero ID: | Alexander, methylene o Acute (0-96 58126 | chloride to fathead minnows. Bulletin of Enviro 5 hour); Aquatic; Fish static | nmental Co | ntaminati | on and ' | Toxicology 20:344-352 |
|------------------------|---------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|------------------------|----------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Domain | | Metric | $\operatorname{Rating}^{\dagger}$ | MWF^{\star} | Score | $Comments^{\dagger\dagger}$ |
| Domain 1: Test | Substance | | | | | |
| | Metric 1: | Test Substance Identity | High | $\times 2$ | 2 | trichloroethylene identified by name |
| | Metric 2: | Test Substance Source | Medium | $\times 1$ | 2 | Authors work for chemical company that produces TCE. |
| | Metric 3: | Test Substance Purity | Low | × 1 | 3 | Not indicated, but because TCE is a common sol- vent produced by the company, assuming at mini- mum technical grade. |
| Domain 2: Test | Design | | | | | |
| | Metric 4: | Negative Controls | High | $\times 2$ | 2 | |
| | Metric 5: | Negative Control Response | Low | $\times 1$ | 3 | Not indicated, only LC50 for TCE reported., but no deviances from test guideline [COMMITTEE ON METHODS FOR TOXICITY TESTS WITH- AQUATIC ORGANISMS (1975)] indicated. |
| | Metric 6: | Randomized Allocation | Low | $\times 1$ | 3 | Randomization not indicated, but followed test guidelines. |
| Domain 3: Expo | sure Characte | erization | | | | |
| Ĩ | Metric 7: | Experimental System/Test Media Preparation | Low | $\times 2$ | 6 | Covered with plastic wrap, but no indication that headspace minimized. |
| | Metric 8: | Consistency of Exposure Administration | High | $\times 1$ | 1 | |
| | Metric 9: | Measurement of Test Substance Concentra- tion | Low | × 2 | 6 | No measurements were made in the static test and this chemical is very volatile. It was mentioned that containers were covered but there was no mention of headspace minimizing. "In the static water fish toxi- city tests the nominal concentration, or that amount of chemical initially added to the test chambers, was used to calculate the LC 10, LC SO, and LC 90 tox- icity values." |
| | Metric 10: | Exposure Duration and Frequency | High | $\times 1$ | 1 | |
| | Metric 11: | Number of Exposure Groups/Spacing of Exposure Levels | Low | $\times 1$ | 3 | Test concentrations not provided. |
| | Metric 12: | Testing at or Below Solubility Limit | High | $\times 1$ | 1 | |
| | | Continued on next page | | | | |

| Study Citation: | Alexander, | H. C.,McCarty, W. M.,Bartlett, E. A., 1978. | Toxicity of | perchloroe | ethylene | , trichloroethylene, 1,1,1-trichloroethane, and |
|--------------------|---------------|--------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|------------|----------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Data Type: | Acute (0-96 | b hour); Aquatic; Fish static | nmentar Co | mannan | on and | TOXICOlogy 20:344-352 |
| Hero ID: | 58126 | | | | | |
| Domain | | Metric | $\operatorname{Rating}^{\dagger}$ | MWF^* | Score | $Comments^{\dagger\dagger}$ |
| Domain 4: Test (| Organism | | | | | |
| 2011/01/11/12/02/0 | Metric 13: | Test Organism Characteristics | Low | $\times 2$ | 6 | Fathead minnow is a well known lab species; but from a bait shop, rather than cultured under con- trolled conditions. |
| | Metric 14: | Acclimitization and Pretreatment Conditions | High | $\times 1$ | 1 | |
| | Metric 15: | Number of Organisms and Replicates per Group | Low | $\times 1$ | 3 | Not indicated, but based on use of test guideline, suggests adequate number for statistical analysis. |
| | Metric 16: | Adequacy of Test Conditions | High | $\times 1$ | 1 | |
| Domain 5: Outco | ome Assessme | ent | | | | |
| | Metric 17: | Outcome Assessment Methodology | High | $\times 2$ | 2 | |
| | Metric 18: | Consistency of Outcome Assessment | High | $\times 1$ | 1 | |
| Domain 6: Confe | unding / Var | iable Control | | | | |
| | Metric 19: | Confounding Variables in Test Design and Procedures | High | $\times 2$ | 2 | |
| | Metric 20: | Outcomes Unrelated to Exposure | High | $\times 1$ | 1 | |
| Domain 7: Data | Presentation | and Analysis | | | | |
| | Metric 21: | Statistical Methods | High | × 1 | 1 | |
| | Metric 22: | Reporting of Data | High | $\times 2$ | 2 | |
| | Metric 23: | Explanation of Unexpected Outcomes | High | $\times 1$ | 1 | |
| Overall Quality I | Determinatior | 1 [‡] | $High \longrightarrow$ | Medium | 1.7 | |
| Extracted | | | Yes | | | |

* MWF = Metric Weighting Factor

[†] High = 1; Medium = 2; Low = 3; Unacceptable = 4; N/A has no value.

[‡] The overall rating is calculated as necessary. EPA may not always provide a comment for a metric that has been categorized as High.

$$Overall rating = \begin{cases} 4 & \text{if any metric is Unacceptable} \\ \left\lfloor \sum_{i} \left(\text{Metric Score}_{i} \times \text{MWF}_{i} \right) / \sum_{j} \text{MWF}_{j} \right\rfloor_{0,1} & \text{(round to the nearest tenth) otherwise} \end{cases}$$

,

where High: ≥ 1 to < 1.7; Medium: ≥ 1.7 to < 2.3; Low: ≥ 2.3 to ≤ 3 . If the reviewer determines that the overall rating needs adjustment, the original rating is crossed out and an arrow points to the new rating.

| Data Type: Hero ID: | Methylene o Acute (0-96 58126 | 5 hour); Aquatic; Fish flow-through | nmental Co | ntaminat | tion and | 1 10x1cology 20:344-352 |
|------------------------|-------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------|--------------------|---------------|----------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Domain | | Metric | $Rating^{\dagger}$ | MWF^{\star} | Score | $Comments^{\dagger\dagger}$ |
| Domain 1: Test \$ | Substance | | | | | |
| | Metric 1: | Test Substance Identity | High | $\times 2$ | 2 | |
| | Metric 2: | Test Substance Source | Medium | $\times 1$ | 2 | Authors work for chemical company that produces TCE. |
| | Metric 3: | Test Substance Purity | Low | $\times 1$ | 3 | Not indicated, but because TCE is a common solvent produced by the company, assuming at mini- mum technical grade. |
| Domain 2: Test 1 | Design | | | | | |
| | Metric 4: | Negative Controls | High | × 2 | 2 | Methyl or ethyl alcohol was used as the carrier sol- vent for allcompounds except methylene chloride. A control containing the sameamount of alcohol that is present in the highest chemical concentration and a Lake Huron water control were included in each test series. |
| | Metric 5: | Negative Control Response | Low | × 1 | 3 | Not indicated, only LC50 for TCE reported., but no deviances from test guideline [COMMITTEE ON METHODS FOR TOXICITY TESTS WITH- AQUATIC ORGANISMS (1975)] indicated. |
| | Metric 6: | Randomized Allocation | Low | $\times 1$ | 3 | Randomization not indicated, but followed test guidelines. |
| Domain 3. Expo | sure Characte | erization | | | | |
| 2 onnam of Enpor | Metric 7: | Experimental System/Test Media Prepara- tion | Medium | $\times 2$ | 4 | Covered with plastic wrap, but no indication that headspace minimized. |
| | Metric 8: | Consistency of Exposure Administration | High | $\times 1$ | 1 | |
| | Metric 9: | Measurement of Test Substance Concentra- tion | High | $\times 2$ | 2 | Gas chromatography used to analyze test concentrations daily. |
| | Metric 10: | Exposure Duration and Frequency | High | $\times 1$ | 1 | |
| | Metric 11: | Number of Exposure Groups/Spacing of Exposure Levels | Low | $\times 1$ | 3 | Test concentrations not provided. |
| | Metric 12: | Testing at or Below Solubility Limit | High | $\times 1$ | 1 | |

| Study Citation: | Alexander, H. C.,McCarty, W. M.,Bartlett, E. A., 1978. Toxicity of perchloroethylene, trichloroethylene, 1,1,1-trichloroethane, and mathylane chloride to fathead minnoux. Bulletin of Environmental Contamination and Toxicology 20:344, 352 | | | | | | | |
|------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------|---------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|--|
| Data Type: Hero ID: | Acute (0-96 58126 | bour); Aquatic; Fish flow-through | innentai Oc | manna | Jon and | TOXICOlogy 20.344-352 | | |
| Domain | | Metric | $\operatorname{Rating}^{\dagger}$ | MWF^{\star} | Score | $Comments^{\dagger\dagger}$ | | |
| Domain 4: Test (| Organism | | | | | | | |
| | Metric 13: | Test Organism Characteristics | Low | $\times 2$ | 6 | Fathead minnow is a well known lab species; but from a bait shop, rather than cultured under con- trolled conditions. | | |
| | Metric 14: | Acclimitization and Pretreatment Conditions | High | $\times 1$ | 1 | | | |
| | Metric 15: | Number of Organisms and Replicates per Group | Low | $\times 1$ | 3 | Not indicated, but based on use of test guideline, suggests adequate number for statistical analysis. | | |
| | Metric 16: | Adequacy of Test Conditions | High | $\times 1$ | 1 | | | |
| Domain 5: Outco | ome Assessme | ent. | | | | | | |
| | Metric 17: | Outcome Assessment Methodology | High | $\times 2$ | 2 | | | |
| | Metric 18: | Consistency of Outcome Assessment | High | $\times 1$ | 1 | | | |
| Domain 6: Confe | unding / Ver | viable Control | | | | | | |
| Domain 6: Conic | Motrie 10: | Confounding Variables in Test Design and | High | × 9 | 9 | | | |
| | Metric 19. | Procedures | mgn | ~ 2 | 2 | | | |
| | Metric 20: | Outcomes Unrelated to Exposure | High | $\times 1$ | 1 | | | |
| Domain 7: Data | Presentation | and Analysis | | | | | | |
| Domain 1. Data | Metric 21: | Statistical Methods | High | × 1 | 1 | | | |
| | Metric 22: | Reporting of Data | High | $\times 2$ | 2 | | | |
| | Metric 23: | Explanation of Unexpected Outcomes | High | $\times 1$ | 1 | | | |
| Overall Quality I | Determination | ,ŧ | High | | 1.5 | | | |
| | | - | 8 | | 1.0 | | | |
| Extracted | | | Yes | | | | | |

* MWF = Metric Weighting Factor

[†] High = 1; Medium = 2; Low = 3; Unacceptable = 4; N/A has no value.

(4

[‡] The overall rating is calculated as necessary. EPA may not always provide a comment for a metric that has been categorized as High.

Overall rating =
$$\left\{ \left[\sum_{i} \left(\text{Metric Score}_{i} \times \text{MWF}_{i} \right) / \sum_{j} \text{MWF}_{j} \right]_{0,1} \right.$$
(round to the nearest tenth) otherwise

if any metric is Unacceptable

where High: ≥ 1 to < 1.7; Medium: ≥ 1.7 to < 2.3; Low: ≥ 2.3 to ≤ 3 . If the reviewer determines that the overall rating needs adjustment, the original rating is crossed out and an arrow points to the new rating.

| Study Citation: | Fort, D. J., detoxificati | Stover, E. L., Rayburn, J. R., Hull, M., Ba on metabolites using Xenopus. Birth D | antle, J. A 1993. E efects Research, Par | Evaluation et B: Dev | n of the relopme | developmental toxicity of trichloroethylene and ntal and Reproductive Toxicology 13:35-45 |
|------------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------|-------------------------|---------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Data Type: Hero ID: | Other; Aqu 68271 | atic; other South African clawed frog | | | | |
| Domain | | Metric | $\operatorname{Rating}^{\dagger}$ | MWF^{\star} | Score | $Comments^{\dagger\dagger}$ |
| Domain 1: Test S | Substance | | | | | |
| | Metric 1: | Test Substance Identity | High | $\times 2$ | 2 | Chemical identified by its name trichloroethylene. |
| | Metric 2: | Test Substance Source | High | $\times 1$ | 1 | "Trichloroethylene and cyclohexene oxide were ob- tained from the Aldrich Chemical Company, Mil- waukee, Wisconsin." |
| | Metric 3: | Test Substance Purity | Low | $\times 1$ | 3 | Purity and grade were not reported. |
| Domain 2: Test l | Design Matria 4 | Naratina Controla | Hish | v 9 | 0 | |
| | Metric 4: | Negative Controis | nıgı | × 2 | 2 | ^m Ten to sixteen concentrations were tested in du- plicate. Four separate dishes of 20 embryos each were exposed to FETAX solution and designated FETAX solution controls. Controls, including FET- TAX solution, I percent v/v DMSO, uninhibited MAS (with and without DMSO), each inhibited MAS (with and without DMSO), each inhibited MAS (with and without DMSO), activated acetyl- hyclrazide (FETAX reference proteratogen), and un- activated toxicant, were tested simultaneously with each experiment. All control treatments received an- tibiotics, as well." |
| | Metric 5: | Negative Control Response | High | × 1 | 1 | "In each of the experiments conducted, the FETAX solution, 1 percent v/v DMSO, andMAS or MAS with 1 percent v/v DMSO, control mortality and malformation rates were less than or equal to 5 percent. Mortality and malformation rates for the inhibited MAS failed to exceed 6 percent. Embryos exposed to 3. 0 g/l acetylhydrazide and the intact MAS exhibited mortality and deformity rates of greater than or equal to 90 percent and 100 percent, respectively." |
| | Metric 6: | Randomized Allocation | Low | $\times 1$ | 3 | Researchers did not report how organisms were al- located to study groups. |
| Domain 3: Expos | sure Charact | erization | | | | |

Continued on next page ...

| Study Citation: Data Type: Hero ID: | Fort, D. J., detoxificati Other; Aqu 68271 | Stover, E. L.,Rayburn, J. R.,Hull, M.,Bantle, J. on metabolites using Xenopus. Birth Defects Re natic; other South African clawed frog | A 1993. H esearch, Pa | Evaluation rt B: Dev | n of the elopmer | developmental toxicity of trichloroethylene and ntal and Reproductive Toxicology 13:35-45 |
|-------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------------|---------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Domain | | Metric | $\operatorname{Rating}^{\dagger}$ | MWF^{\star} | Score | ${ m Comments}^{\dagger\dagger}$ |
| | Metric 7: | Experimental System/Test Media Prepara- tion | High | × 2 | 2 | A static renewal test was used for this assay and closed dishes were used which is important given TCE's volatility. "For experiments conducted with- out the MAS, groups of 20 embryos were placed in covered 60 mm plastic Petri dishes (Fisher Scien- tific, Houston, Texas) with varying constant con- centrations of trichloroethylene, dichloroacetic acid, trichloroacetic acid, trichloroethanol or oxalic acid." |
| | Metric 8: | Consistency of Exposure Administration | High | × 1 | 1 | "Trichloroethylene was dissolved in 1 percent v/ v dimethylsulfoxide (DMSO) in FETAX solution. Ten to sixteen concentrations were tested in du- plicate. Four separate dishes of 20 embryos each were exposed to FETAX solution and designated FETAX solution controls. Each treatment vessel contained a total of 8 ml of solution. Tests con- ducted with the MAS or inhibited MAS were also performed in duplicate with 20 embryos exposed per replicate concentration. Each metabolically ac- tivated treatment received $O.A_n111its/dish$ of N- nitrosodimethylamine activity 1 a NADPH generat- ing system, and a penicillin-streptomycin mixture to control bacterial contamination. For each treat- ment, 8 to 14 concentrations were tested. Controls, including FETAX solution, I percent v/v DMSO, uninhibited MAS (with and without DMSO), each inhibited MAS (with and without DMSO), acti- vated acetylhyclrazide (FETAX reference proterato- gen) [12], and unactivated toxicant, were tested simultaneously with each experiment. All control treatments received antibiotics, as well. One range- finding and two definitive concentration-response ex- periments were conducted with and without the MAS or inhibited MAS. The pH of each of the stock solutions was adjusted to 7.0 with NaOH. Embryos were cultured at 23 " 1.CT'C. All solutions were changed every 24 h of the 4-day test, dead embryos removed, and fresh solutions added. Following 96 h of exposure (stage 46 embryos), embryos were fixed in 0. 7 percent formalin (pH7 7.0), and the number of live malformed embryos were ascertained using a dissecting microscope." |

Continued on next page ...

| continued from previous page | | | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------|-------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|--|--|
| Study Citation: Data Type: Hero ID: | Study Citation:Fort, D. J., Stover, E. L., Rayburn, J. R., Hull, M., Bantle, J. A 1993. Evaluation of the developmental toxicity of trichloroethylene and detoxification metabolites using Xenopus. Birth Defects Research, Part B: Developmental and Reproductive Toxicology 13:35-45Data Type:Other; Aquatic; other South African clawed frogHero ID:68271 | | | | | | | | |
| Domain | | Metric | $\operatorname{Rating}^{\dagger}$ | MWF^{\star} | Score | $Comments^{\dagger\dagger}$ | | | |
| | Metric 9: | Measurement of Test Substance Concentra- tion | Low | $\times 2$ | 6 | Study does not report whether measurements were taken, but it does say that it was a static renewal test and that each petri dish had varying constant concentrations of TCE. | | | |
| | Metric 10: | Exposure Duration and Frequency | High | $\times 1$ | 1 | 96 hours of exposure and which is recommended for African clawed frog tadpoles for acute tests and fresh solution was added every 24 hours. | | | |
| | Metric 11: | Number of Exposure Groups/Spacing of Exposure Levels | Medium | $\times 1$ | 2 | It was mentioned that a range finding test was con- ducted prior to the assay, but not mentioned how the spacing of the conc were decided on. | | | |
| | Metric 12: | Testing at or Below Solubility Limit | High | $\times 1$ | 1 | EC50s were far below the solubility for TCE. | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| Domain 4: Test Or | rganism Metric 13: | Test Organism Characteristics | High | $\times 2$ | 2 | Xenopus laevis was used and is the recommended species for these tests according to EPA's test guid- ance 890.2300. | | | |
| | Metric 14: | Acclimitization and Pretreatment Conditions | Low | $\times 1$ | 3 | Unable to fully determine from this study because it reports that "Xenopus adult care, breeding, and embryo collection were performed as described by Dawson and Ban tie [17]." | | | |
| | Metric 15: | Number of Organisms and Replicates per Group | Medium | $\times 1$ | 2 | 20 animals per dish were tested which is recom- mended in EPA guidelines, but only two replicates were used where as guidelines recommend 3 for ex- posure groups and 4 for controls. | | | |
| | Metric 16: | Adequacy of Test Conditions | Low | × 1 | 3 | EPA guidelines (OPPTS 890.1100) recommend 4 " 10 L (10 - 15 cm minimum water depth) /glass or stainless steel, and study reports only 8 ml of solu- tion. | | | |
| Domain 5. Octor | . A agogge | | | | | | | | |
| Domain 5: Outcon | Metric 17. | Outcome Assessment Methodology | High | × 2 | 2 | A 96 hour EC50 and LC50 were determined | | | |
| | Metric 18: | Consistency of Outcome Assessment | Medium | × 1 | 2 | Incomplete reporting of minor details of outcome as- sessment protocol across study groups. | | | |
| Domain C. Corr | unding / V | ichle Control | | | | | | | |
| Domain 6: Confou | Metric 19: | Confounding Variables in Test Design and Procedures | High | $\times 2$ | 2 | No reported differences among study groups in en- vironmental conditions. | | | |
| | Continued on next page | | | | | | | | |

| Study Citation: Data Type: Hero ID: | Fort, D. J., detoxificatio Other; Aqu 68271 | Fort, D. J., Stover, E. L., Rayburn, J. R., Hull, M., Bantle, J. A 1993. Evaluation of the developmental toxicity of trichloroethylene and detoxification metabolites using Xenopus. Birth Defects Research, Part B: Developmental and Reproductive Toxicology 13:35-45 Other; Aquatic; other South African clawed frog 68271 | | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|------------|-------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|--|--|--|
| Domain | | Metric | $\operatorname{Rating}^{\dagger}$ | MWF^* | Score | $Comments^{\dagger\dagger}$ | | | | |
| | Metric 20: | Outcomes Unrelated to Exposure | Medium | × 1 | 2 | Data on attrition and health outcomes unrelated to exposure were not reported for each study group. (Table 2 and 3 show percent responding out of the total number of organisms for each exposure group, but not attrition, or other health outcomes.) | | | | |
| Domain 7: Data | Presentation | and Analysis | | | | | | | | |
| | Metric 21: | Statistical Methods | High | × 1 | 1 | "Litchfield-Wilcoxon prob it analysis [19] was used to determine the 96 h median lethal (LC50) and ter- atogenic (EC50) concentrations of two pooled defini- tive concentration-response tests. The 95 percent confidence intervals were calculated as well. A ter- atogenic index (TI) was calculated by taking the ra- tio of the 96 h LC50 value to the 96 h EC50 (mal- formation) value as a means of assessing teratogenic potential [17]. Ninety-five percent fiducial inter- vals for the TI values were calculated by the method of Finney [20]. Head-tail length of surviving em- bryos was measured as an index of growth using an IBM-AT compatible computer and Sigma Scan (Jan- del Scientific, Corte Madra, CA) digitizing software. The length data were then used to calculate a mini- mum concentration to inhibit growth (MCIG) value for each experiment using the t-test (P <0.05)." | | | | |
| | Metric 22: | Reporting of Data | High | $\times 2$ | 2 | Data on exposure related findings were presented for each treatment and control group. | | | | |
| | Metric 23: | Explanation of Unexpected Outcomes | High | × 1 | 1 | There was an explanation of why the authors thought the controls died in the MAS activated group. | | | | |
| Overall Quality I | Determination | 1 [‡] | High | | 1.5 | | | | | |
| Extracted | | | Yes | | | | | | | |
| Continued on next page | | | | | | | | | | |

... continued from previous page

| Study Citation: | Fort, D. J., Stover, E. L., Rayburn, J. R., Hull, M., Bantl detoxification metabolites using Xenopus. Birth Defec | e, J. A., 1993. Evaluation of the developmental and H | nental toxicity of trichloroethylene and Reproductive Toxicology 13:35-45 |
|------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Data Type: Hero ID: | Other; Aquatic; other South African clawed frog 68271 | and I be research, I are b. bevelopmental and I | toproductive Toxicology 10.00 10 |
| Domain | Metric | $Rating^{\dagger}$ MWF [*] Score | $\mathrm{Comments}^{\dagger\dagger}$ |

* MWF = Metric Weighting Factor

[†] High = 1; Medium = 2; Low = 3; Unacceptable = 4; N/A has no value.

[‡] The overall rating is calculated as necessary. EPA may not always provide a comment for a metric that has been categorized as High.

$$Overall rating = \begin{cases} 4 & \text{if any metric is Unacceptable} \\ \\ \left\lfloor \sum_{i} \left(\text{Metric Score}_{i} \times \text{MWF}_{i} \right) / \sum_{j} \text{MWF}_{j} \right\rceil_{0,1} & \text{(round to the nearest tenth) otherwise} \end{cases},$$

where High: ≥ 1 to < 1.7; Medium: ≥ 1.7 to < 2.3; Low: ≥ 2.3 to ≤ 3 . If the reviewer determines that the overall rating needs adjustment, the original rating is crossed out and an arrow points to the new rating.

| Study Citation: | Sanchez-For sensitivity of Toxicology | rtun, S.,Sanz, F.,Santa-Maria, A.,Ros, J. M.,De of three age classes of Artemia salina larvae to 59:445-451 | Vicente, M seven chlor | I. L.,Enci inated so | inas, M olvents. | . T., Vinagre, E., Barahona, M. V 1997. Acute Bulletin of Environmental Contamination and |
|------------------------|---------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------|---------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Data Type: Hero ID: | Acute (0-96 200570 | b hour); Aquatic; Invertebrates | | | | |
| Domain | | Metric | Rating^\dagger | MWF^* | Score | $Comments^{\dagger\dagger}$ |
| Domain 1: Test S | Substance | | | | | |
| | Metric 1: | Test Substance Identity | High | $\times 2$ | 2 | |
| | Metric 2: | Test Substance Source | High | × 1 | 1 | |
| | Metric 3: | Test Substance Purity | Medium | × 1 | 2 | Purity not provided but authors note it is analytical grade |
| Domain 2: Test l | Design | | | | | |
| | Metric 4: | Negative Controls | High | $\times 2$ | 2 | |
| | Metric 5: | Negative Control Response | Medium | × 1 | 2 | Control response not reported but not expected to affect results. Typically multi-chemical tests will only report control results if significant (i.e. > 10 percent mortality). |
| | Metric 6: | Randomized Allocation | Low | $\times 1$ | 3 | Not reported |
| Damain 9. France | Classication | | | | | |
| Domain 5: Expos | Motrie 7. | Erration | Low | × 9 | C | |
| | Metric 7: | tion | LOW | X Z | 0 | Nominal concentrations used without steps to reduce volatilization of TCE. |
| | Metric 8: | Consistency of Exposure Administration | High | $\times 1$ | 1 | |
| | Metric 9: | Measurement of Test Substance Concentra- tion | Low | $\times 2$ | 6 | Nominal concentrations with no analytical monitor- ing reduces confidence in study results for methylene chloride, but a trend is apparent when compared across the solvents tested that informs the relative toxicity of TCE. |
| | Metric 10: | Exposure Duration and Frequency | High | $\times 1$ | 1 | 24-72 hours. |
| | Metric 11: | Number of Exposure Groups/Spacing of Exposure Levels | Low | × 1 | 3 | Study does not provide exposure concentrations, but paper indicates that "Each solvent concentration was set in sextuplicate" suggesting six exposure con- centrations were used for TCE. LC50/EC50s were determined indicating exposure concentrations suf- ficiently spaced. |
| | Metric 12: | Testing at or Below Solubility Limit | High | $\times 1$ | 1 | |
| Domain 4: Test (| Organism | | | | | |

_

Continued on next page ...

| Study Citation: | Sanchez-Fortun, S., Sanz, F., Santa-Maria, A., Ros, J. M., De Vicente, M. L., Encinas, M. T., Vinagre, E., Barahona, M. V 1997. Acute sensitivity of three age classes of Artemia salina larvae to seven chlorinated solvents. Bulletin of Environmental Contamination and Toxicology 59:445-451 | | | | | | | |
|------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------|-------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|--|
| Data Type: Hero ID: | Acute (0-96 200570 | hour); Aquatic; Invertebrates | | | | | | |
| Domain | | Metric | $\operatorname{Rating}^{\dagger}$ | MWF^{\star} | Score | $Comments^{\dagger\dagger}$ | | |
| | Metric 13. | Test Organism Characteristics | High | × 2 | 2 | | | |
| | Metric 14: | Acclimitization and Pretreatment Conditions | High | × 1 | 1 | | | |
| | Metric 15: | Number of Organisms and Replicates per Group | High | $\times 1$ $\times 1$ | 1 | 10 animals and four replicates per TCE concentra- tion tested. | | |
| | Metric 16: | Adequacy of Test Conditions | High | $\times 1$ | 1 | | | |
| Domain 5: Outco | me Assessme | pat | | | | | | |
| Domain 5. Outee | Metric 17. | Outcome Assessment Methodology | High | × 2 | 2 | | | |
| | Metric 18: | Consistency of Outcome Assessment | High | × 1 | 1 | | | |
| | | | 111,911 | ~ 1 | - | | | |
| Domain 6: Confo | unding / Var | iable Control | | | | | | |
| 20111011 01 001110 | Metric 19: | Confounding Variables in Test Design and | High | $\times 2$ | 2 | | | |
| | | Procedures | | | | | | |
| | Metric 20: | Outcomes Unrelated to Exposure | Medium | × 1 | 2 | Health outcomes unrelated to exposure (i.e. con- trols) not reported, but not expected to affect inter- pretation of results. | | |
| Domain 7. Data | Presentation | and Analysis | | | | | | |
| Domain 1. Dava | Metric 21: | Statistical Methods | High | × 1 | 1 | "The 24 hr-LC50 values, with 95 percent confidence limits, were calculated according to Litchfield and Wilcoxon method (1949) implemented in the Phar- macologicCalculation System (PCS version 4.0, New York). These values were subjected to a two-way analysis of variance with replication within the sub- groups (ANOVA), followed by post hoc contrast with Newman-Keuls Test." | | |
| | Metric 22: | Reporting of Data | Medium | $\times 2$ | 4 | Control results not provided, but unlikely to impact results. | | |
| | Metric 23: | Explanation of Unexpected Outcomes | High | $\times 1$ | 1 | | | |
| Overall Quality I | Determination | ,‡ | High – | $\rightarrow Low$ | 1.5 | Nominal concentrations without analytical measure- ment or measures to reduce volatilization of TCE during testing. | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | Continued on next page | Continued on next page | | | | | |

| Study Citation: | Sanchez-Fortun, S.,Sanz, F.,Santa-Maria, A.,Ros, J sensitivity of three age classes of Artemia salina lat Toxicology 59:445-451 | . M.,De Vicente, M. L.,Encinas, M. rvae to seven chlorinated solvents. | . T., Vinagre, E., Barahona, M. V 1997. Acute Bulletin of Environmental Contamination and |
|-----------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Data Type: | Acute (0-96 hour); Aquatic; Invertebrates | | |
| Hero ID: | 200570 | | |
| Domain | Metric | $Rating^{\dagger}$ MWF [*] Score | $Comments^{\dagger\dagger}$ |
| Future at ad | | Vec | |
| Extracted | | res | |

* MWF = Metric Weighting Factor

[†] High = 1; Medium = 2; Low = 3; Unacceptable = 4; N/A has no value.
[‡] The overall rating is calculated as necessary. EPA may not always provide a comment for a metric that has been categorized as High.

$$Overall rating = \begin{cases} 4 & \text{if any metric is Unacceptable} \\ \\ \left\lfloor \sum_{i} (\text{Metric Score}_{i} \times \text{MWF}_{i}) / \sum_{j} \text{MWF}_{j} \right\rceil_{0,1} & \text{(round to the nearest tenth) otherwise} \end{cases}$$

where High: ≥ 1 to < 1.7; Medium: ≥ 1.7 to < 2.3; Low: ≥ 2.3 to ≤ 3 . If the reviewer determines that the overall rating needs adjustment, the original rating is crossed out and an arrow points to the new rating.

,

| Study Citation: | Brack, W., Ecotoxicolo | Frank, H 1998. Chlorophyll a fluorescence: A gy and Environmental Safety 40:34-41 | tool for the inv | vestigation | of toxi | c effects in the photosynthetic apparatus. |
|------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------|---------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Data Type: Hero ID: | Acute (0-96 660790 | 5 hour); Aquatic; Plants | | | | |
| Domain | | Metric | Rating^\dagger | MWF^{\star} | Score | $Comments^{\dagger\dagger}$ |
| Domain 1: Test S | Substance | | | | | |
| | Metric 1: | Test Substance Identity | High | $\times 2$ | 2 | Test substance was identified by name (Trichloroethylene) |
| | Metric 2: | Test Substance Source | Low | $\times 1$ | 3 | Source was not identified. |
| | Metric 3: | Test Substance Purity | Low | $\times 1$ | 3 | Purity was not reported. |
| | - · | | | | | |
| Domain 2: Test I | Design Motria 4: | Nogativo Controls | High | ~ 2 | 9 | Naroting controls in distilled mater more used |
| | Metric 5: | Negative Control Response | Low | × 4 × 1 | 23 | Control response not reported |
| | Metric 6: | Randomized Allocation | Low | $\times 1$ $\times 1$ | 3 | It was not reported whether there was random allo- |
| | | | | | | cation to test groups |
| Domain 2. Euro | auro Charact | aviation | | | | |
| Domain 5: Expos | Motria 7: | Experimental System /Test Media Propara | High | × 9 | 9 | The relatility of chargingle may taken into consid |
| | Metric 7. | tion | Ingn | ~ 2 | 2 | eration. The tubes were gas-tight sealed by using screw caps with Teflon-lined butyl rubber septa and continuously shaken for 2 h at a temperature of 20 |
| | Metric 8. | Consistency of Exposure Administration | Low | × 1 | 3 | U. Details of exposure for each study group were not re- |
| | | | | | | ported. the study did say that "Aliquots of 5mL of the cell suspension were taken from the turbidostat and diluted in 10-mL brown glass tubes with the same volume of an aqueous solution of the chemi- cal being tested. The tubes were gas-tight sealed by using screw caps with Teflon-lined butyl rubber septa and continuously shaken for 2 h at a temper- ature of 20°C. With this procedure, nonvolatile and volatile compounds could be tested. During incuba- tion, light was excluded to prevent CO2 consump- tion by the algae and to avoid CO2 deficiency during incubation." |
| | Metric 9: | Measurement of Test Substance Concentra- tion | Low | $\times 2$ | 6 | It was not reported whether exposure concentration were measured or not. |
| | Metric 10: | Exposure Duration and Frequency | Medium | $\times 1$ | 2 | Exposure duration is not standard (600 seconds), but could be acceptable for what is being measured (fluorescence). |
| | | Continued on next page | | | | |

| Study Citation: | Brack, W.,l Ecotoxicolo | Frank, H 1998. Chlorophyll a fluorescence: A gy and Environmental Safety 40:34-41 | tool for the inv | estigatio | n of tox | ic effects in the photosynthetic apparatus. |
|------------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------|---------------|----------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Data Type: Hero ID: | Acute (0-96 660790 | 6 hour); Aquatic; Plants | | | | |
| Domain | | Metric | Rating^\dagger | MWF^{\star} | Score | $Comments^{\dagger\dagger}$ |
| | Metric 11: | Number of Exposure Groups/Spacing of Exposure Levels | Unacceptable | $\times 1$ | 4 | Unclear how many exposure groups or what the exposure levels were for TCE. |
| | Metric 12: | Testing at or Below Solubility Limit | Low | × 1 | 3 | Unknown exactly what conc were tested but the tox- icity threshold is well below the high solubility of TCE. |
| Domain 4: Test (| Organism | | | | | |
| | Metric 13: | Test Organism Characteristics | High | $\times 2$ | 2 | Green algae (Chlamydomonas reinhardtii) |
| | Metric 14: | Acclimitization and Pretreatment Conditions | Medium | × 1 | 2 | Some acclimatization conducted with some mi- nor uncertainties about pretreatment. The study says, "Green algae of the species Chlamydomonas reinhardtii [strain 11-32a SAG($\#$), according to Schlosser (1982)] were cultivated in a nutrient solu- tion for unicellular algae (Kuhl and Lorenzen, 1964) in a turbiodstat; use of the turbidostat provides ex- ponentially growing cell suspensions of a constant density and physiological state by dilution with fresh medium controlled by a photoelectric cell. The algae were illuminated continuously by four cool white flu- orescent tubes (4]10 W) aerated, and maintained at a temperature of 20° C. The cultures were kept at a density of 2]106 cells/mL for 2 weeks. The doubling time in the turbidostat was about 13 h." |
| | Metric 15: | Number of Organisms and Replicates per Group | Low | $\times 1$ | 3 | Not reported |
| | Metric 16: | Adequacy of Test Conditions | High | $\times 1$ | 1 | Teflon containers that were sealed |
| Domain 5: Outco | ome Assessme | ent | | | | |
| | Metric 17: | Outcome Assessment Methodology | Medium | $\times 2$ | 4 | For TCE a 600 second EC5 was reported of 13 (F'0/F0) |
| | Metric 18: | Consistency of Outcome Assessment | Low | $\times 1$ | 3 | Details of the assessment protocol were not reported for each study group |
| Domain 6: Confe | ounding / Va | riable Control | | | | |
| | Metric 19: | Confounding Variables in Test Design and Procedures | Low | $\times 2$ | 6 | Not enough information provided to allow a compar- ison of environental conditions between study groups for TCE. |
| | | Continued on next page | | | | |
| Study Citation: Data Type: Hero ID: | Brack, W.,I Ecotoxicolo Acute (0-96 660790 | Frank, H 1998. Chlorophyll a fluorescence gy and Environmental Safety 40:34-41 hour); Aquatic; Plants | : A tool for the inv | estigatior | n of toxi | ic effects in the photosynthetic apparatus. |
|-------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|------------------------|-------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Domain | | Metric | $\operatorname{Rating}^{\dagger}$ | MWF^{\star} | Score | $\mathrm{Comments}^{\dagger\dagger}$ |
| | Metric 20: | Outcomes Unrelated to Exposure | Medium | × 1 | 2 | Data on attrition from controls were not reported for each chemical explicitly but it was mentioned that the test concentrations were cored to the controls. "Toxicity thresholds (TTs) are defined as concen- trations that reduce or increase at least one of the Fluorescence parameters for more than the three- fold value of the maximum of standard deviations of the controls. A TT is attained when the mea- surement deviates by 3, 5, 10, or 20 percent from the respective control value, depending on the re- producibility of the particular parameter. The TTs of the tested chemicals, calculated by linear extrap- olation between the highest concentration without significant effect and the lowest concentration with it, are presented in Table 3." |
| Domain 7: Data | Presentation Metric 21: Metric 22: Metric 23: | and Analysis Statistical Methods Reporting of Data Explanation of Unexpected Outcomes | High Low High | × 1 × 2 × 1 | 1 6 1 | F'0/F0=EC05 and "Toxicity thresholds (TTs) are defined as concentrations that reduce or increase at least one of the Fluorescence parameters for more than the threefold value of the maximum of stan- dard deviations of the controls. A TT is attained when the measurement deviates by 3, 5, 10, or 20 percent from the respective control value, depending on the reproducibility of the particular parameter. The TTs of the tested chemicals, calculated by lin- ear extrapolation between the highest concentra- tion with it, are presented in Table 3." The EC05 was reported to TCE but not much other detail was reported. No unexplained outcomes |
| Overall Quality I | Determination | 1 [‡] | Unacceptable | | 4.0 | |
| Extracted | | | No | | | |
| | | Continued on next page | | | | |

... continued from previous page

| Study Citation: | Brack, W., Frank, H 1998. Chlorophyll a fluorescence: A Ecotoxicology and Environmental Safety 40:34-41 | tool for the in | vestigation of to | xic effects in the photosynthetic apparatus. |
|------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------|----------------------------------------------|
| Data Type: Hero ID: | Acute (0-96 hour); Aquatic; Plants 660790 | | | |
| Domain | Metric | $\operatorname{Rating}^{\dagger}$ | MWF* Score | e Comments ^{††} |

** Consistent with our Application of Systematic Review in TSCARisk Evaluations document, if a metric for a data source receives a score of Unacceptable (score = 4), EPA will determine the study to be unacceptable. In this case, one of the metrics were rated as unacceptable. As such, the study is considered unacceptable and the score is presented solely to increase transparency.

* MWF = Metric Weighting Factor

[†] High = 1; Medium = 2; Low = 3; Unacceptable = 4; N/A has no value.

[‡] The overall rating is calculated as necessary. EPA may not always provide a comment for a metric that has been categorized as High.

$$Overall rating = \begin{cases} 4 & \text{if any metric is Unacceptable} \\ \left[\sum_{i} (Metric Score_{i} \times MWF_{i}) / \sum_{j} MWF_{j} \right]_{0,1} & (round to the nearest tenth) otherwise \end{cases}$$

where High: ≥ 1 to < 1.7; Medium: ≥ 1.7 to < 2.3; Low: ≥ 2.3 to ≤ 3 . If the reviewer determines that the overall rating needs adjustment, the original rating is crossed out and an arrow points to the new rating.

^{††} Metrics that are rated 'High' met the criteria for high confidence as expected for this type of study, and may not require additional comments.

| Domain | | Metric | $\operatorname{Rating}^{\dagger}$ | MWF^{\star} | Score | $\mathrm{Comments}^{\dagger\dagger}$ |
|----------------|--------------|-------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------|-------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Domain 1: Test | Substance | | | | | |
| | Metric 1: | Test Substance Identity | High | $\times 2$ | 2 | Chemical was identified by name. |
| | Metric 2: | Test Substance Source | High | $\times 1$ | 1 | Authors identified Merck as the source of the test substance. |
| | Metric 3: | Test Substance Purity | High | $\times 1$ | 1 | Authors reported greater than 99 percent purity. |
| Domain 2: Test | Design | | | | | |
| | Metric 4: | Negative Controls | High | $\times 2$ | 2 | "Each test series contained three controls without toxicant and two controls with 0.8 mg/L Cu2+ (CuS04). This concentration reduces algal growth to50 percent and is used to check normal sensitivity of the organisms." |
| | Metric 5: | Negative Control Response | Low | $\times 1$ | 3 | The biological responses of the negative control groups were not reported. |
| | Metric 6: | Randomized Allocation | Low | $\times 1$ | 3 | It was not reported whether there was random place- ment of flasks. |
| Domain 3: Expo | sure Charact | erization | | | | |
| | Metric 7: | Experimental System/Test Media Prepara- tion | High | × 2 | 2 | The purpose of the test was to determine a way of doing algae tests with volatile chemicals, as the OECD guidelines recommends using a permeable stopper in the flask to allow CO2 to pass through so as not to impede algae growth. However with volatile chemicals this is not possible because of loss of test substance through vitalization. Therefore in test, they used a closed system that still provided a source of CO2 for the algae. Authors reported, "Deviations between the duplicates, extracted from the same test culture were less than 5 percent . To estimate recovery of this analytical method, 20 mL headspace vials were filled completely with water or alga suspension. The vials were sealed gas" tight with septa. Gravimetrically defined amounts of the volatile chlorinated hydrocarbons were injected via springe through the Septa into the liquids and dis- solved. From these solutions samples were taken and extracted as explained above. Recovery of the method amounted to 90 " S percent and was inde- pendent from cell density." |

Study Citation Prode W Pottler H 1004 Torigity testing of highly velotile chemicals with group algoes A 1.002.000 _____

| Study Citation: Data Type: Hero ID: | Brack, W.,l Acute (0-96 661061 | Rottler, H. 1994. Toxicity testing of highly vola 5 hour); Aquatic; Plants | atile chemic | als with | green al | gae: A new assay. 1:223-228 | |
|-------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------|----------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|
| Domain | | Metric | $\operatorname{Rating}^{\dagger}$ | MWF^{\star} | Score | $Comments^{\dagger\dagger}$ | |
| | Metric 8: | Consistency of Exposure Administration | High | $\times 1$ | 1 | Exposures were administered consistently across study groups. | |
| | Metric 9: | Measurement of Test Substance Concentra- tion | High | × 2 | 2 | Concentrations were measured at the end of the test. Authors stated, "Sampling for measurement of toxi- cant concentration was possible without opening the vessel through septa with screw caps (- Fig. 1)." and "Measurements at the beginning and at the end of the assays showed no significant differences in chem- ical concentrations. Therefore, samples for analysis were taken ac the end of the assay in order to avoid leaks in the septa, which could allow evaporation during the test period. | |
| | Metric 10: | Exposure Duration and Frequency | High | $\times 1$ | 1 | The test was 72 hours in duration, which is recom- mended by OECD Guideline 201. | |
| | Metric 11: | Number of Exposure Groups/Spacing of Exposure Levels | High | $\times 1$ | 1 | Test concentrations are reported in figure 3 and show a dose response for growth inhibition. The figure shows at least 5 concentrations tested which is rec- ommended by OECD Guideline 201. | |
| | Metric 12: | Testing at or Below Solubility Limit | High | × 1 | 1 | The test conc for TCE shown in figure 3 (highest conc is <100 mg/l) are well below TCE's solubility level of 999-1472 mg/l. | |
| Domain 4: Test (| Organism | | | | | | |
| | Metric 13: | Test Organism Characteristics | Medium | $\times 2$ | 4 | This is not a commonly used algal species. Not a TG species. Test used unicellular freshwater green alga Chlamydomonas rehthardtii (strain number 11 -32a SAG) from the University of Gottingen, Germany. | |
| | Metric 14: | Acclimitization and Pretreatment Conditions | High | × 1 | 1 | Pretreatment conditions included, "Precultures and test cultures were grown in the medium for unicel- lular algae according to KUflL (1962) (Table 2). In- cubation of all cultures was done in a Orbital In- cubator (Gallenkamp). The cultures were shaken permanently with a frequency of 120 rpm. They wereilluminated from above with 130 "E/m2s with- out light dark cycle. The photosynthetically effec- tive light was determined with a Quantum Sensor from Licor Inc. The temperature was maintained at 20 " 1 0 -c." | |
| | | Continued on next page | | | | | |

| Study Citation: Data Type: Hero ID: | Brack, W.,H Acute (0-96 661061 | Rottler, H 1994. Toxicity testing of highly vola hour); Aquatic; Plants | atile chemic | als with | green al | gae: A new assay. 1:223-228 |
|-------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------|------------|----------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Domain | | Metric | Rating^\dagger | MWF^* | Score | $\mathrm{Comments}^{\dagger\dagger}$ |
| | Metric 15: | Number of Organisms and Replicates per Group | Medium | × 1 | 2 | Two replicates per test concentration were reported. OECD Guideline 201 states the test should include three replicates, but if determination of a NOEC is not required, the test may be altered to increase the number of concentrations and reduce the number of replicates per conc. There were more than 5 test conc (the recommended number) used for TCE. The cell density in the test cultures amounted to 5 " 103 cells/ml at the beginning of the assays. |
| | Metric 16: | Adequacy of Test Conditions | High | $\times 1$ | 1 | Glass flasks which are recommended in OECD 201. Temp and ph were within recommended ranges. |
| Domain 5: Outco | me Assessme | ent | | | | |
| | Metric 17: | Outcome Assessment Methodology | High | $\times 2$ | 2 | EC10s and EC50s were determined and reported. |
| | Metric 18: | Consistency of Outcome Assessment | High | $\times 1$ | 1 | Outcomes were assessed consistently across study groups. |
| Domain 6: Confo | unding / Var | iable Control | | | | |
| | Metric 19: | Confounding Variables in Test Design and Procedures | High | $\times 2$ | 2 | There were no reported differences among study groups in environmental conditions or other factors that would influence the outcome assessment. |
| | Metric 20: | Outcomes Unrelated to Exposure | Medium | × 1 | 2 | Authors do not report attrition for each study group or the control, but do say that the effective con- centration was controlled analytically, leaving only minor uncertainties. Authors report, "EC10 and 72"h EC50, which are the effective concentration of a chemical by which algal growth is reduced by 10 percent or 50 percent compared to a control in 72 h, respectively, and the 95 percent confidence intervals of these values are shown in Table 3 (- p. 226)." |
| Domain 7: Data | Presentation | and Analysis | | | | |
| | Metric 21: | Statistical Methods | High | $\times 1$ | 1 | Authors reported using the PROBIT routine of SAS. |
| | Metric 22: | Reporting of Data | Medium | $\times 2$ | 4 | Figure 3 shows the results of the tests at each conc for each chemical but it's difficult to determine the exact concentrations from the figure, so some minor uncertainties remain. |
| | | Continued on next page | | | | |

| | | c | • | |
|----|-------------|------|----------|------|
| •• | . continued | from | previous | page |

| Study Citation: Data Type: Hero ID: | Brack, W.,Rottler, H 1994. Toxicity testing of highly volatile chemicals with green algae: A new assay. 1:223-228 Acute (0-96 hour); Aquatic; Plants 661061 | | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------|-------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|--|--|
| Domain | | Metric | $\operatorname{Rating}^{\dagger}$ | MWF^{\star} | Score | $Comments^{\dagger\dagger}$ | | | |
| | Metric 23: | Explanation of Unexpected Outcomes | Medium | × 1 | 2 | SDs were provided, but it was unclear whether or not there were any unexpected outcomes, leaving minor uncertainties. | | | |
| Overall Quality I | Determination | 1 [‡] | High | | 1.4 | | | | |
| Extracted | | | Yes | | | | | | |

* MWF = Metric Weighting Factor

[†] High = 1; Medium = 2; Low = 3; Unacceptable = 4; N/A has no value.

[‡] The overall rating is calculated as necessary. EPA may not always provide a comment for a metric that has been categorized as High.

 $\text{Overall rating} = \begin{cases} 4 & \text{if any metric is Unacceptable} \\ \\ \left| \sum_{i} \left(\text{Metric Score}_{i} \times \text{MWF}_{i} \right) / \sum_{j} \text{MWF}_{j} \right|_{0.1} & \text{(round to the nearest tenth) otherwise} \end{cases},$

where High: ≥ 1 to < 1.7; Medium: ≥ 1.7 to < 2.3; Low: ≥ 2.3 to ≤ 3 . If the reviewer determines that the overall rating needs adjustment, the original rating is crossed out and an arrow points to the new rating.

