EPA/635/R-09/011F
www.epa.gov/iris

TOXICOLOGICAL REVIEW

OF

TRICHLOROETHYLENE

APPENDICES

(CAS No. 79-01-6)

In Support of Summary Information on the Integrated Risk Information System (IRIS)

September 2011

CONTENTS of TOXICOLOGICAL REVIEW for TRICHLOROETHYLENE
Appendices
(CAS No. 79-01-6)

TOXICOLOGICAL REVIEW OF TRICHLOROETHYLENE APPENDICES i
CONTENTS of TOXICOLOGICAL REVIEW for TRICHLOROETHYLENE
Appendices ii
LIST OF TABLES xiii
LIST OF FIGURES xviii
A. PBPK MODELING OF TCE AND METABOLITES—DETAILED METHODS AND RESULTS A-1
A.1. THE HIERARCHICAL BAYESIAN APPROACH TO CHARACTERIZING PBPK MODEL UNCERTAINTY AND VARIABILITY A-1
A.2. EVALUATION OF THE HACK ET AL. (2006) PBPK MODEL A-4
A.2.1. Convergence A-4
A.2.2. Evaluation of Posterior Distributions for Population Parameters A-5
A.2.3. Comparison of Model Predictions With Data A-7
A.2.3.1. Mouse Model A-8
A.2.3.2. Rat Model A-15
A.2.3.3. Human Model A-23
A.3. PRELIMINARY ANALYSIS OF MOUSE GAS UPTAKE DATA: MOTIVATION FOR MODIFICATION OF RESPIRATORY METABOLISM A-32
A.4. DETAILS OF THE UPDATED PBPK MODEL FOR TCE AND ITS METABOLITES A-38
A.4.1. PBPK Model Structure and Equations A-38
A.4.1.1. TCE Submodel A-50
A.4.1.2. TCOH Submodel A-55
A.4.1.3. TCOG Submodel A-57
A.4.1.4. TCA Submodel A-59
A.4.1.5. GSH Conjugation Submodel A-63
A.4.2. Model Parameters and Baseline Values A-64
A.4.3. Statistical Distributions for Parameter Uncertainty and Variability A-64
A.4.3.1. Initial Prior Uncertainty in Population Mean Parameters A-64
A.4.3.2. Interspecies Scaling to Update Selected Prior Distributions in the Rat and Human A-64
A.4.3.3. Population Variance: Prior Central Estimates and Uncertainty A-75
A.4.3.4. Likelihood Function and Prior distributions for Residual Error Estimates A-78
A.4.4. Summary of Bayesian Posterior Distribution Function A-81
A.5. RESULTS OF UPDATED PBPK MODEL A-82
A.5.1. Convergence and Posterior Distributions of Sampled Parameters A-82
A.5.2. Comparison of Model Predictions with Data A-115
A.5.2.1. Mouse Data and Model Predictions A-116
A.5.2.2. Rat Data and Model Predictions A-126