^{††} Metrics that are rated 'High' met the criteria for high confidence as expected for this type of study, and may not require additional comments.

| Study Citation: | Yoshioka, Y ment 43:149 | 7.,Ose, Y.,Sato, T., 1985. Testing for the toxicit 9-157 | y of chemicals w | ith Tetra | hymena | pyriformis. Science of the Total Environ- |
|------------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|------------------------|--------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Data Type: Hero ID: | Acute (0-96 676758 | 5 hour); Aquatic; Invertebrates | | | | |
| Domain | | Metric | $\operatorname{Rating}^{\dagger}$ | MWF^{\star} | Score | $Comments^{\dagger\dagger}$ |
| Domain 1: Test S | Substance | | | | | |
| | Metric 1: | Test Substance Identity | High | $\times 2$ | 2 | Test chemical was identified by name |
| | Metric 2: | Test Substance Source | Low | $\times 1$ | 3 | Source was not reported |
| | Metric 3: | Test Substance Purity | Low | $\times 1$ | 3 | The purity was not reported. |
| Domain 2: Test l | Design | | | | | |
| | Metric 4: | Negative Controls | Low | $\times 2$ | 6 | It is implied that they used a control because they mention using a "blank" to calculate values and show a growth curve for cells in the blank, but there is not much information about what is in the blank. |
| | Metric 5: | Negative Control Response | N/A | | N/A | This is an acute study with lots of chemicals re- ported, and they did not report on the control re- sponse for each chemical. |
| | Metric 6: | Randomized Allocation | Low | $\times 1$ | 3 | There was no mention of random allocation. |
| Domain 2. Erno | guno Charact | aviation | | | | |
| Domain 5: Expo | Motric 7: | Experimental System/Test Media Propara | Modium | × 9 | 4 | The system was alread for TCF which is veletile |
| | Metric 7. | tion | Medium | ~ 2 | 4 | but TCE's system was to see in the sound is volatile, info about headspace in glass, etc) |
| | Metric 8: | Consistency of Exposure Administration | Low | × 1 | 3 | There were differences in how exposure was adminis- tered but because the point of the study was to figure out what housing conditions were best for this type of protozoa. These differences could have effected the EC50 reported. Authors report that some of the temperatures, and amount of food changed the growth rate of the protozoa. |
| | Metric 9: | Measurement of Test Substance Concentra- tion | Low | $\times 2$ | 6 | Measurements were not reported |
| | Metric 10: | Exposure Duration and Frequency | Medium | $\times 1$ | 2 | Various exposure durations were tested to determine which duration was most effective. |
| | Metric 11: | Number of Exposure Groups/Spacing of Exposure Levels | Unacceptable | $\times 1$ | 4 | no information was provided on number of exposure groups or spacing of exposures. |
| | Metric 12: | Testing at or Below Solubility Limit | High | $\times 1$ | 1 | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | Continued on next page | | | | |

| ment 45.149-157 | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Data Type:Acute (0-96 hour); Aquatic; InvertebratesHero ID:676758 | |
| Domain Metric $Rating^{\dagger}$ MWF* Score $Comments^{\dagger\dagger}$ | |
| Domain 4: Test Organism | |
| Metric 13: Test Organism Characteristics Medium × 2 4 Tetrahymena pyriformis was preserved in medium of 2 percent proteasepeptone at 20" was renewed at 2-4 week intervals. Unsu sounds like they cultured their own anima lab from descriptions of previous studies in per. Acknowledgements say "Pr. Nozawa University for providing T. pyriformis in a condition" | a sterile C which ce but it ls in the this pa- t of Gifu germ-free |
| Metric 14: Acclimitization and Pretreatment Conditions High $\times 1$ 1 | |
| Metric 15: Number of Organisms and Replicates per Low × 1 3 Number of test organisms and replicates Group 20 cells per slide were counted using one m counting, but that was the only number pr | were not ted that lethod of ovided. |
| Metric 16: Adequacy of Test Conditions Medium × 1 2 In some of the housing conditions the ani not do as well, but that did not significant the EC50 values. The point of the test we out different housing conditions. it looks testing conditions they used 24 hour test conditions of no 4 for culturing (Pre-cultu 30, hours 24; test culture: medium PRO, type VP (cultured in vertical vessel with silicone rubber stopper). | mals did y change as to try like for time and re: temp temp 30 a porous |
| | |
| Domain 5: Outcome Assessment | |
| Metric 17: Outcome Assessment Methodology Medium $\times 2$ 4 They describe two different methods for the cells but some uncertainties remain e. method they went with. | counting g. which |
| $\underbrace{ Metric 18: Consistency of Outcome Assessment } Medium \times 1 2 \\ \underbrace{ Medium \times 1 }_{uncertainties.} 2 \\ The assessment protocol was reported with the set of the s$ | h minor |
| Domain 6: Confounding / Variable Control | |

Continued on next page ...

| Study Citation: | Yoshioka, Y ment 43:149 | 7.,Ose, Y.,Sato, T., 1985. Testing for the toxicit D-157 | y of chemicals w | vith Tetra | hymena | a pyriformis. Science of the Total Environ- |
|------------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------|--------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Data Type: Hero ID: | Acute (0-96 676758 | hour); Aquatic; Invertebrates | | | | |
| Domain | | Metric | $\operatorname{Rating}^{\dagger}$ | MWF^{\star} | Score | $\mathrm{Comments}^{\dagger\dagger}$ |
| | Metric 19: | Confounding Variables in Test Design and Procedures | Low | × 2 | 6 | "In spite of the considerable influence of the compo- sition of the medium on the growth curve, as shown in Fig. 3 (compare No. 1 with No. 5 and No. 2 with No. 6), there was no significant difference between the EC50 value in 2 percent protoose pep- tone (No. 1) and that in 2 percent polypeptone (No. 5), which were both cultured at 30" C. However, the EC50 value of No. 6 differs significantly from that of No. 2, and the difference between them increased as the test period was increased from 24 to 72 h." |
| | Metric 20: | Outcomes Unrelated to Exposure | Medium | $\times 1$ | 2 | They do mention, "When the culture was contami- nated by the bacterium, the test was repeated." and the effects on growth from test medium (food) was not statistically significant for the EC50 values. |
| Domain 7: Data | Presentation | and Analysis | | | | |
| | Metric 21: | Statistical Methods | High | $\times 1$ | 1 | The effective concentration 50 percent (EC50) values were obtained by plotting therelative growth rates against the concentration of chemical on logarithmic probability paper. |
| | Metric 22: | Reporting of Data | Low | $\times 2$ | 6 | Data for exposure related findings were not shown for each study group. |
| | Metric 23: | Explanation of Unexpected Outcomes | High | $\times 1$ | 1 | Unexpected outcomes were explained. |
| Overall Quality I | Determination | 1 [‡] | Unacceptable | | 4.0 | |
| Extracted | | | No | | | |

** Consistent with our Application of Systematic Review in TSCARisk Evaluations document, if a metric for a data source receives a score of Unacceptable (score = 4), EPA will determine the study to be unacceptable. In this case, one of the metrics were rated as unacceptable. As such, the study is considered unacceptable and the score is presented solely to increase transparency.

* MWF = Metric Weighting Factor

[†] High = 1; Medium = 2; Low = 3; Unacceptable = 4; N/A has no value.

[‡] The overall rating is calculated as necessary. EPA may not always provide a comment for a metric that has been categorized as High.

$$\text{Overall rating} = \begin{cases} 4 & \text{if any metric is Unacceptable} \\ \\ \left\lfloor \sum_{i} \left(\text{Metric Score}_{i} \times \text{MWF}_{i} \right) / \sum_{j} \text{MWF}_{j} \right\rceil_{0,1} & \text{(round to the nearest tenth) otherwise} \end{cases},$$

where High: ≥ 1 to < 1.7; Medium: ≥ 1.7 to < 2.3; Low: ≥ 2.3 to ≤ 3 . If the reviewer determines that the overall rating needs adjustment, the original rating is crossed out and an arrow points to the new rating.

^{††} Metrics that are rated 'High' met the criteria for high confidence as expected for this type of study, and may not require additional comments.

| Study Citation: | n: McDaniel, T.,Martin, P.,Ross, N.,Brown, S.,Lesage, S.,Pauli, B. 2004. Effects of chlorinated solvents on four species of North Ame amphibians. Archives of Environmental Contamination and Toxicology 47:101-109 | | | | | | | |
|------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------|--------------------|---------------|-------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|--|
| Data Type: Hero ID: | Other; Aqu 700434 | atic; other amphibian - wood frog and g | reen frog | | | | | |
| Domain | | Metric | $Rating^{\dagger}$ | MWF^{\star} | Score | $Comments^{\dagger\dagger}$ | | |
| Domain 1: Test S | Substance | | | | | | | |
| | Metric 1: | Test Substance Identity | High | $\times 2$ | 2 | Chemical was identified by name. | | |
| | Metric 2: | Test Substance Source | High | $\times 1$ | 1 | Stock solutions were made from 95 percent pure, analytical-grade PCE, TCE, and cis- and trans-DCE (Sigma-Aldridge). | | |
| | Metric 3: | Test Substance Purity | Medium | × 1 | 2 | "Stock solutions were made from 95 percent pure, analytical-grade PCE, TCE, and cis- and trans-DCE (Sigma-Aldridge)." Only minor uncertainties about the purity being at 95 percent, analytical-grade. | | |
| Domain 2. Tost 1 | Dosign | | | | | | | |
| Domain 2. 1030 1 | Metric 4: | Negative Controls | High | $\times 2$ | 2 | Three replicates of embryos were also raised in un- contaminated groundwater as controls. | | |
| | Metric 5: | Negative Control Response | High | × 1 | 1 | Control mortality was reported in table 2 for each species, and deformities in controls were reported in figure 1. Control response for mortality for wood frogs, green frogs and spotted salamanders were all below 10 percent; for American toads it was about 10.1 percent with one of the replicates having a very high 26 percent mortality rate, so there are uncertainites for this species for this metric. Figure 1 shows that the negative control response for all species for percent mortality is below 10 percent. ASTM guidelines indcate "An acceptable clutch of eggs has the capability of developing into Developmental Stage 46 tadpoles with less than 10 percent mortality." | | |
| | Metric 6: | Randomized Allocation | | × 1 | 0 | For the acute study it was not reported whether the animals were distributed randomly. | | |
| Domain 3: Expos | sure Charact | erization | | | | | | |

Continued on next page ...

_

| Study Citation: | McDaniel, T., Martin, P., Ross, N., Brown, S., Lesage, S., Pauli, B. 2004. Effects of chlorinated solvents on four species of North America amphibians. Archives of Environmental Contamination and Toxicology 47:101-109 | | | | | | |
|------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------|-------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|
| Data Type: Hero ID: | Other; Aqu 700434 | uatic; other amphibian - wood frog and g | reen frog | | | | |
| Domain | | Metric | $\operatorname{Rating}^{\dagger}$ | MWF^{\star} | Score | $Comments^{\dagger\dagger}$ | |
| | Metric 7: | Experimental System/Test Media Protion | epara- High | × 2 | 2 | Containers were covered and sealed and efforts were made to minimize head space. Authors reported that TCE solutions declined by 50 to 80 percent over the 24 hour period between renewals. Authors also mentioned, "Each egg mass was gently divided into clusters of approximately 30 eggs (with the excep- tion of spotted salamanders with 5 to 10 eggs) and placed in a 1-L glass Mason jar containing 300 ml of test solution. The lids on the jars were sealed to reduce volatilization. Dissolved oxygen levels never fell below 80 percent saturation. Three replicates of embryos were also raised in uncontaminated ground- water as controls. Temperature was maintained at 23 +-1°C using a water bath. All tests were con- ducted under a 14L/10D light regime. An exhaust hood over the water bath ensured the removal of accidental gaseous PCE, TCE, and DCE volatilized from the exposure vessels." | |
| | | Continued on next page | | | | | |

| Study Citation: | McDaniel, amphibians | T.,Martin, P.,Ross, N.,Brown, S.,Lesage, S.,Pau s. Archives of Environmental Contamination a | ıli, B 2004. nd Toxicolog | Effects c y 47:101- | of chlorin 109 | nated solvents on four species of North American |
|------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|------------------------|-------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Data Type: Hero ID: | Other; Aqu 700434 | iatic; other amphibian - wood frog and green f | rog | | | |
| Domain | | Metric | $\operatorname{Rating}^{\dagger}$ | MWF^{\star} | Score | $Comments^{\dagger\dagger}$ |
| | Metric 8: | Consistency of Exposure Administration | Medium | × 1 | 2 | Authors indicate that there may have been some losses of test chemical during decanting test solu- tions and during the placing of eggs in test cham- bers, and while testing a subsample at 1 hour of exposure TCE conc were only within 70 percent of nominal. The authors report, "Stock solutions of TCE, PCE, and DCE were dissolved in local ground- water in a dilution series. Groundwater was used as the medium for acute tests to emulate conditions in surface waters fed by chloroethylene- contaminated groundwater. Nominal test concentrations were as follows: PCE-2.5, 7.5, 12.5, and 20 mg/L; TCE-12.5, 20, 40, and60 mg/L; and cis- and trans-DCE-12.5, 60, and 100 mg/L. Based on the results of initial ex- posures of American toad embryos, a second expo- sure was conducted with elevated concentrations of PCE and TCE as follows: PCE-15, 30, and 45 mg/ L; and TCE-35, 55, and 85 mg/L. Maximum expo- sure concentrations of PCE and TCE were limited by the compounds' solubility in groundwater. Con- centrations of test solutions, including controls, were measured at 24 h (just prior to solution renewal, see below). Concentrations at $t = 0$ h were based on dilutions of measured stock solutions. Some losses occurred while decanting test solutions and during the placing of eggs in test chambers. In a sub- sample of test solutions measured at 1 h of expo- sure, concentrations of PCE were within 90 percent of nominal, while cis- and trans-DCE were within 90 percent. However, levels of TCE were only within 70 percent of nominal." |
| | | Continued on next page | | | | |

| Study Citation: Data Type: Hero ID: | McDaniel, 7 amphibians Other; Aqu 700434 | Γ.,Martin, P.,Ross, N.,Brown, S.,Lesage, S.,Pauli Archives of Environmental Contamination and atic; other amphibian - wood frog and green fro | , B 2004. d Toxicolog g | Effects o y 47:101- | f chlorin 109 | nated solvents on four species of North American |
|-------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------|------------------------|------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Domain | | Metric | $Rating^{\dagger}$ | MWF^{\star} | Score | $Comments^{\dagger\dagger}$ |
| | Metric 9: | Measurement of Test Substance Concentra- tion | High | × 2 | 2 | Measured concentrations were taken, and used to derive an EC50. Authors reported "To prevent volatilization, a glass flask (6 L) was filled to ca- pacity with stock solution to reduce head space and then stirred using a stir bar at low speed to pre- vent disruption of the surface. Stock solutions were stirred until the compound was dissolved or until the solution had reached saturation (between 2 and 48 h, depending on the compound). Despite these precautions, actual concentrations tended to be less than nominal concentrations. For this reason, con- centrations of stock solutions were measured priorto mixing of the test solutions, using Purge and Trap GC/MS accordingto U.S. EPA method 82 60B (U.S. EPA 1996), to ensure that testsolutions were within 10 percent of the nominal concentration at 1h of ex- posure. The GS/MS was performed on a Hewlett Packard 6890 gas chromatograph, using a Hewlett Packard 5973 mass selective detector, a 3100 purge and trap concentrator, and a PTA-30 purge and trap autosampler. The method detection limit for all chloroethylene analyses was 1 ppb. |
| | Metric 10: | Exposure Duration and Frequency | High | $\times 1$ | 1 | ASTM guidelines for FETAX on American clawed frog suggest 96 hours and a static renewal set up, renewed every 24 hours, which this study does for the acute test. |
| | Metric 11: | Number of Exposure Groups/Spacing of Exposure Levels | Medium | × 1 | 2 | This study had four exposure groups for TCE and ASTM FETAX Guidelines suggests the following "At a minimum, five concentrations for each end- point are used. However, additional concentrations between the EC16 and EC84 are highly recom- mended to ensure obtaining accurate 96-hour LC50 and EC50 values." |
| | Metric 12: | Testing at or Below Solubility Limit | High | × 1 | 1 | Solubility was taken into consideration, and expo- sure concentrations kept below the solubility of TCE in growndwater. |

Domain 4: Test Organism

Continued on next page ...

| Study Citation: Data Type: Hero ID: | McDaniel, T.,Martin, P.,Ross, N.,Brown, S.,Lesage, S.,Pauli, B 2004. Effects of chlorinated solvents on four species of North American amphibians. Archives of Environmental Contamination and Toxicology 47:101-109 Other; Aquatic; other amphibian - wood frog and green frog 700434 | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------|-------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|--|
| Domain | | Metric | $\operatorname{Rating}^{\dagger}$ | MWF^{\star} | Score | $Comments^{\dagger\dagger}$ | | |
| | Metric 13: | Test Organism Characteristics | Medium | × 2 | 4 | Wood frog and green frog: Test organisms seem to be sufficiently sensitive to the exposures adminis- tered to derive an EC50, but are not a suggested species in the ASTM guideline or OECD and EPA guidelines for amphibian growth and development, which suggest African clawed frog. This study in- stead used these species to test sensitivity for North American species. Only minor uncertainties because they are not suggested species from a guideline. | | |
| | Metric 14: | Acclimitization and Pretreatment Conditions | Low | × 1 | 3 | Study authors did not report whether animals were acclimatized or whether pretreatment conditions were the the same for treatment and controls. They authors do report, " In 2001 and 2002, egg masses of wood frogs, spotted salamanders," American toads, and green frogs were collected from a wetland not contaminated with chloroethylenes in F1amborough Township (Ontario,Canada). Water from wetlands were tested for chloroethylenes in 2001 from each site where eggs were collected. No chloroethylenes were detected; the minimum detection limit for this analysis was 1 ppb. Egg masses were less than 24 h old when exposures were initiated. For each species, three egg masses were used (with the exception of the second exposure of American toads, where only one egg mass was used). Each egg.mass was from a different female and represented a replicate. Thus, there were three replicate jars for each chemical by concentration combination, for a total of 45 jars per species. Eggs were not dejellied prior to exposure to more accurately imitatenatural exposure conditions. Each egg mass was gently divided into clusters of ap- proximately 30 eggs (with the exception of spotted salamanders with 5 to 10 eggs) and placed in a 1-L glass Mason jar containing 300 ml of test solution." | | |
| | Metric 15: | Number of Organisms and Replicates per Group | High | × 1 | 1 | ASTM guidelines suggest 20-25 and two replicates, and the study authors reported, "there were three replicate jars for each chemical" and, "Each egg mass was gently divided into clusters of approxi- mately 30 eggs (with the exception of spotted sala- manders with 5 to 10 eggs) and placed in a 1-L glass Mason jar containing 300 ml of test solution." | | |
| | | Continued on next page | | | | | | |

| Study Citation: M | McDaniel, T., Martin, P., Ross, N., Brown, S., Lesage, S., Pauli, B. 2004. Effects of chlorinated solvents on four species of North American amphibians. Archives of Environmental Contamination and Toxicology 47:101-109 | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------|---------------------------|------------------------|-------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|--|
| Data Type: C Hero ID: 7 | Other; Aqua 700434 | atic; other amphibian - wood frog and green fro | eg. | , , | | | | |
| Domain | | Metric | Rating^\dagger | MWF^{\star} | Score | $Comments^{\dagger\dagger}$ | | |
| | Metric 16: | Adequacy of Test Conditions | Medium | × 1 | 2 | Animals were held in 1 L glass mason jars contain- ing 300 ml of test solution. Jars were sealed and temperature was maintined at 23+-1 degree C us- ing a water bath. All tests were conducted under 14L/10D light regime. The ASTM guidelines rec- ommend glass, and this temperature is approprate for african clawed frog but unsure if this temperature is also appropriate for these north american species. Additionally the photoperiod is longer than the one recommended in the ASTM Guidelines. | | |
| Domain 5: Outcome | e Assessme | \mathbf{nt} | | | | | | |
| Ν | Metric 17: | Outcome Assessment Methodology | High | $\times 2$ | 2 | Outcome assessment methodology addressed the in- tended outcomes of interest and was sensitive for the outcomes of interest. LC50 and EC50 were reported which are the recommended outcomes in ASTM guidelines for FETAX. | | |
| N | Metric 18: | Consistency of Outcome Assessment | Medium | × 1 | 2 | All animals were assessed at the end of the 96 hour period with minor uncertainties due to incomplete reporting. | | |
| Domain 6: Confoun | nding / Var | iable Control | | | | | | |
| Ν | Metric 19: | Confounding Variables in Test Design and Procedures | High | $\times 2$ | 2 | No reported differences among study groups in en- vironmental conidtions. | | |
| Ν | Metric 20: | Outcomes Unrelated to Exposure | Medium | × 1 | 2 | Controls for the wood frogs and green frogs were under 10 percent mortality and deformities. Details on attrition unrelated to exposure for each exposure concentration were also reported as the average with a range. There is a wide range of portailities between the replicates. | | |
| Domain 7: Data Pre | resentation | and Analysis | | | | | | |
| N | Metric 21: | Statistical Methods | High | × 1 | 1 | A two-factor ANOVA was used. ASTM FETAX Guidelines suggests either probit analysis, trimmed Spearman-Karber analysis, or the two-point graphi- cal method to estimate LC50 and EC50 values. | | |
| | | Continued on next page | | | | | | |

| Study Citation: | McDaniel, T., Martin, P., Ross, N., Brown, S., Lesage, S., Pauli, B 2004. Effects of chlorinated solvents on four species of North American amphibians. Archives of Environmental Contamination and Toxicology 47:101-109 | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------|-------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|--|--|
| Data Type: Hero ID: | Other; Aqu 700434 | atic; other amphibian - wood frog and green t | frog | | | | | | |
| Domain | | Metric | $\operatorname{Rating}^{\dagger}$ | MWF^{\star} | Score | $\mathrm{Comments}^{\dagger\dagger}$ | | | |
| | Metric 22: | Reporting of Data | Medium | × 2 | 4 | Data was reported for each exposure group in ei- ther table or graphical form. It's hard to tell the exact numbers from the graphical representation of the EC50 values for each exposure level, resulting in minor uncertainities. | | | |
| | Metric 23: | Explanation of Unexpected Outcomes | High | $\times 1$ | 1 | Unexpected outcomes were explained. (e.g. loss of TCE through evaporation, damaged eggs in transit) | | | |
| Overall Quality Determination [‡] | | | High | | 1.4 | | | | |
| Extracted | | | Yes | | | | | | |

* MWF = Metric Weighting Factor

[†] High = 1; Medium = 2; Low = 3; Unacceptable = 4; N/A has no value.

[‡] The overall rating is calculated as necessary. EPA may not always provide a comment for a metric that has been categorized as High.

$$\text{Overall rating} = \begin{cases} 4 & \text{if any metric is Unacceptable} \\ \\ \left\lfloor \sum_{i} \left(\text{Metric Score}_{i} \times \text{MWF}_{i} \right) / \sum_{j} \text{MWF}_{j} \right\rceil_{0.1} & \text{(round to the nearest tenth) of } \end{cases}$$

he nearest tenth) otherwise

where High: ≥ 1 to < 1.7; Medium: ≥ 1.7 to < 2.3; Low: ≥ 2.3 to ≤ 3 . If the reviewer determines that the overall rating needs adjustment, the original rating is crossed out and an arrow points to the new rating.

^{††} Metrics that are rated 'High' met the criteria for high confidence as expected for this type of study, and may not require additional comments.

| Data Type: Hero ID: | McDaniel, amphibians Other; Aqu 700434 | s. Archives of Environmental Contamin atic; other amphibian - american toad | ation and Toxicology | Effects o y 47:101- | 109 | lated solvents on four species of North American |
|------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------|------------------------|-------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Domain | | Metric | $Rating^{\dagger}$ | MWF^{\star} | Score | $Comments^{\dagger\dagger}$ |
| Domain 1: Test § | Substance | | | | | |
| | Metric 1: | Test Substance Identity | High | $\times 2$ | 2 | Chemical was identified by name. |
| | Metric 2: | Test Substance Source | High | $\times 1$ | 1 | Stock solutions were made from 95 percent pure, analytical-grade PCE, TCE, and cis- and trans-DCE (Sigma-Aldridge). |
| | Metric 3: | Test Substance Purity | Medium | × 1 | 2 | "Stock solutions were made from 95 percent pure, analytical-grade PCE, TCE, and cis- and trans-DCE (Sigma-Aldridge)." Only minor uncertainties about the purity being at 95 percent, analytical-grade. |
| Domain 2: Test J | Design | | | | | |
| | Metric 4: | Negative Controls | High | $\times 2$ | 2 | Three replicates of embryos were also raised in un- contaminated groundwater as controls. |
| | Metric 5: | Negative Control Response | Medium | × 1 | 2 | Control mortality was reported in table 2 for each species, and deformities in controls were reported in figure 1. Control response for mortality for wood frogs, green frogs and spotted salamanders were all below 10 percent; for American toads it was about 10.1 percent with one of the replicates having a very high 26 percent mortality rate, so there are uncertainites for this species for this metric. Authors threw those numbers out and indicated that the high mortality rate for that replicate could have been due to damage the eggs recieved in transit. Figure 1 shows that the negative control response for all species for percent mortality is below 10 percent. ASTM guidelines indcate "An acceptable clutch of eggs has the capability of developing into Developmental Stage 46 tadpoles with less than 10 percent mortality." |
| | Metric 6: | Randomized Allocation | Low | $\times 1$ | 3 | For the acute study it was not reported whether the animals were distributed randomly. |

_

Continued on next page ...

| Study Citation: | McDaniel, amphibian | T.,Martin, P.,Ross, N.,Brown, S.,Lesage, S.,F s. Archives of Environmental Contamination | auli, B 2004. and Toxicolog | Effects o v 47:101- | f chlorii 109 | nated solvents on four species of North American |
|------------------------|------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|------------------------|------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Data Type: Hero ID: | Other; Aqu 700434 | uatic; other amphibian - american toad | | 5,5 | | |
| Domain | | Metric | $\operatorname{Rating}^{\dagger}$ | MWF^{\star} | Score | $Comments^{\dagger\dagger}$ |
| | Metric 7: | Experimental System/Test Media Prepation | ra- High | × 2 | 2 | Containers were covered and sealed and efforts were made to minimize head space. Authors reported that TCE solutions declined by 50 to 80 percent over the 24 hour period between renewals. Authors also mentioned, "Each egg mass was gently divided into clusters of approximately 30 eggs (with the excep- tion of spotted salamanders with 5 to 10 eggs) and placed in a 1-L glass Mason jar containing 300 ml of test solution. The lids on the jars were sealed to reduce volatilization. Dissolved oxygen levels never fell below 80 percent saturation. Three replicates of embryos were also raised in uncontaminated ground- water as controls. Temperature was maintained at 23 +-1"C using a water bath. All tests were con- ducted under a 14L/10D light regime. An exhaust hood over the water bath ensured the removal of accidental gaseous PCE, TCE, and DCE volatilized from the exposure vessels." |
| | | Continued on next page | | | | |

... continued from previous page

| Study Citation: Data Type: Hero ID: | McDaniel, amphibians Other; Aqu 700434 | T.,Martin, P.,Ross, N.,Brown, S.,Lesage, S.,Pau s. Archives of Environmental Contamination a latic; other amphibian - american toad | ıli, B 2004. nd Toxicolog | Effects o y 47:101- | f chlorin 109 | nated solvents on four species of North American |
|-------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|------------------------|------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Domain | | Metric | $\operatorname{Rating}^{\dagger}$ | MWF^{\star} | Score | $Comments^{\dagger\dagger}$ |
| | Metric 8: | Consistency of Exposure Administration | Medium | × 1 | 2 | Authors indicate that there may have been some losses of test chemical during decanting test solu- tions and during the placing of eggs in test cham- bers, and while testing a subsample at 1 hour of exposure TCE conc were only within 70 percent of nominal. The authors report, "Stock solutions of TCE, PCE, and DCE were dissolved in local ground- water in a dilution series. Groundwater was used as the medium for acute tests to emulate conditions in surface waters fed by chloroethylene- contaminated groundwater. Nominal test concentrations were as follows: PCE-2.5, 7.5, 12.5, and 20 mg/L; TCE-12.5, 20, 40, and60 mg/L; and cis- and trans-DCE-12.5, 60, and 100 mg/L. Based on the results of initial ex- posures of American toad embryos, a second expo- sure was conducted with elevated concentrations of PCE and TCE as follows: PCE-15, 30, and 45 mg/ L; and TCE-35, 55, and 85 mg/L. Maximum expo- sure concentrations of PCE and TCE were limited by the compounds' solubility in groundwater. Con- centrations of test solutions, including controls, were measured at 24 h (just prior to solution renewal, see below). Concentrations at $t = 0$ h were based on dilutions of measured stock solutions. Some losses occurred while decanting test solutions and during the placing of eggs in test chambers. In a sub- sample of test solutions measured at 1 h of expo- sure,concentrations of PCE were within 90 percent. However, levels of TCE were only within 70 percent of nominal." |

Continued on next page ...

| Study Citation: Data Type: Hero ID: | McDaniel, 7 amphibians Other; Aqu 700434 | Γ.,Martin, P.,Ross, N.,Brown, S.,Lesage, S.,Pauli . Archives of Environmental Contamination and atic; other amphibian - american toad | , B 2004. l Toxicolog | Effects o y 47:101- | f chlorir 109 | ated solvents on four species of North American |
|-------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|------------------------|------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Domain | | Metric | $\operatorname{Rating}^{\dagger}$ | MWF^{\star} | Score | $Comments^{\dagger\dagger}$ |
| | Metric 9: | Measurement of Test Substance Concentra- tion | High | × 2 | 2 | Measured concentrations were taken, and used to derive an EC50. Authors reported "To prevent volatilization, a glass flask (6 L) was filled to ca- pacity with stock solution to reduce head space and then stirred using a stir bar at low speed to pre- vent disruption of the surface. Stock solutions were stirred until the compound was dissolved or until the solution had reached saturation (between 2 and 48 h, depending on the compound). Despite these precautions, actual concentrations For this reason, con- centrations of stock solutions were measured priorto mixing of the test solutions, using Purge and Trap GC/MS accordingto U.S. EPA method 82 60B (U.S. EPA 1996), to ensure that testsolutions were within 10 percent of the nominal concentration at 1h of ex- posure. The GS/MS was performed on a Hewlett Packard 6890 gas chromatograph, using a Hewlett Packard 5973 mass selective detector, a 3100 purge and trap concentrator, and a PTA-30 purge and trap autosampler. The method detection limit for all chloroethylene analyses was 1 ppb. |
| | Metric 10: | Exposure Duration and Frequency | High | × 1 | 1 | ASTM guidelines for FETAX on American clawed frog suggest 96 hours and a static renewal set up, renewed every 24 hours, which this study does for the acute test. |
| | Metric 11: | Number of Exposure Groups/Spacing of Exposure Levels | Low | × 1 | 3 | This study had four exposure groups for TCE and ASTM FETAX Guidelines suggests the following "At a minimum, five concentrations for each end- point are used. However, additional concentrations between the EC16 and EC84 are highly recom- mended to ensure obtaining accurate 96-hour LC50 and EC50 values." For American toads the concen- trations were too low to generate either an LC50 or an EC50. |
| | Metric 12: | Testing at or Below Solubility Limit | High | $\times 1$ | 1 | Solubility was taken into consideration, and expo- sure concentrations kept below the solubility of TCE in growndwater. |
| Domain 4: Test (| Organism | | | | | |
| | | Continued on next page | | | | |

| Study Citation: Data Type: Hero ID: | McDaniel, 7 amphibians Other; Aqu 700434 | Γ.,Martin, P.,Ross, N.,Brown, S.,Lesage, S.,Pauli A. Archives of Environmental Contamination and atic; other amphibian - american toad | i, B 2004. d Toxicolog | Effects o y 47:101- | f chlorir 109 | nated solvents on four species of North American |
|-------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|------------------------|------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Domain | | Metric | $\operatorname{Rating}^{\dagger}$ | MWF^{\star} | Score | $Comments^{\dagger\dagger}$ |
| | Metric 13: | Test Organism Characteristics | Medium | × 2 | 4 | American toads: Test organisms seem to be suffi- ciently sensitive to the exposures administered to derive an EC50, but are not a suggested species in the ASTM guideline or OECD and EPA guidelines for amphibian growth and development which sug- gest African clawed frog. This study instead used these species to test sensitivity for North American species. Only minor uncertainties because they are not suggested species from a guideline. |
| | Metric 14: | Acclimitization and Pretreatment Conditions | Low | × 1 | 3 | Study authors did not report whether animals were acclimatized or whether pretreatment conditions were the the same for treatment and controls. They authors do report, " In 2001 and 2002, egg masses of wood frogs, spotted salamanders," American toads, and green frogs were collected from a wetland not contaminated with chloroethylenes in F1amborough Township (Ontario,Canada). Water from wetlands were tested for chloroethylenes in 2001 from each site where eggs were collected. No chloroethylenes were detected; the minimum detection limit for this analysis was 1 ppb. Egg masses were less than 24 h old when exposures were initiated. For each species, three egg masses were used (with the exception of the second exposure of American toads, where only one egg mass was used). Each egg.mass was from a different female and represented a replicate. Thus, there were three replicate jars for each chemical by concentration combination, for a total of 45 jars per species. Eggs were not dejellied prior to exposure to more accurately imitatenatural exposure conditions. Each egg mass was gently divided into clusters of ap- proximately 30 eggs (with the exception of spotted salamanders with 5 to 10 eggs) and placed in a 1-L glass Mason jar containing 300 ml of test solution." |
| | Metric 15: | Number of Organisms and Replicates per Group | High | × 1 | 1 | ASTM guidelines suggest 20-25 and two replicates, and the study authors reported, "there were three replicate jars for each chemical" and, "Each egg mass was gently divided into clusters of approxi- mately 30 eggs (with the exception of spotted sala- manders with 5 to 10 eggs) and placed in a 1-L glass Mason jar containing 300 ml of test solution." |
| | | Continued on next page | | | | |

| Study Citation: | McDaniel, T., Martin, P., Ross, N., Brown, S., Lesage, S., Pauli, B. 2004. Effects of chlorinated solvents on four species of North American amphibians. Archives of Environmental Contamination and Toxicology 47:101-109 | | | | | | | |
|------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------|---------------------------|------------------------|-------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|--|
| Data Type: Hero ID: | Other; Aqua 700434 | atic; other amphibian - american toad | | , | | | | |
| Domain | | Metric | Rating^\dagger | MWF^{\star} | Score | $Comments^{\dagger\dagger}$ | | |
| | Metric 16: | Adequacy of Test Conditions | Medium | × 1 | 2 | Animals were held in 1 L glass mason jars contain- ing 300 ml of test solution. Jars were sealed and temperature was maintined at 23+-1 degree C us- ing a water bath. All tests were conducted under 14L/10D light regime. The ASTM guidelines rec- ommend glass, and this temperature is appropriate for african clawed frog but unsure if this temperature is also appropriate for these north american species. Additionally the photoperiod is longer than the one recommended in the ASTM Guidelines. | | |
| Domain 5: Outcor | me Assessme | ent | | | | | | |
| | Metric 17: | Outcome Assessment Methodology | High | $\times 2$ | 2 | Outcome assessment methodology addressed the in- tended outcomes of interest and was sensitive for the outcomes of interest. LC50 and EC50 were reported which are the recommended outcomes in ASTM guidelines for FETAX. | | |
| | Metric 18: | Consistency of Outcome Assessment | Medium | $\times 1$ | 2 | All animals were assessed at the end of the 96 hour period with minor uncertainties due to incomplete reporting. | | |
| Domain 6: Confor | unding / Var | iable Control | | | | | | |
| | Metric 19: | Confounding Variables in Test Design and Procedures | High | $\times 2$ | 2 | No reported differences among study groups in en- vironmental conidtions. | | |
| | Metric 20: | Outcomes Unrelated to Exposure | Medium | × 1 | 2 | One of the controls for the American toads had very high mortality 26 percent, results from that clutch were removed. authors suggest the egg mass may have been damaged in transit. Details on attrition unrelated to exposure for each exposure concentra- tion were also reported as the average with a range. There is a wide range of mortalities between the replicates, and zero mortality at the highest concen- tration. | | |
| Domain 7. Data F | Presentation | and Analysis | | | | | | |
| | Metric 21: | Statistical Methods | High | $\times 1$ | 1 | A two-factor ANOVA was used. ASTM FETAX Guidelines suggests either probit analysis, trimmed Spearman-Karber analysis, or the two-point graphi- cal method to estimate LC50 and EC50 values. | | |
| | | Continued on next page | | | | | | |

| Study Citation: | McDaniel, T.,Martin, P.,Ross, N.,Brown, S.,Lesage, S.,Pauli, B 2004. Effects of chlorinated solvents on four species of North American amphibians. Archives of Environmental Contamination and Toxicology 47:101-109 Other: Aquatic: other amphibian - american toad | | | | | | | | |
|-------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------|-------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|--|--|
| Hero ID: | 700434 | atte, other ampinoian - american toad | | | | | | | |
| Domain | | Metric | $\operatorname{Rating}^\dagger$ | MWF^{\star} | Score | $\mathrm{Comments}^{\dagger\dagger}$ | | | |
| | Metric 22: | Reporting of Data | Medium | × 2 | 4 | Data was reported for each exposure group in ei- ther table or graphical form. It's hard to tell the exact numbers from the graphical representation of the EC50 values for each exposure level, resulting in minor uncertainites. | | | |
| | Metric 23: | Explanation of Unexpected Outcomes | High | $\times 1$ | 1 | Unexpected outcomes were explained. (e.g. loss of TCE through evaporation, damaged eggs in transit) | | | |
| Overall Quality I | Determinatior | 1 [‡] | High | | 1.5 | | | | |
| Extracted | | | Yes | | | | | | |

* MWF = Metric Weighting Factor

[†] High = 1; Medium = 2; Low = 3; Unacceptable = 4; N/A has no value.

[‡] The overall rating is calculated as necessary. EPA may not always provide a comment for a metric that has been categorized as High.

$$\text{Overall rating} = \begin{cases} 4 & \text{if any metric is Unacceptable} \\ \\ \left\lfloor \sum_{i} \left(\text{Metric Score}_{i} \times \text{MWF}_{i} \right) / \sum_{j} \text{MWF}_{j} \right\rceil_{0.1} & \text{(round to the nearest tenth) of the second sec$$

he nearest tenth) otherwise

where High: ≥ 1 to < 1.7; Medium: ≥ 1.7 to < 2.3; Low: ≥ 2.3 to ≤ 3 . If the reviewer determines that the overall rating needs adjustment, the original rating is crossed out and an arrow points to the new rating.

^{††} Metrics that are rated 'High' met the criteria for high confidence as expected for this type of study, and may not require additional comments.

| Study Citation: | McDaniel, amphibians | T.,Martin, P.,Ross, N.,Brown, S.,Lesage, S., s. Archives of Environmental Contaminatio | Pauli, B 2004. on and Toxicology | Effects o y 47:101- | f chlorir 109 | ated solvents on four species of North American | | |
|------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|------------------------|------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|--|
| Data Type: Hero ID: | Other; Aqu 700434 | atic; other amphibian - spotted salamder | | | | | | |
| Domain | | Metric | $\operatorname{Rating}^{\dagger}$ | MWF^{\star} | Score | $Comments^{\dagger\dagger}$ | | |
| Domain 1: Test S | Substance | | | | | | | |
| | Metric 1: | Test Substance Identity | High | $\times 2$ | 2 | Chemical was identified by name. | | |
| | Metric 2: | Test Substance Source | High | $\times 1$ | 1 | Stock solutions were made from 95 percent pure, analytical-grade PCE, TCE, and cis- and trans-DCE (Sigma-Aldridge). | | |
| | Metric 3: | Test Substance Purity | Medium | × 1 | 2 | "Stock solutions were made from 95 percent pure, analytical-grade PCE, TCE, and cis- and trans-DCE (Sigma-Aldridge)." Only minor uncertainties about the purity being at 95 percent, analytical-grade. | | |
| Domain 2: Test 1 | Design | | | | | | | |
| | Metric 4: | Negative Controls | High | $\times 2$ | 2 | Three replicates of embryos were also raised in un- contaminated groundwater as controls. | | |
| | Metric 5: | Negative Control Response | High | × 1 | 1 | Control mortality was reported in table 2 for each species, and deformities in controls were reported in figure 1. Control response for mortality for wood frogs, green frogs and spotted salamanders were all below 10 percent; for American toads it was about 10.1 percent with one of the replicates having a very high 26 percent mortality rate, so there are uncertainites for this species for this metric. Figure 1 shows that the negative control response for all species for percent mortality is below 10 percent. ASTM guidelines indcate "An acceptable clutch of eggs has the capability of developing into Developmental Stage 46 tadpoles with less than 10 percent mortality." | | |
| | Metric 6: | Randomized Allocation | Low | $\times 1$ | 3 | For the acute study it was not reported whether the animals were distributed randomly. | | |
| Domain 3: Expos | Domain 3: Exposure Characterization | | | | | | | |

Continued on next page ...

_

| Study Citation: | McDaniel, amphibian | T.,Martin, P.,Ross s. Archives of Envi | s, N.,Brown, S.,Lesage ironmental Contamir | e, S.,Pauli nation and | , B 2004. I Toxicolog | Effects of v 47:101- | f chlorir 109 | nated solvents on four species of North American |
|------------------------|------------------------|-------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------------|------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Data Type: Hero ID: | Other; Aqu 700434 | atic; other amphil | bian - spotted salame | der | | | | |
| Domain | | | Metric | | $\operatorname{Rating}^{\dagger}$ | MWF^{\star} | Score | $\mathrm{Comments}^{\dagger\dagger}$ |
| | Metric 7: | Experimental S tion | system/Test Media I | Prepara- | Low | × 2 | 6 | Containers were covered and sealed but htere was no mention of minimizing head space, and authors mentioned that TCE solutions declined by 50 to 80 percent over the 24 hour period between renewals. Authors also mentioned, "Each egg mass was gently divided into clusters of approximately 30 eggs (with the exception of spotted salamanders with 5 to 10 eggs) and placed in a 1-L glass Mason jar contain- ing 300 ml of test solution. The lids on the jars were sealed to reduce volatilization. Dissolved oxygen lev- els never fell below 80 percent saturation. Three replicates of embryos were also raised in uncontam- inated groundwater as controls. Temperature was maintained at $23 + 1^{\circ}$ C using a water bath. All tests were conducted under a 14L/10D light regime. An exhaust hood over the water bath ensured the removal of accidental gaseous PCE, TCE, and DCE volatilized from the exposure vessels." |
| | | Continued | l on next page | | | | | |

| Study Citation: Data Type: Hero ID: | McDaniel, amphibian Other; Aqu 700434 | T.,Martin, P.,Ross, N.,Brown, S.,Lesage, S.,Pau s. Archives of Environmental Contamination a matic; other amphibian - spotted salamder | ıli, B 2004. nd Toxicolog | Effects o y 47:101- | f chlorin 109 | nated solvents on four species of North American |
|-------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|------------------------|------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Domain | | Metric | $\operatorname{Rating}^{\dagger}$ | MWF^{\star} | Score | $Comments^{\dagger\dagger}$ |
| | Metric 8: | Consistency of Exposure Administration | Medium | × 1 | 2 | Authors indicate that there may have been some losses of test chemical during decanting test solu- tions and during the placing of eggs in test cham- bers, and while testing a subsample at 1 hour of exposure TCE conc were only within 70 percent of nominal. The authors report, "Stock solutions of TCE, PCE, and DCE were dissolved in local ground- water in a dilution series. Groundwater was used as the medium for acute tests to emulate conditions in surface waters fed by chloroethylene- contaminated groundwater. Nominal test concentrations were as follows: PCE-2.5, 7.5, 12.5, and 20 mg/L; TCE-12.5, 20, 40, and60 mg/L; and cis- and trans-DCE-12.5, 60, and 100 mg/L. Based on the results of initial ex- posures of American toad embryos, a second expo- sure was conducted with elevated concentrations of PCE and TCE as follows: PCE-15, 30, and 45 mg/ L; and TCE-35, 55, and 85 mg/L. Maximum expo- sure concentrations of PCE and TCE were limited by the compounds' solubility in groundwater. Con- centrations of test solutions, including controls, were measured at 24 h (just prior to solution renewal, see below). Concentrations at $t = 0$ h were based on dilutions of measured stock solutions. Some losses occurred while decanting test solutions and during the placing of eggs in test chambers. In a sub- sample of test solutions measured at 1 h of expo- sure, concentrations of PCE were within 90 percent. However, levels of TCE were only within 70 percent of nominal." |
| | | Continued on most more | | | | |

Continued on next page ...

| Study Citation: Data Type: Hero ID: | McDaniel, T.,Martin, P.,Ross, N.,Brown, S.,Lesage, S.,Pauli, B 2004. Effects of chlorinated solvents on four species of North American amphibians. Archives of Environmental Contamination and Toxicology 47:101-109 Other; Aquatic; other amphibian - spotted salamder 700434 | | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------|-------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|--|--|
| Domain | | Metric | $\operatorname{Rating}^{\dagger}$ | MWF^{\star} | Score | $Comments^{\dagger\dagger}$ | | | |
| | Metric 9: | Measurement of Test Substance Concentra- tion | High | × 2 | 2 | Measured concentrations were taken, and used to derive an EC50. Authors reported "To prevent volatilization, a glass flask (6 L) was filled to ca- pacity with stock solution to reduce head space and then stirred using a stir bar at low speed to pre- vent disruption of the surface. Stock solutions were stirred until the compound was dissolved or until the solution had reached saturation (between 2 and 48 h, depending on the compound). Despite these precautions, actual concentrations tended to be less than nominal concentrations. For this reason, con- centrations of stock solutions, using Purge and Trap GC/MS accordingto U.S. EPA method 82 60B (U.S. EPA 1996), to ensure that testsolutions were within 10 percent of the nominal concentration at 1h of ex- posure. The GS/MS was performed on a Hewlett Packard 5973 mass selective detector, a 3100 purge and trap concentrator, and a PTA-30 purge and trap autosampler. The method detection limit for all chloroethylene analyses was 1 ppb. | | | |
| | Metric 10: | Exposure Duration and Frequency | Low | × 1 | 3 | ASTM guidelines for FETAX on American clawed frog suggest 96 hours and a static renewal set up, re- newed every 24 hours, which this study does for the acute test. However, it appears that 96 hours is not enough time for salamanders. Authors state, "Ex- posures followed a 96-h static renewal process with test solutions refreshed daily. Most eggs hatched during the 96-h exposure period with the exception of spotted sal anders. After 96 h, survivorship was assessed; larvae were then euthanized with a solution of clove oil. Spotted salamanders had not hatched by the end of the 96-h period since they take up to a week longer to develop to hatching than the anuran species chosen. The developing salamander embryos were placed in clean groundwater until hatching was complete. Anuran embryos were staged at 96 h ac- cording to Gosner (1960) to test for effects of ex- posures on developmental rates. Salamander larvae were staged at 192 h according to Harrison (1969). Larvae were examined for developmental deformities according to the Atlas of Abnonnalities (Bantle et al. 1998) for Xenopus laevis tadpoles. | | | |

Continued on next page ...

| Study Citation: | McDaniel, T., Martin, P., Ross, N., Brown, S., Lesage, S., Pauli, B. 2004. Effects of chlorinated solvents on four species of North American amphibians. Archives of Environmental Contamination and Toxicology 47:101-109 | | | | | | | | |
|------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------|-------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|--|--|
| Data Type: Hero ID: | Other; Aqu 700434 | atic; other amphibian - spotted salamder | i ionicolog | ,, 11.101 | 100 | | | | |
| Domain | | Metric | $\operatorname{Rating}^{\dagger}$ | MWF^{\star} | Score | $Comments^{\dagger\dagger}$ | | | |
| | Metric 11: | Number of Exposure Groups/Spacing of Exposure Levels | Medium | × 1 | 2 | This study had four exposure groups for TCE and ASTM FETAX Guidelines suggests the following "At a minimum, five concentrations for each end- point are used. However, additional concentrations between the EC16 and EC84 are highly recom- mended to ensure obtaining accurate 96-hour LC50 and EC50 values." | | | |
| | Metric 12: | Testing at or Below Solubility Limit | High | $\times 1$ | 1 | Solubility was taken into consideration, and expo- sure concentrations kept below the solubility of TCE in growndwater. | | | |
| Domain 4: Test (| Organism | | | | | | | | |
| | Metric 13: | Test Organism Characteristics | Medium | × 2 | 4 | Spotted salamander: Test organisms seem to be suf- ficiently sensitive to the exposures administered to derive an EC50, but are not a suggested species in the ASTM guideline or OECD and EPA guidelines for amphibian growth and development which sug- gest African clawed frog. This study instead used these species to test sensitivity for North American species. Only minor uncertainties because they are not suggested species from a guideline. | | | |
| | | Continued on next page | | | | | | | |

| Study Citation: Data Type: Hero ID: | McDaniel, 7 amphibians Other; Aqu 700434 | F.,Martin, P.,Ross, N.,Brown, S.,Lesage, S.,Pauli Archives of Environmental Contamination and atic; other amphibian - spotted salamder | , B 2004. I Toxicolog | Effects o y 47:101- | f chlorin 109 | nated solvents on four species of North American |
|-------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------|------------------------|------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Domain | | Metric | Rating^\dagger | MWF^{\star} | Score | $Comments^{\dagger\dagger}$ |
| | Metric 14: | Acclimitization and Pretreatment Conditions | Low | × 1 | 3 | Study authors did not report whether animals were acclimatized or whether pretreatment conditions were the the same for treatment and controls. They authors do report, " In 2001 and 2002, egg masses of wood frogs, spotted salamanders," American toads, and green frogs were collected from a wetland not contaminated with chloroethylenes in F1amborough Township (Ontario,Canada). Water from wetlands were tested for chloroethylenes in 2001 from each site where eggs were collected. No chloroethylenes were detected; the minimum detection limit for this analysis was 1 ppb. Egg masses were less than 24 h old when exposures were initiated. For each species, three egg masses were used (with the exception of the second exposure of American toads, where only one egg mass was used). Each egg.mass was from a different female and represented a replicate. Thus, there were three replicate jars for each chemical by concentration combination, for a total of 45 jars per species. Eggs were not dejellied prior to exposure to more accurately imitatenatural exposure conditions. Each egg mass was gently divided into clusters of ap- proximately 30 eggs (with the exception of spotted salamanders with 5 to 10 eggs) and placed in a 1-L glass Mason jar containing 300 ml of test solution." |
| | Metric 15: | Number of Organisms and Replicates per Group | Low | × 1 | 3 | ASTM guidelines suggest 20-25 and two replicates, and the study authors reported, "there were three replicate jars for each chemical" and, "Each egg mass was gently divided into clusters of approxi- mately 30 eggs (with the exception of spotted sala- manders with 5 to 10 eggs) and placed in a 1-L glass Mason jar containing 300 ml of test solution." This resulted in the nominal and measured conc for TCE not having an adequate sample size to gener- ate confidence intervals. Because salamanders are difficult to rear in the lab in high numbers, this was taken into consideration in the scoring for this met- ric (given a low instead of an unacceptable). Addi- tionally the number of organisms suggested in the ASTM guidelines are based on another species. |

| Study Citation: | McDaniel, T., Martin, P., Ross, N., Brown, S., Lesage, S., Pauli, B. 2004. Effects of chlorinated solvents on four species of North American amphibians. Archives of Environmental Contamination and Toxicology 47:101-109 | | | | | | | | |
|------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------|-------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|--|--|
| Data Type: Hero ID: | Other; Aqu 700434 | atic; other amphibian - spotted salamder | | <i>y</i> | | | | | |
| Domain | | Metric | $\operatorname{Rating}^\dagger$ | MWF^{\star} | Score | $Comments^{\dagger\dagger}$ | | | |
| | Metric 16: | Adequacy of Test Conditions | Medium | × 1 | 2 | Animals were held in 1 L glass mason jars contain- ing 300 ml of test solution. Jars were sealed and temperature was maintined at 23+-1 degree C us- ing a water bath. All tests were conducted under 14L/10D light regime. The ASTM guidelines rec- ommend glass, and this temperature is approprate for african clawed frog but unsure if this temperature is also appropriate for these north american species. Additionally the photoperiod is longer than the one recommended in the ASTM Guidelines. | | | |
| Domain 5: Outcome Assessment | | | | | | | | | |
| | Metric 17: | Outcome Assessment Methodology | High | × 2 | 2 | Outcome assessment methodology addressed the in- tended outcomes of interest and was sensitive for the outcomes of interest. LC50 and EC50 were reported which are the recommended outcomes in ASTM guidelines for FETAX. Dead individuals were counted and removed at the end of each 24 hours. | | | |
| | Metric 18: | Consistency of Outcome Assessment | Medium | × 1 | 2 | All animals were assessed at the end of the 96 hour period with minor uncertainties due to incomplete reporting. | | | |
| Domain 6: Confo | unding / Var | iable Control | | | | | | | |
| Domain 0. Como | Metric 19: | Confounding Variables in Test Design and Procedures | High | $\times 2$ | 2 | No reported differences among study groups in en- vironmental conidtions. | | | |
| | Metric 20: | Outcomes Unrelated to Exposure | Medium | × 1 | 2 | Controls for the spotted salamanders were under 10 percent mortality and deformities. Details on attri- tion unrelated to exposure for each exposure con- centration were also reported as the average with a range. There is a wide range of portailities between the replicates. | | | |
| Domain 7. Data | Presentation | and Analysis | | | | | | | |
| | Metric 21: | Statistical Methods | Medium | × 1 | 2 | A two-factor ANOVA was used. ASTM FETAX Guidelines suggests either probit analysis, trimmed Spearman-Karber analysis, or the two-point graphi- cal method to estimate LC50 and EC50 values. How- ever due to sample size authors were not able to gen- erate confidence intervals. | | | |
| | | Continued on next page | | | | | | | |

| Study Citation: Data Type: | McDaniel, 7 amphibians Other; Aqu | AcDaniel, T.,Martin, P.,Ross, N.,Brown, S.,Lesage, S.,Pauli, B 2004. Effects of chlorinated solvents on four species of North American amphibians. Archives of Environmental Contamination and Toxicology 47:101-109 Other; Aquatic; other amphibian - spotted salamder | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------|-------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|--|--|--|
| Hero ID: | 700434 | , , , | | | | | | | | |
| Domain | | Metric | $\operatorname{Rating}^{\dagger}$ | MWF^{\star} | Score | $Comments^{\dagger\dagger}$ | | | | |
| | Metric 22: | Reporting of Data | Medium | $\times 2$ | 4 | Data was reported for each exposure group in ei- ther table or graphical form. It's hard to tell the exact numbers from the graphical representation of the EC50 values for each exposure level, resulting in minor uncertainites. | | | | |
| | Metric 23: | Explanation of Unexpected Outcomes | High | $\times 1$ | 1 | Unexpected outcomes were explained. (e.g. loss of TCE through evaporation, damaged eggs in transit) | | | | |
| Overall Quality Determination [‡] | | | Medium | | 1.8 | | | | | |
| Extracted | | | Yes | | | | | | | |

* MWF = Metric Weighting Factor

[†] High = 1; Medium = 2; Low = 3; Unacceptable = 4; N/A has no value.