A.5.2.3. Human Data and Model Predictions A-140
A.6. EVALUATION OF RECENTLY PUBLISHED TOXICOKINETIC DATA A-174
A.6.1. TCE Metabolite Toxicokinetics in Mice: Kim et al. (2009) A-175
A.6.2. TCE Toxicokinetics in Rats: Liu et al. (2009) A-179
A.6.3. TCA Toxicokinetics in Mice and Rats: Mahle et al. (1999) and Green (2003a, 2003b) A-180
A.6.3.1. Analysis Using Evans et al. (2009) and Chiu et al. (2009) PBPK Model A-181
A.6.3.2. Summary of Results From Chiu of Bayesian Updating of Evans et al. (2009) and Chiu et al. (2009) Model Using TCA Drinking Water Data A-182
A.7. UPDATED PBPK MODEL CODE A-190
B. SYSTEMATIC REVIEW OF EPIDEMIOLOGIC STUDIES ON CANCER AND TCE EXPOSURE B-1
B.1. INTRODUCTION B-1
B.2. METHODOLOGIC REVIEW OF EPIDEMIOLOGIC STUDIES ON CANCER AND TCE B-1
B.2.1. Study Designs and Characteristics B-25
B.2.2. Outcomes Assessed in TCE Epidemiologic Studies B-27
B.2.3. Disease Classifications Adopted in TCE Epidemiologic Studies B-28
B.2.4. Exposure Classification B-30
B.2.5. Follow-up in TCE Cohort Studies B-32
B.2.6. Interview Approaches in Case-Control Studies of Cancer and TCE Exposure B-33
B.2.7. Sample Size and Approximate Statistical Power B-35
B.2.8. Statistical Analysis and Result Documentation B-42
B.2.9. Systematic Review for Identifying Cancer Hazards and TCE Exposure B-45
B.2.9.1. Cohort Studies B-46
B.2.9.2. Case-Control Studies B-49
B.2.9.3. Geographic-Based Studies B-53
B.2.9.4. Recommendation of Studies for Treatment Using Meta-Analysis Approaches B-53
B.3. INDIVIDUAL STUDY REVIEWS AND ABSTRACTS B-56
B.3.1. Cohort Studies B-56
B.3.1.1. Studies of Aerospace Workers B-56
B.3.1.2. Cancer Incidence Studies Using Biological Monitoring Databases B-93
B.3.1.3. Studies in the Taoyuan Region of Taiwan B-104
B.3.1.4. Studies of Other Cohorts B-116
B.3.2. Case-Control Studies B-160
B.3.2.1. Bladder Cancer Case-Control Studies B-160
B.3.2.2. CNS Cancers Case-Control Studies B-168
B.3.2.3. Colon and Rectal Cancers Case-Control Studies B-176
B.3.2.4. Esophageal Cancer Case-Control Studies B-188
B.3.2.5. Liver Cancer Case-Control Studies B-192

B.3.2.6. Lymphoma Case-Control Studies B-196
B.3.2.7. Childhood Leukemia B-235
B.3.2.8. Melanoma Case-Control Studies B-250
B.3.2.9. Pancreatic Cancer Case-Control Studies B-254
B.3.2.10. Prostatic Cancer Case-Control Studies B-258
B.3.2.11. RCC Case-Control Studies—Arnsberg Region of Germany B-262
B.3.2.12. RCC Case-Control Studies—Arve Valley Region of France B-274
B.3.2.13. RCC Case-Control Studies in Other Regions B-282
B.3.2.14. Other Cancer Site Case-Control Studies B-296
B.3.3. Geographic-Based Studies B-300
B.3.3.1. Coyle et al. (2005) B-300
B.3.3.2. Morgan and Cassady (2002) B-304
B.3.3.3. Cohn et al. (1994b) B-308
B.3.3.4. Vartiainen et al. (1993) B-312
B.3.3.5. Mallin (1990) B-315
B.3.3.6. Isacson et al. (1985) B-319
B.3.3.7. Studies in the Endicott Area of New York B-323
B.3.3.8. Studies in Arizona B-333
C. META-ANALYSIS OF CANCER RESULTS FROM EPIDEMIOLOGICAL STUDIES C-1
C.1. METHODOLOGY C-1
C.2. META-ANALYSIS FOR NHL C-5
C.2.1. Overall Effect of TCE Exposure C-5
C.2.1.1. Selection of RR Estimates C-5
C.2.1.2. Results of Meta-Analyses C-10
C.2.2. NHL Effect in the Highest Exposure Groups C-17
C.2.2.1. Selection of RR Estimates C-17
C.2.2.2. Results of Meta-Analyses C-22
C.2.3. Discussion of NHL Meta-Analysis Results C-25
C.3. META-ANALYSIS FOR KIDNEY CANCER C-28
C.3.1. Overall Effect of TCE Exposure C-28
C.3.1.1. Selection of RR Estimates C-28
C.3.1.2. Results of Meta-Analyses C-34
C.3.2. Kidney Cancer Effect in the Highest Exposure Groups C-38
C.3.2.1. Selection of RR Estimates C-38
C.3.2.2. Results of Meta-Analyses C-43
C.3.3. Discussion of Kidney Cancer Meta-Analysis Results C-46
C.4. META-ANALYSIS FOR LIVER CANCER C-49
C.4.1. Overall Effect of TCE Exposure C-49
C.4.1.1. Selection of RR Estimates C-49
C.4.1.2. Results of Meta-Analyses C-53
C.4.2. Liver Cancer Effect in the Highest Exposure Groups C-57
C.4.2.1. Selection of RR Estimates C-57
C.4.2.2. Results of Meta-Analyses C-60
C.4.3. Discussion of Liver Cancer Meta-Analysis Results C-62
C.5. META-ANALYSIS FOR LUNG CANCER C-63