[‡] The overall rating is calculated as necessary. EPA may not always provide a comment for a metric that has been categorized as High.

$$\text{Overall rating} = \begin{cases} 4 & \text{if any metric is Unacceptable} \\ \\ \left\lfloor \sum_{i} \left(\text{Metric Score}_{i} \times \text{MWF}_{i} \right) / \sum_{j} \text{MWF}_{j} \right\rceil_{0.1} & \text{(round to the nearest tenth) otherwise} \end{cases}$$

where High: ≥ 1 to < 1.7; Medium: ≥ 1.7 to < 2.3; Low: ≥ 2.3 to ≤ 3 . If the reviewer determines that the overall rating needs adjustment, the original rating is crossed out and an arrow points to the new rating.

^{††} Metrics that are rated 'High' met the criteria for high confidence as expected for this type of study, and may not require additional comments.

| Study Citation: | Fort, D.,Ra | ayburn, J.,Deyoung, D.,Bantle, J., 1991. Assessi FETAX, Drug and Chemical Toxicology 14:143 | ing the effic | eacy of ar | 1 Aroclo | or 1254-induced exogenous metabolic activation |
|------------------------|----------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------|----------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Data Type: Hero ID: | Other; Aqu 701994 | atic; other amphibian - frog | 100 | | | |
| Domain | | Metric | $\operatorname{Rating}^{\dagger}$ | MWF^{\star} | Score | $Comments^{\dagger\dagger}$ |
| Domain 1: Test S | Substance | | | | | |
| | Metric 1: | Test Substance Identity | High | $\times 2$ | 2 | Identified by name trichloroethylene |
| | Metric 2: | Test Substance Source | High | $\times 1$ | 1 | Aldrich, Milwaukee, WI |
| | Metric 3: | Test Substance Purity | Low | $\times 1$ | 3 | Not reported |
| Domain 2: Test 1 | Design | | | | | |
| | Metric 4: | Negative Controls | High | × 2 | 2 | Four separate dishes of 20 embryos were exposed to FETAX solution alone and designated FETAX solution controls. Controls including FETAX solu- tion,each MAS, CO-MAS + toxicant (negative con- trol), cyclophosphamide (FETAX reference Aroclor 1254 MAS proteratogen7 "9 - 11) and acetylhy- drazide (additional mixed MAS positive control7), and unactivated toxicant were tested concurrently with each experiment. |
| | Metric 5: | Negative Control Response | High | × 1 | 1 | In this study, FETAX solution control embryo mortality and malformation rates were <2 . 0 percent and <5 percent, respectively . Mortality and malformation rates for each MAS control were <4 percent and <9 percent, respectively. Acceptable rates of FETAX solution a nd MAS control mortality and malformation are generally 1 0 percent . No less than 86 percent of those embryos subjected to 4.0 mg/ml activated cyclophosphamide and e ither the Aroclor 1254 or the mixed MAS died . Survivors of the previous treatments were severely deformed . Exposure of embryos to 3 . 0 mg/ml activated acetylhydrazide and the INH MAS or mixed MAS produced mortality and malformation rates >43 percent and 100 percent, respectively . |
| | Metric 6: | Randomized Allocation | Low | $\times 1$ | 3 | Not reported how allocation was conducted |
| Domain 3: Expo | sure Charact | erization | | | | |
| | Metric 7: | Experimental System/Test Media Preparation | Low | $\times 2$ | 6 | Covered petri dishes were used but there was no mention of headspace or other considerations for volatility. |
| | | Continued on next page | | | | |
| | | | | | | |

| Study Citation: Data Type: Hero ID: | Fort, D.,Ra system for Other; Aqu 701994 | Fort, D.,Rayburn, J.,Deyoung, D.,Bantle, J. 1991. Assessing the efficacy of an Aroclor 1254-induced exogenous metabolic activation system for FETAX. Drug and Chemical Toxicology 14:143-160 Other; Aquatic; other amphibian - frog 701994 | | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------|-------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|--|--|--|
| Domain | | Metric | $\operatorname{Rating}^{\dagger}$ | MWF^{\star} | Score | $\mathrm{Comments}^{\dagger\dagger}$ | | | | |
| | Metric 8: | Consistency of Exposure Administration | Low | $\times 1$ | 3 | Only general details of exposure administration were given. All solutions were renewed every 24 hours in a static renewal system for 96 hours. | | | | |
| | Metric 9: | Measurement of Test Substance Concentration | Low | $\times 2$ | 6 | Not reported how test concentrations were deter- mined, and because substance is volatile could have substantial impacts on results. | | | | |
| | Metric 10: | Exposure Duration and Frequency | High | × 1 | 1 | Published protocol for FETAX suggest a static- renewal, 96 hour test, which is what the authors of this paper conducted in this study. While it's not an OECD or EPA guideline study, other peer reviewed publications have used FETAX repeatedly, and the ASTM guidelines methods were reviewed by NTP at the request of EPA, and determined that FETAX data can be used to identify and pri- oritize sites with increased developmental toxicity risks. "Due to varying susceptibilities among ani- mals, testing in multiple species is considered neces- sary to protect the environment. For each species, it is a combination of toxicants, water quality, and the organism itself that defines the hazard for a spe- cific concentration of a toxicant within defined water quality conditions. Ecotoxicological standards are generally based on the susceptibility of the adult animal, which may not provide adequate protec- tion for embryonic development and reproduction in many species. It is inherently impossible to eval- uate developmental toxicity without exposing ani- mals throughout development and assessing for ad- verse effects in multiple life stages. and for Early embryonic and juvenile stages are often the most susceptible periods for the toxic effects of many en- vironmental contaminants. Embryonic development in amphibians is sensitive to water quality. Be- cause ofthis, FETAX has been used in ecotoxicolog- ical studies to evaluate the potential developmental hazard of contaminated surface waters, sediments, waste site soils, and industrial wastewater and to evaluate the efficacy of wastewater treatment pro- cedures. In this context, the resulting data can be used to identify and prioritize sites with increased developmental toxicity risks. " | | | | |

... continued from previous page

Continued on next page ...

| Study Citation: | Fort, D.,Rayburn, J.,Deyoung, D.,Bantle, J. 1991. Assessing the efficacy of an Aroclor 1254-induced exogenous metabolic activation system for FETAX. Drug and Chemical Toxicology 14:143-160 | | | | | | | | |
|------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------|-------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|--|--|
| Data Type: Hero ID: | Other; Aqu 701994 | atic; other amphibian - frog | | | | | | | |
| Domain | | Metric | $\operatorname{Rating}^{\dagger}$ | MWF^{\star} | Score | $\mathrm{Comments}^{\dagger\dagger}$ | | | |
| | Metric 11: | Number of Exposure Groups/Spacing of Exposure Levels | High | × 1 | 1 | For each compound, 12-18 concentrations were tested with replicates. FETAX publications suggest at least 5 test conc are appropriate. Also the study reports "For each compound, one range-finding and two definitive dose-response assays were conducted with and without the MAS." | | | |
| | Metric 12: | Testing at or Below Solubility Limit | High | $\times 1$ | 1 | | | | |
| Domain 4: Test C | Organism | | | | | | | | |
| | Metric 13: | Test Organism Characteristics | High | $\times 2$ | 2 | Xenopus laevis was used in this study and is the recommended species in ASTM guidelines. | | | |
| | Metric 14: | Acclimitization and Pretreatment Conditions | Low | × 1 | 3 | Uncertainties remain because the acclimatization was not fully described in this paper. Authors write, "Xenopus adult care, breeding, and embryo collec- tion were performed as described by Dawson and Bantle." | | | |
| | Metric 15: | Number of Organisms and Replicates per Group | Medium | × 1 | 2 | 20 embryos were used in replicate. Guidelines for ASTM FETAX state "Each of the three definitive tests is conducted using embryos from a different male/female pair of X. laevis. Each test consists of several different concentrations of the test sub- stance with two replicate dishes at each test con- centration and four replicate dishes for each control. Each plastic or glass Petri dish contains 20 or 25 embryos, respectively. The number of embryos per dish, the number of replicate dishes per test sub- stance concentration, and the number of replicate tests per study were not based on a formal scien- tific analysis. Rather, selection was based on the best scientific judgement of the developers/users of the assay at the time the ASTM FETAX Guideline (1991, 1998) was prepared (J. Bantle and D. Fort, personal communication)." | | | |
| | | Continued on next page | | | | | | | |

| Hero ID: 701994 Domain Metric Ratingt MWF* Score Comments ^{††} Metric 16: Adequacy of Test Conditions Medium × 1 2 Mnore uncertainties about housing. Temp and photon discussion of the appropriate according to published by published of the other appropriate according to published of the other appropriate according to published of the other appropriate according to published of the appropriate according to published of the appropriate according to published of the appropriate according to the appropriate | Study Citation: Data Type: | Fort, D.,Rayburn, J.,Deyoung, D.,Bantle, J 1991. Assessing the efficacy of an Aroclor 1254-induced exogenous metabolic activation system for FETAX. Drug and Chemical Toxicology 14:143-160 Other; Aquatic; other amphibian - frog | | | | | | | | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------|-------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|--|--|
| Domain Metric Rating! MWF* Score Comments ^{††} Metric 16: Adequacy of Test Conditions Medium × 1 2 Minor uncertainties about housing. Temp and phare appropriate seconding to published recommendations. The operations conducted without the MAS, groups of 20 embryos were placed in 60 mm covered plastic Petri foldses with avging concentrations of the appropriate test compound. "Each training of the appropriate test compound." Each training of the appropriate test compound." The phi of all took solutions were transmit took solutions were removed at the took solutions were removed at the solution. If the phi of all took solutions were removed at the solution. If the phi of all took solutions were removed at the solution. If the phi of all took solutions were removed at the solution. If the phi of all took solutions were removed at the solution. If the phi of all took solutions were removed at the test optimal. The isolation and flow concorbon plastic test solution, and flow concorbon plastic design and the solution. If the phi of all took solutions are considered in this unclear what were the solution. If the phi of all took solutions are considered in this marks, "The phi of all the solutions were stabilished. The study states, "Boh methin that concentrations (LCG) and the concentrations (LCG) and the concentrations (Indications (LCG) and the concentrations (Indications (LCG)) andithe concentrations (Indications | Hero ID: | 701994 | | | | | | | | |
| Metric 16: Adequacy of Test Conditions Medium × 1 2 Minor uncertainties about housing. Temp and phare appropriate according to published recommen- tations. "For experiments conducted without the MAS, groups of 20 embryos were placed in 60 nm Metric 16: Adequacy of Test Conditions Medium × 1 2 Minor uncertainties about housing. Temp and phare appropriate according to published recommen- trations. "The pull of all set2" in this way ing concen- trations of the appropriate test compound." "Each treatment disk contrained a total of 8 ml of 8 | Domain | | Metric | $\operatorname{Rating}^{\dagger}$ | MWF^{\star} | Score | $Comments^{\dagger\dagger}$ | | | |
| Domain 5: Outcome Assessment Metric 17: Outcome Assessment Methodology High × 2 2 ASTM guidance states that "Only those biological responses related to mortality and malformations are considered in this analysis" and an LC50 and EC50 for malformations mare considered in this analysis" and an LC50 and EC50 for malformations gree stabilished. The study states, "96-h median lethal concentrations (LC50) and the concentrations inducing gross terata in 50 percent of the surviving larvae (EC50) along with respective 95 percent confidence limits were determined using Litchfield Wilcoxon probit analysis . 20 A Teratogenic Index (TI=LC50/EC50) was used as a meth6d of assessing teratogenic potential . 5 18-11, 21 Head-tail length of surviving embryos was measured as an index of embryos growth. Minimum concentrations to inhibit growth (MCIG) were determined with the t-Tset (p<0.05)." | | Metric 16: | Adequacy of Test Conditions | Medium | × 1 | 2 | Minor uncertainties about housing. Temp and ph are appropriate according to published recommen- dations. "For experiments conducted without the MAS, groups of 20 embryos were placed in 60 mm covered plastic Petri dishes with varying concen- trations of the appropriate test compound." "Each treatment dish contained a total of 8 ml of solu- tion." "The pH of all stock solutions was 7.0. Em- bryos were cultured at 23"1"c. All solutions were renewed every 24 h. Dead embryos were removed at this time." The ASTM guidance states "Glass, Type 316 stainless steel, nylon, and fluorocarbon plastic should be used whenever possible to minimize dis- solution, leaching, and sorption." It is unclear what kind of plastic these petri dishes are made of. | | | |
| Domain 3: Outcome Assessment Metric 17: Outcome Assessment Methodology High × 2 2 ASTM guidance states that "Only those biological responses related to mortality and malformations are considered in this analysis" and an LC50 and EC50 for malformations were established. The study states, "96-h median lethal concentrations (LC50) and the concentrations inducing gross terata in 50 percent of the surviving larvae (EC50) along with respective 95 percent confidence limits were determined using Litchfield Wilcoxon probit analysis . Metric 18: Consistency of Outcome Assessment Medium × 1 2 Incomplete reporting of minor details of outcome assessment protocol Domain 6: Confounding / Variable Control Metric 19: Confounding Variables in Test Design and Medium × 2 4 Incomplete data across study groups, and there could be confounding due to the volatility of the chemical. | | | | | | | | | | |
| Metric 18: Consistency of Outcome Assessment Medium × 1 2 Incomplete reporting of minor details of outcome assessment protocol Domain 6: Confounding / Variable Control Metric 19: Confounding Variables in Test Design and Medium × 2 4 Incomplete data across study groups, and there could be confounding due to the volatility of the chemical. Continued on next page Continued on next page Continued on the chemical. Continued on the chemical. | Domain 5: Outco | Metric 17: | Outcome Assessment Methodology | High | × 2 | 2 | ASTM guidance states that "Only those biological responses related to mortality and malformations are considered in this analysis" and an LC50 and EC50 for malformations were established. The study states, "96-h median lethal concentrations (LC50) and the concentrations inducing gross terata in 50 percent of the surviving larvae (EC50) along with respective 95 percent confidence limits were deter- mined using Litchfield Wilcoxon probit analysis . 20 A Teratogenic Index (TI=LC50/EC50) was used as a meth6d of assessing teratogenic potential . 5 18- ll, 21 Head-tail length of surviving embryos was measured as an index of embryo growth. Minimum concentrations to inhibit growth (MCIG) were de- termined with the t-Test ($p<0.05$)." | | | |
| Domain 6: Confounding / Variable Control Metric 19: Confounding Variables in Test Design and Medium × 2 4 Incomplete data across study groups, and there Procedures Continued on next page | | Metric 18: | Consistency of Outcome Assessment | Medium | × 1 | 2 | Incomplete reporting of minor details of outcome as- sessment protocol | | | |
| Continued on next page | Domain 6: Confo | ounding / Var Metric 19: | iable Control Confounding Variables in Test Design and Procedures | Medium | $\times 2$ | 4 | Incomplete data across study groups, and there could be confounding due to the volatility of the chemical | | | |
| | | Continued on next page | | | | | | | | |

| Study Citation: | Fort, D.,Rayburn, J.,Deyoung, D.,Bantle, J. 1991. Assessing the efficacy of an Aroclor 1254-induced exogenous metabolic activation system for FETAX. Drug and Chemical Toxicology 14:143-160 | | | | | |
|------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------------|---------------|-------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Data Type: Hero ID: | Other; Aqu 701994 | atic; other amphibian - frog | | | | |
| Domain | | Metric | Rating^\dagger | MWF^{\star} | Score | $Comments^{\dagger\dagger}$ |
| | Metric 20: | Outcomes Unrelated to Exposure | Medium | × 1 | 2 | There was some discussion of health outcomes unrelated to exposure with only minor uncertainties about why there were differences between the various controls. "In this study, FETAX solut ion control embryo mortality and malformation rates were <2 . 0 percent and <5 percent, respectively . Mortality and malformation rates for each MAS contro l were <4 percent and <9 percent, respectively. Acceptable rates of FETAX solution a nd MAS control mortal ity and malformation are generally 1 0 percent . No less than 86 percent of those embryos subjected to 4.0 mg/ml activated cyclophosphamide and e ither the Aroclor 1254 or the mixed MAS died . Survivors of the previous treatments were s everely deformed . Exposure of embryos to 3 . 0 mg/ml activated acetylhydrazide and the INH MAS or mixed MAS produced mortality and malformation rates >43 percent and 100 percent, respectively." |
| Domain 7: Data Presentation and Analysis | | | | | | |
| | Metric 21: | Statistical Methods | High | × 1 | 1 | ASTM guidance says that either probit analysis, trimmed Spearman-Karber analysis or the two-point graphical methode are used to estimate the LC50 and EC50 values. This study states that the "96-h median lethal concentrations (LC50) and the con- centrations inducing gross terata in 50 percent of the surviving larvae (EC50) along with respective 95 percent confidence limits were determined using Litchfield Wilcoxon probit analysis. A Teratogenic Index (TI=LC50/EC50) was used as a method of assessing teratogenic potential. Head-tail length of surviving embryos was measured as an index of em- bryo growth. Minimum concentrations to inhibit growth (MCIG) were determined with t he t-Test (p<0.05)." |
| | Metric 22: | Reporting of Data | Medium | × 2 | 4 | Some information is given for each treatment group, but it's incomplete. information was given for TCE alone, TCE and MAS, etc but not for each exposure group |
| Continued on next page | | | | | | |

... continued from previous page
| Study Citation: Data Type: Hero ID: | Fort, D.,Rayburn, J.,Deyoung, D.,Bantle, J. 1991. Assessing the efficacy of an Aroclor 1254-induced exogenous metabolic activation system for FETAX. Drug and Chemical Toxicology 14:143-160 Other; Aquatic; other amphibian - frog 701994 | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------|-------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|--|
| Domain | | Metric | $\operatorname{Rating}^{\dagger}$ | MWF^{\star} | Score | $\mathrm{Comments}^{\dagger\dagger}$ | | |
| | Metric 23: | Explanation of Unexpected Outcomes | High | × 1 | 1 | Unexpected outcomes were discussed. "Several of the TCE-induced malformations including cardiac effects observed in the avian modelare similar to those recorded with Xenopus. Differences in the ability of TCE to induce terata in mammals, birds, and frog embryos may be the result of differences in embryonic susceptibility across the phylogenetic range, route of exposure, as well as, pharmaco- logical nature of the test system. Themajority of mammalian studies utilized pulmonary exposure, whereas, the avian system and FETAX provide di- rect embryonic exposure to toxicants. Positive re- sults in FETAX may, in fact, be due to highly embryotoxic intermediates or metabolites of TCE. The formation of a reactive epoxide intermediate (TCEoxide) has been identified in rat, rabbit, and mouse." | | |
| Overall Quality I | Determination | a‡ | Medium | | 1.8 | | | |
| Extracted | | | Yes | | | | | |
| * MWF = Metric Weighting Factor † High = 1; Medium = 2; Low = 3; Unacceptable = 4; N/A has no value. ‡ The overall rating is calculated as necessary. EPA may not always provide a comment for a metric that has been categorized as High. | | | | | | | | |

 $\text{Overall rating} = \begin{cases} 4 & \text{if any metric is Unacceptable} \\ \left[\sum_{i} (\text{Metric Score}_{i} \times \text{MWF}_{i}) / \sum_{j} \text{MWF}_{j}\right]_{0.1} & (\text{round to the nearest tenth}) \text{ otherwise} \end{cases},$

where High: ≥ 1 to < 1.7; Medium: ≥ 1.7 to < 2.3; Low: ≥ 2.3 to ≤ 3 . If the reviewer determines that the overall rating needs adjustment, the original rating is crossed out and an arrow points to the new rating.

| Study Citation: | Fort, D., Rogers, R., Stover, E., Finch, R 2001. Optimization of an exogenous metabolic activation system for FETAX. I. Post-isolation rat liver microsome mixtures. Drug and Chemical Toxicology 24:103-115 | | | | | | | | |
|------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------|-------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|--|--|
| Data Type: Hero ID: | Other; Aqu 701995 | atic; other amphibian - frog | gy 24.105-1 | 10 | | | | | |
| Domain | | Metric | $\operatorname{Rating}^{\dagger}$ | MWF^{\star} | Score | $Comments^{\dagger\dagger}$ | | | |
| Domain 1: Test S | ubstance | | | | | | | | |
| | Metric 1: | Test Substance Identity | High | $\times 2$ | 2 | Chemical identified by name | | | |
| | Metric 2: | Test Substance Source | High | $\times 1$ | 1 | Signma St Louise Missouri | | | |
| | Metric 3: | Test Substance Purity | Low | $\times 1$ | 3 | Purity not reported | | | |
| Domain 2: Test I | Design | | | | | | | | |
| | Metric 4: | Negative Controls | High | $\times 2$ | 2 | Four separate dishes of 20 embryos were exposed FE- TAX solution alone and designated FETAX solution controls. | | | |
| | Metric 5: | Negative Control Response | High | × 1 | 1 | In this study, FETAX solution control embryo mor- tality and malformation rates were 5.0 percent and 6.3 percent, respectively. Mortality and malforma- tion rates for each MAS control were 7.5 percent and 7.6 percent, respectively. | | | |
| | Metric 6: | Randomized Allocation | Low | $\times 1$ | 3 | It was not reported how animals were allocated | | | |
| Domoin 2. Europ | una Chanact | | | | | | | | |
| Domain 3: Expos | Metric 7: | Experimental System/Test Media Prepara- tion | Low | $\times 2$ | 6 | Dishes were covered but no mention of headspace minimizing was given. TCE is very volatile, and it was not indicated whether concentrations were con- firmed through measurement. | | | |
| | Metric 8: | Consistency of Exposure Administration | Medium | × 1 | 2 | Only general details of exposure administration were given. This study reports that solutions were re- newed every 24 hours in a static renewal system for 96 hours, and "For each compound, 12"18 con- centrations were tested in duplicate. Four separate dishes of 20 embryos were exposed FETAX solu- tion alone and designated FETAX solution controls. Each treatment dish contained a total of 10mL of solution." | | | |
| | Metric 9: | Measurement of Test Substance Concentra- tion | Low | $\times 2$ | 6 | It was not reported whether test concentrations were measured, and based on professional judgment of ex- periment design and nature of test substance, actual concentration cannot be expected to be similar to nominal concentration. | | | |
| | Continued on next page | | | | | | | | |

| Study Citation: Data Type: Hero ID: | Fort, D.,Ro rat liver mid Other; Aqu 701995 | Fort, D.,Rogers, R.,Stover, E.,Finch, R.: 2001. Optimization of an exogenous metabolic activation system for FETAX. I. Post-isolation rat liver microsome mixtures. Drug and Chemical Toxicology 24:103-115 Other; Aquatic; other amphibian - frog 701995 | | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------|-------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|--|--|--|
| Domain | | Metric | $\operatorname{Rating}^{\dagger}$ | MWF^{\star} | Score | $\mathrm{Comments}^{\dagger\dagger}$ | | | | |
| | Metric 10: | Exposure Duration and Frequency | High | × 1 | 1 | FETAX is a static-renewal bioassay, and in accor- dance with other published FETAX assays (and the ASTM guidelines which were reviewed by NTP), the study authors did a 96 hour test with the solutions renewed every 24 hours. | | | | |
| | Metric 11: | Number of Exposure Groups/Spacing of Exposure Levels | High | × 1 | 1 | "For each compound, one range-finding and two definitive dose-responseassays were conducted with and without the MASs." and "For each com- pound,12"18 concentrations were tested in dupli- cate." FETAX publications suggest at least 5 test conc are appropriate. | | | | |
| | Metric 12: | Testing at or Below Solubility Limit | High | $\times 1$ | 1 | | | | | |
| Domain 4. Test (| Organism | | | | | | | | | |
| Domain 4. 1650 V | Metric 13: | Test Organism Characteristics | High | $\times 2$ | 2 | Xenopus laevis are used in this study are the recom- mended species for FETAX in ASTM guidelines | | | | |
| | Metric 14: | Acclimitization and Pretreatment Conditions | Low | $\times 1$ | 3 | The study reports, "X. laevis adult care, breeding, and embryo collection were preformed as described in ASTM E1439-98" and it is not clear from this paper whether animals were acclimatized. | | | | |
| | Metric 15: | Number of Organisms and Replicates per Group | Medium | × 1 | 2 | This study used 20 in replicate in plastic dishes. Guidelines for ASTM FETAX state "Each of the three definitive tests is conducted using embryos from a different male/female pair of X. laevis. Each test consists of several different concentrations of the test substance with two replicate dishes at each test concentration and four replicate dishes for each con- trol. Each plastic or glass Petri dish contains 20 or 25 embryos, respectively. The number of embryos per dish, the number of replicate dishes per test sub- stance concentration, and the number of replicate tests per study were not based on a formal scien- tific analysis. Rather, selection was based on the best scientific judgement of the developers/users of the assay at the time the ASTM FETAX Guideline (1991, 1998) was prepared (J. Bantle and D. Fort, personal communication)." | | | | |

Continued on next page ...

| Study Citation: Data Type: | Fort, D.,Rogers, R.,Stover, E.,Finch, R 2001. Optimization of an exogenous metabolic activation system for FETAX. I. Post-isolation rat liver microsome mixtures. Drug and Chemical Toxicology 24:103-115 Other; Aquatic; other amphibian - frog | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------|---------------|-------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|--|
| Hero ID: | 701995 | | | | | | | |
| Domain | | Metric | Rating^\dagger | MWF^{\star} | Score | $Comments^{\dagger\dagger}$ | | |
| | Metric 16: | Adequacy of Test Conditions | Medium | × 1 | 2 | Minor uncertainties about housing. The ASTM guidance on FETAX suggest 23 degrees C +-3 which was maintained in this study, and ph was maintained between the suggested 6.5 and 9.0 range with 7.7 being optimal. Each treatment dish contained a total of 10mL of solution for 20 embryos each which is enough according to ASTM Guidance. This guidance also states "Glass, Type 316 stainless steel, nylon, and fluorocarbon plastic should be used whenever possible to minimize dissolution, leaching, and sorption." It is unclear what kind of plastic these petri dishes are made of. | | |
| DIFO | | | | | | | | |
| Domain 5: Outco | Metric 17: | outcome Assessment Methodology | High | $\times 2$ | 2 | Outcome assessment methodology addressed the in- tended outcomes of interest. ASTM guidance states that "Only those biological responses related to mor- tality and malformations are considered in this anal- ysis" and an LC50 and EC50 for malformations were established. | | |
| | Metric 18: | Consistency of Outcome Assessment | Medium | $\times 1$ | 2 | Incomplete reporting of minor details of outcome as- sessment protocol | | |
| Demein 6. Cenfe | | ishla Control | | | | | | |
| Domain 6: Confe | Metric 19: | Confounding Variables in Test Design and Procedures | Medium | $\times 2$ | 4 | Incomplete data across study groups, and there could be confounding due to the volatility of the chemical. | | |
| | Metric 20: | Outcomes Unrelated to Exposure | High | × 1 | 1 | The study reports "In this study, FETAX solu- tion control embryo mortality and malformation rates were 5.0 percent and 6.3 percent, respectively. Mortality and malformation rates for each MAS control were 7.5 percent and 7.6 percent, respec- tively.Acceptable rates of FETAX solution and MAS control mortality andmalformation are generally 10 percent." | | |
| Domain 7: Data | Presentation | and Analysis | | | | | | |

Continued on next page ...

| Study Citation: Data Type: Hero ID: | Fort, D.,Ro rat liver mi Other; Aqu 701995 | Fort, D.,Rogers, R.,Stover, E.,Finch, R.: 2001. Optimization of an exogenous metabolic activation system for FETAX. I. Post-isolation rat liver microsome mixtures. Drug and Chemical Toxicology 24:103-115 Other; Aquatic; other amphibian - frog 701995 | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------|-------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|--|--|
| Domain | | Metric | $\operatorname{Rating}^{\dagger}$ | MWF^{\star} | Score | $Comments^{\dagger\dagger}$ | | | |
| | Metric 21: | Statistical Methods | High | × 1 | 1 | ASTM guidance says that either probit analysis, trimmed Spearman-Karber analysis or the two-point graphical methode are used to estimate the LC50 and EC50 values. The study reports, "96 h median lethal concentrations (LC50) and the concentrations inducing gross terata in 50 percent of the surviv- ing larvae (EC50) along with respective 95 per- cent fiducial limits were determined using trimmed Spearman-Karber analysis. Head-tail length of sur- viving embryos was measured as an index of embryo growth. Minimum concentrations to inhibit growth (MCIG) were determined using ANOVA [Bonferroni t-test (p <0.05)]." | | | |
| | Metric 22: | Reporting of Data | Low | $\times 2$ | 6 | Data for exposure related findings were not shown for each study group but results were described in the text. | | | |
| | Metric 23: | Explanation of Unexpected Outcomes | High | $\times 1$ | 1 | No unexplained outcomes. | | | |
| Overall Quality I | Determination | n‡ | Medium | | 1.8 | | | | |
| Extracted | | | Yes | | | | | | |

* MWF = Metric Weighting Factor

[†] High = 1; Medium = 2; Low = 3; Unacceptable = 4; N/A has no value.

[‡] The overall rating is calculated as necessary. EPA may not always provide a comment for a metric that has been categorized as High.

$$Overall rating = \begin{cases} 4 & \text{if any metric is Unacceptable} \\ \\ \left\lfloor \sum_{i} \left(\text{Metric Score}_{i} \times \text{MWF}_{i} \right) / \sum_{j} \text{MWF}_{j} \right\rceil_{0.1} & \text{(round to the nearest tenth) otherwise} \end{cases}$$

,

where High: ≥ 1 to < 1.7; Medium: ≥ 1.7 to < 2.3; Low: ≥ 2.3 to ≤ 3 . If the reviewer determines that the overall rating needs adjustment, the original rating is crossed out and an arrow points to the new rating.

| Study Citation: | Niederlehner, B., Cairns, J., Smith, E. 1998. Modeling acute and chronic toxicity of nonpolar narcotic chemicals and mixtures to Ceriodaphnia dubia. Ecotoxicology and Environmental Safety 39:136-146 | | | | | | | | |
|------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------|-------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|--|--|
| Data Type: Hero ID: | Acute (0-96 707209 | 5 hour); Aquatic; Invertebrates | Ū | | | | | | |
| Domain | | Metric | $\operatorname{Rating}^{\dagger}$ | MWF^{\star} | Score | $Comments^{\dagger\dagger}$ | | | |
| Domain 1: Test S | Substance | | | | | | | | |
| | Metric 1: | Test Substance Identity | High | $\times 2$ | 2 | TCE identified by name | | | |
| | Metric 2: | Test Substance Source | High | × 1 | 1 | Test compounds (Table 1) were obtained from AldrichChemical (Milwaukee, Wisconsin). All were widely employedindustrial chemicals and have a mode-of-actionclassified as nonpolar narcosis (Schultz et al., 1990; VanLeeuwen et al., 1992; Rus- som et al., 1997). | | | |
| | Metric 3: | Test Substance Purity | Medium | $\times 1$ | 2 | Test substance purity is reported as 99.5 percent as labeled but not independently verified. | | | |
| Domain 2. Test I | Design | | | | | | | | |
| Domain 2. 1000 1 | Metric 4: | Negative Controls | Low | $\times 2$ | 6 | Authors reported using negative controls but did not report details of the negative control group. | | | |
| | Metric 5: | Negative Control Response | High | $\times 1$ | 1 | Negative control response for mortality for 2-day study reported in table 4. | | | |
| | Metric 6: | Randomized Allocation | Low | $\times 1$ | 3 | Not randomly allocated | | | |
| | CI I | | | | | | | | |
| Domain 3: Expos | Matria 7 | Europimental System /Test Madia Dranana | II: mh | v 9 | 0 | | | | |
| | Metric 7: | tion | підії | × 2 | 2 | The test was conducted in a closed container and filled to capacity to limit volitization. "25-ml borosilicate glass vials filled to capacity and closed tightly using teflon PTFE-lined silicon septa held in place by polypropylene screw-on caps. These vials are sold by scientific suppliers as 'EPA vials' forstor- age of water samples. Masten et al. (1994) found that static-renewal tests with these vials maintained concentrations of volatile chemicals more success- fully than flowthrough test designs." | | | |
| | Metric 8: | Consistency of Exposure Administration | Medium | $\times 1$ | 2 | Only minor uncertainties about exposure administration | | | |
| | | Continued on next page | | | | | | | |

| Study Citation: | Niederlehner, B., Cairns, J., Smith, E. 1998. Modeling acute and chronic toxicity of nonpolar narcotic chemicals and mixtures to Ceriodaphnia dubia. Ecotoxicology and Environmental Safety 39:136-146 | | | | | | | | |
|------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------|-------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|--|--|
| Data Type: Hero ID: | Acute (0-96 707209 | b hour); Aquatic; Invertebrates | 0 | | | | | | |
| Domain | | Metric | $\operatorname{Rating}^{\dagger}$ | MWF^{\star} | Score | $Comments^{\dagger\dagger}$ | | | |
| | Metric 9: | Measurement of Test Substance Concentra- tion | High | × 2 | 2 | "In tests with individual components, toxicant con- centrations were measured at the beginning and end of the experiment. Newly prepared test solution and 24-h-old test solution composited from three replicates from each treatment level were analyzed. Acute toxicological results are based on the geomet- ric mean of the two measured concentrations for each treatment level measured at the beginning of the test." | | | |
| | Metric 10: | Exposure Duration and Frequency | High | $\times 1$ | 1 | 48 hour test for daphnia | | | |
| | Metric 11: | Number of Exposure Groups/Spacing of Exposure Levels | High | $\times 1$ | 1 | EPA effluent guidelines for C. dubia recommends 5 test concentrations and there were 5 in this acute test | | | |
| | Metric 12: | Testing at or Below Solubility Limit | High | $\times 1$ | 1 | | | | |
| | o · | | | | | | | | |
| Domain 4: Test (| Organism | | TT: 1 | 0 | 0 | | | | |
| | Metric 13: | Test Organism Characteristics | High | × 2 | 2 | Ceriodaphnia dubia is suitable and recom- mended in EPA effluent test guidelines. https:/ /www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2015-12/ documents/method_1002_2002.pdf | | | |
| | Metric 14: | Acclimitization and Pretreatment Conditions | Low | $\times 1$ | 3 | The study does not report how long test organisms were acclimatized. | | | |
| | Metric 15: | Number of Organisms and Replicates per Group | Low | × 1 | 3 | The study says that "Responses are based on a sam- ple size of 10" but it's unclear if that means 10 in- dividuals or 10 brood cups (10 brood cups is recom- mended in the EPA effluent guidelines for C. dubia.) Elsewhere in the study it states "Newly prepared test solution and 24-h-old test solution composited from three replicates from each treatment level were analyzed." The methods say they follow the guide- lines, but the description isn't explicit about how many animals were actually used. | | | |
| | | Continued on next page | | | | | | | |

| Study Citation: Niederlehr Ceriodaph | on: Niederlehner, B., Cairns, J., Smith, E., 1998. Modeling acute and chronic toxicity of nonpolar narcotic chemicals and mixtures to Ceriodaphnia dubia. Ecotoxicology and Environmental Safety 39:136-146 | | | | | | | |
|------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|--------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|--|--|
| Data Type: Acute (0-9 Hero ID: 707209 | 6 hour); Aquatic; Invertebrates | | 110 | | | | | |
| Domain | Metric | Rating^\dagger | MWF^{\star} | Score | $Comments^{\dagger\dagger}$ | | | |
| Metric 16: | Adequacy of Test Conditions | Medium | × 1 | 2 | Only minor uncertainties about housing. "The stan- dard, short-term, chronic toxicity test method de- veloped for U.S. EPA's Whole Effluent Testing Pro- gram (U.S. EPA, 1994) was followed with modifi- cations to minimize volatilization of test chemicals. Instead of 30-ml beakers, individual organisms were tested in 25-ml borosilicate glass vials filled to capac- ity and closed tightly using teflon PTFE-lined sili- con"septa held in place by polypropylene screw-on caps. These vials are sold by scientific suppliers as "EPA vials" for storage of water samples. Masten et al. (1994) found that static-renewal tests with these vials maintained concentrations of volatile chemi- cals more successfully than flowthrough test designs. Tests were conducted in artificial moderately hard water (U.S. EPA, 1994; Table 2). Light was pro- vided by full spectrum fluorescent bulbs with a color rendering index >90 at an intensity of 20 mE/m 2/S and a photoperiod of 16L: 8D. Daphnids were feel an algae and cereal leaf mix containing equal numbers of cells of Se/enastrwn capricornutum and Ch/ore/ la uu/garis mixed with a rye grass infusion (ASTivI, 1994). This mixture was added to diluted stock so- lutions to yield a final concentration of 3 x 105 algal cells/ml and 0.03 mg/ml solids from cereal grass in each test vial. Component algae were cultured indi- vidually in modified Bold's basal medium (ASTM, 1994). Solutions were renewed daily. Dissolved oxy- gen was monitored on 24-h-old solutions and always remained above 7.0 ppm." | | | |
| Domain 5: Outcome Assessm | nent | | | | | | | |
| Metric 17: Metric 18: | Outcome Assessment Methodology | High High | $\times 2$ $\times 1$ | 2 1 | $\mathrm{LC50}$ measured for acute toxicity over 48 hours | | | |
| | Consistency of Outcome Assessment | 111g11 | ~ 1 | 1 | | | | |
| Domain 6: Confounding / Va | ariable Control | | | | | | | |
| Metric 19: | Confounding Variables in Test Design and Procedures | High | $\times 2$ | 2 | No reported differences between study groups in en- vironmental conditions or other factors that could influence the outcome assessment. | | | |
| | Continued on next page | | | | | | | |

... continued from previous page

| Study Citation: | : Niederlehner, B., Cairns, J., Smith, E 1998. Modeling acute and chronic toxicity of nonpolar narcotic chemicals and mixtures to Ceriodaphnia dubia. Ecotoxicology and Environmental Safety 39:136-146 | | | | | | | |
|------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------|-------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|--|
| Data Type: Hero ID: | Acute (0-96 707209 | b hour); Aquatic; Invertebrates | Salety 55.150- | 140 | | | | |
| Domain | | Metric | $\operatorname{Rating}^{\dagger}$ | MWF^{\star} | Score | $Comments^{\dagger\dagger}$ | | |
| | Metric 20: | Outcomes Unrelated to Exposure | High | × 1 | 1 | Table 4 indicates sample size for each test concen- tration, and shows if the sample size dropped to 9 rather than 10. All test conc for TCE had a sample size of 10. | | |
| Domain 7: Data | Presentation | and Analysis | | | | | | |
| | Metric 21: | Statistical Methods | High | × 1 | 1 | "Toxicity tests with individual chemicals were an- alyzed to determine criterion effect levels for mor- tality and reproduction following standard methods (U.S. EPA, 1994). Both 2- and 7-clay LC50s (con- centrations lethal to 50'Yo of the organisms) were calculated using binomial or trimmed Spearman- Karber tests, as appropriate. After appropriate tests of normality, effects on reproduction (number of young per female through the end of the lest) were analyzed withANOV A, followed by one-sided Dun- nett's comparison of means to the control to deter- mine NOELs (no-observed effect levels) and LOELs (lowest-observed-effect levels). In addition, IC50s (concentrations inhibiting reproduction by50 per- cent relative to mean control performance) were cal- culated from smoothed data using bootstrap analy- sis (Norberg-King, 1993)." | | |
| | Metric 22: | Reporting of Data | High | $\times 2$ | 2 | Results were reported for each exposure group. | | |
| | Metric 23: | Explanation of Unexpected Outcomes | High | $\times 1$ | 1 | No unexpected outcomes for TCE. | | |
| Overall Quality | Determination | n‡ | High | | 1.4 | | | |
| Extracted | | | Yes | | | | | |

* MWF = Metric Weighting Factor

[†] High = 1; Medium = 2; Low = 3; Unacceptable = 4; N/A has no value.

[‡] The overall rating is calculated as necessary. EPA may not always provide a comment for a metric that has been categorized as High.

 $\text{Overall rating} = \begin{cases} 4 & \text{if any metric is Unacceptable} \\ \\ \left\lfloor \sum_{i} \left(\text{Metric Score}_{i} \times \text{MWF}_{i} \right) / \sum_{j} \text{MWF}_{j} \right\rceil_{0.1} & \text{(round to the nearest tenth) otherwise} \end{cases},$

where High: ≥ 1 to < 1.7; Medium: ≥ 1.7 to < 2.3; Low: ≥ 2.3 to ≤ 3 . If the reviewer determines that the overall rating needs adjustment, the original rating is crossed out and an arrow points to the new rating.

| Study Citation: | Niederlehner, B., Cairns, J., Smith, E. 1998. Modeling acute and chronic toxicity of nonpolar narcotic chemicals and mixtures to Ceriodaphnia dubia. Ecotoxicology and Environmental Safety 39:136-146 | | | | | | | | |
|------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------|-------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|--|--|
| Data Type: Hero ID: | Other; Aqu 707209 | uatic; Invertebrates | | | | | | | |
| Domain | | Metric | $\operatorname{Rating}^{\dagger}$ | MWF^{\star} | Score | $\mathrm{Comments}^{\dagger\dagger}$ | | | |
| Domain 1. Test 9 | Substance | | | | | | | | |
| Domain 1. 1050 | Metric 1: | Test Substance Identity | High | $\times 2$ | 2 | TCE identified by name | | | |
| | Metric 2: | Test Substance Source | High | × 1 | 1 | Test compounds ey hand Test compounds were obtained from Aldrich Chem- ical (Milwaukee, Wisconsin). All were widely em- ployed industrial chemicals and have a mode-of- action classified as nonpolar narcosis (Schultz et al., 1990; Van Leeuwen et al., 1992; Russom et al., 1997). | | | |
| | Metric 3: | Test Substance Purity | Medium | $\times 1$ | 2 | Test substance purity is reported as 99.5 percent as labeled but not independently verified. | | | |
| Domain 2. Test I | Design | | | | | | | | |
| Domain 2. 1000 1 | Metric 4: | Negative Controls | Low | $\times 2$ | 6 | Authors reported using negative controls but did not report details of the negative control group. | | | |
| | Metric 5: | Negative Control Response | High | $\times 1$ | 1 | Negative control response was reported in Table 4. No mortality was observed, and mean young for re- pro was reported. | | | |
| | Metric 6: | Randomized Allocation | Low | $\times 1$ | 3 | Not randomly allocated | | | |
| Damain 9. France | (1) | | | | | | | | |
| Domain 3: Expos | Motrie 7 | Erration | II: mb | v 9 | 0 | | | | |
| | Metric 7: | Experimental System/Test Media Prepara- tion | nıgn | × 2 | 2 | The test was conducted in a closed container and filled to capacity to limit volitization. "25-ml borosilicate glass vials filled lo capacity and closed tightly using teflon PTFE-lined silicon septa held in place by polypropylene screw-on caps. These vials are sold by scientific suppliers as "EPA vials" for storage of water samples. Masten et al. (1994) found that static-renewal tests with these vials maintained concentrations of volatile chemicals more success- fully than flow through test designs." | | | |
| | Metric 8: | Consistency of Exposure Administration | Medium | $\times 1$ | 2 | Only minor uncertainties about exposure administration. | | | |
| | Continued on next page | | | | | | | | |

| Study Citation: | Niederlehner, B., Cairns, J., Smith, E., 1998. Modeling acute and chronic toxicity of nonpolar narcotic chemicals and mixtures to | | | | | | | | | |
|------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------|-------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|--|--|--|
| Data Type: Hero ID: | Other; Aqu 707209 | Other; Aquatic; Invertebrates 707209 | | | | | | | | |
| Domain | | Metric | $\operatorname{Rating}^{\dagger}$ | MWF^{\star} | Score | $Comments^{\dagger\dagger}$ | | | | |
| | Metric 9: | Measurement of Test Substance Concentra- tion | High | × 2 | 2 | "In tests with individual components, toxicant con- centrations were measured at the beginning and end of the experiment. Newly prepared test solution and 24-h-old test solution composited from three repli- cates from each treatment level were analyzed. [] Chronic toxicological results are based on the ge- ometric "mean of the four measured concentrations for each treatment level measured during the dura- tion of the experiment." | | | | |
| | Metric 10: | Exposure Duration and Frequency | High | $\times 1$ | 1 | 7 days recommended for EPA effluent guidelines for C. dubia. https://www.epa.gov/sites/production/ files/2015-12/documents/method_1002_2002.pdf | | | | |
| | Metric 11: | Number of Exposure Groups/Spacing of Exposure Levels | High | $\times 1$ | 1 | EPA effluent guidelines recommend 5 test concen- trations and 5 were used in this study. https:/ /www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2015-12/ documents/method_1002_2002.pdf | | | | |
| | Metric 12: | Testing at or Below Solubility Limit | High | $\times 1$ | 1 | , _ | | | | |
| Domain 4. Test (| Iraniem | | | | | | | | | |
| | Metric 13: | Test Organism Characteristics | High | $\times 2$ | 2 | Ceriodaphnia dubia is suitable and recom- mended in EPA effluent test guidelines. https:/ /www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2015-12/ documents/method_1002_2002.pdf | | | | |
| | Metric 14: | Acclimitization and Pretreatment Conditions | Low | $\times 1$ | 3 | The study not report how long test organisms were acclimatized. | | | | |
| | Metric 15: | Number of Organisms and Replicates per Group | Low | × 1 | 3 | The study says that "Responses are based on a sam- ple size of 10" but it's unclear if that means 10 in- dividuals or 10 brood cups (10 brood cups is recom- mended in the EPA effluent guidelines for C. dubia.) Elsewhere in the study it states "Newly prepared test solution and 24-h-old test solution composited from three replicates from each treatment level were analyzed." The methods say they follow the guide- lines, but the description isn't explicit about how many animals were actually used. | | | | |
| | Continued on next page | | | | | | | | | |

| Study Citation: | on: Niederlehner, B., Cairns, J., Smith, E., 1998. Modeling acute and chronic toxicity of nonpolar narcotic chemicals and mixtures to Ceriodaphnia dubia. Ecotoxicology and Environmental Safety 39:136-146 | | | | | | | |
|------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------|-------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|--|
| Data Type: Hero ID: | Other; Aqu 707209 | atic; Invertebrates | n Salety 55.156 | 10 | | | | |
| Domain | | Metric | $\operatorname{Rating}^{\dagger}$ | MWF^{\star} | Score | $Comments^{\dagger\dagger}$ | | |
| | Metric 16: | Adequacy of Test Conditions | Medium | × 1 | 2 | Only minor uncertainties about housing. "The stan- dard, short-term, chronic toxicity test method de- veloped for U.S. EPA's Whole Effluent Testing Pro- gram (U.S. EPA, 1994) was followed with modifi- cations to minimize volatilization of test chemicals. Instead of 30-ml beakers, individual organisms were tested in 25-ml borosilicate glass vials filled to capac- ity and closed tightly using teflon PTFE-lined sili- con"septa held in place by polypropylene screw-on caps. These vials are sold by scientific suppliers as "EPA vials" for storage of water samples. Masten et al. (1994) found that static-renewal tests with these vials maintained concentrations of volatile chemi- cals more successfully than flowthrough test designs. Tests were conducted in artificial moderately hard water (U.S. EPA, 1994; Table 2). Light was pro- vided by full spectrum fluorescent bulbs with a color rendering index >90 at an intensity of 20 mE/m 2/S and a photoperiod of 16L: 8D. Daphnids were feel an algae and cereal leaf mix containing equal numbers of cells of Se/enastrwn capricornutum and Ch/ore/ la uu/garis mixed with a rye grass infusion (ASTivI, 1994). This mixture was added to diluted stock so- lutions to yield a final concentration of 3 x 105 algal cells/ml and 0.03 mg/ml solids from cereal grass in each test vial. Component algae were cultured indi- vidually in modified Bold's basal medium (ASTM, 1994). Solutions were renewed daily. Dissolved oxy- gen was monitored on 24-h-old solutions and always remained above 7.0 ppm." | | |
| Domain 5: Outco | ome Assessme | ent | | | | | | |
| | Metric 17: | Outcome Assessment Methodology | High | $\times 2$ | 2 | LC50, NOEC, LOEC, and IC50 (for repro) were measured after 7 days which is in accor- dance with EPA effluent guidelines for C. du- bia. https://www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/ 2015-12/documents/method 1002 2002 rdf | | |
| | Metric 18: | Consistency of Outcome Assessment | High | × 1 | 1 | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | | |
| Domain 6: Confo | Domain 6: Confounding / Variable Control | | | | | | | |
| | Continued on next page | | | | | | | |

| Study Citation: | Niederlehner, B., Cairns, J., Smith, E., 1998. Modeling acute and chronic toxicity of nonpolar narcotic chemicals and mixtures to Ceriodaphnia dubia. Ecotoxicology and Environmental Safety 39:136-146 | | | | | | |
|------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------|-------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|
| Data Type: Hero ID: | Other; Aqua 707209 | atic; Invertebrates | cty 55.150- | 140 | | | |
| Domain | | Metric | $\operatorname{Rating}^{\dagger}$ | MWF^{\star} | Score | $Comments^{\dagger\dagger}$ | |
| | Metric 19: | Confounding Variables in Test Design and Procedures | High | $\times 2$ | 2 | No reported differences between study groups in en- vironmental conditions or other factors that could influence the outcome assessment. | |
| | Metric 20: | Outcomes Unrelated to Exposure | High | × 1 | 1 | Table 4 indicates sample size for each test concen- tration, and shows if the sample size dropped to 9 rather than 10. All test conc for TCE had a sample size of 10. | |
| Domain 7: Data | Presentation | and Analysis | | | | | |
| | Metric 21: | Statistical Methods | High | × 1 | 1 | "Toxicity tests with individual chemicals were an- alyzed to determine criterion effect levels for mor- tality and reproduction following standard methods (U.S. EPA, 1994). Both 2- and 7-day LC50s (con- centrations lethal to 50'Yo of theorganisms) were calculated using binomial or trimmed Spearman- Karber tests, as appropriate. After appropriate tests of normality, effects on reproduction (number of young per female through the end of the lest) were analyzed withANOVA, followed by one-sided Dun- nett's comparison of means to the control to deter- mine NOELs (no-observed effect levels) and LOELs (lowest-observed-effect levels). In addition, IC50s (concentrations inhibiting reproduction by 50 per- cent relative to mean control performance) were cal- culated from smoothed data using bootstrap analy- sis (Norberg-King, 1993)." | |
| | Metric 22: | Reporting of Data | High II:h | $\times 2$ | 2 | Results were reported for each exposure group. | |
| | Metric 23: | Explanation of Unexpected Outcomes | High | × 1 | 1 | No unexpected outcomes for TCE. | |
| Overall Quality I | Determination | ţţ | High | | 1.4 | | |
| Extracted | | | Yes | | | | |
| | | Continued on next page | | | | | |

| Study Citation: | Niederlehner, B., Cairns, J., Smith, E., 1998. Ceriodaphnia dubia. Ecotoxicology and Enviro | Modeling acute and chronic toxicity of nonpolar onmental Safety 39:136-146 | narcotic chemicals and mixtures to |
|------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Data Type: Hero ID: | Other; Aquatic; Invertebrates 707209 | | |
| Domain | Metric | $Rating^{\dagger}$ MWF* Score | $Comments^{\dagger\dagger}$ |

* MWF = Metric Weighting Factor

[†] High = 1; Medium = 2; Low = 3; Unacceptable = 4; N/A has no value.

[‡] The overall rating is calculated as necessary. EPA may not always provide a comment for a metric that has been categorized as High.

$$Overall rating = \begin{cases} 4 & \text{if any metric is Unacceptable} \\ \left| \sum_{i} (Metric Score_{i} \times MWF_{i}) / \sum_{j} MWF_{j} \right|_{0,1} & (round to the nearest tenth) otherwise \end{cases}$$

,

where High: ≥ 1 to < 1.7; Medium: ≥ 1.7 to < 2.3; Low: ≥ 2.3 to ≤ 3 . If the reviewer determines that the overall rating needs adjustment, the original rating is crossed out and an arrow points to the new rating.

| Study Citation: | Labra, M., of Chromiu | Mattia, F.,Bernasconi, M.,Bertacchi, D.,Grassi, m and Volatile Organic Contaminants to Pseud | F.,Bruni, I. okirchnerie | ,Citterio, lla subcap | S 2010 itata. W | The Combined Toxic and Genotoxic Effects Vater, Air, and Soil Pollution 213:57-70 |
|------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Data Type: Hero ID: | Acute (0-96 1059985 | 6 hour); Aquatic; Plants | | _ | | |
| Domain | | Metric | $\operatorname{Rating}^{\dagger}$ | MWF^{\star} | Score | $Comments^{\dagger\dagger}$ |
| Domain 1: Test S | Substance | | | | | |
| | Metric 1: | Test Substance Identity | High | $\times 2$ | 2 | Test substance was identified by name, trichloroethylene. |
| | Metric 2: | Test Substance Source | High | $\times 1$ | 1 | Authors report that TCE is from Applichem, Ger- many. |
| | Metric 3: | Test Substance Purity | Low | $\times 1$ | 3 | Purity not reported. |
| Domain 2: Test I | Design | | | | | |
| | Metric 4: | Negative Controls | Low | $\times 2$ | 6 | There was a control, but authors reported only lim- ited details. |
| | Metric 5: | Negative Control Response | Low | $\times 1$ | 3 | The biological responses of the negative control groups were not reported. |
| | Metric 6: | Randomized Allocation | Low | $\times 1$ | 3 | Authors did not comment on randomized allocation of test species. |
| Domain 3. Expo | suro Charact | prization | | | | |
| Domain 5. Expo | Metric 7: | Experimental System/Test Media Prepara- tion | Low | $\times 2$ | 6 | There was no mention of covering or sealing Erlen- meyer flasks, and it was not mentioned whether mea- surements were taken. |
| | Metric 8: | Consistency of Exposure Administration | Low | × 1 | 3 | Exposure administration seems consistent but not confirmed with measured concentrations. Only nom- inal concentrations used and there was no mention of flasks being covered. |
| | Metric 9: | Measurement of Test Substance Concentra- tion | Low | $\times 2$ | 6 | TCE is volatile and authors did not appear to measure the concentration in water. |
| | Metric 10: | Exposure Duration and Frequency | High | $\times 1$ | 1 | The study had a duration of 72 hours with a sin- gle exposure in Erlenmeyer flasks, which is in accor- dance with OECD 201 test guidelines. |
| | Metric 11: | Number of Exposure Groups/Spacing of Exposure Levels | High | × 1 | 1 | Authors report 5 exposure groups, and at least 5 are suggested in OECD 201 test guidelines. Addition- ally, spacing of exposure groups were able to mea- sure an effect. |
| | Metric 12: | Testing at or Below Solubility Limit | High | $\times 1$ | 1 | Concentrations of TCE in this study were below TCE's solubility level. |
| | | Continued on next page | | | | |

| Study Citation: | Labra, M.,M of Chromius | Mattia, F.,Bernasconi, M.,Bertacchi, D.,Grassi, T m and Volatile Organic Contaminants to Pseudo | F.,Bruni, I. okirchnerie | ,Citterio, lla subcapi | S 2010 itata. W | . The Combined Toxic and Genotoxic Effects Vater, Air, and Soil Pollution 213:57-70 |
|------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Data Type: Hero ID: | Acute (0-96 1059985 | hour); Aquatic; Plants | | | | |
| Domain | | Metric | $\operatorname{Rating}^{\dagger}$ | MWF^{\star} | Score | $Comments^{\dagger\dagger}$ |
| | | | | | | |
| Domain 4: Test (| Organism | | | | | |
| | Metric 13: | Test Organism Characteristics | High | $\times 2$ | 2 | Pseudokirchneriella subcapitata was used in this test, and is a recommended species in OECD 201 test guidelines. |
| | Metric 14: | Acclimitization and Pretreatment Conditions | High | × 1 | 1 | Authors reported that the algae were acclimatized. " The P. subcapitata strain (SAG 61.81) used in this study was obtained from the Collection of Algal Cul- tures, G"ttingen, Germany (SAG). The algae were cultured in static and axenic condition in Bristol"s medium solution (Nichols 1979). Algae were period- ically transferred in a new medium (every 7 days) to obtain viable cell in log phase. These cultures were used to inoculate Erlenmeyer flasks containing 100 mL of solution to a final concentration of about 1"105 cell mL"1." |
| | Metric 15: | Number of Organisms and Replicates per Group | High | $\times 1$ | 1 | Algal cell concentrations were reported at about 1"105 cell/mL which is within OECD 201 recom- mendations, and the test included two replicates. |
| | Metric 16: | Adequacy of Test Conditions | Medium | $\times 1$ | 2 | Authors did not report all test conditions however controls seemed to do well, so only minor uncertain- ties remained. |
| Domain 5. Outao | mo Accocomo | nt | | | | |
| Domain 5. Outco | Metric 17: | Outcome Assessment Methodology | High | $\times 2$ | 2 | The authors described the outcome assessment methodology, reported results in the figures and the text, and the test was sensitive for the outcome of interest. |
| | Metric 18: | Consistency of Outcome Assessment | High | $\times 1$ | 1 | Study protocol was reported and outcomes were as- sessed consistently across study groups using the same protocol in all study groups. |
| Domain 6: Confo | unding / Var | iable Control | | | | |
| Domain 0. Collio | Metric 19: | Confounding Variables in Test Design and Procedures | High | $\times 2$ | 2 | There were no reported differences among the study groups in environmental conditions of other factors that could influence the outcome of the assessment. |
| | Metric 20: | Outcomes Unrelated to Exposure | High | × 1 | 1 | There were no reported differences among study groups that could influence the outcome of the as- sessment. |
| | | Continued on next page | | | | |

| Study Citation: | Labra, M.,Mattia, F.,Bernasconi, M.,Bertacchi, D.,Grassi, F.,Bruni, I.,Citterio, S. 2010. The Combined Toxic and Genotoxic Effects of Chromium and Volatile Organic Contaminants to Pseudokirchneriella subcapitata. Water, Air, and Soil Pollution 213:57-70 | | | | | | |
|-------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------------------|------------------------|-------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|
| Data Type: | Acute (0-96 | hour); Aquatic; Plants | | | | | |
| Hero ID: | 1059985 | | | | | | |
| Domain | | Metric | $\operatorname{Rating}^{\dagger}$ | MWF^{\star} | Score | $Comments^{\dagger\dagger}$ | |
| Domain 7: Data | Presentation | and Analysis | | | | | |
| | Metric 21: | Statistical Methods | High | × 1 | 1 | Authors reported acceptable statistical methods, and results of the analysis were reported for each study group. "Data were used to calculate mean values" standard deviations. Data were statistically analyzed by Statistica for Windows v. 6.0 (StatSoft Italia srl 2001) and StatGraphics programme for- Windows (version 5.0, Manugistic, MD, USA). The Duncan test for a multiple sample comparison was applied when normality and homogeneity of variance were satisfied." | |
| | Metric 22: | Reporting of Data | Medium | $\times 2$ | 4 | Some of the key data points were reported, but authors did not explicitly report a NOEC and a LOEC. | |
| | Metric 23: | Explanation of Unexpected Outcomes | High | $\times 1$ | 1 | There were no unexplained outcomes reported. | |
| Overall Quality I | Determination | 1 [‡] | $\frac{\text{High}}{} \longrightarrow }$ | Medium | 1.7 | | |
| Extracted | | | Yes | | | | |

* MWF = Metric Weighting Factor

[†] High = 1; Medium = 2; Low = 3; Unacceptable = 4; N/A has no value.

[‡] The overall rating is calculated as necessary. EPA may not always provide a comment for a metric that has been categorized as High.

$$\text{Overall rating} = \begin{cases} 4 & \text{if any metric is Unacceptable} \\ \\ \left\lfloor \sum_{i} \left(\text{Metric Score}_{i} \times \text{MWF}_{i} \right) / \sum_{j} \text{MWF}_{j} \right\rceil_{0.1} & \text{(round to the nearest tenth) otherwise} \end{cases}$$

where High: ≥ 1 to < 1.7; Medium: ≥ 1.7 to < 2.3; Low: ≥ 2.3 to ≤ 3 . If the reviewer determines that the overall rating needs adjustment, the original rating is crossed out and an arrow points to the new rating.

,

| Study Citation: | Abernethy, AND CHLO PARTITIO Acute (0-96 | S.,Bobra, A. M.,Shiu, W. Y.,Wells, P. G.,Ma ORINATED HYDROCARBONS TO TWO PLA NING. Aquatic Toxicology 5 hour): Aquatic: Invertebrates | ckay, D 1 NKTONIC | 1986. A C CRUST | CUTE | LETHAL TOXICITY OF HYDROCARBONS NS THE KEY ROLE OF ORGANISM-WATER | | | |
|------------------|---------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|--------------------|-------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|--|--|
| Hero ID: | 1486051 | | | | | | | | |
| Domain | | Metric | $\operatorname{Rating}^{\dagger}$ | MWF^{\star} | Score | $Comments^{\dagger\dagger}$ | | | |
| Domain 1: Test S | Domain 1: Test Substance | | | | | | | | |
| | Metric 1: | Test Substance Identity | High | $\times 2$ | 2 | Chemical identified by name (trichloroethylene). | | | |
| | Metric 2: | Test Substance Source | Low | $\times 1$ | 3 | The source of the chemicals were not identified. | | | |
| | Metric 3: | Test Substance Purity | Medium | × 1 | 2 | Test purity was reported at at least 97 percent, but it is unclear exactly what purity TCE. | | | |
| Domain 2: Test I | Design | | | | | | | | |
| | Metric 4: | Negative Controls | Medium | $\times 2$ | 4 | Study authors reported using a negative control but didn't say whether it was a water or solvent control. | | | |
| | Metric 5: | Negative Control Response | High | $\times 1$ | 1 | Negative control response was reported at always less than or equal to 10 percent. | | | |
| | Metric 6: | Randomized Allocation | Low | $\times 1$ | 3 | Researchers did not report how organisms were as- signed to study groups | | | |
| Domain 3: Expos | sure Characte | erization | | | | | | | |
| | Metric 7: | Experimental System/Test Media Prepara- tion | High | × 2 | 2 | Closed system was used for TCE and maintenance of consistent exposure concentration was considered prime importance. Air spaces in exposure chambers were eliminated to minimize volatilization loss of the toxicant from water, a serious uncontrolled variable in many previous toxicity studies with hydrocarbons in static systems. This limited available oxygen to that dissolved iii the water at the start of each test, typically at a concentration of 8-9 mg/l. | | | |
| | Metric 8: | Consistency of Exposure Administration | Medium | × 1 | 2 | Briefly, saturated aqueous solutions of single com- pounds were prepared and diluted to provide at least 5 exposure concentrations plus a control for each toxicity test. Test chambers were filled and sealed in 33 ml glass vials with teflon-lined screw caps. | | | |
| | Metric 9: | Measurement of Test Substance Concentra- tion | Medium | $\times 2$ | 4 | Only nominal conc were used but measures were taken to limit test chemical loss in the test chambers. | | | |
| | | Continued on next page | | | | | | | |

| Study Citation: | Abernethy, S.,Bobra, A. M.,Shiu, W. Y.,Wells, P. G.,Mackay, D 1986. ACUTE LETHAL TOXICITY OF HYDROCARBONS AND CHLORINATED HYDROCARBONS TO TWO PLANKTONIC CRUSTACEANS THE KEY ROLE OF ORGANISM-WATER PARTITIONING. Aquatic Toxicology | | | | | | | |
|------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|------------------------|-------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|--|
| Data Type: Hero ID: | Acute (0-96 hour); Aquatic; Invertebrates 1486051 | | | | | | | |
| Domain | | Metric | $\operatorname{Rating}^{\dagger}$ | MWF^{\star} | Score | $Comments^{\dagger\dagger}$ | | |
| | Metric 10: | Exposure Duration and Frequency | High | $\times 1$ | 1 | Static exposure for 24 hour duration for Artemia. Handbook of Ecotoxicology ed Calow (1998) says an LC50 can be obtained using Artemia after a 24 hour exposure. | | |
| | Metric 11: | Number of Exposure Groups/Spacing of Exposure Levels | Medium | $\times 1$ | 2 | Five exposure conc plus controls but unsure of the spacing of exposure levels. | | |
| | Metric 12: | Testing at or Below Solubility Limit | High | $\times 1$ | 1 | LC50 was well below TCE's solubility. | | |
| Domain 1. Test (| Draanism | | | | | | | |
| | Metric 13: | Test Organism Characteristics | High | $\times 2$ | 2 | Artemia used | | |
| | Metric 14: | Acclimitization and Pretreatment Conditions | Low | $\times 1$ | 3 | Study did not report whether organisms were accli- matized. | | |
| | Metric 15: | Number of Organisms and Replicates per Group | Low | $\times 1$ | 3 | Number of organisms was not reported. | | |
| | Metric 16: | Adequacy of Test Conditions | Low | × 1 | 3 | Handbook of Ecotoxicology ed Calow recommends 25 degrees in darkness for test procedures for this species. Temperature in this study may be too low. Study reports, Artemia nauplii were hatched from cysts under controlled environmental conditions to provide a large number of test organisms of exactly the same age and physiological condition for each test (Wells et al., 1982). Bioassays were conducted in the dark at 20 " 1 "C for Artemia tests. Animals were not feed, nor were toxicant solutions aerated during the 48 h exposure period. Checks on animal condition were made at 24 h and 48 h. Each animal was classified as alive/swimming or dead. Death was defined by the lack of visible internal or external movements after gently rotating the test chamber under a Stercostar zoom microscope. | | |
| Domain 5: Outco | ome Assessme | ent | | | | | | |
| | Metric 17: | Outcome Assessment Methodology | High | $\times 2$ | 2 | Outcome of interest was reported (LC50s). | | |
| | Metric 18: | Consistency of Outcome Assessment | Medium | $\times 1$ | 2 | Incomplete details of test protocol was reported. | | |
| Domain 6: Confo | ounding / Var | iable Control | | | | | | |
| | | Continued on next page | | | | | | |

 \tilde{c}_{0}^{∞}

| Study Citation: Data Type: Hero ID: | Abernethy, AND CHLO PARTITIO Acute (0-96 1486051 | S.,Bobra, A. M.,Shiu, W. Y.,Wells, P. G.,Ma DRINATED HYDROCARBONS TO TWO PLA NING. Aquatic Toxicology 5 hour); Aquatic; Invertebrates | ckay, D 1 NKTONIC | 1986. AG C CRUST | CUTE I | LETHAL TOXICITY OF HYDROCARBONS NS THE KEY ROLE OF ORGANISM-WATER |
|-------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------|--------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Domain | | Metric | $\operatorname{Rating}^{\dagger}$ | MWF^{\star} | Score | $Comments^{\dagger\dagger}$ |
| | Metric 19: | Confounding Variables in Test Design and Procedures | Medium | $\times 2$ | 4 | Study did not provide enough information to allow a comparison of environmental conditions or other non-treatment-related factors across study groups. Unlikely to have major impacts on results. |
| | Metric 20: | Outcomes Unrelated to Exposure | Medium | $\times 1$ | 2 | Data on attrition for each study group was not re- ported, but unlikely to have major impacts on re- sults. |
| Domain 7: Data | Presentation | and Analysis | | | | |
| | Metric 21: | Statistical Methods | Medium | × 1 | 2 | Percent mortality at each concentration was corrected for control mortality (always $< \text{or} = \text{to 10 percent}$) (Abbott, 1925) and nominal medial lethal concentrations (LC50 values), slope factors, and 95 percent confidence limits were calculated by the graphical method of Litchfield and Wilcoxon (1948). |
| | Metric 22: | Reporting of Data | Low | $\times 2$ | 6 | Data for exposure-related findings were not shown for each study group, but results were described in the test. Data were only reported for some out- comes. |
| | Metric 23: | Explanation of Unexpected Outcomes | High | $\times 1$ | 1 | No unexpected outcomes reported. |
| Overall Quality I | Determination | 1 [‡] | Medium | | 1.8 | |
| Extracted | | | Yes | | | |

* MWF = Metric Weighting Factor

[†] High = 1; Medium = 2; Low = 3; Unacceptable = 4; N/A has no value.

[‡] The overall rating is calculated as necessary. EPA may not always provide a comment for a metric that has been categorized as High.

$$\text{Overall rating} = \begin{cases} 4 & \text{if any metric is Unacceptable} \\ \\ \left\lfloor \sum_{i} \left(\text{Metric Score}_{i} \times \text{MWF}_{i} \right) / \sum_{j} \text{MWF}_{j} \right\rceil_{0.1} & \text{(round to the nearest tenth) otherwise} \end{cases}$$

,

where High: ≥ 1 to < 1.7; Medium: ≥ 1.7 to < 2.3; Low: ≥ 2.3 to ≤ 3 . If the reviewer determines that the overall rating needs adjustment, the original rating is crossed out and an arrow points to the new rating.

| Study Citation: | : . 1987. ASSESSMENTS OF THE FEASIBILITY AND EVIDENCE OF TEST METHODS OF LEVELS I AND II OF THE CHEM- ICALS ACT ON THIOUREA | | | | | |
|------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------|-------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Data Type: Hero ID: | Other; Aqu 1745587 | atic; Fish | | | | |
| Domain | | Metric | $\operatorname{Rating}^{\dagger}$ | MWF^{\star} | Score | $Comments^{\dagger\dagger}$ |
| Domain 1: Test S | Substance | | | | | |
| | Metric 1: | Test Substance Identity | High | $\times 2$ | 2 | Trichloroethylene identified by name |
| | Metric 2: | Test Substance Source | High | $\times 1$ | 1 | Source is Merck 11872 p.a., lot no 8594665 |
| | Metric 3: | Test Substance Purity | Low | $\times 1$ | 3 | Purity was not reported for TCE. |
| Domain 2: Test 1 | Design | | | | | |
| | Metric 4: | Negative Controls | Low | $\times 2$ | 6 | A control group was not reported but the authors say they did the test in accordance with OECD 305 which calls for a control. |
| | Metric 5: | Negative Control Response | Low | $\times 1$ | 3 | Response was not reported |
| | Metric 6: | Randomized Allocation | Low | $\times 1$ | 3 | Not reported |
| Domain 3: Expo | sure Characte | erization | | | | |
| | Metric 7: | Experimental System/Test Media Prepara- tion | Low | × 2 | 6 | It was a semi-static closed system that did have some head space. Authors admitted that a flow through design would be preferable with minimized headspace for volatile chemicals. The authors say that TCE in particular had considerable conc fluc- tuations in the various aquaria, and the guideline could not be followed in a meaningful way. |
| | Metric 8: | Consistency of Exposure Administration | Unacceptable | $\times 1$ | 4 | The authors say that TCE in particular had consid- erable conc fluctuations in the various aquaria, and the guideline could not be followed in a meaningful way. |
| | Metric 9: | Measurement of Test Substance Concentra- tion | Medium | $\times 2$ | 4 | TCE was analyzed by gas chromatography with EC detector. |
| | Metric 10: | Exposure Duration and Frequency | High | × 1 | 1 | The exposure was for 2 weeks according to OECD guideline 305 B. there were 8 aquaria each with 25 L capacity arranged and filled with 20 L deionized water. Stock solutions of test substances were prepared in water or acetone. Test conditions were semi static. |
| | | Continued on next page | | | | |

| Study Citation: | . 1987. ASS ICALS ACT | SESSMENTS OF THE FEASIBILITY AND ΕΛ Γ ON THIOUREA. | IDENCE OF ' | TEST ME | THODS | OF LEVELS I AND II OF THE CHEM- |
|------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|------------------------|-------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Data Type: Hero ID: | Other; Aqu 1745587 | atic; Fish | | | | |
| Domain | | Metric | $\operatorname{Rating}^{\dagger}$ | MWF^{\star} | Score | $Comments^{\dagger\dagger}$ |
| | Metric 11: | Number of Exposure Groups/Spacing of Exposure Levels | Low | × 1 | 3 | Only one exposure group was used. The authors say, "The number of 7 samples per aquarium of 7 fish each sample, as proposed in the Guideline, could not be complied with, since, the oxygen content in the basins dropped exceedingly over 48 hours. The number of fish in the aquaria. was reduced to 28 or: 32 fish and, in general, a parallel experiment has been carried out. In the case of 28 fish on 7 consecutive days, in the case. of 32 fish on 8 consec- utive days, 4 fish were sampled. In accordance with the Guideline, the work was carried out with two or three test concentrations, which differed by the factor of 10, whereby, as far as possible, the higher concentration was 1/50 below the EC-50 determined in this Institute." |
| | Metric 12: | Testing at or Below Solubility Limit | High | $\times 1$ | 1 | |
| Domain 4: Tost | Organism | | | | | |
| Domain 4. Test | Metric 13: | Test Organism Characteristics | High | $\times 2$ | 2 | Zebra fish (Branchydanio rerio) were used which are a recommended species according to EPA test guide- lines 850.1075. |
| | Metric 14: | Acclimitization and Pretreatment Conditions | Medium | × 1 | 2 | Fish were acclimatized but uncertainties remain. Authors report, "Prior to test begin, the test fish were acclimatized in an 80 L aquarium. Unlike the test aquaria, this was continuously aerated. The wa- ter was reconditioned like in the test aquaria. The fish were fed several times daily with Tetra Min, us- ing an automatic feeding device." |
| | Metric 15: | Number of Organisms and Replicates per Group | High | × 1 | 1 | The study says, "The number of 7 samples per aquarium of 7 fish each sample, as proposed in the Guideline, could not be complied with, since, the oxygen content in the basins dropped exceedingly over 48 hours. The number of fish in the aquaria. was reduced to 28 or: 32 fish and, in 9enera1, a par- allel experiment has been carried out. In the case of 28 fish on 7 consecutive days, in the case. of 32 fish on 8 consecutive days, 4 fish were sampled. In accordance with the Guideline, the work was carried out with two or three test concentrations, which dif- fered by the factor of 10, whereby, as far as possible, the higher concentration was 1/50 below the EC50 determined in this Institute." |
| | | Continued on next page | | | | |

| Study Citation: | . 1987. ASS | SESSMENTS OF THE FEASIBILITY AND EV | IDENCE OF T | EST ME | THODS | OF LEVELS I AND II OF THE CHEM- |
|-------------------|---------------|-----------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|------------------------|--------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Data Type | Other: Acu | I ON IHIOUREA. atic: Fish | | | | |
| Hero ID: | 1745587 | aute, Fish | | | | |
| Domain | | Metric | $\operatorname{Rating}^{\dagger}$ | MWF^{\star} | Score | $Comments^{\dagger\dagger}$ |
| | Metric 16: | Adequacy of Test Conditions | High | × 1 | 1 | After the fish were introduced the aquaria were closed with glass plates equipped with two no 29 standard ground apertures through which ground- glass thermometer and threaded pipe with HWS clo- sure were introduced, the cable leading through the latter to an aquarium heater. the temperature in the aquaria were 23-25 degrees. After 48 hours samples were again taken the ph and the oxygen contents measured and then the fish were fed. Bout 2 hours after the feeding the fish were transferred into newly prepared aquaria, thus one cycle was complete. |
| Domain E. Outas | | | | | | |
| Domain 5: Outco | Motria 17 | Outcome Assessment Methodology | High | ~ 2 | 9 | |
| | Metric 18: | Consistency of Outcome Assessment | High | × 4 × 1 | 2 1 | |
| | Metric 10. | Consistency of Outcome Assessment | Iligii | ~ 1 | 1 | |
| Domain 6: Confo | ounding / Var | iable Control | | | | |
| | Metric 19: | Confounding Variables in Test Design and Procedures | High | $\times 2$ | 2 | |
| | Metric 20: | Outcomes Unrelated to Exposure | Medium | $\times 1$ | 2 | Data on attrition and outcomes unrelated to expo- sure were not reported for each study group. |
| Domain 7. Data | Procentation | and Analysia | | | | |
| Domain 7. Data | Metric 21. | Statistical Methods | High | × 1 | 1 | |
| | Metric 22: | Reporting of Data | High | $\times 2$ | 2 | Average conc in water, average conc in fish, BCFs and duration were reported for each test conc. no information was provided for a control |
| | Metric 23: | Explanation of Unexpected Outcomes | High | $\times 1$ | 1 | Unexpected outcomes were addressed. |
| Overall Quality I | Determinatior | 1‡ | Unacceptable | | 4.0 | |
| Extracted | | | No | | | |
| | | Continued on next page | | | | |

... continued from previous page

| Study Citation: | . 1987. ASSESSMENTS OF THE FEASIBILITY ICALS ACT ON THIOUREA. | AND EVIDENCE OF T | EST METHODS OF LE | EVELS I AND II OF THE CHEM- |
|------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Data Type: Hero ID: | Other; Aquatic; Fish 1745587 | | | |
| Domain | Metric | $\operatorname{Rating}^{\dagger}$ | MWF [*] Score | $\mathrm{Comments}^{\dagger\dagger}$ |

** Consistent with our Application of Systematic Review in TSCARisk Evaluations document, if a metric for a data source receives a score of Unacceptable (score = 4), EPA will determine the study to be unacceptable. In this case, one of the metrics were rated as unacceptable. As such, the study is considered unacceptable and the score is presented solely to increase transparency.

* MWF = Metric Weighting Factor

[†] High = 1; Medium = 2; Low = 3; Unacceptable = 4; N/A has no value.

[‡] The overall rating is calculated as necessary. EPA may not always provide a comment for a metric that has been categorized as High.

$$Overall rating = \begin{cases} 4 & \text{if any metric is Unacceptable} \\ \left[\sum_{i} (Metric Score_{i} \times MWF_{i}) / \sum_{j} MWF_{j} \right]_{0,1} & (round to the nearest tenth) otherwise \end{cases}$$

where High: ≥ 1 to < 1.7; Medium: ≥ 1.7 to < 2.3; Low: ≥ 2.3 to ≤ 3 . If the reviewer determines that the overall rating needs adjustment, the original rating is crossed out and an arrow points to the new rating.

| Study Citation: Data Type: Hero ID: | . 1987. ASS ICALS AC' Acute (0-96 1745587 | SESSMENTS OF THE FEASIBILITY AND EV T ON THIOUREA. 5 hour); Aquatic; Plants | IDENCE OF T | EST ME | THODS | OF LEVELS I AND II OF THE CHEM- |
|-------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|------------|-------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Domain | 1149001 | Metric | $\operatorname{Rating}^{\dagger}$ | MWF* | Score | $\mathrm{Comments}^{\dagger\dagger}$ |
| Domain 1. Test | Substance | | | | | |
| Domain 1. 1050 k | Metric 1: | Test Substance Identity | High | $\times 2$ | 2 | Trichloroethylene identified by name |
| | Metric 2: | Test Substance Source | High | × 1 | 1 | Source is Merck 11872 p.a., lot no 8594665 |
| | Metric 3: | Test Substance Purity | Low | $\times 1$ | 3 | Purity not reported |
| Domain 2. Test I | Design | | | | | |
| Domain 2. 1000 1 | Metric 4: | Negative Controls | Medium | $\times 2$ | 4 | Some information was given about a negative con- trol, but minor uncertainties remain. |
| | Metric 5: | Negative Control Response | Medium | × 1 | 2 | A biological response in the control was alluded to when authors referred to the fact that growth for algae in this test was very slow after 3 days, so test results cannot be used. |
| | Metric 6: | Randomized Allocation | Low | $\times 1$ | 3 | It was not reported whether a random allocation was used. |
| Domain 3: Expos | sure Characto Metric 7: | erization Experimental System/Test Media Prepara- tion | Unacceptable | × 2 | 8 | Growth of algae was very slow, so test criteria could not be satisfied, and tests were discontinued. "Since, in the case of low growth inhibition (approx. 1 - 15 percent), the growth curves for each concentration indicate very flat course, the EC10 values for all the chemicals tested could not be very accurately de- termine. Also the EC10 and EC50 values relating to the volatile substances, e.q. 1,1-dichlocoethylene, trichloroethylene and benzene are uncertain. Since a large part of these chemicals volatilize, the EC10 and EC50 values could be lower than the values de- termined according to the guideline in Erlenmeyer flasks fitted with Kapsenberg caps. Therefore we have also carried out experiments in enclosed sys- tem on the basis of work published by Galassi and Vighi (7). Nevertheless, our experiments in 300 ml Erlenmeyer flasks fitted with ground-glass stopper indicated that the growth of algae was very slow and after 3 days stagnation set in. Since the test criteria could not be satisfied, these experiments were then discontinued." |

Continued on next page ...

91

| Study Citation: | itation: . 1987. ASSESSMENTS OF THE FEASIBILITY AND EVIDENCE OF TEST METHODS OF LEVELS I AND II OF THE CHEM- ICALS ACT ON THIOUREA. | | | | | | | | |
|------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|------------------------|-------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|--|--|
| Data Type: Hero ID: | Acute (0-96 1745587 | 5 hour); Aquatic; Plants | | | | | | | |
| Domain | | Metric | $\operatorname{Rating}^{\dagger}$ | MWF^{\star} | Score | $Comments^{\dagger\dagger}$ | | | |
| | Metric 8: | Consistency of Exposure Administration | High | $\times 1$ | 1 | | | | |
| | Metric 9: | Measurement of Test Substance Concentra- tion | Low | $\times 2$ | 6 | It is not clear whether measurements were taken but authors mention that volatile chemicals were at lower conc at the end of the test, alluding that they. | | | |
| | Metric 10: | Exposure Duration and Frequency | High | $\times 1$ | 1 | the exposure was for 96 hours and in a static system, which is in accordance with EPA guidelines | | | |
| | Metric 11: | Number of Exposure Groups/Spacing of Exposure Levels | Low | $\times 1$ | 3 | This was not reported and results were not reliable according to study authors. | | | |
| | Metric 12: | Testing at or Below Solubility Limit | High | $\times 1$ | 1 | | | | |
| Domain 4. Test | Demain 4. Test Organism | | | | | | | | |
| | Metric 13: | Test Organism Characteristics | High | $\times 2$ | 2 | Fresh-water algae (Scenedesmus subsplcatus) were used, which is in agreement with EPA test guideline 850.5400. | | | |
| | Metric 14: | Acclimitization and Pretreatment Conditions | Low | $\times 1$ | 3 | Pretreatment was not recorded. | | | |
| | Metric 15: | Number of Organisms and Replicates per Group | Low | $\times 1$ | 3 | It is unclear how many organisms per exposure group. | | | |
| | Metric 16: | Adequacy of Test Conditions | Unacceptable | × 1 | 4 | Authors reported very slow growth in the algae, leading to authors discontinuing the test. "Since, in the case of low growth inhibition (approx. 1 - 15 percent), the growth curves for each concentration indicate very flat course, the EC10 values for all the chemicals tested could not be very accurately de- termine. Also the EC10 and EC50 values relating to the volatile substances, e.q. 1,1-dichlocoethylene, trichloroethylene and benzene are uncertain. Since a large part of these chemicals volatilize, the EC10 and EC50 values could be lower than the values de- termined according to the guideline in Erlenmeyer flasks fitted with Kapsenberg caps. Therefore we have also carried out experiments in enclosed sys- tem on the basis of work published by Galassi and Vighi (7). Nevertheless, our experiments in 300 ml Erlenmeyer flasks fitted with ground-glass stopper indicated that the growth of algae was very slow and after 3 days stagnation set in. Since the test criteria could not be satisfied, these experiments were then discontinued." | | | |

Continued on next page ...

| Study Citation: | on: . 1987. ASSESSMENTS OF THE FEASIBILITY AND EVIDENCE OF TEST METHODS OF LEVELS I AND II OF THE CHEM- ICALS ACT ON THIOUREA. | | | | | | |
|------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------|-------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|
| Data Type: | Acute (0-96 | hour): Aquatic: Plants | | | | | |
| Hero ID: | 1745587 | , , , 1 , | | | | | |
| Domain | | Metric | $\operatorname{Rating}^{\dagger}$ | MWF^{\star} | Score | $Comments^{\dagger\dagger}$ | |
| Domain 5: Outcome Assessment | | | | | | | |
| | Metric 17: | Outcome Assessment Methodology | High | $\times 2$ | 2 | | |
| | Metric 18: | Consistency of Outcome Assessment | High | $\times 1$ | 1 | | |
| Domain 6: Confo | ounding / Var Metric 19: | iable Control Confounding Variables in Test Design and Procedures | Unacceptable | × 2 | 8 | It seems that non-treatment-related factors may have influenced he results of the test. "Since, in the case of low growth inhibition (approx. 1 - 15 percent), the growth curves for each concentration indicate very flat course, the EC10 values for all the chemicals tested could not be very accurately de- termine. Also the EC10 and EC50 values relating to the volatile substances, e.q. 1,1-dichlocoethylene, trichloroethylene and benzene are uncertain. Since a large part of these chemicals volatilize, the EC10 and EC50 values could be lower than the values de- termined according to the guideline in Erlenmeyer flasks fitted with Kapsenberg caps. Therefore we have also carried out experiments in enclosed sys- tem on the basis of work published by Galassi and Vighi (7). Nevertheless, our experiments in 300 ml Erlenmeyer flasks fitted with ground-glass stopper indicated that the growth of algae was very slow and after 3 days stagnation set in. Since the test criteria could not be satisfied, these experiments were then discontinued." | |
| | | Continued on next page | | | | | |

| Study Citation: | on: . 1987. ASSESSMENTS OF THE FEASIBILITY AND EVIDENCE OF TEST METHODS OF LEVELS I AND II OF THE CHEM- ICALS ACT ON THIOUREA. Acute (0-96 hour): Aquatic: Plants | | | | | | |
|-------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------|-------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|
| Hero ID: | 1745587 | nour), Aquatic, I lants | | | | | |
| Domain | | Metric | $\operatorname{Rating}^{\dagger}$ | MWF^{\star} | Score | Comments ^{††} | |
| | Metric 20: | Outcomes Unrelated to Exposure | Unacceptable | × 1 | 4 | "Since, in the case of low growth inhibition (approx. 1 - 15 percent), the growth curves for each concen- tration indicate very flat course, the EC10 values for all the chemicals tested could not be very accurately determine. Also the EC10 and EC50 values relating to the volatile substances, e.q. 1,1-dichlocoethylene, trichloroethylene and benzene are uncertain. Since a large part of these chemicals volatilize, the EC10 and EC50 values could be lower than the values de- termined according to the guideline in Erlenmeyer flasks fitted with Kapsenberg caps. Therefore we have also carried out experiments in enclosed sys- tem on the basis of work published by Galassi and Vighi (7). Nevertheless, our experiments in 300 ml Erlenmeyer flasks fitted with ground-glass stopper indicated that the growth of algae wa3s very slow and after 3 days stagnation set in. Since the test cri- teria could not be satisfied, these experiments were then discontinued." | |
| Domain 7: Data | Presentation | and Analysis | | | | | |
| | Metric 21: | Statistical Methods | High | $\times 1$ | 1 | | |
| | Metric 22: | Reporting of Data | Medium | $\times 2$ | 4 | Only EC10 and EC50 were reported | |
| | Metric 23: | Explanation of Unexpected Outcomes | High | × 1 | 1 | Unexpected outcomes were addressed | |
| Overall Quality I | Determination | 1 [‡] | Unacceptable | | 4.0 | | |
| Extracted | | | No | | | | |

** Consistent with our Application of Systematic Review in TSCARisk Evaluations document, if a metric for a data source receives a score of Unacceptable (score = 4), EPA will determine the study to be unacceptable. In this case, four of the metrics were rated as unacceptable. As such, the study is considered unacceptable and the score is presented solely to increase transparency.

* MWF = Metric Weighting Factor

[†] High = 1; Medium = 2; Low = 3; Unacceptable = 4; N/A has no value.

[‡] The overall rating is calculated as necessary. EPA may not always provide a comment for a metric that has been categorized as High.

$$\text{Overall rating} = \begin{cases} 4 & \text{if any metric is Unacceptable} \\ \\ \left\lfloor \sum_{i} \left(\text{Metric Score}_{i} \times \text{MWF}_{i} \right) / \sum_{j} \text{MWF}_{j} \right\rceil_{0,1} & \text{(round to the nearest tenth) otherwise} \end{cases}$$

,

where High: ≥ 1 to < 1.7; Medium: ≥ 1.7 to < 2.3; Low: ≥ 2.3 to ≤ 3 . If the reviewer determines that the overall rating needs adjustment, the original rating is crossed out and an arrow points to the new rating.

| Study Citation: | Bacsi, I.,Te testing the assemblage | beroek, T.,B-Beres, V.,Toeroek, P.,Tothmeresz, toxicity of chlorinated hydrocarbons on a cyano s. Hydrobiologia 710:189-203 | B.,Nagy, A. S., bacterium strain | Vasas, G (Syneche | 2013. ococcus | Laboratory and microcosm experiments PCC 6301) and on natural phytoplankton |
|------------------------|-------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|----------------------|------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Data Type: Hero ID: | Acute (0-9) 2127844 | 6 hour); Aquatic; Plants | | | | |
| Domain | | Metric | $\operatorname{Rating}^{\dagger}$ | MWF^{\star} | Score | $\mathrm{Comments}^{\dagger\dagger}$ |
| Domain 1: Test S | Substance | | | | | |
| | Metric 1: | Test Substance Identity | High | $\times 2$ | 2 | TCE was identified by name and described. Authors reported, "trichloroethylene (TCE)"one of the most widely produced chlorinated hydrocarbons" |
| | Metric 2: | Test Substance Source | Low | $\times 1$ | 3 | not reported |
| | Metric 3: | Test Substance Purity | Low | $\times 1$ | 3 | not reported |
| Domain 9. Tost 1 | Docier | | | | | |
| Domain 2. Test i | Metric 4: | Negative Controls | Medium | × 2 | 4 | controls were used but details about what exactly controls included were not given. Authors reported, "The growth of the control cultures (without addi- tion of chlorinated hydrocarbons) and treated cul- tures was monitored by measuring chlorophyll-a con- tent and by counting cell numbers." |
| | Metric 5: | Negative Control Response | Low | $\times 1$ | 3 | control response was given but only until 25 hours. |
| | Metric 6: | Randomized Allocation | Low | $\times 1$ | 3 | not reported |
| Domain 3. Expo | sure Charact | erization | | | | |
| Domain 9. Expo | Metric 7: | Experimental System/Test Media Prepara- tion | Unacceptable | × 2 | 8 | the laboratory system was open and measurements were not taken, and flasks were open and aerated which can lead to rapid volatilization of TCE, how- ever this was by design in order to better compare results in the lab to a microcosm experiment also preformed. |
| | Metric 8: | Consistency of Exposure Administration | Low | $\times 1$ | 3 | details not given about exposure administration for each exposure level. |
| | Metric 9: | Measurement of Test Substance Concentra- tion | Low | $\times 2$ | 6 | measured concentrations were not taken and cannot be expected to be close to nominal concentration due to the volatility of the chemical. However, this experiment measured effects in just the few hours after exposure. |
| | | Continued on next page | | | | |

| Study Citation: | n: Bacsi, I., Toeroek, T., B-Beres, V., Toeroek, P., Tothmeresz, B., Nagy, A. S., Vasas, G. 2013. Laboratory and microcosm experiments testing the toxicity of chlorinated hydrocarbons on a cyanobacterium strain (Synechococcus PCC 6301) and on natural phytoplankton assemblages. Hydrobiologia 710:189-203 | | | | | | | |
|------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------|---------------|-------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|--|
| Data Type: Hero ID: | Acute (0-96 2127844 | j hour); Aquatic; Plants | | | | | | |
| Domain | | Metric | Rating^\dagger | MWF^{\star} | Score | $Comments^{\dagger\dagger}$ | | |
| | Metric 10: | Exposure Duration and Frequency | Low | × 1 | 3 | exposure happened once and was measured in the few hours after exposure. This is not in accordance with any guidelines, but was designed to mimic con- ditions that were carried out in microcosm experi- ment for comparison purposes. | | |
| | Metric 11: | Number of Exposure Groups/Spacing of Exposure Levels | Unacceptable | $\times 1$ | 4 | it appears only one exposure group was used to mimic the conditions in the microcosm | | |
| | Metric 12: | Testing at or Below Solubility Limit | Low | $\times 1$ | 3 | unsure what the actual exposure concentration was from the author's reporting. | | |
| Domain 4: Test | Domain 4: Test Organism | | | | | | | |
| | Metric 13: | Test Organism Characteristics | Medium | $\times 2$ | 4 | cyanobacterium Synecococcus elongatus (PCC 6301). not a recommended test species in OECD 201 but in the same genus as a recommended test species for cyanobacteria | | |
| | Metric 14: | Acclimitization and Pretreatment Conditions | Low | $\times 1$ | 3 | not reported | | |
| | Metric 15: | Number of Organisms and Replicates per Group | Medium | × 1 | 2 | the initial cell density is outside the range for this genus in OECD201 (synechococcus leopoliensis rec- ommended cell density is $5x10\hat{4}$ - $10\hat{5}$). This experi- ment starts at about $100x10\hat{6}$. Each study was done in triplicate which is recommended. | | |
| | Metric 16: | Adequacy of Test Conditions | Low | $\times 1$ | 3 | limited reporting of housing conditions | | |
| Demain F. Oater | | | | | | | | |
| Domain 5: Outco | Metric 17: | outcome Assessment Methodology | Low | × 2 | 6 | Outcome assessment methodology is described for changes in growth and enzyme activity. Growth measures are appropriate but some uncertainties re- main for how enzyme activity was measured (with incomplete methodology described). Uncertainties also exist for when measures were taken. Measure- ments were taken for growth every second hour, and for enzyme activity at hour 0, 4, 8, 12, 24. | | |
| | Metric 18: | Consistency of Outcome Assessment | Low | $\times 1$ | 3 | details regarding execution of study protocol across study groups was not reported. | | |
| Domain 6: Confe | ounding / Var | riable Control | | | | | | |

96

Continued on next page ...

| Study Citation: | Bacsi, I., Toeroek, T., B-Beres, V., Toeroek, P., Tothmeresz, B., Nagy, A. S., Vasas, G. 2013. Laboratory and microcosm experiments testing the toxicity of chlorinated hydrocarbons on a cyanobacterium strain (Synechococcus PCC 6301) and on natural phytoplankton assemblages. Hydrobiologia 710:189-203 Acute (0-96 hour): Aquatic: Plants | | | | | | | |
|-------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|------------------------|-------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|--|
| Hero ID: | Acute (0-96 2127844 | o nour); Aquatic; Plants | | | | | | |
| Domain | | Metric | $\operatorname{Rating}^{\dagger}$ | MWF^{\star} | Score | $Comments^{\dagger\dagger}$ | | |
| | Metric 19: | Confounding Variables in Test Design and Procedures | Medium | $\times 2$ | 4 | study did not provide enough information about env conditions across study groups. | | |
| | Metric 20: | Outcomes Unrelated to Exposure | Low | $\times 1$ | 3 | authors did not report data on health outcomes unrelated to exposure | | |
| Domain 7: Data | Presentation | and Analysis | | | | | | |
| | Metric 21: | Statistical Methods | High | $\times 1$ | 1 | Significance was determined trough ANOVA and Tukey test. All experiments were done in triplicate. | | |
| | Metric 22: | Reporting of Data | Low | $\times 2$ | 6 | data was reported in figures, but not very well in text and the exact concentrations at which algae was exposed is not reported. | | |
| | Metric 23: | Explanation of Unexpected Outcomes | High | × 1 | 1 | Unexpected outcomes were explained e.g. "In labo- ratory cultures, chlorophyll content of the cells sig- nificantly changed only at the end ofthe experiments (Fig. 1c). Thus, the changes in the concentration of chlorophyll-a were because of the decrease in cell number. It is not clear if the toxicity of tetrachloro derivatives is higher. The membrane damagingef- fects of these lipophilic compounds, i.e., because of their metabolism and oxidative stress can cause re- duced chlorophyll-a levels. Such chlorophyllloss (de- composition of antenna pigments) was shown under oxidative stress in the green alga, Chlorella vulgaris (Qian et al., 2009)." | | |
| Overall Quality I | Determination | n‡ | Unacceptable | | 4.0 | | | |
| Extracted | | | No | | | | | |

** Consistent with our Application of Systematic Review in TSCARisk Evaluations document, if a metric for a data source receives a score of Unacceptable (score = 4), EPA will determine the study to be unacceptable. In this case, two of the metrics were rated as unacceptable. As such, the study is considered unacceptable and the score is presented solely to increase transparency.

* MWF = Metric Weighting Factor

[†] High = 1; Medium = 2; Low = 3; Unacceptable = 4; N/A has no value.

[‡] The overall rating is calculated as necessary. EPA may not always provide a comment for a metric that has been categorized as High.

$$Overall rating = \begin{cases} 4 & \text{if any metric is Unacceptable} \\ \left[\sum_{i} (Metric Score_{i} \times MWF_{i}) / \sum_{j} MWF_{j} \right]_{0,1} & (round to the nearest tenth) otherwise \end{cases}$$

,

where High: ≥ 1 to < 1.7; Medium: ≥ 1.7 to < 2.3; Low: ≥ 2.3 to ≤ 3 . If the reviewer determines that the overall rating needs adjustment, the original rating is crossed out and an arrow points to the new rating.

| Study Citation: | Dobaradara TRICHLOI PHOTOLY | n, S.,Mahvi, A. H.,Nabizadeh, R.,Ramavand ROETHYLENE (TCE) TOXICITY ON DAPHN SIS PROCESSES. Fresenius Environmental Bu | li, B.,Nazn NIA MAGN lletin 21:15 | nara, S., A (D. M. 33-1538 | Zarei, AGNA) | S 2012. BIOASSAY COMPARISON OF BEFORE AND AFTER ULTRASOUND AND |
|------------------------|-----------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Data Type: Hero ID: | Acute (0-96 2127941 | b hour); Aquatic; Invertebrates | | | | |
| Domain | | Metric | Rating^\dagger | MWF^{\star} | Score | $Comments^{\dagger\dagger}$ |
| Domain 1: Test S | Substance | | | | | |
| | Metric 1: | Test Substance Identity | High | $\times 2$ | 2 | TCE is identified by name and uses described |
| | Metric 2: | Test Substance Source | High | $\times 1$ | 1 | Test source reported as Merck company, Germany. |
| | Metric 3: | Test Substance Purity | High | × 1 | 1 | The solutions were prepared by diluting the pure TCE (>99 percent), which was produced by Merck company, Germany. |
| Domain 2: Test I | Design | | | | | |
| | Metric 4: | Negative Controls | High | $\times 2$ | 2 | For bioassay experiments, 10 infants (age <24 h) were exposed to a volume of 100 ml in a 250-ml glass beaker (8 glass beakers for 8 different concentrations, and 1 beaker was considered as control in which TCE was not added). |
| | Metric 5: | Negative Control Response | Low | $\times 1$ | 3 | Not reported |
| | Metric 6: | Randomized Allocation | Low | $\times 1$ | 3 | Not reported |
| Domain 3. Expos | suro Charact | prization | | | | |
| Domain 0. Expo | Metric 7: | Experimental System/Test Media Prepara- tion | Low | $\times 2$ | 6 | There was no mention that containers were covered, and no measurements were reported that would con- firm exposure concentrations. |
| | Metric 8: | Consistency of Exposure Administration | Low | $\times 1$ | 3 | Details of how exposures were administered were not reported, and it is important to know given TCE is volatile |
| | Metric 9: | Measurement of Test Substance Concentra- tion | Low | $\times 2$ | 6 | It was not reported whether measurements were taken |
| | Metric 10: | Exposure Duration and Frequency | Low | × 1 | 3 | There is no mention of renewing the TCE treated beakers with test chemical. Especially with volatile chemicals it would be better to have static renewal or flow through systems. |
| | | Continued on next page | | | | |

| Study Citation: | Dobaradara TRICHLOH PHOTOLY | n, S.,Mahvi, A. H.,Nabizadeh, R.,Ramavand ROETHYLENE (TCE) TOXICITY ON DAPHN SIS PROCESSES. Fresenius Environmental Bu | li, B.,Nazn NIA MAGN lletin 21:153 | nara, S., A (D. M 33-1538 | ,Zarei, S AGNA) | S 2012. BIOASSAY COMPARISON OF BEFORE AND AFTER ULTRASOUND AND |
|------------------------|-----------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Data Type: Hero ID: | Acute (0-96 2127941 | b hour); Aquatic; Invertebrates | | | | |
| Domain | | Metric | $\operatorname{Rating}^{\dagger}$ | MWF^{\star} | Score | $\mathrm{Comments}^{\dagger\dagger}$ |
| | Metric 11: | Number of Exposure Groups/Spacing of Exposure Levels | High | × 1 | 1 | There were 8 different exposure levels, and OECD guideline 202 recommends at least 5. Authors report, "The initial concentration of TCE was 100 mg L-1, experimental concentrations tested were 100, 75, 50, 40, 30, 20, 10 and 5 percent of effluents from processes diluted with dilution water (ultrapure water, resistivity 18.2 M" cm)." |
| | Metric 12: | Testing at or Below Solubility Limit | High | $\times 1$ | 1 | Highest test conc was 100 mg/L far below the solubility of TCE |
| Domain 4: Test (| Organism | | | | | |
| | Metric 13: | Test Organism Characteristics | High | $\times 2$ | 2 | Daphnia magna used in this test |
| | Metric 14: | Acclimitization and Pretreatment Conditions | High | × 1 | 1 | Authors report, "Firstly, D. magna was caught from its living site, then cultured lonely, and infants of this primary D. magna were used for culture in large amounts. Dilution water was made up of tap water, which was dechlorinated by sodium thiosulfate, and also passed through a column of activated carbon. The quality parameters of dilution water are shown in Table 2. D. magna was maintained in a 10-L glass vessel containing medium for culture in a 12/12-h light-dark cycle, with temperature-control at 21"1 "C. Sheep manure was used as culture medium, and D. magna was fed with yeast every two days at a concentration of 100 mg L-1." |
| | Metric 15: | Number of Organisms and Replicates per Group | High | $\times 1$ | 1 | 10 animals were placed in each beaker and the experiment was done in triplicate. |
| | Metric 16: | Adequacy of Test Conditions | High | $\times 1$ | 1 | 10 L glass housing was used, with ph, hardness and temperature within the recommended ranges |
| Domain 5: Outco | ome Assessme | ent | | | | |
| | Metric 17: | Outcome Assessment Methodology | Medium | $\times 2$ | 4 | Methodology for counting lethality is good, however the recommended outcome to measure is immobi- lization which was not measured. Lethality was sen- sitive enough to see an effect for this experiment. |
| | Metric 18: | Consistency of Outcome Assessment | High | $\times 1$ | 1 | Consistent execution of the study. |
| | | Continued on next page | | | | |

| Study Citation: Data Type: Hero ID: | Citation: Dobaradaran, S.,Mahvi, A. H.,Nabizadeh, R.,Ramavandi, B.,Nazmara, S.,Zarei, S 2012. BIOASSAY COMPARISON OF TRICHLOROETHYLENE (TCE) TOXICITY ON DAPHNIA MAGNA (D. MAGNA) BEFORE AND AFTER ULTRASOUND AND PHOTOLYSIS PROCESSES. Fresenius Environmental Bulletin 21:1533-1538 Type: Acute (0-96 hour); Aquatic; Invertebrates D: 2127941 | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------|-------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|--|
| Domain | | Metric | $\operatorname{Rating}^{\dagger}$ | MWF^{\star} | Score | $Comments^{\dagger\dagger}$ | | |
| Domain 6: Confounding / Variable Control | | | | | | | | |
| | Metric 19: | Confounding Variables in Test Design and Procedures | High | $\times 2$ | 2 | | | |
| | Metric 20: | Outcomes Unrelated to Exposure | High | $\times 1$ | 1 | | | |
| Domain 7: Data | Presentation | and Analysis | | | | | | |
| | Metric 21: | Statistical Methods | High | $\times 1$ | 1 | Probit analysis was used to determine an LC50 | | |
| | Metric 22: | Reporting of Data | Low | $\times 2$ | 6 | Reporting of effects at each exposure level was great, but the actual exposure conc was reported in per- centv/v, and measurements were not reported. | | |
| | Metric 23: | Explanation of Unexpected Outcomes | High | $\times 1$ | 1 | | | |
| Overall Quality Determination [‡] | | | Medium | | 1.7 | | | |
| Extracted | | | Yes | | | | | |

* MWF = Metric Weighting Factor

[†] High = 1; Medium = 2; Low = 3; Unacceptable = 4; N/A has no value.

[‡] The overall rating is calculated as necessary. EPA may not always provide a comment for a metric that has been categorized as High.

 $\text{Overall rating} = \begin{cases} 4 & \text{if any metric is Unacceptable} \\ \\ \left\lfloor \sum_{i} \left(\text{Metric Score}_{i} \times \text{MWF}_{i} \right) / \sum_{j} \text{MWF}_{j} \right\rceil_{0.1} & (\text{round to the nearest tenth}) \text{ otherwise} \end{cases},$

where High: ≥ 1 to < 1.7; Medium: ≥ 1.7 to < 2.3; Low: ≥ 2.3 to ≤ 3 . If the reviewer determines that the overall rating needs adjustment, the original rating is crossed out and an arrow points to the new rating.

| Study Citation: | on: Lukavsky, J., Furnadzhieva, S., Dittrt, F 2011. Toxicity of Trichloroethylene (TCE) on Some Algae and Cyanobacteria. Bulletin of | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------|-------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|--|
| | Environme | ntal Contamination and Toxicology 86:226-231 | - | | | | | |
| Data Type: | Acute (0-96 | o hour); Aquatic; Plants | | | | | | |
| Hero ID: | 2128165 | | | | | | | |
| Domain | | Metric | $\operatorname{Rating}^{\dagger}$ | MWF^{\star} | Score | $Comments^{\dagger\dagger}$ | | |
| Domain 1: Test S | Substance | | | | | | | |
| | Metric 1: | Test Substance Identity | High | $\times 2$ | 2 | Chemical is identified by name and its uses are described. | | |
| | Metric 2: | Test Substance Source | Low | $\times 1$ | 3 | The source was not reported. | | |
| | Metric 3: | Test Substance Purity | Low | $\times 1$ | 3 | Purity was not reported. | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| Domain 2: Test I | Design | | | | | | | |
| | Metric 4: | Negative Controls | Medium | × 2 | 4 | Authors report using a control with methanol. Authors report, "Nutrient solution "Z", after Zehnder in Staub (1961), was spiked with TCE: 100 mg was dissolved in 2 mL of methanol (Lachema, CZ), and then added to 100 mL of sterile Z medium. Controls received an equal volume of methanol. This solution was diluted to the desired concentrations by an identical nutrient solution, but without either TCE or methanol." | | |
| | Metric 5: | Negative Control Response | High | $\times 1$ | 1 | Negative control response was reported in figures and in the text. | | |
| | Metric 6: | Randomized Allocation | Low | $\times 1$ | 3 | Random allocation was not reported. | | |
| Domain 3: Exposure Characterization | | | | | | | | |

Continued on next page ...

| Study Citation: Data Type: | Lukavsky, J.,Furnadzhieva, S.,Dittrt, F.: 2011. Toxicity of Trichloroethylene (TCE) on Some Algae and Cyanobacteria. Bulletin of Environmental Contamination and Toxicology 86:226-231 Acute (0-96 hour); Aquatic; Plants | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------|------------------------|-------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|--|
| Hero ID: | 2128165 | | | | | | | |
| Domain | | Metric | Rating^\dagger | MWF^{\star} | Score | $\mathrm{Comments}^{\dagger\dagger}$ | | |
| | Metric 7: | Experimental System/Test Media Prepara- tion | High | × 2 | 2 | Authors took the volatility of TCE into considera- tion. Authors reported, "Assay in glass enclosures were performed according to ISO/DIS 14442 (1998) the glass enclosures (volume of 1.5 mL), were sealed with silicone stoppers coated with Teflon on the in- ner side (screw top vials, Supelco, USA). An identi- cal nutrient solution was used, as described above, but also spiked with 3 g/L KHCO3 (source of in- organic carbon). The inoculum of 0.04"0.06 g/L of dry weight was higher because of a shorter exposi- tion time. The enclosures were exposed horizontally under the same light intensity and temperature as the plates and shaken 10 x/day. Every day, 0.2 mL was measured into 6 replicate wells in an immuno- logical FB plate, and the OD 750 nm was measured identically as in the previous protocol. O2 concen- trations were measured by a polarographic Clark- type oxygen sensor, and PH by a miniaturized com- bined electrode, both joined to a MEM 102 multime- ter (Chemoprojekt Satalice, CZ), the measurements were performed with no replicates." | | |
| | Metric 8: | Consistency of Exposure Administration | Medium | $\times 1$ | 2 | Some species were tested in plates and some were tested in glass enclosures. | | |
| | Metric 9: | Measurement of Test Substance Concentra- tion | Low | × 2 | 6 | Measurements of TCE were not taken, however, au- thors reported measuring other conditions includ- ing "Every day, 0.2 mL was measured into 6 repli- catewells in an immunological FB plate, and the OD 750 nm was measured identically as in the previ- ous protocol. O2 concentrations were measured by a polarographic Clarktype oxygen sensor, and pH by a miniaturized combined electrode, both joined to a MEM 102 multimeter (Chemoprojekt Satal- ice, CZ), the measurements were performed with no replicates." | | |
| | Metric 10: | Exposure Duration and Frequency | Low | $\times 1$ | 3 | The duration of the experiment were acceptable for algae, however authors did not indicate whether the experiment was static or static renewal. | | |
| | Metric 11: | Number of Exposure Groups/Spacing of Exposure Levels | High | $\times 1$ | 1 | There were 5 exposure groups which is OECD 201 recommended, and the concentrations were sensitive enough to derive an EC50. | | |
| | Metric 12: | Testing at or Below Solubility Limit | High | $\times 1$ | 1 | Conc were far below TCE's solubility level. | | |
| | | Continued on next page | | | | | | |
| Study Citation: | Lukavsky, J Environmer | I., Furnadzhieva, S., Dittrt, F. 2011. Toxicity of ntal Contamination and Toxicology 86:226-231 | f Trichloroe | ethylene | (TCE) o | on Some Algae and Cyanobacteria. Bulletin of |
|------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------|------------------------|---------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Data Type: Hero ID: | Acute (0-96 2128165 | 6 hour); Aquatic; Plants | | | | |
| Domain | | Metric | Rating^\dagger | MWF^{\star} | Score | $\mathrm{Comments}^{\dagger\dagger}$ |
| Domain 4: Test (| Organism | | | | | |
| | Metric 13: | Test Organism Characteristics | High | $\times 2$ | 2 | At least one of the cyanobacteria species used are a recommended species in OECD201, Desmodesmus subspicatus. Other species used include Raphido- celis subcapitata and Chlorella kessleri. |
| | Metric 14: | Acclimitization and Pretreatment Conditions | Low | $\times 1$ | 3 | Acclimatization conditions were not reported. |
| | Metric 15: | Number of Organisms and Replicates per Group | Low | $\times 1$ | 3 | 6 replicates were reported but no initial cell density was reported. |
| | Metric 16: | Adequacy of Test Conditions | Low | × 1 | 3 | Temperature reported in study (30 degrees C) is higher than recommended temperature in OECD201 (21-24 +-2 degrees C). No temperature was given for the glass enclosures. It appears some of the health outcomes (related to growth) could have been due to housing conditions. However, part of the experiment was to determine whether the housing was adequate or not and they used two different housing condi- tions to compare. |
| Domain 5: Outco | ome Assessme | ent | | | | |
| | Metric 17: | Outcome Assessment Methodology | High | × 2 | 2 | Authors measured growth using dry weight. Authors indicate "OD in plates were evaluated under an iEMS reader (Labscale, SF) at wavelength 750 nm, and the optical density was converted to dry weight after individual conversion curves for each species. EC50 (the concentration of a tested substance at which the cell density, biomass, O2 production or pH increment is 50 percent of that of the untreated algae) was determined graphically according to standard ISO (2004) omitting." |
| | Metric 18: | Consistency of Outcome Assessment | Medium | × 1 | 2 | There are minor uncertainties about consistency be- tween outcome assessment between the dish and glass enclosure studies. Consider this minor because part of the purpose of the experiment was to de- termine which housing was more conducive to the experiment. |
| Domain 6: Confe | unding / Var | riable Control | | | | |
| Domain 0. Conte | Metric 19: | Confounding Variables in Test Design and Procedures | Medium | $\times 2$ | 4 | Only minor uncertainties. There was no mention of temperature in the glass enclosures. Both test setups were enclosed and sealed. |
| | | Continued on next page | | | | |

| Study Citation: | Lukavsky, J Environmer | J., Furnadzhieva, S., Dittrt, F. 2011. Toxicity ntal Contamination and Toxicology 86:226-23 | v of Trichloroe 1 | thylene | (TCE) | on Some Algae and Cyanobacteria. Bulletin of |
|-------------------|---------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|------------------------|-------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Data Type: | Acute (0-96 | b hour); Aquatic; Plants | | | | |
| Hero ID: | 2128165 | | | | | |
| Domain | | Metric | $\operatorname{Rating}^{\dagger}$ | MWF^{\star} | Score | $\mathrm{Comments}^{\dagger\dagger}$ |
| | Metric 20: | Outcomes Unrelated to Exposure | Low | $\times 1$ | 3 | It seemed some of the species were affected by the housing conditions. |
| Domain 7: Data | Presentation | and Analysis | | | | |
| | Metric 21: | Statistical Methods | High | × 1 | 1 | Authors reported, "EC50 (the concentration of a tested substance at which the cell density, biomass, O2 production or pH increment is 50 percent of that of the untreated algae) was determined graphically according to standard ISO (2004) omitting the stimulation peaks. In addition, growth curves plotted as time"dry weight or OD 750, can indicate EC50 as concentration when cell number is constant, and stabilized. Six replicates were measured, for OD evaluation, error bars are plotted as "sx = H (nRx2 - (Rx)2/n2)." |
| | Metric 22: | Reporting of Data | Medium | $\times 2$ | 4 | Some results were reported in detail for each expo- sure group. However, not all results were reported in this way |
| | Metric 23: | Explanation of Unexpected Outcomes | Medium | $\times 1$ | 2 | Some of the unexpected outcomes were explained. |
| Overall Quality 1 | Determination | 'nţţ | Medium | | 1.9 | |
| | | | | | | |
| Extracted | | | Yes | | | |

* MWF = Metric Weighting Factor

[†] High = 1; Medium = 2; Low = 3; Unacceptable = 4; N/A has no value.

[‡] The overall rating is calculated as necessary. EPA may not always provide a comment for a metric that has been categorized as High.

$$\text{Overall rating} = \begin{cases} 4 & \text{if any metric is Unacceptable} \\ \\ \left\lfloor \sum_{i} \left(\text{Metric Score}_{i} \times \text{MWF}_{i} \right) / \sum_{j} \text{MWF}_{j} \right\rceil_{0.1} & \text{(round to the nearest tenth) otherwise} \end{cases}$$

where High: ≥ 1 to < 1.7; Medium: ≥ 1.7 to < 2.3; Low: ≥ 2.3 to ≤ 3 . If the reviewer determines that the overall rating needs adjustment, the original rating is crossed out and an arrow points to the new rating.

| Data Type: Hero ID: | Acute (0-96 2298399 | b hour); Aquatic; Fish static | | | | |
|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------|-------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Domain | | Metric | $\operatorname{Rating}^\dagger$ | MWF^{\star} | Score | $Comments^{\dagger\dagger}$ |
| Domain 1: Test | Substance | | | | | |
| | Metric 1: | Test Substance Identity | High | $\times 2$ | 2 | Chemical was identified by name. |
| | Metric 2: | Test Substance Source | Medium | $\times 1$ | 2 | The source of TCE was not reported, but gas chro- matography was used to verify identity of chemical. "The determination of the test compounds in wa- ter samples was accomplished by solvent extraction followed by gas chromatography analysis." |
| | Metric 3: | Test Substance Purity | Low | $\times 1$ | 3 | Purity of the test substance was not reported. |
| Domain 2. Tost | Dosign | | | | | |
| Domain 2. 16st | Metric 4: | Negative Controls | High | $\times 2$ | 2 | Both water and acetone controls were used in acute static and flow-through tests |
| | Metric 5: | Negative Control Response | Low | $\times 1$ | 3 | Control response was not reported |
| | Metric 6: | Randomized Allocation | Low | $\times 1$ | 3 | Researchers did not report the method for how or- ganisms were allocated to study groups, or their de- ficiencies regarding allocation method. |
| Domoin 2. Euro | oguno Chonset | | | | | |
| Domain 5. Exp | Metric 7: | Experimental System/Test Media Prepara- tion | High | $\times 2$ | 2 | Static system with minimal headspace for volatile substance was used. |
| | Metric 8: | Consistency of Exposure Administration | Low | $\times 1$ | 3 | Exposure concentrations were not reported in the static test |
| | Metric 9: | Measurement of Test Substance Concentra- tion | Medium | $\times 2$ | 4 | Static acute test didn't test concentrations and only relied on nominal concentrations. |
| | Metric 10: | Exposure Duration and Frequency | High | $\times 1$ | 1 | Static test was renewed every 24 hours over the course of 96 hours. |
| | Metric 11: | Number of Exposure Groups/Spacing of Exposure Levels | Medium | $\times 1$ | 2 | Concentrations were prepared in a logarithmic series but the method used to determine an appropriate range was not mentioned. |
| | Metric 12: | Testing at or Below Solubility Limit | High | $\times 1$ | 1 | - |

| Study Citation: | Smith, A. D.,Bharath, A.,Mallard, C.,Orr, D.,Smith, K.,Sutton, J. A.,Vukmanich, J.,McCarty, L. S.,Ozburn, G. W. 1991. The acute and chronic toxicity of 10 chlorinated organic-compounds to the american flagfish (jordanella-floridae). Archives of Environmental Contamination and Toxicology 20:94-102 | | | | | | | |
|------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|---------------------------|---------------|-------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|--|
| Data Type: Hero ID: | Acute (0-96 2298399 | hour); Aquatic; Fish static | | | | | | |
| Domain | | Metric | Rating^\dagger | MWF^{\star} | Score | $Comments^{\dagger\dagger}$ | | |
| | Metric 13: | Test Organism Characteristics | Medium | $\times 2$ | 4 | Juvenile flagfish (2-4 months) were used, and were laboratory raised. Not an OECD or EPA recom- mended species. Also had minor uncertainties about where the fish were obtained. | | |
| | Metric 14: | Acclimitization and Pretreatment Conditions | Medium | × 1 | 2 | Minor uncertainties about details provided. Authors report, "Laboratory-reared juvenile (2-4 month) flagfish were used. Fish were raised in the dilu- ent water and fed freshly-hatched and adult brine shrimp. Fish were not fed during the tests." | | |
| | Metric 15: | Number of Organisms and Replicates per Group | Low | $\times 1$ | 3 | Only 5 juvenile flagfish were used per aquarium when OECD recommends at least 7. | | |
| | Metric 16: | Adequacy of Test Conditions | High | $\times 1$ | 1 | | | |
| Domain 5: Outco | ome Assessme | ent. | | | | | | |
| | Metric 17: | Outcome Assessment Methodology | High | $\times 2$ | 2 | | | |
| | Metric 18: | Consistency of Outcome Assessment | High | $\times 1$ | 1 | | | |
| Domain 6: Confo | unding / Va | iable Control | | | | | | |
| Domain 0. Como | Metric 19. | Confounding Variables in Test Design and | High | × 2 | 2 | | | |
| | 1000110 101 | Procedures | 111811 | ~ = | - | | | |
| | Metric 20: | Outcomes Unrelated to Exposure | Low | $\times 1$ | 3 | No adverse outcomes were reported for TCE, and control response was not reported. | | |
| Domain 7: Data | Procentation | and Analysis | | | | | | |
| Domain 7. Data | Metric 21. | Statistical Methods | High | × 1 | 1 | | | |
| | Metric 22: | Reporting of Data | Low | $\times 2$ | 6 | The data for the static test were not presented in full, and no information was reported for controls. | | |
| | Metric 23: | Explanation of Unexpected Outcomes | High | $\times 1$ | 1 | There were no unexpected outcomes for TCE in this paper. | | |
| Overall Quality I | Determination | h [‡] | Medium | | 1.7 | | | |
| Extracted | | | Yes | | | | | |
| | | Continued on next page | | | | | | |
| | | Commuea on next page | | | | | | |

| | I I O | | |
|------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------|
| Study Citation: | Smith, A. D.,Bharath, A.,Mallard, C.,Orr, D.,Smith, K.,Su and chronic toxicity of 10 chlorinated organic-compounds Contamination and Toxicology 20:94-102 | atton, J. A., Vukmanich, J., McCarty, L. S., Oz to the american flagfish (jordanella-floridae | burn, G. W 1991. The acute e). Archives of Environmental |
| Data Type: Hero ID: | Acute (0-96 hour); Aquatic; Fish static 2298399 | | |
| Domain | Metric | $Rating^{\dagger}$ MWF [*] Score | Comments ^{††} |

* MWF = Metric Weighting Factor † High = 1; Medium = 2; Low = 3; Unacceptable = 4; N/A has no value.

[‡] The overall rating is calculated as necessary. EPA may not always provide a comment for a metric that has been categorized as High.

$$Overall rating = \begin{cases} 4 & \text{if any metric is Unacceptable} \\ \left| \sum_{i} (Metric \ Score_{i} \times MWF_{i}) / \sum_{j} MWF_{j} \right|_{0.1} & (round to the nearest tenth) otherwise \end{cases},$$

where High: ≥ 1 to < 1.7; Medium: ≥ 1.7 to < 2.3; Low: ≥ 2.3 to ≤ 3 . If the reviewer determines that the overall rating needs adjustment, the original rating is crossed out and an arrow points to the new rating.

| Data Type: Hero ID: | Acute (0-96 2298399 | b hour); Aquatic; Fish flow-through | | | | |
|------------------------|------------------------|--------------------------------------------------|---------------------------|------------------------|-------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Domain | | Metric | Rating^\dagger | MWF^{\star} | Score | $Comments^{\dagger\dagger}$ |
| Domain 1: Test S | Substance | | | | | |
| | Metric 1: | Test Substance Identity | High | $\times 2$ | 2 | Chemical was identified by name. |
| | Metric 2: | Test Substance Source | Medium | × 1 | 2 | The source of TCE was not reported, but gas chro matography was used to verify identity of chemical "The determination of the test compounds in wa- ter samples was accomplished by solvent extraction followed by gas chromatography analysis." |
| | Metric 3: | Test Substance Purity | Low | $\times 1$ | 3 | Purity of the test substance was not reported. |
| Domain 2: Test I | Design | | | | | |
| | Metric 4: | Negative Controls | High | $\times 2$ | 2 | Both water and acetone controls were used in acute static and flow-through tests. |
| | Metric 5: | Negative Control Response | Low | $\times 1$ | 3 | Control response was not reported. |
| | Metric 6: | Randomized Allocation | Low | × 1 | 3 | Researchers did not report the method for how or ganisms were allocated to study groups, or their de- ficiencies regarding allocation method. |
| Domain 3. Expos | sure Characte | erization | | | | |
| Domain 9. Expo | Metric 7: | Experimental System/Test Media Prepara- tion | High | $\times 2$ | 2 | "Fresh solutions were added at a rate of 6 L/hr Each aquarium wassampled at least three times to determine the concentrations of thetest solutions." |
| | Metric 8: | Consistency of Exposure Administration | Low | $\times 1$ | 3 | Exposure concentrations were not reported in the flow-through test. Five or six duplicate, logarithmi- cally distributed concentrations of the test solutions were used in 30-L aquaria. |
| | Metric 9: | Measurement of Test Substance Concentra- tion | High | $\times 2$ | 2 | Flow-through acute test measured test concentrations and Fresh solutions were added at a rate of 6 L/hr. Each aquarium was sampled at least three times to determine the concentrations of the test solutions. |
| | Metric 10: | Exposure Duration and Frequency | High | $\times 1$ | 1 | Flow-through test was renewed every 6 hours over the course of 96 hours |

| Study Citation: | Smith, A. D.,Bharath, A.,Mallard, C.,Orr, D.,Smith, K.,Sutton, J. A.,Vukmanich, J.,McCarty, L. S.,Ozburn, G. W. 1991. The acute and chronic toxicity of 10 chlorinated organic-compounds to the american flagfish (jordanella-floridae). Archives of Environmental Contamination and Toxicology 20:94-102 | | | | | | |
|------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------|-------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|
| Data Type: Hero ID: | Acute (0-96 2298399 | b hour); Aquatic; Fish flow-through | | | | | |
| Domain | | Metric | $\operatorname{Rating}^\dagger$ | MWF^{\star} | Score | $\mathrm{Comments}^{\dagger\dagger}$ | |
| | Metric 11: | Number of Exposure Groups/Spacing of Exposure Levels | Medium | $\times 1$ | 2 | Concentrations were prepared in a logarithmic series but the method used to determine an appropriate range was not mentioned. | |
| | Metric 12: | Testing at or Below Solubility Limit | High | $\times 1$ | 1 | | |
| Domain 4. Tost | Organian | | | | | | |
| Domain 4. Test | Metric 13: | Test Organism Characteristics | Medium | $\times 2$ | 4 | Juvenile flagfish (2-4 months) were used, and were laboratory raised. Not an OECD or EPA recom- mended species. Also had minor uncertainties about where the fish were obtained. | |
| | Metric 14: | Acclimitization and Pretreatment Conditions | Medium | × 1 | 2 | Minor uncertainties about details provided. Authors report, "Laboratory-reared juvenile (2-4 month) flagfish were used. Fish were raised in the dilu- ent water and fed freshly-hatched and adult brine shrimp. Fish were not fed during the tests." | |
| | Metric 15: | Number of Organisms and Replicates per Group | High | $\times 1$ | 1 | 10 juvenile flagfish were used per aquarium, and OECD recommends at least 7. | |
| | Metric 16: | Adequacy of Test Conditions | High | $\times 1$ | 1 | | |
| Domain 5: Outco | me Assessme | sont | | | | | |
| Domain 5. Outer | Metric 17: | Outcome Assessment Methodology | High | $\times 2$ | 2 | | |
| | Metric 18: | Consistency of Outcome Assessment | High | × 1 | 1 | | |
| Domain 6: Confe | unding / Var | viable Control | | | | | |
| Domain 0. Come | Metric 19 | Confounding Variables in Test Design and | High | × ? | 2 | | |
| | Metric 15. | Procedures | mgn | ~ 2 | 2 | | |
| | Metric 20: | Outcomes Unrelated to Exposure | Low | $\times 1$ | 3 | No adverse outcomes were reported for TCE, and control response was not reported. | |
| Domain 7: Data | Presentation | and Analysis | | | | | |
| | Metric 21: | Statistical Methods | High | $\times 1$ | 1 | | |
| | Metric 22: | Reporting of Data | Low | $\times 2$ | 6 | The data for the static test were not presented in full, and no information was reported for controls. | |
| | | Continued on next page | | | | | |

| Study Citation: | Smith, A. D.,Bharath, A.,Mallard, C.,Orr, D.,Smith, K.,Sutton, J. A.,Vukmanich, J.,McCarty, L. S.,Ozburn, G. W. 1991. The acute and chronic toxicity of 10 chlorinated organic-compounds to the american flagfish (jordanella-floridae). Archives of Environmental Contamination and Toxicology 20:94-102 | | | | | | | | |
|-------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|------------------------|-------|----------------------------------------------------------|--|--|--|--|
| Data Type: | Acute (0-96 hour); Aquatic; Fish flow-through | Acute (0-96 hour): Aquatic: Fish flow-through | | | | | | | |
| Hero ID: | 2298399 | | | | | | | | |
| Domain | Metric | $\operatorname{Rating}^\dagger$ | MWF^{\star} | Score | $Comments^{\dagger\dagger}$ | | | | |
| | Metric 23: Explanation of Unexpected Outcomes | High | $\times 1$ | 1 | There were no unexpected outcomes for TCE in this paper. | | | | |
| Overall Quality I | Determination [‡] | High | | 1.6 | | | | | |
| Extracted | | Yes | | | | | | | |

* MWF = Metric Weighting Factor

[†] High = 1; Medium = 2; Low = 3; Unacceptable = 4; N/A has no value.

[‡] The overall rating is calculated as necessary. EPA may not always provide a comment for a metric that has been categorized as High.

 $\text{Overall rating} = \begin{cases} 4 & \text{if any metric is Unacceptable} \\ \\ \left\lfloor \sum_{i} \left(\text{Metric Score}_{i} \times \text{MWF}_{i} \right) / \sum_{j} \text{MWF}_{j} \right\rceil_{0.1} & \text{(round to the nearest tenth) otherwise} \end{cases},$ where High: ≥ 1 to < 1.7; Medium: ≥ 1.7 to < 2.3; Low: ≥ 2.3 to ≤ 3 . If the reviewer determines that the overall rating needs adjustment, the original rating is crossed out and an arrow points to the new rating.

^{††} Metrics that are rated 'High' met the criteria for high confidence as expected for this type of study, and may not require additional comments.

... continued from previous page

| Data Type: Hero ID: | Chronic (> 2298399 | 21 days); Aquatic; Fish | | | | |
|----------------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------------------------------|---------------------------|---------------|-------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Domain | | Metric | Rating^\dagger | MWF^{\star} | Score | $Comments^{\dagger\dagger}$ |
| Domain 1: Test | Substance | | | | | |
| | Metric 1: | Test Substance Identity | High | $\times 2$ | 2 | Chemical was identified by name. |
| | Metric 2: | Test Substance Source | Medium | $\times 1$ | 2 | The source of TCE was not reported, but gas chro matography was used to verify identity of chemica "The determination of the test compounds in wa ter samples was accomplished by solvent extraction followed by gas chromatography analysis." |
| | Metric 3: | Test Substance Purity | Low | $\times 1$ | 3 | Purity of the test substance was not reported. |
| Domain 2 [.] Test | Design | | | | | |
| Domain 2. Test | Metric 4: | Negative Controls | High | $\times 2$ | 2 | Both water and acetone controls were used in chron test |
| | Metric 5: | Negative Control Response | High | $\times 1$ | 1 | Negative control response was reported for chron test. |
| | Metric 6: | Randomized Allocation | Medium | × 1 | 2 | Researchers reported allocating fish randomly to the exposure apparatus. Did not specifically say if the were randomly allocated to control, but it is as sumed, so only minor uncertainty. |
| Domain 3: Expo | sure Characte | rization | | | | |
| | Metric 7: | Experimental System/Test Media Prepara- tion | High | $\times 2$ | 2 | The flow-through diluter was the same unit used is the acute |
| | Metric 8: | Consistency of Exposure Administration | High | × 1 | 1 | Exposure concentrations were reported for the chronic test. Five duplicate, logarithmically dis- tributed concentrations of the test solutions, were used in 30-L aquaria. |
| | Metric 9: | Measurement of Test Substance Concentra- tion | High | × 2 | 2 | Water samples were analyzed 5 days per wee throughout the 28-day exposure period; sample co lection was from the mid-point of the tanks. De termination of the test compounds in water sample was accomplished by solvent extraction followed be gas chromatography (GC) analysis. |
| | Metric 10: | Exposure Duration and Frequency | High | $\times 1$ | 1 | Flow-through exposure with fresh solutions added a rate of 6 L/hr . |

| Study Citation: | Smith, A. D.,Bharath, A.,Mallard, C.,Orr, D.,Smith, K.,Sutton, J. A.,Vukmanich, J.,McCarty, L. S.,Ozburn, G. W. 1991. The acute and chronic toxicity of 10 chlorinated organic-compounds to the american flagfish (jordanella-floridae). Archives of Environmental Contamination and Toxicology 20:94-102 | | | | | | | |
|------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------|------------------------|-------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|--|
| Data Type: Hero ID: | Chronic (>2 2298399 | 21 days); Aquatic; Fish | | | | | | |
| Domain | | Metric | Rating^\dagger | MWF^{\star} | Score | $\mathrm{Comments}^{\dagger\dagger}$ | | |
| | Metric 11: | Number of Exposure Groups/Spacing of Exposure Levels | Medium | $\times 1$ | 2 | "Concentrations were prepared in a logarithmic se- ries and the 96-hrLC50's calculated from the acute flagfish data were used to establish the exposure gra- dients employed in these chronic tests." | | |
| | Metric 12: | Testing at or Below Solubility Limit | High | $\times 1$ | 1 | | | |
| Domain 4: Test (| Organism | | | | | | | |
| | Metric 13: | Test Organism Characteristics | Medium | $\times 2$ | 4 | Embryo/larval flagfish were used, and were labora- tory raised. Not an OECD or EPA recommended species. Also had minor uncertainties about where the fish were obtained. | | |
| | Metric 14: | Acclimitization and Pretreatment Conditions | Medium | × 1 | 2 | Minor uncertainties about details provided. Authors report, "Laboratory-reared juvenile (2-4 month) flagfish were used. Fish were raised in the dilu- ent water and fed freshly-hatched and adult brine shrimp. Fish were not fed during the tests." | | |
| | Metric 15: | Number of Organisms and Replicates per Group | Medium | $\times 1$ | 2 | 50 fry (one week old) per test level and the controls. Duplicate exposures were used, but OECD recom- mends 4 or 5. | | |
| | Metric 16: | Adequacy of Test Conditions | High | $\times 1$ | 1 | | | |
| Domain 5: Outco | ome Assessme | ent | | | | | | |
| | Metric 17: | Outcome Assessment Methodology | High | $\times 2$ | 2 | A 28-day outcome was measured which is what is recommended by OECD, but a 10-day outcome was also reported. | | |
| | Metric 18: | Consistency of Outcome Assessment | High | $\times 1$ | 1 | - | | |
| Domain 6: Confo | ounding / Var | iable Control | | | | | | |
| | Metric 19: | Confounding Variables in Test Design and Procedures | High | $\times 2$ | 2 | | | |
| | Metric 20: | Outcomes Unrelated to Exposure | High | × 1 | 1 | No adverse outcomes were reported for TCE, and controls had 87 percent survival for a 28-day survival test. | | |
| Domain 7: Data | Domain 7: Data Presentation and Analysis | | | | | | | |

| Study Citation: Data Type: Hero ID: | Smith, A. D and chronic Contaminat Chronic (>2 2298399 | D.,Bharath, A.,Mallard, C.,Orr, D.,Smith, K. toxicity of 10 chlorinated organic-compoun ion and Toxicology 20:94-102 21 days); Aquatic; Fish | .,Sutton, J. A., nds to the ame | Vukmani erican fla | ich, J.,N gfish (jo | AcCarty, L. S.,Ozburn, G. W 1991. The acute ordanella-floridae). Archives of Environmental |
|-------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Domain | | Metric | $\operatorname{Rating}^{\dagger}$ | MWF^{\star} | Score | $Comments^{\dagger\dagger}$ |
| | Metric 21: Metric 22: Metric 23: | Statistical Methods Reporting of Data Explanation of Unexpected Outcomes | High High High | $\begin{array}{c} \times \ 1 \\ \times \ 2 \\ \times \ 1 \end{array}$ | $egin{array}{c} 1 \\ 2 \\ 1 \end{array}$ | Control information was reported for outcomes. There were no unexpected outcomes for TCE in this |
| Overall Quality I | Determination | ± | High | | 1 2 | paper. |
| Overall Quality 1 | Jetermination | | nigii | | 1.5 | |
| Extracted | | | Yes | | | |

* MWF = Metric Weighting Factor

[†] High = 1; Medium = 2; Low = 3; Unacceptable = 4; N/A has no value.
[‡] The overall rating is calculated as necessary. EPA may not always provide a comment for a metric that has been categorized as High.

$$\text{Overall rating} = \begin{cases} 4 & \text{if any metric is Unacceptable} \\ \\ \left\lfloor \sum_{i} \left(\text{Metric Score}_{i} \times \text{MWF}_{i} \right) / \sum_{j} \text{MWF}_{j} \right\rceil_{0.1} & \text{(round to the nearest tenth) otherwise} \end{cases}$$

,

where High: ≥ 1 to < 1.7; Medium: ≥ 1.7 to < 2.3; Low: ≥ 2.3 to ≤ 3 . If the reviewer determines that the overall rating needs adjustment, the original rating is crossed out and an arrow points to the new rating. ^{††} Metrics that are rated 'High' met the criteria for high confidence as expected for this type of study, and may not require additional comments.

| Study Citation: | Rayburn, I Journal of | D. J. Deyoung, J. A. Bantle, D. J. Fort, R. Mcn Applied Toxicology 11:253-260 | ew. 1991. Altere | ed develo | pmenta | l toxicity caused by three carrier solvents. |
|------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------|--------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Data Type: Hero ID: | Other; Aqu 2307041 | atic; other | | | | |
| Domain | | Metric | $\operatorname{Rating}^{\dagger}$ | MWF^{\star} | Score | $Comments^{\dagger\dagger}$ |
| Domain 1: Test S | Substance | | | | | |
| | Metric 1: | Test Substance Identity | N/A | | N/A | chemical identified by name, trichloroethylene, and by cas $79-01-6$ |
| | Metric 2: | Test Substance Source | Medium | × 1 | 2 | Source was reported, Aldrich chemical co, but batch/lot number was not reported and it was not reported whether the manufacturer verified the iden- tity of the chemical or whether authors verified the identity through analytical methods. |
| | Metric 3: | Test Substance Purity | Low | $\times 1$ | 3 | purity and or grade were not reported. |
| Domain 2. Tost 1 | Dogian | | | | | |
| Domain 2. 16st 1 | Metric 4: | Negative Controls | High | $\times 2$ | 2 | "Four groups of 25 embryos were exposed to FETAX solution and used as controls for each test." |
| | Metric 5: | Negative Control Response | Medium | $\times 1$ | 2 | negative control response is repoted in the text and in several tables. In at least one of the experiments the percent mortaility was just over 10 percent. |
| | Metric 6: | Randomized Allocation | Low | $\times 1$ | 3 | It was not reported whether animals were allocated randomly |
| Domain 3: Expo | auro Charact | prization | | | | |
| Domain 5. Expo | Metric 7: | Experimental System/Test Media Prepara- tion | Unacceptable | $\times 2$ | 8 | The study does not say whether petri dishes were covered or sealed in some way, and there were no concentrations measureed to verify what the animals were exposed to. |
| | Metric 8: | Consistency of Exposure Administration | Medium | $\times 1$ | 2 | • |
| | Metric 9: | Measurement of Test Substance Concentra- tion | Low | $\times 2$ | 6 | exposure concentrations were not reported. |
| | Metric 10: | Exposure Duration and Frequency | High | $\times 1$ | 1 | duration was 96 hour and every 24 hours solutions were renewed, which is the recommended duration and frequency from the ASTM Guidance. |
| | | Continued on next page | | | | |

| Study Citation: | Rayburn, D. J. Deyoung, J. A. Bantle, D. J. Fort, R. Mcnew. 1991. Altered developmental toxicity caused by three carrier solvents. Journal of Applied Toxicology 11:253-260 | | | | | | | | | |
|------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|------------|-------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|--|--|--|
| Data Type: Hero ID: | Other; Aqu 2307041 | Other; Aquatic; other 2307041 | | | | | | | | |
| Domain | | Metric | $\operatorname{Rating}^{\dagger}$ | MWF* | Score | $\mathrm{Comments}^{\dagger\dagger}$ | | | | |
| | Metric 11: | Number of Exposure Groups/Spacing of Exposure Levels | Medium | × 1 | 2 | There were 6 exposure groups for TCE, but it is unclear how the spacing of exposure levels was de- termined, although it does appear as though they did a range finding test as they state, "One range and three definitive experiments were performed to determine the 96-h LC50, 96-h EC50 (malforma- tion), the Teratogenic Index (TI) (96-h LCsc/96-h EC50) and the Minimum Concentration to Inhibit Growth (MCIG) for the three solvents and two ter- atogens. The 96-h LC25 and LCsci, and 96-h EC25 and EC50 (malformation) were determined using Litchfield-Wilcoxon probit analysis." | | | | |
| | Metric 12: | Testing at or Below Solubility Limit | Medium | × 1 | 2 | authors do not mention having trouble testing TCE at the levels they did, but with the way they reported the exposure levels $percent(v/v)$ it's hard to tell whether the concs were below the solubility of TCE. | | | | |
| Domain 4: Test (| Organism | | | | | | | | | |
| | Metric 13: | Test Organism Characteristics | High | $\times 2$ | 2 | Xenopus embryos were used in these experiments which are the suggested species in ASTM guidance. | | | | |
| | Metric 14: | Acclimitization and Pretreatment Conditions | Low | × 1 | 3 | study did not report whether the organisms were acclimatized. it only states, "Animal care and breeding were performed according toBantle et al. (1989)." | | | | |
| | Metric 15: | Number of Organisms and Replicates per Group | High | $\times 1$ | 1 | two replicates per group with 20-25 embrayos used, which is according to the ASTM guidance. | | | | |
| | Metric 16: | Adequacy of Test Conditions | Low | × 1 | 3 | Some information was given about housing, but not many details. Authors report adequate volume of so- lution in the Petri dishes which are plastic. Authors also say that each experiment folloed standard meth- ods of test opteration and embryo evaluation from two papers including Bantle et al (1989) and Dawson and Bangle (1987). However no specifics were given about temperaure, ph etc. | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | |

Domain 5: Outcome Assessment

| Study Citation: | on: Rayburn, D. J. Deyoung, J. A. Bantle, D. J. Fort, R. Mcnew. 1991. Altered developmental toxicity caused by three carrier solvents. Journal of Applied Toxicology 11:253-260 | | | | | | | |
|------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------|-------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|--|
| Data Type: Hero ID: | Other; Aqua 2307041 | atic; other | | | | | | |
| Domain | | Metric | $\operatorname{Rating}^{\dagger}$ | MWF^{\star} | Score | $\mathrm{Comments}^{\dagger\dagger}$ | | |
| | Metric 17: | Outcome Assessment Methodology | High | $\times 2$ | 2 | LC50 and EC50s were measured which were the sug- gested outcomes measured in the ASTM guidance, and the authors did measured NOELs and LOELs at the for mortality and malformations at the exposure levels tested. | | |
| | Metric 18: | Consistency of Outcome Assessment | Medium | $\times 1$ | 2 | incomplete reporting of minor details | | |
| Domain 6: Confe | ounding / Var | iable Control | | | | | | |
| | Metric 19: | Confounding Variables in Test Design and Procedures | Low | $\times 2$ | 6 | study did not report enough details to allow a com- parison of environmental conditions across study groups. | | |
| | Metric 20: | Outcomes Unrelated to Exposure | Medium | $\times 1$ | 2 | authors reported that at least one of the controls had a greater than 10 percent mortality and malfor- mation rate, but it was just over 10 percent. | | |
| Domain 7: Data | Presentation | and Analysis | | | | | | |
| Domain 1. Dava | Metric 21: | Statistical Methods | High | × 1 | 1 | "The 96-h LC25 and LCsci, and 96-h EC25 and EC50 (malformation) were determined us- ing Litchfield-Wilcoxon probit analysis.20 Dunnett's testwas used to determine the No-Observable-Effect Concentrations (NOEC) for malformation and mor- tality. The MCIG was determined by comparing head-tail lengths between control and experimental groups using the Hest for grouped observations." | | |
| | Metric 22: | Reporting of Data | Unacceptable | $\times 2$ | 8 | results were reported in percent v/v which is not a concetration. | | |
| | Metric 23: | Explanation of Unexpected Outcomes | Medium | $\times 1$ | 2 | explainaitons were given for unexpected outcomes. | | |
| Overall Quality I | Determination | 1 [‡] | Unacceptable | | 4.0 | | | |
| Extracted | | | No | | | | | |
| | Continued on next page | | | | | | | |

| Study Citation: Data Type: | Rayburn, D. J. Deyoung, J. A. Bantle, D. Journal of Applied Toxicology 11:253-260 Other; Aquatic; other | J. Fort, R. Mcnew. 1991 | . Altered developm | nental toxicity caused by | three carrier solvents. |
|-------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------|----------------------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Hero ID: Domain | 2307041 Metric | Rat | $\operatorname{ing}^{\dagger}$ MWF* So | core C | $comments^{\dagger\dagger}$ |

** Consistent with our Application of Systematic Review in TSCARisk Evaluations document, if a metric for a data source receives a score of Unacceptable (score = 4), EPA will determine the study to be unacceptable. In this case, two of the metrics were rated as unacceptable. As such, the study is considered unacceptable and the score is presented solely to increase transparency.

* MWF = Metric Weighting Factor

[†] High = 1; Medium = 2; Low = 3; Unacceptable = 4; N/A has no value.

[‡] The overall rating is calculated as necessary. EPA may not always provide a comment for a metric that has been categorized as High.

... continued from previous page

$$Overall rating = \begin{cases} 4 & \text{if any metric is Unacceptable} \\ \left[\sum_{i} (Metric Score_{i} \times MWF_{i}) / \sum_{j} MWF_{j} \right]_{0,1} & (round to the nearest tenth) otherwise \end{cases}$$

where High: ≥ 1 to < 1.7; Medium: ≥ 1.7 to < 2.3; Low: ≥ 2.3 to ≤ 3 . If the reviewer determines that the overall rating needs adjustment, the original rating is crossed out and an arrow points to the new rating.

| Data Type: Hero ID: | Other; Aqua 2800252 | atic; Fish | | | | |
|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------|-------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Domain | | Metric | $\operatorname{Rating}^{\dagger}$ | MWF^{\star} | Score | $Comments^{\dagger\dagger}$ |
| Domain 1: Test S | Substance | | | | | |
| | Metric 1: | Test Substance Identity | High | $\times 2$ | 2 | Chemical was identified by name, trichloroethyler |
| | Metric 2: | Test Substance Source | High | $\times 1$ | 1 | Source was identified by Wako Pure Chemicals, Caka, Japan. |
| | Metric 3: | Test Substance Purity | Low | $\times 1$ | 3 | Not reported |
| Domain 2: Test I | Design | | | | | |
| Domain 21 1000 1 | Metric 4: | Negative Controls | Medium | $\times 2$ | 4 | Authors report a concentration of 0 for TCE in the tables of results. No control is mentioned in t text otherwise. Unsure if the control is just water contains a solvent. |
| | Metric 5: | Negative Control Response | High | $\times 1$ | 1 | Control response is noted in the tables |
| | Metric 6: | Randomized Allocation | Low | $\times 1$ | 3 | Not reported |
| Domain 3: Expos | sure Characte | rization | | | | |
| | Metric 7: | Experimental System/Test Media Prepara- tion | Low | × 2 | 6 | Very little information is given about the actual posure of the cells to TCE in this paper. It is a clear whether the volatile nature of TCE was tak into consideration during in the test setup to duce volatilization. It also doesn't say anythi about whether the source of the fish (collected pe odicallyat Mochimune Harbor, Shizuoka prefectu Japan) was contaminated or now. |
| | Metric 8: | Consistency of Exposure Administration | Low | $\times 1$ | 3 | Very little information was given about how ce were exposed to TCE |
| | Metric 9: | Measurement of Test Substance Concentra- tion | Low | $\times 2$ | 6 | The test substance was not measured and the technical is very volatile. |
| | Metric 10: | Exposure Duration and Frequency | Low | × 1 | 3 | Duration was 48 hours for this study. OECD gu ance on genotoxicity assays say that 24 hours sho be enough for assays without metabolic activation It appears that there was only a one time expose but it's unclear and no measurements were report to determine the actual conc cells were exposed t |
| | Metric 11: | Number of Exposure Groups/Spacing of Exposure Levels | High | $\times 1$ | 1 | 6 exposure groups were used for this experiment |

| Study Citation: | on: Hayashi, M.,Ueda, T.,Uyeno, K.,Wada, K.,Kinae, N.,Saotome, K.,Tanaka, N.,Takai, A.,Sasaki, Y. F.,Asano, N.,Sofuni, T.,Ojima, Y 1998. Development of genotoxicity assay systems that use aquatic organisms. Mutation Research 399:125-133 | | | | | | | | | | |
|------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------|--------------------|------------|-------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|
| Data Type: Hero ID: | Other; Aqu 2800252 | Other; Aquatic; Fish 2800252 | | | | | | | | | |
| Domain | | Metric | $Rating^{\dagger}$ | MWF^* | Score | $\mathrm{Comments}^{\dagger\dagger}$ | | | | | |
| | Metric 12: | Testing at or Below Solubility Limit | Medium | × 1 | 2 | A subset of the exposure conc exceeded the water solubility limit but a sufficient range of exposure conc was tested to characterize a conc-response rela- tionship. Just one conc (3000mg/L) was above the solubility level and there were 5 other conc levels below the solubility level. | | | | | |
| Domain 4: Test (| Organism | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Metric 13: | Test Organism Characteristics | Medium | $\times 2$ | 4 | R. ocellatus ocellatus embryos were used for the chromosomal aberration. There are no guidelines for this type of study for fish. This species is suitable for metaphase analysis. | | | | | |
| | Metric 14: | Acclimitization and Pretreatment Conditions | Medium | $\times 1$ | 2 | Odontobutis obscura obscura were collected from the Tomio River, Nara prefecture, Japan and then cultured in R. laboratory aquariums. Aquarium con- ditions were not reported. | | | | | |
| | Metric 15: | Number of Organisms and Replicates per Group | Low | × 1 | 3 | Guidelines say that there should be enough cells and replicates at each exposure group to have statistical power. There were about 30 cells in each exposure level. However some conc levels had no replicates, some had duplicates and some had triplicates. | | | | | |
| | Metric 16: | Adequacy of Test Conditions | Low | $\times 1$ | 3 | Housing was not described. | | | | | |
| Domain 5: Outco | me Assessme | sont | | | | | | | | | |
| Domain 9. Outer | Metric 17: | Outcome Assessment Methodology | Medium | $\times 2$ | 4 | Outcome assessment methodology was partially re- ported by the authors but minor uncertainties re- main. | | | | | |
| | Metric 18: | Consistency of Outcome Assessment | High | $\times 1$ | 1 | It appears that the outcomes were assessed consistently across study groups. | | | | | |
| Domain 6. Confo | unding / Vor | viable Control | | | | | | | | | |
| Domain 0. Come | Metric 19: | Confounding Variables in Test Design and Procedures | High | $\times 2$ | 2 | No reported differences among the study groups in environmental conditions that could influence the outcomes assessment. | | | | | |
| | Metric 20: | Outcomes Unrelated to Exposure | High | $\times 1$ | 1 | Cell attrition reported for each study group and are acceptable. | | | | | |
| Domain 7: Data | Presentation | and Analysis | | | | | | | | | |
| | Domain (, Data riesentation and Analysis | | | | | | | | | | |

| Study Citation: Data Type: Hero ID: | Hayashi, M 1998. Devel Other; Aqui 2800252 | Hayashi, M.,Ueda, T.,Uyeno, K.,Wada, K.,Kinae, N.,Saotome, K.,Tanaka, N.,Takai, A.,Sasaki, Y. F.,Asano, N.,Sofuni, T.,Ojima, Y 1998. Development of genotoxicity assay systems that use aquatic organisms. Mutation Research 399:125-133 Other; Aquatic; Fish 2800252 | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|------------------------|-------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|--|--|--|
| Domain | | Metric | $\operatorname{Rating}^{\dagger}$ | MWF^{\star} | Score | $Comments^{\dagger\dagger}$ | | | | |
| | Metric 21: | Statistical Methods | Medium | × 1 | 2 | Fisher exact tests was used. The OECD genetic toxi- cology test guidelines state "the result is outside the distribution of the historical negative control data (e.g. Poisson-based 95 percent control limits)." | | | | |
| | Metric 22: | Reporting of Data | Medium | $\times 2$ | 4 | Most data was presented in tables for each exposure level. Only minor uncertainties remain about how many replicates there were at higher exposure levels. | | | | |
| | Metric 23: | Explanation of Unexpected Outcomes | High | $\times 1$ | 1 | | | | | |
| Overall Quality Determination [‡] | | | Medium | | 2.0 | | | | | |
| Extracted | | | | | | | | | | |

[‡] The overall rating is calculated as necessary. EPA may not always provide a comment for a metric that has been categorized as High.

$$Overall rating = \begin{cases} 4 & \text{if any metric is Unacceptable} \\ \\ \left\lfloor \sum_{i} \left(\text{Metric Score}_{i} \times \text{MWF}_{i} \right) / \sum_{j} \text{MWF}_{j} \right\rceil_{0.1} & \text{(round to the nearest tenth) otherwise} \end{cases}$$

,

where High: ≥ 1 to < 1.7; Medium: ≥ 1.7 to < 2.3; Low: ≥ 2.3 to ≤ 3 . If the reviewer determines that the overall rating needs adjustment, the original rating is crossed out and an arrow points to the new rating. ^{††} Metrics that are rated 'High' met the criteria for high confidence as expected for this type of study, and may not require additional comments.

| Data Type: Hero ID: | Acute (0-96 2801609 | 6 hour); Aquatic; Plants | | | | |
|------------------------|------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------|-------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Domain | | Metric | $\operatorname{Rating}^{\dagger}$ | $\rm MWF^{\star}$ | Score | $Comments^{\dagger\dagger}$ |
| Domain 1: Test S | Substance | | | | | |
| | Metric 1: | Test Substance Identity | High | $\times 2$ | 2 | TCE is identified by name. |
| | Metric 2: | Test Substance Source | Medium | × 1 | 2 | Source was not reported but actual TCE test conc trations were analytically determined at the init tion and termination of the test or when 100 perce mortality occurred in a treatment. |
| | Metric 3: | Test Substance Purity | Low | $\times 1$ | 3 | Test substance purity was not reported. |
| Domain 2. Tost I | Dogion | | | | | |
| Domain 2. Test I | Metric 4: | Negative Controls | High | $\times 2$ | 2 | Included a negative control group using just seav |
| | Metric 5: | Negative Control Response | Low | $\times 1$ | 3 | Negative control response not reported. |
| | Metric 6: | Randomized Allocation | Low | $\times 1$ | 3 | Researchers did not report how organisms were located to study groups. |
| Domain 3. Expos | sure Characte | erization | | | | |
| 2 Junior Di Expor | Metric 7: | Experimental System/Test Media Prepara- tion | Low | × 2 | 6 | The alga, S. costatum, was tested in 125-mL flas containing 50 mL of testt solution or control w ter. Each flask was inoculated with approximate 2.0 x 104 cells/mL. The cultures were incubated 20+1°C under 4,300 lux illumination. Test conce trations and c"5ni:rols were triplicated. Measu ments of in vivo chlorophyll a were made using Turner Model III fluorometer after 24, 48, 72, a 96 h of exposure. Cell counts were made after 96 h exposure using a hemacytometer and Zeiss Standa 14-compound microscope. There was no mention containers being covered, but the study did rep- test concentrations measured at the beginning a end of the test. |
| | Metric 8: | Consistency of Exposure Administration | High | $\times 1$ | 1 | Details of exposure administration were report and exposures were administered consistently acre study groups. |
| | Metric 9: | Measurement of Test Substance Concentra- | High | $\times 2$ | 2 | Test concentrations were measured at the beginning in the second |

| Study Citation: Ward, G. S., Tolmsoff, A. J., Petrocelli, S. R. 1986. ACUTE TOXICITY OF TRICHLOROETHYLENE TO SALTWATER ORGAN- ISMS. Bulletin of Environmental Contamination and Toxicology 37:830-836 | | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------|------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|------------------------|-------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|--|
| Data Type: Hero ID: | Acute (0-96 2801609 | hour); Aquatic; Plants | | | | | | |
| Domain | | Metric | $\operatorname{Rating}^{\dagger}$ | MWF^{\star} | Score | $\mathrm{Comments}^{\dagger\dagger}$ | | |
| | Metric 10: | Exposure Duration and Frequency | High | $\times 1$ | 1 | The duration of exposure and frequency was re- ported as ok for algae. Could be 72 or 96 hours. In this case it was 96 hours. | | |
| | Metric 11: | Number of Exposure Groups/Spacing of Exposure Levels | Medium | × 1 | 2 | There were 5 exposure groups with a duplicate at each exposure level. no range finding test was con- ducted, and instead concentrations were spaced by 6.25, 12.5, 25, 50 and 100 percent of the water solu- ble fraction. | | |
| | Metric 12: | Testing at or Below Solubility Limit | High | $\times 1$ | 1 | Test concentrations were spaced by 6.25, 12.5, 25, 50 and 100 percent of the water soluble fraction. | | |
| Domain 4: Test Organism | | | | | | | | |
| | Metric 13: | Test Organism Characteristics | High | $\times 2$ | 2 | Skeletonema costatum is one of the recommended species for saltwater from EPA guidelines. | | |
| | Metric 14: | Acclimitization and Pretreatment Conditions | High | × 1 | 1 | "The alga tested was the chain-forming diatom; Skeletonemacostatum. The culture was obtained from the EPA EnvironmentalResearch Laboratory, Gulf Breeze, Fla., and maintained in stockcul- ture at Bionomics Marine Research Laboratory (BMRL),Pensacola, Fla, according to procedures in U.S. EPA (1978)." | | |
| | Metric 15: | Number of Organisms and Replicates per Group | Medium | $\times 1$ | 2 | Each flask was inoculated with approximately 2.0 x $10\hat{4}$ cells/mL (1.5 x $10\hat{6}$ is recommended by EPA guidelines for Skeletonema), and tests were done in triplicate which is recommended by EPA guidelines. | | |
| | Metric 16: | Adequacy of Test Conditions | Medium | × 1 | 2 | The alga, S. costatum, was tested in 125-mL flasks containing 50 mL of test solution or control wa- ter. The cultures were incubated at $20+1$ °C un- der 4,300 lux illumination. This is recommended by EPA guidelines. Only minor uncertainties remain. | | |
| Domain 5: Outco | me Assessme | nt | | | | | | |
| | Metric 17: | Outcome Assessment Methodology | High | $\times 2$ | 2 | Outcomes of interest were measured appropriately. | | |
| | Metric 18: | Consistency of Outcome Assessment | Medium | $\times 1$ | 2 | Incomplete reporting of minor details of outcome as- sessment protocol execution. | | |
| Domain 6: Confo | unding / Var | iable Control | | | | | | |
| | | Continued on next page | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |

| Study Citation: | Ward, G. S., Tolmsoff, A. J., Petrocelli, S. R 1986. ACUTE TOXICITY OF TRICHLOROETHYLENE TO SALTWATER ORGAN- ISMS. Bulletin of Environmental Contamination and Toxicology 37:830-836 | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------|---------------|-------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|--|--|--|
| Data Type: Hero ID: | Acute (0-96 2801609 | Acute (0-96 hour); Aquatic; Plants 2801609 | | | | | | | | |
| Domain | | Metric | Rating^\dagger | MWF^{\star} | Score | $Comments^{\dagger\dagger}$ | | | | |
| | Metric 19: | Confounding Variables in Test Design and Procedures | Low | $\times 2$ | 6 | The study did not provide enough information to allow a comparison of conditions or other non- treatment related factors across study groups. | | | | |
| | Metric 20: | Outcomes Unrelated to Exposure | Low | $\times 1$ | 3 | Data on attrition and/or health outcomes unrelated to exposure were not reported for each study group. | | | | |
| Domain 7: Data | Presentation | and Analysis Statistical Methods | Uich | × 1 | 1 | | | | | |
| | Metric 21: | Statistical Methods | nıgı | × 1 | 1 | Based on the results of the tests, 24-, 48-, 72-, and 96-h LC50s or EC50s and 95 percent confidence lim- its were calculated, where possible. The computer program generated the LC- or EC50 values using the following statistical methods: moving average angle, probit, and binomial probability (Stephan 1977). | | | | |
| | Metric 22: | Reporting of Data | Low | $\times 2$ | 6 | Data for exposure related finding were not shown for each study group. | | | | |
| | Metric 23: | Explanation of Unexpected Outcomes | High | $\times 1$ | 1 | No unexplained outcomes reported. | | | | |
| Overall Quality Determination [‡] | | Medium | | 1.8 | | | | | | |
| Extracted | | | Yes | | | | | | | |

* MWF = Metric Weighting Factor
† High = 1; Medium = 2; Low = 3; Unacceptable = 4; N/A has no value.
‡ The overall rating is calculated as necessary. EPA may not always provide a comment for a metric that has been categorized as High.

$$\text{Overall rating} = \begin{cases} 4 & \text{if any metric is Unacceptable} \\ \\ \left\lfloor \sum_{i} \left(\text{Metric Score}_{i} \times \text{MWF}_{i} \right) / \sum_{j} \text{MWF}_{j} \right\rceil_{0.1} & \text{(round to the nearest tenth) otherwise} \end{cases}$$

,

where High: ≥ 1 to < 1.7; Medium: ≥ 1.7 to < 2.3; Low: ≥ 2.3 to ≤ 3 . If the reviewer determines that the overall rating needs adjustment, the original rating is crossed out and an arrow points to the new rating.

| Data Type: Hero ID: | Acute (0-96 2801609 | hour); Aquatic; Fish | | | | |
|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------|---------------|-------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Domain | | Metric | Rating^\dagger | MWF^{\star} | Score | $Comments^{\dagger\dagger}$ |
| Domain 1: Test S | Substance | | | | | |
| | Metric 1: | Test Substance Identity | High | $\times 2$ | 2 | TCE is identified by name. |
| | Metric 2: | Test Substance Source | Medium | × 1 | 2 | Source was not reported but actual TCE test conc trations were analytically determined at the ini tion and termination of the test or when 100 perc mortality occurred in a treatment. |
| | Metric 3: | Test Substance Purity | Low | $\times 1$ | 3 | Test substance purity was not reported. |
| | | | | | | |
| Domain 2: Test l | Metric 4: | Negative Controls | High | $\times 2$ | 2 | Included a negative control group using just sea ter. |
| | Metric 5: | Negative Control Response | Low | $\times 1$ | 3 | Negative control response not reported. |
| | Metric 6: | Randomized Allocation | Low | $\times 1$ | 3 | Researchers did not report how organisms were located to study groups |
| Domain 3: Expo | sure Characte | rization | | | | |
| Domain of English | Metric 7: | Experimental System/Test Media Prepara- tion | Medium | $\times 2$ | 4 | The study used covered glass containers but vol zation still occurred in the static system. The stu- did report test concentrations measured at the ginning and end of the test. |
| | Metric 8: | Consistency of Exposure Administration | High | $\times 1$ | 1 | Details of exposure administration were repor and exposures were administered consistently acr study groups. |
| | Metric 9: | Measurement of Test Substance Concentra- tion | High | $\times 2$ | 2 | Test concentrations were measured at the beginn and end of the test. |
| | Metric 10: | Exposure Duration and Frequency | High | $\times 1$ | 1 | The duration of exposure and frequency was ported as is appropriate for fish. 96 hour static t |
| | Metric 11: | Number of Exposure Groups/Spacing of Exposure Levels | Medium | × 1 | 2 | There were 5 exposure groups with a duplicate each exposure level. No range finding test was c ducted, and instead concentrations were spaced 6.25, 12.5, 25, 50 and 100 percent of the water so ble fraction. |
| | Metric 12: | Testing at or Below Solubility Limit | High | $\times 1$ | 1 | Test concentrations were spaced by 6.25, 12.5, 50 and 100 percent of the water soluble fraction. |

| Study Citation: | Ward, G. S., Tolmsoff, A. J., Petrocelli, S. R., 1986. ACUTE TOXICITY OF TRICHLOROETHYLENE TO SALTWATER ORGAN- ISMS. Bulletin of Environmental Contamination and Toxicology 37:830-836 | | | | | | | | | | |
|------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------|--------------------|------------|-------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|
| Data Type: Hero ID: | Acute (0-96 2801609 | Acute (0-96 hour); Aquatic; Fish 2801609 | | | | | | | | | |
| Domain | | Metric | $Rating^{\dagger}$ | MWF* | Score | $Comments^{\dagger\dagger}$ | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Domain 4: Test 0 | Organism | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Metric 13: | Test Organism Characteristics | High | $\times 2$ | 2 | Sheepshead minnow is one of the recommended species for saltwater from EPA guidelines (EPA TG 850.1085). | | | | | |
| | Metric 14: | Acclimitization and Pretreatment Conditions | Medium | × 1 | 2 | Some uncertainty around how acclimatization oc- curred. Study reports, "Sheepshead minnows, Cyprinodon variegatus, were hatched and reared for 4 to 6 days at BMRL. Sheepshead minnow eggs were spawned naturally in the laboratory in natural sea water basically following procedures in U.S. EPA (1978)." | | | | | |
| | Metric 15: | Number of Organisms and Replicates per Group | High | $\times 1$ | 1 | At least 7 fish per exposure group is recommended by OECD, and this test had 10. | | | | | |
| | Metric 16: | Adequacy of Test Conditions | Medium | × 1 | 2 | Mysids and fish were tested in 1.6-L covered-glass dishes containing 1.0 L of test solution or control seawater. With 10 fish per container, and OECD recommended 1 liter per g of fish, and the average mass of fish were 1.4 mg we weight. Only small un- certainties about housing remain. | | | | | |
| Domain 5: Outco | me Assessme | nt | | | | | | | | | |
| Domain 0. Outoe | Metric 17: | Outcome Assessment Methodology | High | $\times 2$ | 2 | Outcomes of interest were measured appropriately | | | | | |
| | Metric 18: | Consistency of Outcome Assessment | Medium | $\times 1$ | 2 | Incomplete reporting of minor details of outcome as- sessment protocol execution. | | | | | |
| Domain 6: Confo | unding / Var | iable Control | | | | | | | | | |
| | Metric 19: | Confounding Variables in Test Design and Procedures | Low | $\times 2$ | 6 | The study did not provide enough information to allow a comparison of conditions or other non- treatment related factors across study groups | | | | | |
| | Metric 20: | Outcomes Unrelated to Exposure | Low | $\times 1$ | 3 | Data on attrition and/or health outcomes unrelated to exposure were not reported for each study group. | | | | | |
| Domain 7: Data | Presentation | and Analysis | | | | | | | | | |

| Study Citation: | Ward, G. S., Tolmsoff, A. J., Petrocelli, S. R. 1986. ACUTE TOXICITY OF TRICHLOROETHYLENE TO SALTWATER ORGAN- ISMS. Bulletin of Environmental Contamination and Toxicology 37:830-836 | | | | | | | | | |
|------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------|-------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|--|--|--|
| Data Type: Hero ID: | Acute (0-96 hour); Aquatic; Fish 2801609 | | | | | | | | | |
| Domain | | Metric | $\operatorname{Rating}^{\dagger}$ | MWF^{\star} | Score | $\mathrm{Comments}^{\dagger\dagger}$ | | | | |
| | Metric 21: | Statistical Methods | High | × 1 | 1 | Based on the results of the tests, 24-, 48-, 72-, and 96-h LC50s or EC50s and 95 percent confidence lim- its were calculated, where possible. The computer program generated the LC- or EC50 values using the following statistical methods: moving average angle, probit, and binomial probability (Stephan 1977). | | | | |
| | Metric 22: | Reporting of Data | Low | $\times 2$ | 6 | Data for exposure related finding were not shown for each study group. | | | | |
| | Metric 23: | Explanation of Unexpected Outcomes | High | × 1 | 1 | Unexpected outcome was explained, "Differences be- tween TCE test concentrations at which mild intoxi- cation symptoms were observed in test organisms in this study and by Borthwick (1977) may possibly be explained on the basis of carrier solvent synergism and/or temperature effects." | | | | |
| Overall Quality I | Determination | 1 [‡] | Medium | | 1.7 | | | | | |
| Extracted | | | Yes | | | | | | | |

* MWF = Metric Weighting Factor

[†] High = 1; Medium = 2; Low = 3; Unacceptable = 4; N/A has no value.

[‡] The overall rating is calculated as necessary. EPA may not always provide a comment for a metric that has been categorized as High.

$$Overall rating = \begin{cases} 4 & \text{if any metric is Unacceptable} \\ \left\lfloor \sum_{i} (Metric \ Score_{i} \times MWF_{i}) / \sum_{j} MWF_{j} \right\rfloor_{0.1} & (round to the nearest tenth) otherwise \end{cases}$$

,

where High: ≥ 1 to < 1.7; Medium: ≥ 1.7 to < 2.3; Low: ≥ 2.3 to ≤ 3 . If the reviewer determines that the overall rating needs adjustment, the original rating is crossed out and an arrow points to the new rating.

| Data Type: Hero ID: | Acute (0-96 2801609 | b hour); Aquatic; Invertebrates | | | | |
|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------|---------------|-------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Domain | | Metric | Rating^\dagger | MWF^{\star} | Score | $\mathrm{Comments}^{\dagger\dagger}$ |
| Domain 1: Test S | Substance | | | | | |
| | Metric 1: | Test Substance Identity | High | $\times 2$ | 2 | TCE is identified by name. |
| | Metric 2: | Test Substance Source | Medium | $\times 1$ | 2 | Source was not reported but actual TCE test com- trations were analytically determined at the ini- tion and termination of the test or when 100 per- mortality occurred in a treatment. |
| | Metric 3: | Test Substance Purity | Low | $\times 1$ | 3 | Test substance purity was not reported. |
| Domain 2: Test I | Design | | | | | |
| | Metric 4: | Negative Controls | High | $\times 2$ | 2 | Reported using a negative control group with seawater. |
| | Metric 5: | Negative Control Response | Low | $\times 1$ | 3 | Negative control response was not reported. |
| | Metric 6: | Randomized Allocation | Low | $\times 1$ | 3 | Researchers did not report how organisms were located to study groups. |
| Domain 2. Eurog | una Characta | wization | | | | |
| Domain 5. Expos | Metric 7: | Experimental System/Test Media Prepara- tion | Medium | $\times 2$ | 4 | The study used covered glass containers but vo zation still occurred in the static system. The st did report test concentrations measured at the ginning and end of the test. |
| | Metric 8: | Consistency of Exposure Administration | High | $\times 1$ | 1 | Details of exposure administration were report and exposures were administered consistently act study groups. |
| | Metric 9: | Measurement of Test Substance Concentra- tion | High | $\times 2$ | 2 | Test concentrations were measured at the beginn and end of the test. |
| | Metric 10: | Exposure Duration and Frequency | High | $\times 1$ | 1 | The duration of exposure and frequency was ported as is appropriate for mysids. 96 hour sta- test |
| | Metric 11: | Number of Exposure Groups/Spacing of Exposure Levels | Medium | × 1 | 2 | There were 5 exposure groups with a duplicate each exposure level. no range finding test was of ducted, and instead concentrations were spaced 6.25, 12.5, 25, 50 and 100 percent of the water so |

| Study Citation: | tudy Citation: Ward, G. S., Tolmsoff, A. J., Petrocelli, S. R. 1986. ACUTE TOXICITY OF TRICHLOROETHYLENE TO SALTWATER ORGAN- ISMS. Bulletin of Environmental Contamination and Toxicology 37:830-836 | | | | | | | |
|------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------|-------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|--|
| Data Type: Hero ID: | Acute (0-96 2801609 | bour); Aquatic; Invertebrates | | | | | | |
| Domain | | Metric | $\operatorname{Rating}^{\dagger}$ | MWF^{\star} | Score | $Comments^{\dagger\dagger}$ | | |
| | Metric 12: | Testing at or Below Solubility Limit | High | $\times 1$ | 1 | Test concentrations were spaced by 6.25 , 12.5 , 25 , 50 and 100 percent of the water soluble fraction. | | |
| Domain 4: Test (| Organism | | | | | | | |
| | Metric 13: | Test Organism Characteristics | High | $\times 2$ | 2 | Mysid shrimp is one of the recommended species for saltwater from EPA guidelines. | | |
| | Metric 14: | Acclimitization and Pretreatment Conditions | High | × 1 | 1 | Study reports, "Mysid shrimp, Mysidopsis bahia, were born in culture at BMRL and maintained for 3 days before testing. Mysids were reared in natu- ral sea water generally following procedures in U.S. EPA (1978). During holding, temperature was main- tained at 22+1"C and salinity at 19 ppt." | | |
| | Metric 15: | Number of Organisms and Replicates per Group | High | × 1 | 1 | Ten mysids for each container and each concentra- tion had a duplicate. EPA recommends 20 animals at each conc level (EPA TG 850.1035). | | |
| | Metric 16: | Adequacy of Test Conditions | Medium | × 1 | 2 | Mysids and fish were tested in 1.6-L covered-glass dishes containing 1.0 L of test solution or control seawater. Shrimp were fed live (48-h old) brine shrimp nauplii on Days 0 and 2 during the test. Only small uncertainties about housing remain. | | |
| Domain 5: Outco | me Assessme | ont | | | | | | |
| Domain 5. Outco | Metric 17: | Outcome Assessment Methodology | High | $\times 2$ | 2 | Outcomes of interest were measured appropriately. | | |
| | Metric 18: | Consistency of Outcome Assessment | Medium | $\times 1$ | 2 | Incomplete reporting of minor details of outcome as- sessment protocol execution. | | |
| Domain 6: Confe | unding / Var | iable Control | | | | | | |
| Domain of Come | Metric 19: | Confounding Variables in Test Design and Procedures | Low | $\times 2$ | 6 | The study did not provide enough information to allow a comparison of conditions or other non- treatment related factors across study groups | | |
| | Metric 20: | Outcomes Unrelated to Exposure | Low | $\times 1$ | 3 | Data on attrition and/or health outcomes unrelated to exposure were not reported for each study group | | |
| Domain 7: Data | Presentation | and Analysis | | | | | | |
| | | Continued on next page | | | | | | |

| Study Citation: Data Type: Hero ID: | Ward, G. S., Tolmsoff, A. J., Petrocelli, S. R.: 1986. ACUTE TOXICITY OF TRICHLOROETHYLENE TO SALTWATER ORGAN- ISMS. Bulletin of Environmental Contamination and Toxicology 37:830-836 Acute (0-96 hour); Aquatic; Invertebrates 2801609 | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------|---------------------------|---------------|-------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|--|
| Domain | | Metric | Rating^\dagger | MWF^{\star} | Score | $Comments^{\dagger\dagger}$ | | |
| | Metric 21: | Statistical Methods | High | × 1 | 1 | Based on the results of the tests, 24-, 48-, 72-, and 96-h LC50s or EC50s and 95 percent confidence lim- its were calculated, where possible. The computer program generated the LC- or EC50 values using the following statistical methods: moving average angle, probit, and binomial probability (Stephan 1977). | | |
| | Metric 22: | Reporting of Data | Low | $\times 2$ | 6 | Data for exposure related finding were not shown for each study group. | | |
| | Metric 23: | Explanation of Unexpected Outcomes | High | $\times 1$ | 1 | No unexplained outcomes were reported. | | |
| Overall Quality I | Determination | 1 [‡] | Medium | | 1.7 | | | |
| Extracted | | | Yes | | | | | |

* MWF = Metric Weighting Factor

[†] High = 1; Medium = 2; Low = 3; Unacceptable = 4; N/A has no value.

[‡] The overall rating is calculated as necessary. EPA may not always provide a comment for a metric that has been categorized as High.

$$Overall rating = \begin{cases} 4 & \text{if any metric is Unacceptable} \\ \\ \left\lfloor \sum_{i} \left(\text{Metric Score}_{i} \times \text{MWF}_{i} \right) / \sum_{j} \text{MWF}_{j} \right\rceil_{0.1} & \text{(round to the nearest tenth) otherwise} \end{cases}$$

,

where High: ≥ 1 to < 1.7; Medium: ≥ 1.7 to < 2.3; Low: ≥ 2.3 to ≤ 3 . If the reviewer determines that the overall rating needs adjustment, the original rating is crossed out and an arrow points to the new rating.

| Study Citation: | Dierickx, P. | J 1993. Comparison between fish lethality da | ata and the | in vitro | cytotox | cicity of lipophilic solvents to cultured fish cells |
|------------------------------|--------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------|---------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Data Type | in a two-con Acute (0.96) | npartment model. Chemosphere 27:1511-1518 hour): Aquatic: Fish | | | | |
| Hero ID: | 2803221 | nour), require, r isi | | | | |
| Domain | | Metric | $\operatorname{Rating}^{\dagger}$ | MWF^{\star} | Score | $Comments^{\dagger\dagger}$ |
| Domain 1: Test S | Substance | | | | | |
| | Metric 1: | Test Substance Identity | High | $\times 2$ | 2 | Chemical identified by name, trichloroethylene |
| | Metric 2: | Test Substance Source | Low | $\times 1$ | 3 | Not reported |
| | Metric 3: | Test Substance Purity | Low | $\times 1$ | 3 | Purity, grade not reported |
| Domain 2 [.] Test I | Design | | | | | |
| 20main 2. 1000 1 | Metric 4: | Negative Controls | Medium | $\times 2$ | 4 | A control was used, but not much detail is given. Authors report, "During this period the cells, re- maining in culture medium, are in contact with the test chemical, solubilized in paraffin, through the microporous membrane. Pure paraffin was used as the control." |
| | Metric 5: | Negative Control Response | Low | $\times 1$ | 3 | Not reported |
| | Metric 6: | Randomized Allocation | Low | $\times 1$ | 3 | Allocation method not reported |
| Domain 3: Expos | sure Characte | rization | | | | |
| 2 oman of Enpor | Metric 7: | Experimental System/Test Media Prepara- tion | Low | $\times 2$ | 6 | TCE is very volatile, and there was no mention of covering the wells or preventing loss of test sub- stance. However the test was only 24 hours long so some of the TCE may have been in the wells by the end of the test. |
| | Metric 8: | Consistency of Exposure Administration | High | $\times 1$ | 1 | |
| | Metric 9: | Measurement of Test Substance Concentra- tion | Low | $\times 2$ | 6 | Exposure conc was not measured or not reported |
| | Metric 10: | Exposure Duration and Frequency | Medium | $\times 1$ | 2 | The exposure duration was 24 hours, which was enough time to record an effect of total protein inhi- bition, so it appears to be a sufficient duration. Only minor uncertainties remain. It was a static exposure in wells. |
| | Metric 11: | Number of Exposure Groups/Spacing of Exposure Levels | Low | × 1 | 3 | Number of exposure groups and spacing were not re- ported; however the authors were able to determine an EC50 for total protein expression. |
| | | Continued on next page | | | | |

| Study Citation: Data Type: Hero ID: | Dierickx, P. in a two-con Acute (0-96 2803221 | J. 1993. Comparison between fish lethality dan partment model. Chemosphere 27:1511-1518 hour); Aquatic; Fish | ata and the | e in vitro | cytotox | cicity of lipophilic solvents to cultured fish cells |
|-------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|------------|---------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Domain | | Metric | $\operatorname{Rating}^{\dagger}$ | MWF* | Score | $\mathrm{Comments}^{\dagger\dagger}$ |
| | Metric 12: | Testing at or Below Solubility Limit | Medium | × 1 | 2 | Because exposure levels were not reported, it is un- clear if they were all below the solubility limit, how- ever the EC50 was far below the solubility for TCE. |
| Domain 4: Test (| Organism Metric 13: | Test Organism Characteristics | Medium | $\times 2$ | 4 | Cultured fathead minnow fish cells were used for this study. While this is a well studies species, minor un- certainties remain about whether this cell line (FHM |
| | | | | | | established fishcell line, derived from tissue posterior to the anus from fathead minnow) are appropriate for this type of in vitro test. |
| | Metric 14: | Acclimitization and Pretreatment Conditions | High | $\times 1$ | 1 | Cells were cultured in the lab and pretreated before the test. |
| | Metric 15: | Number of Organisms and Replicates per Group | Medium | × 1 | 2 | Authors report, "6.105 cells in 0.2 mL culture medium were seeded in each of the 12 transwells." Minor uncertainties about what cell density is ap- propriate for fish cells. |
| | Metric 16: | Adequacy of Test Conditions | Low | × 1 | 3 | Control response was not reported for TCE so it's difficult to tell whether the housing conditions were adequate for this cell line's normal functioning |
| | | | | | | |

Domain 5: Outcome Assessment

| Study Citation: | Dierickx, P. in a two-con | J. 1993. Comparison between fish lethality dan partment model. Chemosphere 27:1511-1518 | ata and the | e in vitro | cytotox | cicity of lipophilic solvents to cultured fish cells |
|------------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------|---------------|---------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Data Type: Hero ID: | Acute (0-96 2803221 | hour); Aquatic; Fish | | | | |
| Domain | | Metric | Rating^\dagger | MWF^{\star} | Score | $\mathrm{Comments}^{\dagger\dagger}$ |
| | Metric 17: | Outcome Assessment Methodology | High | × 2 | 2 | EC50s (for total protein inhibition) were determined to measure cytotoxicity using the following method- ology, "Each well was rinsed once with 0.5 mL Hank's balanced salt solution on the outer mem- branic side and twice on the inner side, and placed in an empty well of a new 24well tissue culture plate. The remaining cells were lysed with 0.2 mL 2 per- cent Na2C03 in 0.1 N NaoH per transwell for 15 min at 34 "C. This solution was then replaced 2 times with the same solution, at room temperature, and the combined fractions were used for a protein determination according to Lowry et al (1951) as previously described for Hep G2 cells (Dierickx, 1989). The results are expressed as percentages of control cultures, which typically contained 85-105 "g protein/transwell. The relative toxicity of the test chemicals is established by the determination of the EC50. This is the concentration of test chem- ical in the lower compartment required to induce a 50 percent inhibition of the total protein content in the upper compartment (transwell). In order to determine the reproducibility of EC50 determina- tions, the EC50 values of cyclopentanol, cyclohex- anone and 2-chlorotoluene were measured in three independent assays. A standard deviation of less than 6 percent was found in these independent as- says. Therefore, the EC50 values of the other com- pounds were determined in single experiments." |
| | Metric 18: | Consistency of Outcome Assessment | High | $\times 1$ | 1 | |
| Domain 6: Confo | ounding / Var | iable Control | | | | |
| | Metric 19: | Confounding Variables in Test Design and Procedures | Low | $\times 2$ | 6 | The study did not provide enough information to allow a comparison of the environmental conditions for each study group. |
| | Metric 20: | Outcomes Unrelated to Exposure | Low | $\times 1$ | 3 | Cell attrition was not reported for TCE for each study group. |
| Domain 7: Data | Presentation | and Analysis | | | | |
| | | Continued on next page | | | | |

| Study Citation: Data Type: Hero ID: | Dierickx, P. in a two-con Acute (0-96 2803221 | . J., 1993. Comparison between fish lethality mpartment model. Chemosphere 27:1511-151 5 hour); Aquatic; Fish | v data and the 8 | e in vitro | cytotox | cicity of lipophilic solvents to cultured fish cells |
|-------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------|---------------|---------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Domain | | Metric | $Rating^{\dagger}$ | MWF^{\star} | Score | $Comments^{\dagger\dagger}$ |
| | Metric 21: | Statistical Methods | Low | × 1 | 3 | The statistical method used to derive the EC50 was not reported in detail. Authors simply state, "In- terpolation of these curves gives the EC50 values,by computing the concentration needed to reduce the total protein content by 50 percent." |
| | Metric 22: | Reporting of Data | Low | $\times 2$ | 6 | Data for exposure related findings were not reported for each study group. |
| | Metric 23: | Explanation of Unexpected Outcomes | Low | × 1 | 3 | Authors acknowledge the discrepancy between this study (which did not find a linear correlation be- tween the published LC50 levels and the EC50 val- ues they produced in this test) and previous studies which did, but the reasons are unclear. |
| Overall Quality I | Determination | n‡ | Low | | 2.3 | |
| Extracted | | | Yes | | | |

* MWF = Metric Weighting Factor

[†] High = 1; Medium = 2; Low = 3; Unacceptable = 4; N/A has no value.

[‡] The overall rating is calculated as necessary. EPA may not always provide a comment for a metric that has been categorized as High.

$$\label{eq:overall rating} \text{Overall rating} = \left\{ \begin{array}{ll} 4 & \text{if any metric is Unacceptable} \\ \\ \left\lfloor \sum_i \left(\text{Metric Score}_i \times \text{MWF}_i \right) / \sum_j \text{MWF}_j \right\rceil_{0.1} & (\text{round to the nearest tenth}) \text{ otherwise} \end{array} \right.,$$

where High: ≥ 1 to < 1.7; Medium: ≥ 1.7 to < 2.3; Low: ≥ 2.3 to ≤ 3 . If the reviewer determines that the overall rating needs adjustment, the original rating is crossed out and an arrow points to the new rating.

| Study Citation: Data Type: Hero ID: | Bacsi, I.,Go nated hydro Acute (0-96 3298076 | onda, S.,B-Beres, V.,Novak, Z.,Nagy, S. A.,Vasa ocarbons: effects of dominant species sensitivity 5 hour); Aquatic; Plants | s, G 2015. Alto and initial diver | erations of sity. Ecc | of phyto otoxicolc | plankton assemblages treated with chlori- ogy 24:823-834 |
|-------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Domain | | Metric | $\operatorname{Rating}^{\dagger}$ | MWF^{\star} | Score | $Comments^{\dagger\dagger}$ |
| Domain 1: Test S | Substance | | | | | |
| | Metric 1: | Test Substance Identity | High | $\times 2$ | 2 | Test substance identified by name, trichloroethylene and use was described. |
| | Metric 2: | Test Substance Source | Low | $\times 1$ | 3 | Not reported |
| | Metric 3: | Test Substance Purity | Low | $\times 1$ | 3 | Not reported |
| Domain 2: Test I | Design | | | | | |
| | Metric 4: | Negative Controls | Medium | × 2 | 4 | Controls in beakers and pond sample controls were used but details about what exactly controls in- cluded were not given. Authors reported, "12 l water sample from the pond was filled into 4 plas- tic (polimethylpenthene"PMP) beakers (3 l to each one)." |
| | Metric 5: | Negative Control Response | Medium | × 1 | 2 | Control response was reported in figures, until 3 days. Some uncertainties remain about exact numbers for control response, but an approximation can be seen in the figures. |
| | Metric 6: | Randomized Allocation | N/A | | N/A | Not applicable to allocate individual algae to study groups randomly. |
| Domain 3. Expos | uro Charact | rization | | | | |
| Domain 5. Expos | Metric 7: | Experimental System/Test Media Prepara- tion | Unacceptable | × 2 | 8 | Beakers were used for the pond experiment and the authors allude the fact that the beakers are "en- closed", but it is unclear whether enough precau- tions are taken to avoid volatilization of the test chemicals and no measurements of test chemical were taken. No nominal concentrations were given either. |
| | Metric 8: | Consistency of Exposure Administration | Low | $\times 1$ | 3 | Details not given about exposure administration for each exposure level. |
| | Metric 9: | Measurement of Test Substance Concentra- tion | Low | × 2 | 6 | Measured concentrations were not taken and cannot be expected to be close to nominal concentration due to the volatility of the chemical. Additionally this experiment measured effects 24 hours, 48 hours and 96 hours after exposure, giving this substance plenty of time to volatilize. |
| | | Continued on next page | | | | |

| Study Citation: Data Type: Hero ID: | Bacsi, I.,Go nated hydro Acute (0-96 3298076 | onda, S.,B-Beres, V.,Novak, Z.,Nagy, S. A.,Vasa ocarbons: effects of dominant species sensitivity 6 hour); Aquatic; Plants | s, G 2015. Al and initial div | lterations of ersity. Ecc | of phyto toxicolo | plankton assemblages treated with chlori- ogy 24:823-834 |
|-------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|------------------------------|----------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Domain | | Metric | $\operatorname{Rating}^{\dagger}$ | MWF^{\star} | Score | $\mathrm{Comments}^{\dagger\dagger}$ |
| | Metric 10: | Exposure Duration and Frequency | Low | × 1 | 3 | 96 hours is an acceptable amount of time to measure effects in algae however the exposure only occurred once at time 0, and this chemical volatilizes quickly, so multiple exposures are necessary to maintain test concentrations. |
| | Metric 11: | Number of Exposure Groups/Spacing of Exposure Levels | N/A | | N/A | It appears only one exposure group was used how- ever, with a microcosm experiment this may be ac- ceptable. |
| | Metric 12: | Testing at or Below Solubility Limit | Low | × 1 | 3 | Unsure what the actual exposure concentration was from the author's reporting. No measurements were taken to confirm, but authors report, "Treated as- semblages were theoretically saturated solvents at the beginning of the experiments." |
| Domain 4. Tost | Organism | | | | | |
| Domain 4. Test | Metric 13: | Test Organism Characteristics | Medium | × 2 | 4 | Test organisms were a variety of algae species (59 taxa were reported in 2011 and 95 in 2012) found in the Garden Pond in the Botanical Garden of the University of Debrecen. Dominant species was Tra- chelomonas volvocinopsis. |
| | Metric 14: | Acclimitization and Pretreatment Conditions | Low | $\times 1$ | 3 | Not reported |
| | Metric 15: | Number of Organisms and Replicates per Group | Medium | × 1 | 2 | Authors report, "All experiments were done in triplicates," which is recommended. Abundance was reported at about 11×106 in the 2012 experi- ment, which is outside the range of densities given in OECD 201 recommendations (e.g. the high- est recommended cell density is for synechococcus leopoliensis at $5 \times 104-105$). |
| | Metric 16: | Adequacy of Test Conditions | Low | $\times 1$ | 3 | Beakers were plastic and it is unclear whether they are chemically inert. Measurements of ph, tempera- ture, O2 conc were taken. |
| Domain 5: Outco | ome Assessme | ent | | | | |

| Study Citation: | Study Citation: Bacsi, I.,Gonda, S.,B-Beres, V.,Novak, Z.,Nagy, S. A.,Vasas, G. 2015. Alterations of phytoplankton assemblages treated with chlori- nated hydrocarbons: effects of dominant species sensitivity and initial diversity. Ecotoxicology 24:823-834 | | | | | | | |
|------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------|---------------------------|---------------|-------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|--|
| Data Type: Hero ID: | Acute (0-96 3298076 | b hour); Aquatic; Plants | | - | | | | |
| Domain | | Metric | Rating^\dagger | MWF^{\star} | Score | $Comments^{\dagger\dagger}$ | | |
| | Metric 17: | Outcome Assessment Methodology | High | × 2 | 2 | Outcome assessment methodology is described for changes in growth, and species diversity. Growth measures are appropriate according OECD guidance 201. Diversity was measured in the following way, "The phytoplankton samples were processed accord- ing to the Utermo"hl method (1958) and European Standard EN 15204:2006. An Olympus CKX31 in- verted microscope and 4009 magnification was used for counting and taxa identification." | | |
| | Metric 18: | Consistency of Outcome Assessment | Low | $\times 1$ | 3 | Details regarding execution of study protocol across study groups was not reported. | | |
| Domain 6: Confo | ounding / Var | iable Control | | | | | | |
| | Metric 19: | Confounding Variables in Test Design and Procedures | High | $\times 2$ | 2 | Authors measured ph, O2 conc, water temp, and contols and treatment groups were kept in similar conditions in the pond in the same basket. | | |
| | Metric 20: | Outcomes Unrelated to Exposure | Low | $\times 1$ | 3 | A storm could have affected growth, diversity in this experiment. | | |
| Domain 7: Data | Presentation | and Analysis | | | | | | |
| | Metric 21: | Statistical Methods | High | $\times 1$ | 1 | Significance was determined trough ANOVA and Tukey test. All experiments were done in triplicate. | | |
| | Metric 22: | Reporting of Data | Low | $\times 2$ | 6 | Data was reported in figures, but not very well in text and the exact concentrations at which algae was exposed is not reported. | | |
| | Metric 23: | Explanation of Unexpected Outcomes | High | × 1 | 1 | Unexpected outcomes were addressed, "The ob- served decrease of chlorophyll-a content and algal abundance in the first 24 h probably occurred due to a summer storm with stormy wind, rain and a tem- perature drop of 6 C in 2011. Meteorological events like heavy rainfall, hot weather periods and stormy hours can have a pronounced impact on hydraulics, water temperature and nutrient supply. Such short- term variability is thought to be important in the changes of algal community structure." | | |
| Overall Quality I | Determination | n‡ | Unacceptable | | 4.0 | | | |
| | | Continued on next page | | | | | | |

... continued from previous page

| Study Citation: Data Type: Hero ID: | Bacsi, I.,Gonda, S.,B-Beres, V.,Novak, Z.,Nagy, S. A.,Vasas, G. 2015. Alterations of phytoplankton assemblages treated with chlori- nated hydrocarbons: effects of dominant species sensitivity and initial diversity. Ecotoxicology 24:823-834 Acute (0-96 hour); Aquatic; Plants 3298076 | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|------------|--------------------------------------|--|--|
| Domain | Metric | $\operatorname{Rating}^{\dagger}$ | MWF* Score | $\mathrm{Comments}^{\dagger\dagger}$ | | |
| Extracted | | No | | | | |

** Consistent with our Application of Systematic Review in TSCARisk Evaluations document, if a metric for a data source receives a score of Unacceptable (score = 4), EPA will determine the study to be unacceptable. In this case, one of the metrics were rated as unacceptable. As such, the study is considered unacceptable and the score is presented solely to increase transparency.

* MWF = Metric Weighting Factor

[†] High = 1; Medium = 2; Low = 3; Unacceptable = 4; N/A has no value.

[‡] The overall rating is calculated as necessary. EPA may not always provide a comment for a metric that has been categorized as High.

$$Overall rating = \begin{cases} 4 & \text{if any metric is Unacceptable} \\ \\ \left\lfloor \sum_{i} \left(\text{Metric Score}_{i} \times \text{MWF}_{i} \right) / \sum_{j} \text{MWF}_{j} \right\rceil_{0.1} & \text{(round to the nearest tenth) otherwise} \end{cases}$$

where High: ≥ 1 to < 1.7; Medium: ≥ 1.7 to < 2.3; Low: ≥ 2.3 to ≤ 3 . If the reviewer determines that the overall rating needs adjustment, the original rating is crossed out and an arrow points to the new rating.

| Study Citation: | Houde, M., chloride (V 116 | Douville, M.,Gagnon, P.,Sproull, J.,Cloutier, F. C): evaluation of gene transcription, cellular act | . 2015. Exp ivity, and li | posure of fe-history | Daphn y param | ia magna to trichloroethylene (TCE) and vinyl eters. Ecotoxicology and Environmental Safety |
|------------------------|----------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------------|------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Data Type: Hero ID: | Other; Aqu 3502953 | atic; Invertebrates | | | | |
| Domain | | Metric | $\operatorname{Rating}^{\dagger}$ | MWF^{\star} | Score | Comments ^{††} |
| Domain 1: Test S | Substance | | | | | |
| | Metric 1: | Test Substance Identity | High | $\times 2$ | 2 | Chemical identified by name and cas |
| | Metric 2: | Test Substance Source | Medium | × 1 | 2 | Source of TCE was reported but not analytically verified. Authors report, "Stock standard solutions of TCE was obtained from Supelco (Bellefonte, PA, USA) and were diluted in methanol and water." |
| | Metric 3: | Test Substance Purity | Low | $\times 1$ | 3 | Not reported |
| Domain 2: Test I | Design | | TT: 1 | | 0 | |
| | Metric 4: | Negative Controls | High | × 2 | 2 | Methanol control group was included with 6 repli- cates. methanol is listed as a suitable control sol- vent for daphnia, and authors report that methanol concentration never exceeded 0.1 percent which is recommended in OECD 211 as well. |
| | Metric 5: | Negative Control Response | Medium | × 1 | 2 | Control response was reported for some but not all responses. e.g. no control response was reported for gene expression. |
| | Metric 6: | Randomized Allocation | Low | $\times 1$ | 3 | Not reported |
| Domain 3: Expos | sure Characte | erization | | | | |
| | Metric 7: | Experimental System/Test Media Prepara- tion | High | $\times 2$ | 2 | Physical chemical properties were taken into con- sideration. Authors used standardized methods for volatile organic compounds (PNLET, 2011). Each beaker was covered with a watch glass and left at 20 degrees C. |
| | Metric 8: | Consistency of Exposure Administration | High | $\times 1$ | 1 | A lot of detail was reported in the paper and supple- mentary information about exposure administration timing and actual concentrations. Exposure admin- istration was described as |
| | Metric 9: | Measurement of Test Substance Concentra- tion | High | × 2 | 2 | Authors measured conc of TCE extensively, reporting the measured conc at hour 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 8 24 30 48. |
| | | Continued on next page | | | | |

| Study Citation: | Houde, M.,Douville, M.,Gagnon, P.,Sproull, J.,Cloutier, F 2015. Exposure of Daphnia magna to trichloroethylene (TCE) and vinyl chloride (VC): evaluation of gene transcription, cellular activity, and life-history parameters. Ecotoxicology and Environmental Safety 116 | | | | | | | |
|------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|--------------------------|--------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|--|
| Data Type: Hero ID: | Other; Aqu 3502953 | atic; Invertebrates | | | | | | |
| Domain | | Metric | $\operatorname{Rating}^{\dagger}$ | MWF^{\star} | Score | $\mathrm{Comments}^{\dagger\dagger}$ | | |
| | Metric 10: | Exposure Duration and Frequency | High | × 1 | 1 | Considering the volatile properties of the studied compounds, renewal of the media was conducted ev- ery 24 h in order to ensure the continuous exposure of D. magna. New stock solutions were prepared at every media renewal and water temperature, con- ductivity, dissolved oxygen, pH, and hardness were- monitored. | | |
| | Metric 11: | Number of Exposure Groups/Spacing of Exposure Levels | Medium | $\times 1$ | 2 | For the chronic toxicity test, only 3 conc were tested, and OECD 211 recommends 5. Concentrations were determined by what levels found in the environment (in river water in Quebec Canada). | | |
| | Metric 12: | Testing at or Below Solubility Limit | High | $\times 1$ | 1 | Concentrations were far below TCE's solubility. | | |
| | . | | | | | | | |
| Domain 4: Test C | Jrganism Motrie 13: | Test Organism Characteristics | High | × 9 | 9 | Darkais manage word in this study | | |
| | Metric 15: Motric 14: | Acclimitization and Protreatment Conditions | пign High | $\times 2$ $\times 1$ | 2 1 | Daphnia magna were used in this study | | |
| | Methe 14. | Acclimitization and Fretreatment Conditions | mgn | * 1 | 1 | retreatment conditions were reported and acceptable. Authors reported, "Geneti- cally homogenous D. magna were cultured in growthchamber following Environment Canada's method(EnvironmentCanada, 1990). Cul- tureswerekeptat2071 "C with a photoperiodof 16hlight:8hdark.Organismswerefedgreenalgae Pseudokirchneriella subcapitata (concentra- tion: 3.85105 cells/mL) and YCT preparation (yeast"cerophyll"trout chow, concentration: 0.0125g/L) everyday. All experiments were per- formed under the same constant temperature and diurnal lighting conditions." | | |
| | Metric 15: | Number of Organisms and Replicates per Group | High | $\times 1$ | 1 | OECD recommends 10 animals at each test conc. In this study 10 animals were used per treatment. | | |
| | Metric 16: | Adequacy of Test Conditions | High | $\times 1$ | 1 | Temperature, light/dark period were within OECD 211 recommended ranges. Food was also appropri- ate. | | |
| Domain 5: Outco | ome Assessme | ent | | | | | | |

Continued on next page ...

139

| | | continued from previous page | | | | |
|------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------|-------------------------|------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Study Citation: | Houde, M., chloride (Vo 116 | Douville, M.,Gagnon, P.,Sproull, J.,Cloutier, F. C): evaluation of gene transcription, cellular act | . 2015. Exp ivity, and li | posure of fe-history | Daphn y paran | ia magna to trichloroethylene (TCE) and vinyl neters. Ecotoxicology and Environmental Safety |
| Data Type: Hero ID: | Other; Aqua 3502953 | atic; Invertebrates | | | | |
| Domain | | Metric | Rating^\dagger | MWF^{\star} | Score | $Comments^{\dagger\dagger}$ |
| | Metric 17: | Outcome Assessment Methodology | High | $\times 2$ | 2 | Outcome was measured by protein expression and genes being up or down regulated. No EC50 was es- tablished, and no effect on overall reproduction was found. |
| | Metric 18: | Consistency of Outcome Assessment | High | $\times 1$ | 1 | |
| Domain 6: Confo | ounding / Var | iable Control | | | | |
| | Metric 19: | Confounding Variables in Test Design and Procedures | High | $\times 2$ | 2 | Test setup and procedure seems sufficient |
| | Metric 20: | Outcomes Unrelated to Exposure | High | $\times 1$ | 1 | No unexpected health outcomes |
| Domain 7: Data | Presentation | and Analysis | | | | |
| | main 7: Data Presentation and Analysis Metric 21: Statistical Methods Medium × 1 2 Most of the statistical analysis mentioned v propriate (recommended in OECD 211, wi some uncertainty around using the Krusk test for brooding times were compared with Kruska tests. Numbers of neonates were modeled dispersed Poisson variates and animal size end of the 10days exposurewere compared ANOVAs. Relative gene transcription betw posed and non-exposed organisms (methat trols) were compared using Wilcoxon signe tests (probabilities corrected to control ti discovery rate). Biomarker responses to c nant concentrations were compared to control ANOVAs and Dunnett''s procedure. Relati between biomarkers and genes were assesses Spearman''s correlations. The significance ti | | | | | |
| | Metric 22: | Reporting of Data | Medium | $\times 2$ | 4 | Data was reported for each study group for some but not all end points. |
| | Metric 23: | Explanation of Unexpected Outcomes | High | $\times 1$ | 1 | Sufficient discussion of results |
| Overall Quality I | Determination | ţ | High | | 1.3 | |
| | | Continued on next page | | | | |
| | | Commued on next page | | | | |

| Study Citation: | Houde, M.,Douville, M.,Gagnon, P.,Sproull, J.,Cloutier, F chloride (VC): evaluation of gene transcription, cellular ac 116 | 2015. Exposure of Daphnia magna to trich tivity, and life-history parameters. Ecotoxicol | ogy and Environmental Safety |
|-----------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------|
| Data Type: | Other; Aquatic; Invertebrates | | |
| Hero ID: | 3502953 | | |
| Domain | Metric | $Rating^{\dagger}$ MWF [*] Score | $Comments^{\dagger\dagger}$ |
| Extracted | | Yes | |
| | | | |

* MWF = Metric Weighting Factor

[†] High = 1; Medium = 2; Low = 3; Unacceptable = 4; N/A has no value.
[‡] The overall rating is calculated as necessary. EPA may not always provide a comment for a metric that has been categorized as High.

$$Overall rating = \begin{cases} 4 & \text{if any metric is Unacceptable} \\ \\ \left\lfloor \sum_{i} (\text{Metric Score}_{i} \times \text{MWF}_{i}) / \sum_{j} \text{MWF}_{j} \right\rceil_{0.1} & \text{(round to the nearest tenth) otherwise} \end{cases}$$

where High: ≥ 1 to < 1.7; Medium: ≥ 1.7 to < 2.3; Low: ≥ 2.3 to ≤ 3 . If the reviewer determines that the overall rating needs adjustment, the original rating is crossed out and an arrow points to the new rating.

,

| Data Type: Hero ID: | Other; Aqu 3546158 | atic; Invertebrates | | | | |
|------------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|------------------------|-------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Domain | | Metric | $\operatorname{Rating}^{\dagger}$ | MWF^{\star} | Score | $\mathrm{Comments}^{\dagger\dagger}$ |
| Domain 1: Test S | Substance | | | | | |
| | Metric 1: | Test Substance Identity | High | $\times 2$ | 2 | Substance was identified by name |
| | Metric 2: | Test Substance Source | Low | $\times 1$ | 3 | Not reported |
| | Metric 3: | Test Substance Purity | Low | × 1 | 3 | Not reported |
| Domain 2: Test I | Design | | | | | |
| | Metric 4: | Negative Controls | High | $\times 2$ | 2 | Controls consisted in two aquariums each contain 10 l of filtered lake water.Aquariums were cover limit water and/or product evaporation. |
| | Metric 5: | Negative Control Response | High | $\times 1$ | 1 | Response of the negative control was reported |
| | Metric 6: | Randomized Allocation | Low | $\times 1$ | 3 | Not reported |
| Domain 3: Expos | Metric 7: | erization Experimental System/Test Media Prepara- tion | Medium | × 2 | 4 | The loss of TCE during the preparation of the taminated water and during the exposure was important in spite of glass covers on aquarium moderate, intermittent aeration to try to reveloperation. Measurements were taken to verifi actual conc the clams were exposed to. Result chemical analysis are presented in Table 1. As and TOL are volatile products, an important was observed during the preparation of mixture mainly to homogenisation (loss of 23 up to 44 cent for TCE and 6 up to 45 percent for TOL). |
| | Metric 8: | Consistency of Exposure Administration | Medium | × 1 | 2 | Some loss of test chemical during preparation of tures but in general the administration was co tent being a one-time static exposure. |
| | Metric 9: | Measurement of Test Substance Concentra- tion | High | $\times 2$ | 2 | Measurements of test substances were taken; n nal conc were 1.56, 6.25, 25 and 100 mg/l for and measured conc were 1.2, 3.6, 14, and 69.4. |
| | Metric 10: | Exposure Duration and Frequency | Medium | × 1 | 2 | Exposure was a one-time static exposure with results assessed at the end of 5 days. The guide for acute tox for bivalves from EPA suggest hour flow through exposure, but authors in thi per were trying to mimic conditions that may of in the field with a one time spill |

| Study Citation: | Vidal, M.,Bassères, A.,Narbonne, J 2001. Potential biomarkers of trichloroethylene and toluene exposure in Corbicula fluminea. | | | | | | |
|------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------|---------------|-------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|
| Data Type: | Other; Aqu | atic; Invertebrates | | | | | |
| Hero ID: | 3546158 | | | | | | |
| Domain | | Metric | Rating^\dagger | MWF^{\star} | Score | $Comments^{\dagger\dagger}$ | |
| | Metric 11: | Number of Exposure Groups/Spacing of Exposure Levels | Medium | × 1 | 2 | 5 tests concentrations are recommended in EPA test guidelines for bivalves (850.1055). this test only has 4 test concentration | |
| | Metric 12: | Testing at or Below Solubility Limit | High | $\times 1$ | 1 | Test conc were far below TCE solubility level. | |
| Domain 4: Test (| Organism | | | 0 | 4 | | |
| | Metric 13: | Test Organism Characteristics | Medium | × 2 | 4 | Corbicula fluminea, a freshwater clam, is not a listed recommended test species for bivalves in the EPA 850.1055 guidelines but is present in freshwater en- vironments in Asia, the US, and increasingly in Eu- rope. | |
| | Metric 14: | Acclimitization and Pretreatment Conditions | High | $\times 1$ | 1 | | |
| | Metric 15: | Number of Organisms and Replicates per Group | Medium | $\times 1$ | 2 | Replicates not reported; number of organisms was reported. | |
| | Metric 16: | Adequacy of Test Conditions | Medium | × 1 | 2 | Temperature, ph, light and dark, lack of crowded conditions are consistent with what is recommended for the | |
| Domain 5: Outco | ome Assessme | ent | | | | | |
| Domain of Outor | Metric 17: | Outcome Assessment Methodology | High | $\times 2$ | 2 | | |
| | Metric 18: | Consistency of Outcome Assessment | High | $\times 1$ | 1 | | |
| | 1. / 37 | | | | | | |
| Domain 6: Confe | ounding / Var | Table Control | TT: 1 | | 0 | | |
| | Metric 19: | Confounding Variables in Test Design and Procedures | High | × 2 | 2 | There does not seem to be any differences among study groups in environmental conditions. | |
| | Metric 20: | Outcomes Unrelated to Exposure | High | $\times 1$ | 1 | No health outcomes unrelated to exposure | |
| Domain 7: Data | Presentation | and Analysis | | | | | |
| | | Continued on next page | | | | | |

| Study Citation: Data Type: Hero ID: | Vidal, M.,E Environmer Other; Aqu 3546158 | Bassères, A.,Narbonne, J 2001. Potential latal Toxicology and Pharmacology 9:87-97 atic; Invertebrates | biomarkers of | trichloro | ethylen | e and toluene exposure in Corbicula fluminea. |
|-------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------|---------------|---------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Domain | | Metric | Rating^\dagger | MWF^{\star} | Score | $Comments^{\dagger\dagger}$ |
| | Metric 21: | Statistical Methods | High | × 1 | 1 | Authors report, "Statistica software (5.1 release, Statsoft) was used forall statistical evaluations. Data distributed normally were submitted to a Brown"Forsythe test for homogeneity of variances (across dose groups). Data fulfilling this require- ment were then submitted to a univariate analy- sis of variance (ANOVA) with "dose" (of TCE or TOL) as the independent variable and biochemical parameters as dependent variables. Whenever a sig- nificant (P50.05) dose effect was established on a biochemical parameter response, a Tukey HSD mul- tiple comparison test was used to check significant (P50.05) differences between doses. Correlations be- tween the dose and biochemical parameter responses were determined with the Pearson correlationcoeffi- cient (significant for P50.05). As additional stud- ies, discriminant analysis (DA), often referred to as canonical variate analysis, were performed to try todiscriminate doses (of TCE or TOL) from each other and to determine biochemical parameters al- lowing the best discrimination between doses. Un- like univariate analysis, multivariate analysis such as DA takes intoaccount the whole biochemical pa- rameter responses and, thus, provides an integrated approach. DA procedures and its applications in en- vironmental biomonitoring have been described by Adams et al. (1994)." |
| | Metric 22: | Reporting of Data | Medium | $\times 2$ | 4 | Mechanistic data was reported for each exposure level, however behavioral patterns mentioned in the discussion were not reported and would be helpful in establishing an EC50. |
| | Metric 23: | Explanation of Unexpected Outcomes | High | $\times 1$ | 1 | No unexpected outcomes |
| Overall Quality I | Determination | 1 [‡] | High | | 1.5 | |
| Extracted | | | Yes | | | |
| | | Continued on next page | | | | |

| Study Citation: | Vidal, M.,Bassères, A.,Narbonne, J. 2001. Environmental Toxicology and Pharmacology | Potential biomarkers of tr 9:87-97 | richloroethylene and | toluene exposure in Corbicula fluminea. |
|------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------------------------|
| Data Type: Hero ID: | Other; Aquatic; Invertebrates 3546158 | | | |
| Domain | Metric | $\operatorname{Rating}^{\dagger}$ | MWF [*] Score | $Comments^{\dagger\dagger}$ |

* MWF = Metric Weighting Factor

[†] High = 1; Medium = 2; Low = 3; Unacceptable = 4; N/A has no value.

[‡] The overall rating is calculated as necessary. EPA may not always provide a comment for a metric that has been categorized as High.

$$Overall rating = \begin{cases} 4 & \text{if any metric is Unacceptable} \\ \left| \sum_{i} (Metric Score_{i} \times MWF_{i}) / \sum_{j} MWF_{j} \right|_{0,1} & (round to the nearest tenth) otherwise \end{cases}$$

,

where High: ≥ 1 to < 1.7; Medium: ≥ 1.7 to < 2.3; Low: ≥ 2.3 to ≤ 3 . If the reviewer determines that the overall rating needs adjustment, the original rating is crossed out and an arrow points to the new rating.

| Study Citation: | Ando, T.,C Trichloroetl | Dtsuka, S.,Nishiyama, M.,Senoo, K.,Watanabe hylene on the Growth of Planktonic Green Alg | , M. M.,M ae, Chlorel | atsumoto, la vulgaris | S 20 5 NIES2 | 003. Toxic Effects of Dichloromethane and 27, Selenastrum capricornutum NIES35, and |
|------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| | Volvulina st | teinii NIES545. 18:43-46 | , , | 0 | | , 1 , |
| Data Type: Hero ID: | Other; Aqu 3617103 | atic; Plants | | | | |
| Domain | | Metric | $\operatorname{Rating}^{\dagger}$ | MWF^{\star} | Score | $\mathrm{Comments}^{\dagger\dagger}$ |
| Domain 1. Tost | Substanco | | | | | |
| Domain 1. Test | Metric 1: | Test Substance Identity | High | $\times 2$ | 2 | Test substance was identified by name, trichloroethylene, and described as a typical organic solvent. |
| | Metric 2: | Test Substance Source | Low | $\times 1$ | 3 | Test substance source was not specified. |
| | Metric 3: | Test Substance Purity | Low | $\times 1$ | 3 | The purity not specified. |
| Domain 2: Test I | Design | | | | | |
| | Metric 4: | Negative Controls | High | $\times 2$ | 2 | Controls were included for each species. |
| | Metric 5: | Negative Control Response | High | $\times 1$ | 1 | The growth effects were reported for the controls in the figures. |
| | Metric 6: | Randomized Allocation | Low | $\times 1$ | 3 | There was no mention of random allocation. |
| Domain 3: Expos | sure Characte | erization | | | | |
| | Metric 7: | Experimental System/Test Media Prepara- tion | Low | × 2 | 6 | According to the authors description, this testing procedure appeared to bestatic, but details about the test procedure were lacking. In particular, there- was uncertainty about whether evaporation of the solvents occurred. |
| | Metric 8: | Consistency of Exposure Administration | High | $\times 1$ | 1 | Exposure was administered consistently across study groups. |
| | Metric 9: | Measurement of Test Substance Concentra- tion | Low | $\times 2$ | 6 | Test concentrations reported in terms of nominal concentrations. |
| | Metric 10: | Exposure Duration and Frequency | High | $\times 1$ | 1 | The test algae were cultured for 10 days and the ab- sorption of light bychlorophyll a was measured every 2 days as a measure of algal growth. |
| | Metric 11: | Number of Exposure Groups/Spacing of Exposure Levels | Medium | × 1 | 2 | Concentrations were reported as 0, 0.003, 0.03, 0.3 and 3 mg/L. This corresponded to 0, one-tenth, ten- fold and 100 fold of the Japanese national effluent standards for TCE. However, there were only 4 test concentrations while OECD recommends at least 5. |
| | Metric 12: | Testing at or Below Solubility Limit | High | $\times 1$ | 1 | Test conc. were well below TCE's solubility level. |
| | | | | | | |
| | | Continued on next page | | | | |

| Study Citation: | c: Ando, T.,Otsuka, S.,Nishiyama, M.,Senoo, K.,Watanabe, M. M.,Matsumoto, S 2003. Toxic Effects of Dichloromethane and Trichloroethylene on the Growth of Planktonic Green Algae, Chlorella vulgaris NIES227, Selenastrum capricornutum NIES35, and Volvulina steinii NIES545. 18:43-46 Other: Aquatic: Plants | | | | | | | | |
|------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------|--------------------|------------|-------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|--|--|
| Hero ID: | 3617103 | | | | | | | | |
| Domain | | Metric | $Rating^{\dagger}$ | MWF* | Score | $Comments^{\dagger\dagger}$ | | | |
| Domain 4: Test (| Drganism | | | | | | | | |
| 2011011 1 2000 | Metric 13: | Test Organism Characteristics | High | $\times 2$ | 2 | C. vulgaris, S. capricornutum, and V. Steinii were used for this study. Strains obtained from Japanese national collection. Although only one species is an OECD recommended test organisms, the other or- ganisms were chosen to cover species that would be able to grow in a wide range of water qualities. | | | |
| | Metric 14: | Acclimitization and Pretreatment Conditions | Medium | $\times 1$ | 2 | Algae were incubated prior to addition of test mate- rial, but details were notprovided, so minor uncer- tainties remain. | | | |
| | Metric 15: | Number of Organisms and Replicates per Group | High | $\times 1$ | 1 | Authors indicated 5 replicates in this study, and OECD 201 recommends at least 3. | | | |
| | Metric 16: | Adequacy of Test Conditions | High | $\times 1$ | 1 | Test vessels were consistent with recommendations for algal growth potential (AGP) test. | | | |
| Domain 5: Outco | ome Assessme | nt | | | | | | | |
| | Metric 17: | Outcome Assessment Methodology | High | $\times 2$ | 2 | Absorbance as a measure of growth/biomass was reported for all test concentrations, which can be used as a surrogate for biomass when measured by a spectrophotometer (as it was in the study) according to OECD TG 201. | | | |
| | Metric 18: | Consistency of Outcome Assessment | High | $\times 1$ | 1 | Outcomes we assessed consistently across study groups. | | | |
| Domain 6: Confo | unding / Var | iable Control | | | | | | | |
| | Metric 19: | Confounding Variables in Test Design and Procedures | High | $\times 2$ | 2 | There were no reported differences among the study groups in environmental conditions or other factors that could influence the outcome assessment. | | | |
| | Metric 20: | Outcomes Unrelated to Exposure | Medium | × 1 | 2 | Data on attrition or health outcomes unrelated to exposure were not reported for each study group but are not likely to have substantial impacts on results. | | | |
| Domain 7: Data | Presentation | and Analysis | | | | | | | |
| | Metric 21: | Statistical Methods | Low | × 1 | 3 | Statistical analysis was performed to determine the significance of differences between control and test concentrations, but test methods were not presented. | | | |
| | Continued on next page | | | | | | | | |

| Study Citation: Data Type: Hero ID: | Ando, T.,C Trichloroeth Volvulina st Other; Aqua 3617103 | Otsuka, S.,Nishiyama, M.,Senoo, K.,Watanal nylene on the Growth of Planktonic Green A ceinii NIES545. 18:43-46 atic; Plants | oe, M. M.,M lgae, Chlorel | atsumoto, la vulgaris | S 20 5 NIES2 | 003. Toxic Effects of Dichloromethane and 227, Selenastrum capricornutum NIES35, and |
|-------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Domain | | Metric | $\operatorname{Rating}^{\dagger}$ | MWF^{\star} | Score | $\mathrm{Comments}^{\dagger\dagger}$ |
| | Metric 22: | Reporting of Data | Low | $\times 2$ | 6 | Absorbance as a measure of growth/biomass was reported for all testconcentrations, which can be used as a surrogate for biomass when measuredby a spectrophotometer (as it was in the study) ac- cording to OECD TG 201.And relative absorbance was reported for each species and each study groupin the figures. However, no EC50 was derived for the species that did see aneffect on relative absorbance. |
| | Metric 23: | Explanation of Unexpected Outcomes | High | $\times 1$ | 1 | No unexplained outcomes reported. |
| Overall Quality I | Determinatior | 1 [‡] | $\frac{\text{High}}{\text{Yes}} \longrightarrow$ | Medium | 1.7 | |

* MWF = Metric Weighting Factor

[†] High = 1; Medium = 2; Low = 3; Unacceptable = 4; N/A has no value.

[‡] The overall rating is calculated as necessary. EPA may not always provide a comment for a metric that has been categorized as High.

$$\text{Overall rating} = \begin{cases} 4 & \text{if any metric is Unacceptable} \\ \\ \left\lfloor \sum_{i} \left(\text{Metric Score}_{i} \times \text{MWF}_{i} \right) / \sum_{j} \text{MWF}_{j} \right\rceil_{0.1} & \text{(round to the nearest tenth) otherwise} \end{cases}$$

,

where High: ≥ 1 to < 1.7; Medium: ≥ 1.7 to < 2.3; Low: ≥ 2.3 to ≤ 3 . If the reviewer determines that the overall rating needs adjustment, the original rating is crossed out and an arrow points to the new rating.

| Study Citation: | Yoshioka, Properties. | Y.,Ose, Y.,Sato, T., 1986. Correlation 12:15-21 | n of the Five Test M | lethods 1 | to Asse | ss Chemical Toxicity and Relation to Physical |
|------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------------------------------|----------------------|---------------|---------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Data Type: Hero ID: | Other; Aqu 3617749 | atic; Invertebrates | | | | |
| Domain | | Metric | $Rating^{\dagger}$ | MWF^{\star} | Score | $Comments^{\dagger\dagger}$ |
| Domain 1: Test S | Substance | | | | | |
| | Metric 1: | Test Substance Identity | High | $\times 2$ | 2 | Chemical identified by name: Trichloroethylene. |
| | Metric 2: | Test Substance Source | Low | $\times 1$ | 3 | Source of TCE was not reported, but it was noted that analytical grade TCE was used. |
| | Metric 3: | Test Substance Purity | Medium | $\times 1$ | 2 | Purity not reported but it was noted that analytical grade TCE was used. |
| Domain 2: Test l | Design | | | | | |
| | Metric 4: | Negative Controls | Low | $\times 2$ | 6 | The study refers to a blank but doesn't say what's in the blank. I assume this is the control for D. japonica (planarian). |
| | Metric 5: | Negative Control Response | Low | × 1 | 3 | The study reports that most of the planarian in the blank test regenerated heads normally, but a number isn't given and TCE isn't discussed specifically. |
| | Metric 6: | Randomized Allocation | Low | $\times 1$ | 3 | It's not reported whether animals were randomly al- located. |

Domain 3: Exposure Characterization

Continued on next page ...

_

| Study Citation: | Yoshioka, Y Properties. | ⁷ .,Ose, Y.,Sato, T., 1986. Correlation of the l 12:15-21 | Five Test N | Aethods | to Asse | ss Chemical Toxicity and Relation to Physical |
|------------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------|------------------------|---------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Data Type: Hero ID: | Other; Aqu 3617749 | atic; Invertebrates | | | | |
| Domain | | Metric | Rating^\dagger | MWF^{\star} | Score | $\mathrm{Comments}^{\dagger\dagger}$ |
| | Metric 7: | Experimental System/Test Media Prepara- tion | Low | × 2 | 6 | It's unclear whether the experiement was conducted in a closed or open system using static or flow through methods. The study reports, "The breed- ing liquid for Dugesia japonica was prepared by dis- solving 3.74 g of NaCl, 0.49 g of KCl, and 8.5 5 g of CaCl2 into distilled water to make 500 ml. This was diluted 100 times and neutralized by NaHCO3 before use. Dugesiajaponica were collected from a stream around which there was no source of pollution and left without food for over 7 days in the breeding liquid to excrete alimentary canal contents. Those of about .2 cm long were used. Dugesia japonica was cut into two parts (head and body part) at the nearest section to the eyes of the trisected part be- tween pharynx and eyes. The body parts were put in 100 ml ofa test solution, and this was left at 20 " 1"C for 7 days. Observation for head re- generation was carried out with a stereomicroscope on Days 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7 after head cutting, and the test solution was replaced at every observatiort. The degree of regeneration was classified as normal, eye spot, tetratophthalmic, anophthalmic, ad death was regarded as the abnormal regeneration number. The ratio of the number to 10 on Day 7 was defined as the abnormal regeneration rate. The concentration of the chemical, at which the abnormal regenera- tion rate reached 50 percent, was defined as EC50" LC50 of D. japonica was determined at the same time. LC50 and EC50 values of the test mentioned above were determined on semilovarithmic paper." |
| | Metric 8: | Consistency of Exposure Administration | Low | $\times 1$ | 3 | Exposure methods were not reported for each study group |
| | Metric 9: | Measurement of Test Substance Concentra- tion | Low | $\times 2$ | 6 | It was not reported whether nominal or measured conc were used. |
| | Metric 10: | Exposure Duration and Frequency | Medium | × 1 | 2 | Exposure occurred over 7 days, and observation was carried out on days 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7 after head cutting, and the test solution was replaced at every observation. |
| | | Continued on next page | | | | |

... continued from previous page

| Study Citation: Yoshioka, Y., Ose, Y., Sato, T., 1986. Correlation of the Five Test Methods to Assess Chemical Toxicity and Relation to Physical Properties 12:15-21 | | | | | | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|
| Data Type:Other; Aquatic; InvertebratesHero ID:3617749 | | | | | | |
| Domain Metric Rating [†] MWF* Score Comments [†] | ;† | | | | | |
| Metric 11: Number of Exposure Groups/Spacing of Ex- Low × 1 3 Not reported for TCE, but for posure Levels 1 3 Not reported for TCE, but for looks like 4 exposure groups wer | other chemicals it re used plus control. | | | | | |
| Metric 12: Testing at or Below Solubility Limit High $\times 1$ 1 Substance was tested well below | solubility. | | | | | |
| Domain 4: Test Organism Metric 13: Test Organism Characteristics Low × 2 6 Uncertainties about the quality isms given they were collected fr | y of the test organ- rom the field and no | | | | | |
| acclimation is mentioned. Study japonica were collected from a st there was no source of pollution for for over 7 days in the breed alignmentary canal contents. Those were used." | y reports, "Dugesia tream around which on and left without ing liquid to excrete e of about 2 cm long | | | | | |
| Metric 14: Acclimitization and Pretreatment Conditions Low × 1 3 Did not report whether they we they were collected from the fiel | re acclimatized and d. | | | | | |
| Metric 15: Number of Organisms and Replicates per Low × 1 3 Group Group The number of animals in each clear, possibly ten? The study sawere put in 100 ml of a test sol left at 20 "1"C for 7 days." Is from 10 different individuals? N not reported. | h solution was not ays "Ten body parts ution, and this was this 10 body parts fumber of replicates | | | | | |
| Metric 16: Adequacy of Test Conditions $Low \times 1 = 3$ Housing not mentioned for plane | arian. | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| Domain 5: Outcome Assessment Metric 17: Outcome Assessment Methodology High X 2 2 Determined on LC50 | | | | | | |
| Metric 18: Consistency of Outcome Assessment $Low \times 1 = 3$ Details of outcome assessment y | vere not reported. | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| Domain 6: Confounding / Variable Control | | | | | | |
| Metric 19: Confounding Variables in Test Design and Medium $\times 2$ 4 Confounding variables are discuprocedures Procedures 4 Confounding variables are discuprocedures 4 to the cutting of the head (stree head). | ussed for planarian. ing may occur due ss of cutting of the | | | | | |
| Metric 20: Outcomes Unrelated to Exposure Low × 1 3 Data on health and attrition we each study group. | ere not reported for | | | | | |
| Domain 7. Data Presentation and Analysis | | | | | | |
| $\begin{array}{c} \text{Medium} \times 1 & 2 \\ \text{Methods not described clearly} \end{array}$ | | | | | | |
| Continued on next page | | | | | | |

... continued from previous page

| Study Citation: | Yoshioka, Y Properties. | Y.,Ose, Y.,Sato, T., 1986. Correlation of the 12:15-21 | e Five Test M | Iethods | to Asses | ss Chemical Toxicity and Relation to Physical |
|-------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|------------------------|----------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Data Type: | Other; Aqua | atic; Invertebrates | | | | |
| Hero ID: | 3617749 | | | | | |
| Domain | | Metric | $\operatorname{Rating}^{\dagger}$ | MWF^{\star} | Score | $\mathrm{Comments}^{\dagger\dagger}$ |
| | Metric 22: | Reporting of Data | Low | $\times 2$ | 6 | Data for exposure related findings not reported for each study group |
| | Metric 23: | Explanation of Unexpected Outcomes | Medium | × 1 | 2 | Authors did report unexpected outcomes and ex- plained some of them, including the planarian num- bers being very different than the other two species. |
| Overall Quality I | Determination | 1 [‡] | Low | | 2.5 | |
| Extracted | | | Yes | | | |

* MWF = Metric Weighting Factor

[†] High = 1; Medium = 2; Low = 3; Unacceptable = 4; N/A has no value.

[‡] The overall rating is calculated as necessary. EPA may not always provide a comment for a metric that has been categorized as High.

$$\text{Overall rating} = \begin{cases} 4 & \text{if any metric is Unacceptable} \\ \\ \left\lfloor \sum_{i} \left(\text{Metric Score}_{i} \times \text{MWF}_{i} \right) / \sum_{j} \text{MWF}_{j} \right\rceil_{0.1} & \text{(round to the nearest tenth) otherwise} \end{cases}$$

,

where High: ≥ 1 to < 1.7; Medium: ≥ 1.7 to < 2.3; Low: ≥ 2.3 to ≤ 3 . If the reviewer determines that the overall rating needs adjustment, the original rating is crossed out and an arrow points to the new rating.

| Study Citation: | ion: Yoshioka, Y.,Ose, Y.,Sato, T., 1986. Correlation of the Five Test Methods to Assess Chemical Toxicity and Relation to Physical Properties. 12:15-21 | | | | | | |
|------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------|-------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|
| Data Type: Hero ID: | Acute (0-96 3617749 | b hour); Aquatic; Fish | | | | | |
| Domain | | Metric | $\operatorname{Rating}^{\dagger}$ | MWF^{\star} | Score | $Comments^{\dagger\dagger}$ | |
| Domain 1: Test S | Substance | | | | | | |
| | Metric 1: | Test Substance Identity | High | $\times 2$ | 2 | Chemical identified by name: Trichloroethylene. | |
| | Metric 2: | Test Substance Source | Low | $\times 1$ | 3 | Source of TCE was not reported, but it was noted that analytical grade TCE was used. | |
| | Metric 3: | Test Substance Purity | Low | $\times 1$ | 3 | Purity was not reported. | |
| Domain 2: Test I | Design Metric 4: | Negative Controls | Unacceptable | $\times 2$ | 8 | The study does not mention a control anywhere. The study refers to a blank for Dugesia japonica | |
| | | | | | | (planarian) but doesn't say what's in the blank, and doesn't mention a blank for O. latipes (red killifish). | |
| | Metric 5: | Negative Control Response | N/A | | N/A | No control reported | |
| | Metric 6: | Randomized Allocation | Low | $\times 1$ | 3 | It's not reported whether animals were randomly al- located. | |
| Domain 3. Expos | ure Characte | prization | | | | | |
| Domain 6. Expor | Metric 7: | Experimental System/Test Media Prepara- tion | Medium | $\times 2$ | 4 | Test was completed in a closed container (sealed with an electrode), but there were some uncertain- ties about how much air space there was in the flask. | |
| | Metric 8: | Consistency of Exposure Administration | Low | $\times 1$ | 3 | Exposure methods were not reported for each study group. | |
| | Metric 9: | Measurement of Test Substance Concentra- tion | Low | $\times 2$ | 6 | It was not reported whether nominal or measured conc were used. | |
| | Metric 10: | Exposure Duration and Frequency | Low | $\times 1$ | 3 | Exposure occurred over 48 hours, and it sounds like a static test but it is not clear. OECD recommends 96 hours for fish acute tests. | |
| | Metric 11: | Number of Exposure Groups/Spacing of Exposure Levels | Low | $\times 1$ | 3 | For TCE, it is unclear how many exposure groups were used for the LC50 determination. (For the oxy- gen uptake it looks like 5 exposure groups according to figure 2 but that was a different test.) | |
| | Metric 12: | Testing at or Below Solubility Limit | High | $\times 1$ | 1 | Substance was tested well below solubility. | |
| Domain 4: Test 0 | Organism | | | | | | |

_

Continued on next page ...

_

| Study Citation: | Yoshioka, Y.,Ose, Y.,Sato, T. 1986. Correlation of the Five Test Methods to Assess Chemical Toxicity and Relation to Physical Properties. 12:15-21 | | | | | | |
|------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------|-------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|
| Data Type: Hero ID: | Acute (0-96 3617749 | i hour); Aquatic; Fish | | | | | |
| Domain | | Metric | $\operatorname{Rating}^{\dagger}$ | MWF^{\star} | Score | $Comments^{\dagger\dagger}$ | |
| | Metric 13: | Test Organism Characteristics | Medium | × 2 | 4 | Minor uncertainties about the quality of the test or- ganisms given they were collected from the market. Study reports, "Orizias latipes (ca. 3 cm, 0.3 g) was obtained from the market and acclimated for at least 1 week in dechlorinated water at 20"C (total hard- ness was about 80 mg/liter). LC50 was determined by exposing 10 O. latipes to 2 liters of a chemical solution at 20 " I "C for 48 hr with the cycle 8 hr dark and 16 hr light. The oxygen uptake rate was determined by putting 10 0. latipes in an Erlen- meyer flask (3-liter) filled with test solution which was saturated with air, and the flask was sealed with an electrode. Then it was left without aeration at 20"C for 4 hr. The concentration of dissolved oxy- gen (DO) was measured by a DO meter (Denkika- gakukeiki type 3) every 30 min. As the oxygen was not supplied by aeration during the test, the result was accepted only when DO concentration was over 3 mg/liter at the end of the test in order to avoid the influence of the lack of DO. IfDO decreased to under 3 mg/liter, the test, the wet weight of O. latipess was measured in order to calculate the oxygen up- take rate per wet weight." | |
| | Metric 14: | Acclimitization and Pretreatment Conditions | Medium | $\times 1$ | 2 | Fish were acclimatized for 1 week and OECD rec- ommends 12 days before they are used for testing. | |
| | Metric 15: | Number of Organisms and Replicates per Group | High | $\times 1$ | 1 | $10~{\rm organisms}$ per exposure group. OECD recommends at least 7 | |
| | Metric 16: | Adequacy of Test Conditions | Medium | $\times 1$ | 2 | 10 fish in 2 liters of water which is a little more than what OECD would recommend. At 0.3 g each and 10 fish per container, it should be a 3 liter flask. | |
| Domain 5: Outco | ome Assessme | ent. | | | | | |
| Domain of Outor | Metric 17: | Outcome Assessment Methodology | High | $\times 2$ | 2 | Derived an LC50 | |
| | Metric 18: | Consistency of Outcome Assessment | Low | $\times 1$ | 3 | Details of outcome assessment were not reported. | |
| Domain 6: Confe | ounding / Var | riable Control | | | | | |
| | | Continued on next page | | | | | |

... continued from previous page

| Study Citation: | : Yoshioka, Y.,Ose, Y.,Sato, T., 1986. Correlation of the Five Test Methods to Assess Chemical Toxicity and Relation to Physical Properties 12:15-21 | | | | | | |
|------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------|-------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|
| Data Type: Hero ID: | Acute (0-96 3617749 | b hour); Aquatic; Fish | | | | | |
| Domain | | Metric | $\operatorname{Rating}^{\dagger}$ | MWF^{\star} | Score | $Comments^{\dagger\dagger}$ | |
| | Metric 19: | Confounding Variables in Test Design and Procedures | Low | $\times 2$ | 6 | Study did not provide enough information to allow a comparison of environmental conditions or other non-treatment-related factors across study groups, and the omitted information is likely to have a sub- stantial impact on study results. | |
| | Metric 20: | Outcomes Unrelated to Exposure | Low | $\times 1$ | 3 | Data on health and attrition were not reported for each study group. | |
| Domain 7: Data | Presentation | and Analysis | | | | | |
| | Metric 21: | Statistical Methods | Medium | $\times 1$ | 2 | Methods not described clearly. | |
| | Metric 22: | Reporting of Data | Low | $\times 2$ | 6 | Data for exposure related findings not reported for each study group. | |
| | Metric 23: | Explanation of Unexpected Outcomes | High | $\times 1$ | 1 | No unexplained outcomes for the killifish. | |
| Overall Quality I | Determination | n‡ | Unacceptable | | 4.0 | | |
| Extracted | | | No | | | | |

** Consistent with our Application of Systematic Review in TSCARisk Evaluations document, if a metric for a data source receives a score of Unacceptable (score = 4), EPA will determine the study to be unacceptable. In this case, one of the metrics were rated as unacceptable. As such, the study is considered unacceptable and the score is presented solely to increase transparency.

* MWF = Metric Weighting Factor

[†] High = 1; Medium = 2; Low = 3; Unacceptable = 4; N/A has no value.

[‡] The overall rating is calculated as necessary. EPA may not always provide a comment for a metric that has been categorized as High.

$$Overall rating = \begin{cases} 4 & \text{if any metric is Unacceptable} \\ \\ \left\lfloor \sum_{i} \left(\text{Metric Score}_{i} \times \text{MWF}_{i} \right) / \sum_{j} \text{MWF}_{j} \right\rceil_{0,1} & \text{(round to the nearest tenth) otherwise} \end{cases}$$

,

where High: ≥ 1 to < 1.7; Medium: ≥ 1.7 to < 2.3; Low: ≥ 2.3 to ≤ 3 . If the reviewer determines that the overall rating needs adjustment, the original rating is crossed out and an arrow points to the new rating.

... continued from previous page

| Study Citation: Y | Zoshioka, Y Properties | V.,Ose, Y.,Sato, T., 1986. Correlation of the l | Five Test Metho | ods to As | sess Ch | emical Toxicity and Relation to Physical |
|-----------------------------|---------------------------|------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|------------|---------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Data Type: A Hero ID: 30 | cute (0-96 617749 | hour); Aquatic; Invertebrates | | | | |
| Domain | | Metric | $\operatorname{Rating}^{\dagger}$ | MWF* | Score | $Comments^{\dagger\dagger}$ |
| Domain 1: Test Sub | ostance | | | | | |
| Ν | letric 1: | Test Substance Identity | High | $\times 2$ | 2 | Chemical identified by name: Trichloroethylene. |
| N | letric 2: | Test Substance Source | Low | $\times 1$ | 3 | Source of TCE was not reported, but it was noted that analytical grade TCE was used. |
| M | letric 3: | Test Substance Purity | Low | $\times 1$ | 3 | Purity is not reported. |
| Damain & Trat Das | | | | | | |
| Domani 2. Test Des M | Ietric 4: | Negative Controls | Unacceptable | $\times 2$ | 8 | The study does not mention a control anywhere. The study refers to a blank for Dugesia japonica (planarian) but doesn't say what's in the blank, and doesn't mention a blank for O. latipes (red killifish). |
| Ν | Ietric 5: | Negative Control Response | N/A | | N/A | No control reported |
| N | letric 6: | Randomized Allocation | Low | $\times 1$ | 3 | It's not reported whether animals were randomly al- located. |
| Domain 2. Euroaum | o Chorooto | ningtion | | | | |
| Domain 5: Exposure | e Characte Istria 7: | Furnerimental System /Test Media Propers | Low | ~ 0 | 6 | To the most second of a local back to second stress of the second s |
| 10. | Tetric 7: | tion | LOW | X Z | 0 | or open, and TCE is a volatile chemical. |
| Ν | Ietric 8: | Consistency of Exposure Administration | Low | $\times 1$ | 3 | Exposure methods were not reported for each study group. |
| N | letric 9: | Measurement of Test Substance Concentra- tion | Low | $\times 2$ | 6 | It was not reported whether nominal or measured conc were used. |
| N | fetric 10: | Exposure Duration and Frequency | Low | $\times 1$ | 3 | Exposure occurred over 4 hours, and OECD 202 rec- ommends 48 hours for invertebrate acute tests. |
| Ν | letric 11: | Number of Exposure Groups/Spacing of Exposure Levels | Unacceptable | $\times 1$ | 4 | For TCE, it is unclear how many exposure groups were used for the LC50 determination. |
| M | letric 12: | Testing at or Below Solubility Limit | High | $\times 1$ | 1 | Substance was tested below solubility. |
| Domain 4: Test Org | ganism Aetric 13: | Test Organism Characteristics | Low | $\times 2$ | 6 | Test species is a saltwater invertebrate, and were used at 5 days old, but the source of the species is not reported. |
| | Continued on next page | | | | | |

| Study Citation: | Yoshioka, Y | 7.,Ose, Y.,Sato, T., 1986. Correlation of the 1 | Five Test Metho | ods to As | ssess Ch | emical Toxicity and Relation to Physical |
|-------------------|---------------|--------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------|----------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Data Type: | Acute (0-96 | b hour); Aquatic; Invertebrates | | | | |
| Hero ID: | 3617749 | ,, , , | | | | |
| Domain | | Metric | $\operatorname{Rating}^{\dagger}$ | MWF^{\star} | Score | $Comments^{\dagger\dagger}$ |
| | Metric 14. | Acclimitization and Pretreatment Conditions | Low | × 1 | 3 | Study did not report acclimating water fleas |
| | Metric 15: | Number of Organisms and Replicates per Group | Low | $\times 1$ $\times 1$ | 3 | Ten organisms per exposure group. For freshwater invertebrates, OECD 202 recommends at least 20. |
| | Metric 16: | Adequacy of Test Conditions | Medium | × 1 | 2 | "Ten M. macrocopa in 100 ml of test solution were put in a 250-ml vial vessel at 20 " 1"C and the sur- vivors were counted after 3 hr in order to determine LC50." |
| Domain 5: Outco | ome Assessme | ent | | | | |
| | Metric 17: | Outcome Assessment Methodology | High | $\times 2$ | 2 | Derived an LC50 |
| | Metric 18: | Consistency of Outcome Assessment | Low | $\times 1$ | 3 | Details of outcome assessment were not reported. |
| Domain 6. Confe | ounding / Vo | viable Control | | | | |
| Domain 0. Come | Metric 19: | Confounding Variables in Test Design and Procedures | Low | $\times 2$ | 6 | The study did not provide enough information to allow a comparison of environmental conditions or other non treatment related factors across study groups. |
| | Metric 20: | Outcomes Unrelated to Exposure | Low | $\times 1$ | 3 | Data on health and attrition were not reported for each study group. |
| Domain 7: Data | Presentation | and Analysis | | | | |
| Domain II Data | Metric 21: | Statistical Methods | Medium | $\times 1$ | 2 | Methods not described clearly. |
| | Metric 22: | Reporting of Data | Low | $\times 2$ | 6 | Data for exposure related findings not reported for each study group. |
| | Metric 23: | Explanation of Unexpected Outcomes | High | × 1 | 1 | No unexplained outcomes for the water flea. |
| Overall Quality I | Determination | n‡ | Unacceptable | | 4.0 | |
| Extracted | | | No | | | |
| | | Continued on next page | | | | |

... continued from previous page

| Study Citation: | Yoshioka, Y., Ose, Y., Sato, T., 1986. Co | Correlation of the Five 7 | Test Methods to | Assess Chemical Toxicity | and Relation to Physical |
|-----------------|-------------------------------------------|---------------------------|------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------------|
| | Properties. 12:15-21 | | | | |
| Data Type: | Acute (0-96 hour); Aquatic; Invertebrates | s | | | |
| Hero ID: | 3617749 | | | | |
| Domain | Metric | | Rating [†] MW | VF* Score | $Comments^{\dagger\dagger}$ |

** Consistent with our Application of Systematic Review in TSCARisk Evaluations document, if a metric for a data source receives a score of Unacceptable (score = 4), EPA will determine the study to be unacceptable. In this case, two of the metrics were rated as unacceptable. As such, the study is considered unacceptable and the score is presented solely to increase transparency.

* MWF = Metric Weighting Factor

[†] High = 1; Medium = 2; Low = 3; Unacceptable = 4; N/A has no value.

[‡] The overall rating is calculated as necessary. EPA may not always provide a comment for a metric that has been categorized as High.

$$Overall rating = \begin{cases} 4 & \text{if any metric is Unacceptable} \\ \left[\sum_{i} (Metric Score_{i} \times MWF_{i}) / \sum_{j} MWF_{j} \right]_{0,1} & (round to the nearest tenth) otherwise \end{cases}$$

where High: ≥ 1 to < 1.7; Medium: ≥ 1.7 to < 2.3; Low: ≥ 2.3 to ≤ 3 . If the reviewer determines that the overall rating needs adjustment, the original rating is crossed out and an arrow points to the new rating.

| Study Citation: Data Type: | Tsai, K. P., Toxicology Acute (0-96 | Chen, C. Y 2007. An Algal Toxicity Database of and Chemistry 26:1931-1939 5 hour); Aquatic; Plants | of Organic T | Coxicants | Derived | by a Closed-System Technique. Environmental |
|-------------------------------|-------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------|---------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Hero ID: | 3617867 | | | | | |
| Domain | | Metric | $\operatorname{Rating}^{\dagger}$ | MWF^{\star} | Score | $\mathrm{Comments}^{\dagger\dagger}$ |
| Domain 1: Test S | Substance | | | | | |
| | Metric 1: | Test Substance Identity | High | $\times 2$ | 2 | Test substance was identified by name. Physical chemical characteristics such as MW, LogP, HLC, and solubility were provided for the test material. |
| | Metric 2: | Test Substance Source | Low | $\times 1$ | 3 | The source was not provided. |
| | Metric 3: | Test Substance Purity | Medium | $\times 1$ | 2 | Purity was not provided. Authors described the chemical purity as "reagent grade." |
| Domain 2: Test I | Design | | | | | |
| | Metric 4: | Negative Controls | Medium | × 2 | 4 | Authors referred to a control when discussing how they calculated their EC50 value, but additional de- tails were not reported. The authors indicated that the details of the test setup can be found at the fol- lowing source: Lin JH, Kao WC, Tsai KP, Chen CY. 2005. A novel algal toxicity testing technique for assessing the toxicity of both metallic and organic toxicants. Water Res 39:1869"1877.This source in- dicates that inclusion of a negative control is a part of the testing procedure. |
| | Metric 5: | Negative Control Response | Low | $\times 1$ | 3 | Negative Control response was not specifically re- ported in the study, but was incorporated into the calculation of the percent inhibition. |
| | Metric 6: | Randomized Allocation | Low | $\times 1$ | 3 | Researchers did not report how organisms were allocated to study groups |
| Domain 3: Expos | sure Characte | erization | | | | |
| | Metric 7: | Experimental System/Test Media Prepara- tion | High | $\times 2$ | 2 | The goal of the study authors was specifically to de- termine the optimal testing conditions for algae. |
| | Metric 8: | Consistency of Exposure Administration | High | $\times 1$ | 1 | The goal of the study authors was specifically to de- termine the optimal testing conditions for algae by providing a more consistent exposure regime. |
| | Metric 9: | Measurement of Test Substance Concentra- tion | Medium | × 2 | 4 | Test concentrations were reported in terms of nom- inal concentrations, but analytical confirmation of the test concentrations was performed at the begin- ning and end of the test by HPLC. This was intended to quantify any potential degradation. |
| | | Continued on next page | | | | |

| Study Citation: | itation: Tsai, K. P., Chen, C. Y 2007. An Algal Toxicity Database of Organic Toxicants Derived by a Closed-System Technique. Environmental Toxicology and Chemistry 26:1931-1939 | | | | | | |
|------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------|-------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|
| Data Type: Hero ID: | Acute (0-96 3617867 | hour); Aquatic; Plants | | | | | |
| Domain | | Metric | $\operatorname{Rating}^{\dagger}$ | MWF^{\star} | Score | $Comments^{\dagger\dagger}$ | |
| | Metric 10: | Exposure Duration and Frequency | Medium | × 1 | 2 | Authors reported, "All tests were conducted in trip- licate, with a test duration of 48 h. The population density of the algae was determined using an elec- tronicparticle counter" 48 hours is acceptable, but 72 hours is recommended in OECD 201. | |
| | Metric 11: | Number of Exposure Groups/Spacing of Exposure Levels | Low | $\times 1$ | 3 | The study report indicated that both a range finding and definitive test were conducted but did not report the test concentrations. | |
| | Metric 12: | Testing at or Below Solubility Limit | Low | × 1 | 3 | It is unclear what test conc were, but the solubility of TCE is very high (999-1472 mg/l), and the EC50 determined was relatively low in comparison 26.24 mg/l) | |
| Domain 4: Test (| Organism | | | | | | |
| | Metric 13: | Test Organism Characteristics | High | $\times 2$ | 2 | Green algae (Pseudokirchneriella subcapitata) which is a recommended test species in OECD Guideline 201. | |
| | Metric 14: | Acclimitization and Pretreatment Conditions | High | $\times 1$ | 1 | Supplemental methodology indicates that algae are incubated until a steady-state is reached | |
| | Metric 15: | Number of Organisms and Replicates per Group | High | × 1 | 1 | 3 Replications were used and cell density was and the initialinoculated cell density was $15,000$ cells/ ml. which is in the OECD 201 recommended range of $5*103$ -104 for this species. | |
| | Metric 16: | Adequacy of Test Conditions | High | × 1 | 1 | Temperature and light intensity were kept at 24 1C and 65 Em2s1 (10 percent), respectively. Algal growth medium [22] with no ethylenediaminetetra- acetic acid content was used for toxicity testing. The initial pH for the growth medium was 7.5, and the initial inoculated cell density was 15,000 cells/ml. | |
| Domain 5: Outco | ome Assessme | ent | | | | | |
| | Metric 17: | Outcome Assessment Methodology | High | $\times 2$ | 2 | Authors proved that closed-system algae testing is more conservative than batch testing. Were able to derive an EC50. | |
| | Metric 18: | Consistency of Outcome Assessment | High | $\times 1$ | 1 | Outcomes were assessed consistently across study groups using the same protocol. | |
| Domain 6: Confo | ounding / Var | iable Control | | | | | |
| | Continued on next page | | | | | | |

| Study Citation: | n: Tsai, K. P., Chen, C. Y. 2007. An Algal Toxicity Database of Organic Toxicants Derived by a Closed-System Technique. Environmental Toxicology and Chemistry 26:1931-1939 | | | | | | | |
|-------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|------------|-------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|--|
| Data Type: | Acute (0-96 | hour); Aquatic; Plants | | | | | | |
| Hero ID: | 3617867 | | | | | | | |
| Domain | | Metric | $\operatorname{Rating}^{\dagger}$ | MWF^* | Score | $Comments^{\dagger\dagger}$ | | |
| | Metric 19: | Confounding Variables in Test Design and Procedures | High | × 2 | 2 | The purpose of the experiment was to determine whether algae are more sensitive to volatile chem- icals when tested in closed-systems than in batch testing. They confirmed that closed system tests were more sensitive for algae relative to batch tests. | | |
| | Metric 20: | Outcomes Unrelated to Exposure | Medium | × 1 | 2 | Data on attrition was not reported for each study group, but is unlikely to have a substantial impact on results. | | |
| Domain 7: Data | Presentation | and Analysis | | | | | | |
| | Metric 21: | Statistical Methods | High | $\times 1$ | 1 | The EC50 was determined using probit analysis. | | |
| | Metric 22: | Reporting of Data | Medium | $\times 2$ | 4 | Results did not include effects at each concentration level; however, this is unlikely to substantially influ- ence outcomes. | | |
| | Metric 23: | Explanation of Unexpected Outcomes | High | $\times 1$ | 1 | There were no unexpected outcomes. | | |
| Overall Quality I | Determination | 1 [‡] | High | | 1.6 | | | |
| Extracted | | | Yes | | | | | |

* MWF = Metric Weighting Factor

[†] High = 1; Medium = 2; Low = 3; Unacceptable = 4; N/A has no value.

[‡] The overall rating is calculated as necessary. EPA may not always provide a comment for a metric that has been categorized as High.

 $\text{Overall rating} = \begin{cases} 4 & \text{if any metric is Unacceptable} \\ \\ \left\lfloor \sum_{i} \left(\text{Metric Score}_{i} \times \text{MWF}_{i} \right) / \sum_{j} \text{MWF}_{j} \right\rceil_{0.1} & \text{(round to the nearest tenth) otherwise} \end{cases},$

where High: ≥ 1 to < 1.7; Medium: ≥ 1.7 to < 2.3; Low: ≥ 2.3 to ≤ 3 . If the reviewer determines that the overall rating needs adjustment, the original rating is crossed out and an arrow points to the new rating.

| Study Citation:SData Type:OHero ID:3 | Schell, J. D. Other; Aqua 3625489 | J. 1987. Interactions of Halogenated Hydroca atic; Fish | ırbon Mixtu | res in th | e Embr | yo of the Japanese Medaka (Oryzias latipes). |
|--------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------|--------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Domain | | Metric | $\operatorname{Rating}^{\dagger}$ | MWF^{\star} | Score | $\mathrm{Comments}^{\dagger\dagger}$ |
| Domain 1: Test Sul | bstance | | | | | |
| Ν | Metric 1: | Test Substance Identity | High | $\times 2$ | 2 | Chemical is identified by name |
| Ν | Metric 2: | Test Substance Source | High | $\times 1$ | 1 | Purchased from Fisher scientific |
| N | Metric 3: | Test Substance Purity | High | $\times 1$ | 1 | Study reports TCE is certified ACS which I believe means greater than 99.5 percent. |
| Domain 2: Test De | sign | | | | | |
| Ν | Metric 4: | Negative Controls | Medium | $\times 2$ | 4 | Clean rearing solution was used as a control, with only minor uncertainties about formulation. |
| Ν | Metric 5: | Negative Control Response | High | $\times 1$ | 1 | • |
| Ν | Metric 6: | Randomized Allocation | Low | $\times 1$ | 3 | Did not report whether allocation to study groups was random. |
| Domain 3: Exposur | re Characte | rization | | | | |
| Ŋ | Metric 7: | Experimental System/Test Media Preparation | High | $\times 2$ | 2 | Volatility of chemical was taken into account in the study design. "Since the chemicals of interest are volatile, exchanging solutions on a daily basis in- sured a more consistent exposure level." |
| Ν | Metric 8: | Consistency of Exposure Administration | High | $\times 1$ | 1 | * |
| Ν | Metric 9: | Measurement of Test Substance Concentra- tion | Low | $\times 2$ | 6 | Nominal concentrations were used and were not measured. TCE is volatile. Rate of loss was deter- mined for carbon tet and chloroform, but not TCE. |
| Ν | Metric 10: | Exposure Duration and Frequency | High | × 1 | 1 | 10 day exposure duration (96 hour preferred for acute, and 28 day preferred for chronic, so this ex- posure period is sub-chronic) which is recommended for fish early life stage OECD. Static renewal method used. Fresh test solutions were exchanged in the vials each day for 10 consecutive days. |
| Ν | Metric 11: | Number of Exposure Groups/Spacing of Exposure Levels | High | $\times 1$ | 1 | After a range finding test, TCE concentrations were 54, 59, 65, 72, 79, and 87 mg/l (log-dose intervals). 6 concentrations used plus control; OECD recommends at least 5 for fish early life stage. |
| Ν | Metric 12: | Testing at or Below Solubility Limit | High | $\times 1$ | 1 | × |
| Domain 4: Test Org | ganism | | | | | |

Continued on next page ...

| Study Citation: Data Type: Hero ID: | Schell, J. D. J 1987. Interactions of Halogenated Hydrocarbon Mixtures in the Embryo of the Japanese Medaka (Oryzias latipes). Other; Aquatic; Fish 3625489 | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------|--------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|
| Domain | | Metric | $\operatorname{Rating}^{\dagger}$ | MWF^{\star} | Score | $Comments^{\dagger\dagger}$ | |
| | Motrie 13. | Test Organism Characteristics | High | × 9 | 9 | rice fich (Innenece Medele) | |
| | Metric 14. | Acclimitization and Protroatmont Conditions | High | $\times 1$ | 2 1 | "Adult male and female medale used for breading | |
| | MUUTIC 14. | | mgn | ~ 1 | 1 | Addit inate and remark inequality and for block of a purpose were obtained from the Carolina Biological Supply Company (Burlington, N.C.). Upon arrival in the laboratory, fish were quarantined from existing laboratory stocks and treated for 24 h with a mixture of malachite green (0.05 mg/L) and formalin (20 mg/L) to protect against infection resulting from the stress associated with handling and transportation during shipment. Following treatment, the fish were partitioned into breeding stocks at a ratio of 3 males:2 females with an optimum number of 60 fish per JO gallon aquarium." | |
| | Metric 15: | Number of Organisms and Replicates per Group | Medium | $\times 1$ | 2 | 10 embryos per dose group, which is acceptable, but no mention of how many replicates. | |
| | Metric 16: | Adequacy of Test Conditions | High | $\times 1$ | 1 | | |
| Domain 5. Outao | ma Accord | set. | | | | | |
| Domain 5: Outco | Motrie 17. | Outcome Aggaggment Mathedalam | Himb | V 9 | 0 | | |
| | Metric 17: | Consistence of Outcome Assessment | High | × 2 | 2 1 | | |
| | Metric 18: | Consistency of Outcome Assessment | High | × 1 | 1 | | |
| Domain 6: Confo | unding / Vai | riable Control | | | | | |
| | Metric 19: | Confounding Variables in Test Design and Procedures | High | $\times 2$ | 2 | No reported differences among the study groups in environmental conditions or other factors that could be influencing the outcome assessment. | |
| | Metric 20: | Outcomes Unrelated to Exposure | Medium | × 1 | 2 | Data on attrition was reported in each exposure group. Other health outcomes were not reported, but I consider these only minor uncertainties. | |
| Domain 7. Data 1 | Presentation | and Analysis | | | | | |
| | Metric 21. | Statistical Methods | High | × 1 | 1 | | |
| | Metric 22 | Reporting of Data | Medium | $\times 2$ | 4 | Most but not all outcomes were reported, only mi- | |
| | | | | ~ = | | nor uncertainties. | |
| | Metric 23: | Explanation of Unexpected Outcomes | High | × 1 | 1 | Unexplained outcomes were reported and discussed for the other chemicals in this paper. No unex- plained outcomes were noted for TCE. | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | Continued on next page | | | | | |

... continued from previous page

| Study Citation: Data Type: Hero ID: | Schell, J. D. J., 1987. Other; Aquatic; Fish 3625489 | Interactions of Halogenated Hydroc | carbon Mixtu | res in th | e Embryo | of the Japanese Medaka (Oryzias latipes). |
|-------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|------------------------|----------|-------------------------------------------|
| Domain | | Metric | $\operatorname{Rating}^{\dagger}$ | MWF^{\star} | Score | $\mathrm{Comments}^{\dagger\dagger}$ |
| Overall Quality D | $Determination^{\ddagger}$ | | High | | 1.4 | |
| Extracted | | | Yes | | | |
| | | | | | | |

* MWF = Metric Weighting Factor

[†] High = 1; Medium = 2; Low = 3; Unacceptable = 4; N/A has no value.

[‡] The overall rating is calculated as necessary. EPA may not always provide a comment for a metric that has been categorized as High.

$$Overall rating = \begin{cases} 4 & \text{if any metric is Unacceptable} \\ \left| \sum_{i} (Metric Score_{i} \times MWF_{i}) / \sum_{j} MWF_{j} \right|_{0.1} & (round to the nearest tenth) otherwise \end{cases}$$

,

where High: ≥ 1 to < 1.7; Medium: ≥ 1.7 to < 2.3; Low: ≥ 2.3 to ≤ 3 . If the reviewer determines that the overall rating needs adjustment, the original rating is crossed out and an arrow points to the new rating.

| Study Citation: Data Type: | Toxicity of Acute (0-9 | S. J., Kahl, M. D., Elonen, G. E., Hamm Organic Chemical Mixtures to the Fatl 6 hour): Aquatic: Fish | head Minnow (Pimp | glund, M hales pro | . D 20 omelas). | 05. A Comparison of the Lethal and Sublethal 24:3117-3127 |
|-------------------------------|---------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------|--------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Hero ID: | 3665276 | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | | | | |
| Domain | | Metric | $\operatorname{Rating}^{\dagger}$ | MWF^{\star} | Score | $Comments^{\dagger\dagger}$ |
| Domain 1: Test | Substance | | | | | |
| | Metric 1: | Test Substance Identity | High | $\times 2$ | 2 | Chemical identified by name, trichloroethylene, and by CAS no. 79-01-6. |
| | Metric 2: | Test Substance Source | Medium | × 1 | 2 | Unclear where TCE specifically was from. Study reports, "Almost all test chemicals were purchased from Aldrich Chemical (Milwaukee, WI, USA), with only a few supplied by other commercial companies. Regardless of source, all chemicals were of a high level of purity (i.e., 95 percent or greater) and were not repurified before testing." |
| | Metric 3: | Test Substance Purity | Medium | × 1 | 2 | At least 95 percent purity but unclear what the purity of TCE is specifically. |
| Domain 2: Test | Design | | | | | |
| | Metric 4: | Negative Controls | Medium | $\times 2$ | 4 | Controls were used, and assume it was just a lake water control given the study says "no solvent car- riers were used and all toxicants were tested at con- centrations below their reported solubility." |
| | Metric 5: | Negative Control Response | Low | $\times 1$ | 3 | No response was reported for control |
| | Metric 6: | Randomized Allocation | Medium | × 1 | 2 | Concentrations were distributed randomly between the two diluters, and for the acute test it was not mentioned whether animals were distributed ran- domly amongst control groups, but study did report that procedures followed standard American Society for Testing and Materials experimental procedure and as described previously. For the chronic exper- iment, embryos were added five at a time into 56 different egg cups which then randomly were added to the treatment and control chambers so that each tank received one cup. |

_

Domain 3: Exposure Characterization

Continued on next page ...

| Study Citation: Data Type: Hero ID: | Broderius, S. J.,Kahl, M. D.,Elonen, G. E.,Hammermeister, D. E.,Hoglund, M. D 2005. A Comparison of the Lethal and Sublethal Toxicity of Organic Chemical Mixtures to the Fathead Minnow (Pimphales promelas). 24:3117-3127 Acute (0-96 hour); Aquatic; Fish 3665276 | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------|-------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|
| Domain | | Metric | $\operatorname{Rating}^{\dagger}$ | MWF^{\star} | Score | $\mathrm{Comments}^{\dagger\dagger}$ | |
| | Metric 7: | Experimental System/Test Media Prepara- tion | Medium | × 2 | 4 | Flow through test was conducted, which is better for volatile chemicals like TCE. It was not specifically noted whether the containers were covered and how much headspace was allowed, but the flow through nature of the test should help with keeping TCE conc consistent. Also measured concentrations were taken. | |
| | Metric 8: | Consistency of Exposure Administration | High | × 1 | 1 | Continuous flow through with a check for any spikes. See following description "To verify the accuracy of the method of analyses, known amounts of toxicant were added to control water so that toxicant con- centrations could be corrected routinely for spiked water recoveries. At least one spike sample was pre- pared for each sample set. A mean percent recov- ery of 90 to 110 percent usually was observed. All statistical/model analyses were based on measured concentrations." | |
| | Metric 9: | Measurement of Test Substance Concentra- tion | High | × 2 | 2 | "Methods of chemical analysis included high- pressure liquid chromatographywith ultraviolet or diode array/fluorescence detectors, and gasliquid chromatography with flame ionization or electron capture detectors. Samples of all test solutions were taken from the test chambers and toxicant mixing trays and analyzed according to a monitoring pro- gram that characterized the toxicant exposures. Du- plicate measurements were made routinely witheach analytical series to define the reproducibility (pre- cision) of the measurements. Percentage duplicate agreements usually were greater than 90 percent. To verify the accuracy of the method of analyses, known amounts of toxicant were added to control water so that toxicant concentrations could be corrected rou- tinely for spiked water recoveries. At least one spike samplewas prepared for each sample set. A mean percent recovery of 90 to 110 percent usually was observed. All statistical/model analyses were based on measured concentrations." | |
| | Metric 10: | Exposure Duration and Frequency | High | × 1 | 1 | Continuous exposure for 96 hours which is one rec- ommended option for the fish acute guidelines from OECD | |
| | Metric 11: | Number of Exposure Groups/Spacing of Exposure Levels | High | × 1 | 1 | Authors used 5 exposure groups, and at least 5 is recommended by OECD 203 test guidelines. | |
| | | Continued on next page | | | | | |

... continued from previous page

| Study Citation: Data Type: Hero ID: | Broderius, S. J.,Kahl, M. D.,Elonen, G. E.,Hammermeister, D. E.,Hoglund, M. D 2005. A Comparison of the Lethal and Sublethal Toxicity of Organic Chemical Mixtures to the Fathead Minnow (Pimphales promelas). 24:3117-3127 Acute (0-96 hour); Aquatic; Fish 3665276 | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|--------------------|---------------|-------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|
| Domain | | Metric | $Rating^{\dagger}$ | MWF^{\star} | Score | $\mathrm{Comments}^{\dagger\dagger}$ | |
| | Metric 12: | Testing at or Below Solubility Limit | High | $\times 1$ | 1 | TCE concentrations tested were below the solubility of TCE. | |
| Domain 4: Test (| Droanism | | | | | | |
| Domain 4. Test e | Metric 13: | Test Organism Characteristics | High | $\times 2$ | 2 | Fathead minnow are an acceptable test species ac- cording to OECD 203 test guidelines. | |
| | Metric 14: | Acclimitization and Pretreatment Conditions | High | × 1 | 1 | Acclimatization took place, and fish were cultured in the lab with appropriate temp for fathead minnow, and ph of 7.8 was within the range of OECD 203 test guidelines. Water hardness was also in the range of OECD 203 test guidelines. | |
| | Metric 15: | Number of Organisms and Replicates per Group | Low | × 1 | 3 | 7 fish are recommended per test conc. It is unclear how many fish were used in the acute test from the description in this paper, "The acute toxicity tests to determine 96-h LC50 values were conducted ac- cording to a standard American Society for Test- ing and Materials experimental procedure [28] and as describedpreviously [27]. By exposing groups of test organisms to a range of concentrations in con- tinuous flow-through systems for separate, binary, or equitoxic multiple chemical mixtures, the percentage mortality in 96-h was determined for numerous tests. Toxicity tests were conducted initially withindivid- ual toxicants and expanded subsequently to numer- ous binary test solutions and multiple toxicant mix- tures. All isoboles of acute joint toxic action were determined for the 96-h LC50 response level. A plot of 96-h LC50 values and 95 percent confidence limits was constructed as test data allowed for eachbinary mixture. | |
| | Metric 16: | Adequacy of Test Conditions | Medium | × 1 | 2 | Housing for the most part are acceptable, but test water was obtained from lake superior and under- went sand filtration. There could be other contam- inants in the water, however because controls were used, and chemicals measurement and analysis took place, only minor uncertainties regarding this detail. The appropriate temp for fathead minnow was used, and the ph of 7.8 within the range of OECD 203 test guidelines. Water hardness was also in the range of OECD 203 test guidelines. | |
| | | | | | | | |

167

Continued on next page ...

| Study Citation: | h: Broderius, S. J.,Kahl, M. D.,Elonen, G. E.,Hammermeister, D. E.,Hoglund, M. D 2005. A Comparison of the Lethal and Sublethal Toxicity of Organic Chemical Mixtures to the Fathead Minnow (Pimphales promelas). 24:3117-3127 | | | | | | |
|------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------|-------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|
| Data Type: Hero ID: | Acute (0-96 3665276 | hour); Aquatic; Fish | | 1 | , | | |
| Domain | | Metric | $\operatorname{Rating}^{\dagger}$ | MWF^{\star} | Score | $Comments^{\dagger\dagger}$ | |
| Domain 5: Outco | me Assessme | ent | | | | | |
| | Metric 17: | Outcome Assessment Methodology | High | $\times 2$ | 2 | LD50 was measured for acute toxicity. EC50 and EC20 were measured and determined for growth for chronic toxicity. | |
| | Metric 18: | Consistency of Outcome Assessment | High | $\times 1$ | 1 | Outcome assessment was consistent between study groups. | |
| Domain 6: Confo | unding / Var | iable Control | | | | | |
| | Metric 19: | Confounding Variables in Test Design and Procedures | High | $\times 2$ | 2 | No reported differences in study groups from envi- ronmental conditions of other factors that could in- fluence the outcome of assessment. | |
| | Metric 20: | Outcomes Unrelated to Exposure | Medium | $\times 1$ | 2 | Health outcomes were not reported for each study group | |
| Domain 7: Data | Presentation | and Analysis | | | | | |
| | Metric 21: | Statistical Methods | High | × 1 | 1 | In the 96-h toxicity tests, mortalities were recorded daily, and an estimate of the LC50 and its 95 percent confidence limits was determined by the trimmed Spearman-Karber method [32]. The 96-h LC50s from the binary mixtures were used to construct isobole diagrams of joint toxic action for the 50 per- cent3120 Environ. Toxicol. Chem. 24, 2005 S.J. Broderius et al. response level. The data on com- bined effects of binary mixtures were analyzed by comparison of the observed results with that ex- pected for the concentration- or response-addition models. | |
| | Metric 22: | Reporting of Data | Medium | $\times 2$ | 4 | Data were not reported for outcomes with negative findings, but tis is unlikely to have substantial im- pact on results. | |
| | Metric 23: | Explanation of Unexpected Outcomes | High | × 1 | 1 | There were no unexplained outcomes. | |
| Overall Quality I | Determination | 1 [‡] | High | | 1.5 | | |
| Extracted | | | Yes | | | | |
| | | Continued on next page | | | | | |

| Study Citation: | Broderius, S. J., Kahl, M. D., Elonen, G. E., Hammer | rmeister, D. E.,Hoglund, M. D 2005. A Con | mparison of the Lethal and Sublethal |
|-----------------|------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Data Type: | Acute (0-96 hour); Aquatic; Fish | ead Minnow (Pimphales prometas). 24:3117-3 | 5127 |
| Hero ID: | 3665276 | | |
| Domain | Metric | $Rating^{\dagger}$ MWF [*] Score | $\mathrm{Comments}^{\dagger\dagger}$ |

 \star MWF = Metric Weighting Factor

[†] High = 1; Medium = 2; Low = 3; Unacceptable = 4; N/A has no value.

[‡] The overall rating is calculated as necessary. EPA may not always provide a comment for a metric that has been categorized as High.

$$Overall rating = \begin{cases} 4 & \text{if any metric is Unacceptable} \\ \left\lfloor \sum_{i} (Metric \ Score_{i} \times MWF_{i}) / \sum_{j} MWF_{j} \right\rceil_{0,1} & (round to the nearest tenth) otherwise \end{cases}$$

,

where High: ≥ 1 to < 1.7; Medium: ≥ 1.7 to < 2.3; Low: ≥ 2.3 to ≤ 3 . If the reviewer determines that the overall rating needs adjustment, the original rating is crossed out and an arrow points to the new rating.

| Study Citation: Data Type: Hero ID: | Broderius, Toxicity of Chronic (> 3665276 | S. J.,Kahl, M. D.,Elonen, G. E.,Hamme Organic Chemical Mixtures to the Fath 21 days); Aquatic; Fish | ermeister, D. E.,Hog lead Minnow (Pimp | glund, M hales pro | . D 20 omelas). | 05. A Comparison of the Lethal and Sublethal 24:3117-3127 |
|-------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------|-----------------------|--------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Domain | | Metric | $Rating^{\dagger}$ | MWF* | Score | Comments ^{††} |
| Domain 1: Test S | Substance | | | | | |
| | Metric 1: | Test Substance Identity | High | $\times 2$ | 2 | Chemical identified by name, trichloroethylene, and by CAS no. 79-01-6. |
| | Metric 2: | Test Substance Source | Medium | × 1 | 2 | Unclear where TCE specifically was from. Study reports, "Almost all test chemicals were purchased from Aldrich Chemical (Milwaukee, WI, USA), with only a few supplied by other commercial companies. Regardless of source, all chemicals were of a high level of purity (i.e., 95 percent or greater) and were not repurified before testing." |
| | Metric 3: | Test Substance Purity | Medium | $\times 1$ | 2 | At least 95 percent purity but unclear what the purity of TCE is specifically. |
| Domain 2: Test 1 | Design | | | | | |
| | Metric 4: | Negative Controls | Medium | $\times 2$ | 4 | Controls were used, and assume it was just a lake water control given the study says "no solvent car- riers were used and all toxicants were tested at con- centrations below their reported solubility." |
| | Metric 5: | Negative Control Response | Low | $\times 1$ | 3 | No response was reported for control. |
| | Metric 6: | Randomized Allocation | High | × 1 | 1 | Concentrations were distributed randomly between the two diluters, and for the acute test it was not mentioned whether animals were distributed ran- domly amongst control groups, but study did report that procedures followed standard American Society for Testing and Materials experimental procedure and as described previously. For the chronic test, embryos were added five at a time into 56 different egg cups which then randomly were added to the treatment and control chambers so that each tank received one cup. |

_

Domain 3: Exposure Characterization

Continued on next page ...

| Study Citation: Data Type: Hero ID: | Broderius, S Toxicity of Chronic (> 3665276 | S. J.,Kahl, M. D.,Elonen, G. E.,Hammermeister Organic Chemical Mixtures to the Fathead Min 21 days); Aquatic; Fish | , D. E.,Hog now (Pimp | glund, M hales pro | . D 20 omelas). | 05. A Comparison of the Lethal and Sublethal 24:3117-3127 | |
|-------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------|--------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|
| Domain | | Metric | $\operatorname{Rating}^{\dagger}$ | MWF^{\star} | Score | $\mathrm{Comments}^{\dagger\dagger}$ | |
| | Metric 7: | Experimental System/Test Media Prepara- tion | Medium | × 2 | 4 | Flow through test was conducted, which is better for volatile chemicals like TCE. It was not specifically noted whether the containers were covered and how much headspace was allowed, but the flow through nature of the test should help with keeping TCE conc consistent. Also measured concentrations were taken. | |
| | Metric 8: | Consistency of Exposure Administration | High | × 1 | 1 | Continuous flow through with a check for any spikes. See following description "To verify the accuracy of the method of analyses, known amounts of toxicant were added to control water so that toxicant con- centrations could be corrected routinely for spiked water recoveries. At least one spike sample was pre- pared for each sample set. A mean percent recov- ery of 90 to 110 percent usually was observed. All statistical/model analyses were based on measured concentrations." | |
| | Metric 9: | Measurement of Test Substance Concentra- tion | High | × 2 | 2 | "Methods of chemical analysis included high- pressure liquid chromatographywith ultraviolet or diode array/fluorescence detectors, and gasliquid chromatography with flame ionization or electron capture detectors. Samples of all test solutions were taken from the test chambers and toxicant mixing trays and analyzed according to a monitoring pro- gram that characterized the toxicant exposures. Du- plicate measurements were made routinely witheach analytical series to define the reproducibility (pre- cision) of the measurements. Percentage duplicate agreements usually were greater than 90 percent. To verify the accuracy of the method of analyses, known amounts of toxicant were added to control water so that toxicant concentrations could be corrected rou- tinely for spiked water recoveries. At least one spike samplewas prepared for each sample set. A mean percent recovery of 90 to 110 percent usually was observed. All statistical/model analyses were based on measured concentrations." | |
| | Metric 10: | Exposure Duration and Frequency | High | $\times 1$ | 1 | Continuous exposure for 32 days which is one rec- ommended option for the fish acute guidelines from OECD 210 for fathead minnows | |
| | Metric 11: | Number of Exposure Groups/Spacing of Exposure Levels | High | $\times 1$ | 1 | 5 exposure groups. at least 5 is recommended by OECD 210 guidelines | |
| | Continued on next page | | | | | | |

| Study Citation: | Study Citation: Broderius, S. J., Kahl, M. D., Elonen, G. E., Hammermeister, D. E., Hoglund, M. D., 2005. A Comparison of the Lethal and Sublethal Toxicity of Organic Chemical Mixtures to the Fathead Minnow (Pimphales promelas). 24:3117-3127 | | | | | | | | |
|------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------|-------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|--|--|
| Data Type: Hero ID: | Chronic (>2 3665276 | Chronic (>21 days); Aquatic; Fish 3665276 | | | | | | | |
| Domain | | Metric | $\operatorname{Rating}^{\dagger}$ | MWF^{\star} | Score | $Comments^{\dagger\dagger}$ | | | |
| | Metric 12: | Testing at or Below Solubility Limit | High | $\times 1$ | 1 | TCE concentrations tested were below TCE's solubility. | | | |
| Domain 4: Test (| Organism | | | | | | | | |
| | Metric 13: | Test Organism Characteristics | High | $\times 2$ | 2 | Fathead minnow are an acceptable test species ac- cording to OECD 210 guidelines. | | | |
| | Metric 14: | Acclimitization and Pretreatment Conditions | High | × 1 | 1 | Acclimatization took place, and fish were cultured in the lab with appropriate temp for fathead minnow, and ph of 7.8 was within the range of OECD 210 guidelines. Water hardness was also in the range of OECD 210 guidelines. | | | |
| | Metric 15: | Number of Organisms and Replicates per Group | High | $\times 1$ | 1 | 80 embryos are recommended by OECD 210. This study did " 40 embryos were added to each of the replicated treatment levels and controls." There were at least two replicates. | | | |
| | Metric 16: | Adequacy of Test Conditions | Medium | × 1 | 2 | Housing for the most part are acceptable, but test water was obtained from lake superior and under- went sand filtration. There could be other contam- inants in the water, however because controls were used, and chemicals measurement and analysis took place, only minor uncertainties regarding this detail. The appropriate temp for fathead minnow was used, and the ph of 7.8 within the range of OECD 210 guidelines. Water hardness was also in the range of OECD 210 guidelines. | | | |
| Domain 5: Outco | mo Assessmo | nt | | | | | | | |
| Domain 5. Outco | Metric 17: | Outcome Assessment Methodology | High | $\times 2$ | 2 | EC50 and EC20 were measured and determined for growth for chronic toxicity. | | | |
| | Metric 18: | Consistency of Outcome Assessment | High | $\times 1$ | 1 | Outcome assessment was consistent between study groups. | | | |
| Domain 6: Confo | unding / Var | iable Control | | | | | | | |
| | Metric 19: | Confounding Variables in Test Design and Procedures | High | × 2 | 2 | No reported differences in study groups from envi- ronmental conditions of other factors that could in- fluence the outcome of assessment. | | | |
| | Continued on next page | | | | | | | | |

| Study Citation: Data Type: Hero ID: | Broderius, S Toxicity of Chronic (>: 3665276 | S. J.,Kahl, M. D.,Elonen, G. E.,Hammermeiste Organic Chemical Mixtures to the Fathead Mi 21 days); Aquatic; Fish | er, D. E.,Hog nnow (Pimp | glund, M hales pro | . D 20 omelas). | 05. A Comparison of the Lethal and Sublethal 24:3117-3127 |
|-------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------|--------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Domain | | Metric | $\operatorname{Rating}^{\dagger}$ | MWF^{\star} | Score | $Comments^{\dagger\dagger}$ |
| | Metric 20: | Outcomes Unrelated to Exposure | Medium | × 1 | 2 | Health outcomes were not reported for each study group, but this is unlikely to have substantial im- pacts on results. |
| Domain 7: Data | Domain 7: Data Presentation and Analysis | | | | | |

Continued on next page ...

... continued from previous page

| Study Citation: Data Type: Hero ID: | Broderius, S. J.,Kahl, M. D.,Elonen, G. E.,Hammermeister, D. E.,Hoglund, M. D 2005. A Comparison of the Lethal and Sublethal Toxicity of Organic Chemical Mixtures to the Fathead Minnow (Pimphales promelas). 24:3117-3127 Chronic (>21 days); Aquatic; Fish 3665276 | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------|-----------------------------------|------------------------|-------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|--|
| Domain | | Metric | $\operatorname{Rating}^{\dagger}$ | MWF^{\star} | Score | $\mathrm{Comments}^{\dagger\dagger}$ | | |
| | Metric 21: | Statistical Methods | Medium | × 1 | 2 | Only minor uncertainties in the method used to derive the EC values. The study says, "Growth (final wet wt) was selected as the graded sublethal response for the ELS studies because it represents an integrated activity of the whole organism. For the ELS tests, growth was defined as the wet weight of a fathead minnow at the end of a 32-d experiment. The concentrations that reduce the growth by 50 or 20 percent compared to the controls (i.e., EC50 and EC20 values) were calculated from a toxicity relationship analysis program developed by Erickson [34]. With this program, the effects of toxicants on wet weight of fathead minnows from early life-stage toxicity tests were analyzed by weighted leastsquares nonlinear regression analysis of the dependant variable (i.e., toxicant concentration). Three mathematical forms of the regression curves that were used are the logistic equation, piecewiselinear, and piecewisetailed regression. The regression using the logistic equation produces a sigmoid-shaped curve with infinite tails, a form similar to probit analysis. Piecewise linear regression produces an effects curve in which the effects variable is constant at a control value below a threshold until it reaches a value of zero at some finite exposure (EC100). The piecewise tailed regression provides a curve that is sigmoid shaped like the logistic equation, but has finite tails and, thus, a finite EC0 and EC100 like the piecewise linear regression. The wet weight of fathead minnows that survived from each individual ELS toxicity test was analyzed by these three regression models. The model that provided the best visual and statistical fit to the experimental data was used to define the test results. Usually that was the piecewise linear or piecewise tailed regression model. A logarithm exposure variable transformation was used in all regression analyses. The analysis provides final estimates for the regression parameters, their standard errors, and 95 percent confidence limits of the best estimate of mean effects. These E | | |

Continued on next page ...
| Study Citation: Data Type: | Broderius, S. J.,Kahl, M. D.,Elonen, G. E.,Hammermeister, D. E.,Hoglund, M. D 2005. A Comparison of the Lethal and Sublethal Toxicity of Organic Chemical Mixtures to the Fathead Minnow (Pimphales promelas). 24:3117-3127 Chronic (>21 days); Aquatic; Fish | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|------------------------|-------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|
| Hero ID: | 3003270 | | | | | | |
| Domain | | Metric | $\operatorname{Rating}^{\dagger}$ | MWF^{\star} | Score | $\mathrm{Comments}^{\dagger\dagger}$ | |
| | Metric 22: | Reporting of Data | Medium | $\times 2$ | 4 | Data were not reported for outcomes with negative findings, but this is unlikely to have a substantial impact on results. | |
| | Metric 23: | Explanation of Unexpected Outcomes | High | $\times 1$ | 1 | No unexpected outcomes reported. | |
| Overall Quality Determination [‡] | | High | | 1.4 | | | |
| Extracted | | | Yes | | | | |

... continued from previous page

* MWF = Metric Weighting Factor

[†] High = 1; Medium = 2; Low = 3; Unacceptable = 4; N/A has no value.

[‡] The overall rating is calculated as necessary. EPA may not always provide a comment for a metric that has been categorized as High.

 $Overall rating = \begin{cases} 4 & \text{if any metric is Unacceptable} \\ \\ \left[\sum_{i} \left(\text{Metric Score}_{i} \times \text{MWF}_{i} \right) / \sum_{j} \text{MWF}_{j} \right]_{0,1} & \text{(round to the nearest tenth) otherwise} \end{cases},$

where High: ≥ 1 to < 1.7; Medium: ≥ 1.7 to < 2.3; Low: ≥ 2.3 to ≤ 3 . If the reviewer determines that the overall rating needs adjustment, the original rating is crossed out and an arrow points to the new rating.

^{††} Metrics that are rated 'High' met the criteria for high confidence as expected for this type of study, and may not require additional comments.

| Domain Metric Rating! MWF* Score Comments ^{+†} Domain 1: Test Substance Metric 1: Metric 2: Test Substance Source High × 2 2 Trichloroethylene identified by name Metric 2: Metric 3: Test Substance Source High × 1 1 Altrich chemical co Metric 3: Test Substance Purity High × 1 1 98 percent purity - lot number 041557 Domain 2: Test Substance Controls Medium × 2 4 a solvent and negative control were used, but it did not say what the solvent was. Metric 5: Negative Control Response Unacceptable × 1 4 Biological response on fegative control and solvent control Metric 6: Randomized Allocation High × 1 1 1 Domain 3: Exposure Characterization Low × 2 6 test was conducted in a closed system. Dissolved O, temperature, and pH were measured throughout the exponient. However despite efforts to produce a closed system, volatilization of the chemical do the reliability and 48 howr. Metric 8: Consistency of Exposure Administration High × 1 1 No differences were reported. <th>Study Citation: Data Type: Hero ID:</th> <th>Leblanc, G. Chronic (> 3683110</th> <th>A.,Surprenant, D. C., 1980. The Chronic Toxic 21 days); Aquatic; Invertebrates</th> <th>city of 8 of the 6</th> <th>5 Priorit</th> <th>y Pollut</th> <th>ants to the Water Flea (Daphnia magna).</th> | Study Citation: Data Type: Hero ID: | Leblanc, G. Chronic (> 3683110 | A.,Surprenant, D. C., 1980. The Chronic Toxic 21 days); Aquatic; Invertebrates | city of 8 of the 6 | 5 Priorit | y Pollut | ants to the Water Flea (Daphnia magna). |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------|----------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Jonain 1: Test Substance Metric 1: Test Substance Identity High × 2 2 Trichloroethylene identified by name Metric 2: Test Substance Source High × 1 1 Natrich chamical co Metric 3: Test Substance Purity High × 1 1 98 percent purity - lot number 041557 Jonain 2: Test Substance Controls Medium × 2 4 a solvent and negative control were used, but it did not say what the solvent was. Jonain 3: Negative Control Response Unacceptable × 1 4 Biological response of negative control and solvent control was reported, but there was only 50 percent or the results of this study are uncereptable. Metric 6: Randomized Allocation High × 1 1 1 Netric 7: Experimental System/Test Media Preparation Low × 2 6 test was conducted in a closed system. Dissolved O, temperature, and pH were measured throughout the chemical or the steriod show show mapid volatilization of the volatile chemical add cort. Becaus TCE is a volatile chemical or the set media within 24 and 84 hours. Metric 8: Consistency of Exposure Administration the chemical for the set media within 24 and 84 hours. Low × 2 6 test was conducted in a closed system. Dioland closed system, volatile chemical on ther | Domain | | Metric | $\operatorname{Rating}^{\dagger}$ | MWF^{\star} | Score | $Comments^{\dagger\dagger}$ |
| Metric 1: Test Substance Identity High × 2 2 Trichloroethylene identified by name Metric 2: Test Substance Purity High × 1 1 Aldrich chemical co Metric 3: Test Substance Purity High × 1 1 Aldrich chemical co Momain 2: Test Substance Purity High × 1 1 98 percent purity - lot number 041557 Momain 2: Test Substance Purity Metric 4: Negative Controls Medium × 2 4 a solvent and negative control were used, but it did not say what the solvent was. Metric 5: Negative Control Response Unacceptable × 1 4 Biological response of negative and solvent control was reported, but there was only 50 percent and 57 percent survival of negative and solvent control was reported, but there was only 50 percent survival of negative and solvent control was reported, but there was only 50 percent survival of the study are unacceptable. Metric 6: Randomized Allocation High × 1 1 Domain 3: Exposure Characterization Low × 2 6 test was conducted in a closed system. Dissolved O, temperature, and pH were measured throughout the experiment. However despite efforts to produce a closed system, volatilization of the conditic ehemical other studies have shown rapid volatilization o | Domain 1: Test S | Substance | | | | | |
| Metric 2: Test Substance Source High × 1 1 Aldrich chemical co Metric 3: Test Substance Purity High × 1 1 98 percent purity - lot number 041557 Jomain 2: Test Design Metric 4: Negative Controls Medium × 2 4 a solvent and negative control were used, but it did not say what the solvent was. Metric 5: Negative Control Response Unacceptable × 1 4 Biological response of negative control and solvent control and solvent control and solvent control and solvent control and repative and solvent control and solvent control and solvent control and solvent control and percent survival of negative control and solvent contrel control and solvent contrel control and solv | | Metric 1: | Test Substance Identity | High | $\times 2$ | 2 | Trichloroethylene identified by name |
| Metric 3: Test Substance Purity High × 1 1 98 percent purity - lot number 041557 Domain 2: Test Design Metric 4: Negative Controls Medium × 2 4 a solvent and negative control were used, but it did not say what the solvent was. Metric 5: Negative Control Response Unacceptable × 1 4 Biological response of negative control and solvent control was reported, but there was only 50 percent and of negative and solvent control was reported, but there was only 50 percent and negative control and solvent control was reported, but there was only 50 percent and negative control and solvent control was reported, but there was only 50 percent and negative control and solvent control was reported, but there was only 50 percent and negative control and solvent control was reported, but there was only 50 percent and negative control and solvent control was reported, but there was only 50 percent and negative control and solvent control was reported, but there was only 50 percent and negative control and solvent control was reported, but there was only 50 percent and negative control was reported, but there was only 50 percent and negative. Metric 6: Randomized Allocation High × 1 1 Domain 3: Exposure Characterization Low × 2 6 test was conducted in a closed system. Dissolved 0, temperature, and pl were measured throughout the coperiment. However despite efforts to produce a closed system, volatilization of other robalic charming solvent controls was reported. Metric 8: Consistency of Exposure Administration High | | Metric 2: | Test Substance Source | High | $\times 1$ | 1 | Aldrich chemical co |
| Momain 2: Test Design Metric 4: Negative Controls Medium × 2 4 a solvent and negative control were used, but it did not say what the solvent was. Metric 5: Negative Control Response Unacceptable × 1 4 Biological response of negative control and solvent control. There fore the results of this study are unacceptable. Metric 6: Randomized Allocation High × 1 1 Domain 3: Exposure Characterization Low × 2 6 test was conducted in a closed system. Dissolved O, temperature, and pH were measured throughout the experiment. However despite efforts to produce a closed system, voltalization of the voltalize chemical other voltalize chemical and therefore relied on nominal concentration where were therefore relied on nominal concentration Metric 8: Consistency of Exposure Administration High × 1 1 No differences were unable to reliably measure the chemical and therefore reliad on nominal concentration for the show ratio of the chemical and therefore relied on nominal concentration fore traits on the experiment of Test Substance | | Metric 3: | Test Substance Purity | High | $\times 1$ | 1 | 98 percent purity - lot number 041557 |
| Metric 4: Negative Controls Medium × 2 4 a solvent and negative control were used, but it did not say what the solvent was. Metric 5: Negative Control Response Unacceptable × 1 4 Biological response of negative control and solvent control. There fore the results of this study are unacceptable. Metric 6: Randomized Allocation High × 1 1 Jomain 3: Exposure Characterization Low × 2 6 test was conducted in a closed system. Dissolved O, temperature, and pH were measured throughout the experiment. However despite efforts to produce a closed system, volatilization of other volatile chemical ion Metric 8: Consistency of Exposure Administration High × 1 1 Metric 9: Measurement of Test Substance Concentration Low × 2 6 test was conducted in newsure TE concentrations of this chronic test. Metric 10: Exposure Duration and Frequency Low × 1 1 No differences were reported. Metric 11: Number of Exposure Groups/Spacing of Exposure Groups/Spacing of Exposure Groups/Spacing of Exposure Levels 1 Daphnids were exposed to five concentrations of each compound, and concentrations were determined by doing an acute range finding test. | Domain 2: Test l | Design | | | | | |
| Metric 5: Negative Control Response Unacceptable × 1 4 Biological response of negative control and solvent control vars reported, but there was only 50 percent and 57 percent survival of negative and solvent control. There fore the results of this study are unacceptable. Metric 6: Randomized Allocation High × 1 1 Domain 3: Exposure Characterization Low × 2 6 test was conducted in a closed system. Dissolved On temperature, and pH were measured throughout the experiment. However despite efforts to produce a closed system, volatilization of the robulate chemical sold occur. Because TCE is a volatile chemical other studies have shown rapid volatilization of the robulation of the robulate ones user TE is a volatile chemical sold occur. Because TCE is a volatile chemical other studies have shown rapid volatilization of the chemical and therefore relied on nominal concentrations. Metric 9: Measurement of Test Substance Concentration Low × 1 1 No differences were reported. Metric 10: Exposure Duration and Frequency Low × 1 3 duration is good at 21 days which is recommended in OECD 211, however it is unclear how often the test concis renewed, which could have substantial results on the experiment given that this chemical is highly volatile. Metric 11: Number of Exposure Groups/Spacing of Exposure Groups/Spacing of Exposure Levels High × 1 1 Daphnidiwer exposed to five concentrations of each compound, and concentrations were deter | | Metric 4: | Negative Controls | Medium | $\times 2$ | 4 | a solvent and negative control were used, but it did not say what the solvent was. |
| Metric 6: Randomized Allocation High × 1 1 Domain 3: Exposure Characterization Metric 7: Experimental System/Test Media Prepara- tion Low × 2 6 test was conducted in a closed system. Dissolved O, temperature, and pH were measured throughout the experiment. However despite efforts to produce an closed system, volatilization of other volatile chemical did occur. Because TCE is a volatile chemical other studies have shown rapid volatilization of the studies have show | | Metric 5: | Negative Control Response | Unacceptable | × 1 | 4 | Biological response of negative control and solvent control was reported, but there was only 50 percent and 57 percent survival of negative and solvent con- trol. There fore the results of this study are unac- ceptable. |
| Domain 3: Exposure Characterization Metric 7: Experimental System/Test Media Prepara- tion Low × 2 6 test was conducted in a closed system. Dissolved O, temperature, and pH were measured throughout the experiment. However despite efforts to produce a closed system, volatilization of other volatilic chem- icals did occur. Because TCE is a volatile chem- tions for the schoric set. Metric 10: Metric 10: Exposure Duration and Frequency Low × 1 3 duration is good at 21 days which is recommended in OECD 211, however it is unclear how often the test con is renewed, which could have substantial results on the experiment given that this chemical is highly volatile. Metric 11: Number of Exposure Groups/Spacing of Ex- posure Levels High × 1 1 Daphnids were exposed to five concentrations of each compound, and concentrations were determined | | Metric 6: | Randomized Allocation | High | $\times 1$ | 1 | • |
| Metric 7: Experimental System/Test Media Prepara- tion Low × 2 6 test was conducted in a closed system. Dissolved O, temperature, and pH were measured throughout the experiment. However despite efforts to produce a closed system, volatilization of other volatile chem- icals did occur. Because TCE is a volatile chemical other studies have shown rapid volatilization of the chemical from test media within 24 and 48 hours. Metric 8: Consistency of Exposure Administration High × 1 1 No differences were reported. Metric 9: Measurement of Test Substance Concentra- tion Low × 2 6 While it was attempted to measure TE concentra- tions authors were unable to reliably measure the chemical and therefore relied on nominal concentra- tions for this chronic test. Metric 10: Exposure Duration and Frequency Low × 1 3 duration is good at 21 days which is recommended in OECD 211, however it is unclear how often the test conc is renewed, which could have substantial results on the experiment given that this chemical is highly volatile. Metric 11: Number of Exposure Groups/Spacing of Ex- posure Levels High × 1 1 Daphnids were exposed to five concentrations of each compound, and concentrations were determined by doing an acute range finding test. | Domain 2. Euro | cura Chanasta | nization | | | | |
| Metric 8: Consistency of Exposure Administration High × 1 1 No differences were reported. Metric 9: Measurement of Test Substance Concentration Low × 2 6 While it was attempted to measure TE concentrations authors were unable to reliably measure the chemical and therefore relied on nominal concentrations for this chronic test. Metric 10: Exposure Duration and Frequency Low × 1 3 duration is good at 21 days which is recommended in OECD 211, however it is unclear how often the test conc is renewed, which could have substantial results on the experiment given that this chemical is highly volatile. Metric 11: Number of Exposure Groups/Spacing of Exposure Levels High × 1 1 Daphnids were exposed to five concentrations of each compound, and concentrations were determined by doing an acute range finding test. | Domain 3: Expos | Metric 7: | Experimental System/Test Media Prepara- tion | Low | × 2 | 6 | test was conducted in a closed system. Dissolved O, temperature, and pH were measured throughout the experiment. However despite efforts to produce a closed system, volatilization of other volatile chem- icals did occur. Because TCE is a volatile chemical other studies have shown rapid volatilization of the chemical from test media within 24 and 48 hours. |
| Metric 9: Measurement of Test Substance Concentra- tion Low × 2 6 While it was attempted to measure TE concentra- tions authors were unable to reliably measure the chemical and therefore relied on nominal concentra- tions for this chronic test. Metric 10: Exposure Duration and Frequency Low × 1 3 duration is good at 21 days which is recommended in OECD 211, however it is unclear how often the test conc is renewed, which could have substantial results on the experiment given that this chemical is highly volatile. Metric 11: Number of Exposure Groups/Spacing of Ex- posure Levels High × 1 1 Daphnids were exposed to five concentrations of each compound, and concentrations were determined by doing an acute range finding test. | | Metric 8: | Consistency of Exposure Administration | High | $\times 1$ | 1 | No differences were reported. |
| Metric 10: Exposure Duration and Frequency Low × 1 3 duration is good at 21 days which is recommended in OECD 211, however it is unclear how often the test conc is renewed, which could have substantial results on the experiment given that this chemical is highly volatile. Metric 11: Number of Exposure Groups/Spacing of Exposure Groups/Spacing of Exposure Levels High × 1 1 Daphnids were exposed to five concentrations of each compound, and concentrations were determined by doing an acute range finding test. | | Metric 9: | Measurement of Test Substance Concentra- tion | Low | $\times 2$ | 6 | While it was attempted to measure TE concentra- tions authors were unable to reliably measure the chemical and therefore relied on nominal concentra- tions for this chronic test. |
| Metric 11: Number of Exposure Groups/Spacing of Ex-High × 1 1 Daphnids were exposed to five concentrations of each compound, and concentrations were determined by doing an acute range finding test. | | Metric 10: | Exposure Duration and Frequency | Low | $\times 1$ | 3 | duration is good at 21 days which is recommended in OECD 211, however it is unclear how often the test conc is renewed, which could have substantial results on the experiment given that this chemical is highly volatile. |
| Continued on next page | | Metric 11: | Number of Exposure Groups/Spacing of Exposure Levels | High | $\times 1$ | 1 | Daphnids were exposed to five concentrations of each compound, and concentrations were determined by doing an acute range finding test. |
| i ii | | | Continued on next page | | | | |

| Study Citation: Data Type: Hero ID: | Leblanc, G. Chronic (>3 3683110 | A.,Surprenant, D. C., 1980. The Chronic Toxi 21 days); Aquatic; Invertebrates | city of 8 of the 6 | 5 Priorit | y Pollut | ants to the Water Flea (Daphnia magna). |
|-------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------|------------------------|----------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Domain | | Metric | $\operatorname{Rating}^\dagger$ | MWF^{\star} | Score | $Comments^{\dagger\dagger}$ |
| | Metric 12: | Testing at or Below Solubility Limit | High | $\times 1$ | 1 | conc were below solubility level. |
| Domain 4: Test (| Organism | | | | | |
| Domain 1, 1000 | Metric 13: | Test Organism Characteristics | High | $\times 2$ | 2 | daphnia magna |
| | Metric 14: | Acclimitization and Pretreatment Conditions | N/A | ~ - | N/A | dupining mogna |
| | Metric 15: | Number of Organisms and Replicates per | High | × 1 | 1 | 10 daphnia per container and done in triplicate |
| | | Group | 8 | – | _ | |
| | Metric 16: | Adequacy of Test Conditions | Unacceptable | × 1 | 4 | it appears the closed nature and no cleaning of the system during the experiment produced bacteria and algae growth that affected the health of the daphnia in both controls between day 15 and 21. |
| Domain 5: Outco | me Assessme | sont | | | | |
| Domain 9. Outer | Metric 17. | Outcome Assessment Methodology | High | × 2 | 2 | |
| | Metric 18: | Consistency of Outcome Assessment | High | × 1 | 1 | |
| | | | 111.9.11 | <u> </u> | - | |
| Domain 6: Confe | ounding / Var | iable Control | | | | |
| | Metric 19: | Confounding Variables in Test Design and Procedures | High | $\times 2$ | 2 | no reported differences among the study groups in environmental conditions or other factors that could influence the outcome of the assessment. |
| | Metric 20: | Outcomes Unrelated to Exposure | Unacceptable | $\times 1$ | 4 | controls had very low survival rate of 50 percent and 57 percent |
| Domain 7. Data | Presentation | and Analysis | | | | |
| Domain 1. Data | Metric 21: | Statistical Methods | N/A | | N/A | not applicable because a chronic toxicity endpoint was not determined |
| | Metric 22: | Reporting of Data | High | $\times 2$ | 2 | results were reported for each exposure group |
| | Metric 23: | Explanation of Unexpected Outcomes | High | $\times 1$ | 1 | unexpected outcomes were discussed, e.g. the high rate of mortality in controls and the growth of bac- teria and algae. |
| Overall Quality I | Determinatior | 1 [‡] | Unacceptable | | 4.0 | |
| Extracted | | | No | | | |
| Continued on next page | | | | | | |

... continued from previous page

... continued from previous page

| Study Citation: Data Type: Hero ID: | Leblanc, G. A., Surprenant, D. C., 1980. The Chronic T Chronic (>21 days); Aquatic; Invertebrates 3683110 | loxicity of 8 of the 6 | 5 Priority Pollutants | to the Water Flea (Daphnia magna). |
|-------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Domain | Metric | $Rating^{\dagger}$ | MWF [*] Score | $Comments^{\dagger\dagger}$ |

** Consistent with our Application of Systematic Review in TSCARisk Evaluations document, if a metric for a data source receives a score of Unacceptable (score = 4), EPA will determine the study to be unacceptable. In this case, three of the metrics were rated as unacceptable. As such, the study is considered unacceptable and the score is presented solely to increase transparency.

* MWF = Metric Weighting Factor

[†] High = 1; Medium = 2; Low = 3; Unacceptable = 4; N/A has no value.

[‡] The overall rating is calculated as necessary. EPA may not always provide a comment for a metric that has been categorized as High.

$$\text{Overall rating} = \begin{cases} 4 \\ \left\lfloor \sum_{i} \left(\text{Metric Score}_{i} \times \text{MWF}_{i} \right) / \sum_{j} \text{MWF}_{j} \right\rceil_{0.} \end{cases}$$

if any metric is Unacceptable

(round to the nearest tenth) otherwise

where High: ≥ 1 to < 1.7; Medium: ≥ 1.7 to < 2.3; Low: ≥ 2.3 to ≤ 3 . If the reviewer determines that the overall rating needs adjustment, the original rating is crossed out and an arrow points to the new rating.

^{††} Metrics that are rated 'High' met the criteria for high confidence as expected for this type of study, and may not require additional comments.