C.5.1. Overall Effect of TCE Exposure....C-63
C.5.1.1. Selection of RR Estimates....C-63
C.5.1.2. Results of Meta-Analyses....C-66
C.5.2. Lung Cancer Effect in the Highest Exposure Groups....C-70
C.5.2.1. Selection of RR Estimates....C-70
C.5.2.2. Results of Meta-Analyses....C-73
C.5.3. Discussion of Lung Cancer Meta-Analysis Results....C-74
C.6. DISCUSSION OF STRENGTHS, LIMITATIONS, AND UNCERTAINTIES IN THE META-ANALYSES....C-76
C.7. CONCLUSIONS....C-78
D. NEUROLOGICAL EFFECTS OF TCE....D-1
D.1. HUMAN STUDIES ON THE NEUROLOGICAL EFFECTS OF TCE....D-1
D.1.1. Changes in Nerve Conduction....D-1
D.1.1.1. Blink Reflex and Masseter Reflex Studies—Trigeminal Nerve....D-1
D.1.1.2. TSEP Studies—Trigeminal Nerve....D-6
D.1.1.3. Nerve Conduction Velocity Studies....D-8
D.1.2. Auditory Effects....D-9
D.1.3. Vestibular Effects....D-12
D.1.4. Visual Effects....D-15
D.1.5. Cognition....D-17
D.1.6. Psychomotor Effects....D-21
D.1.6.1. RT....D-21
D.1.6.2. Muscular Dyscoordination....D-25
D.1.7. Summary Tables....D-27
D.2. CNS TOXICITY IN ANIMAL STUDIES FOLLOWING TCE EXPOSURE....D-84
D.2.1. Alterations in Nerve Conduction....D-84
D.2.2. Auditory Effects....D-85
D.2.2.1. Inhalation....D-85
D.2.2.2. Oral and Injection Studies....D-89
D.2.3. Vestibular System Studies....D-89
D.2.4. Visual Effects....D-90
D.2.5. Cognitive Function....D-91
D.2.6. Psychomotor Effects....D-92
D.2.6.1. Loss of Righting Reflex....D-93
D.2.6.2. FOB and Locomotor Activity Studies....D-93
D.2.6.3. Locomotor Activity....D-96
D.2.7. Sleep and Mood Disorders....D-97
D.2.7.1. Effects on Mood: Laboratory Animal Findings....D-97
D.2.7.2. Sleep Disturbances....D-97
D.2.8. Mechanistic Studies....D-97
D.2.8.1. Dopaminergic Neurons....D-97
D.2.8.2. GABA and Glutamatergic Neurons....D-98
D.2.8.3. Demyelination Following TCE Exposure....D-100
D.2.9. Summary Tables....D-102

E. ANALYSIS OF LIVER AND CO-EXPOSURE ISSUES FOR THE TCE TOXICOLOGICAL REVIEW E-1

E.1. BASIC PHYSIOLOGY AND FUNCTION OF THE LIVER—A STORY OF HETEROGENEITY E-1

E.1.1. Heterogeneity of Hepatocytes and Zonal Differences in Function and Ploidy E-1
E.1.2. Effects of Environment and Age: Variability of Response E-7

E.2. CHARACTERIZATION OF HAZARD FROM TCE STUDIES E-10

E.2.1. Acute Toxicity Studies E-10
E.2.1.1. Soni et al. (1998) E-11
E.2.1.2. Soni et al. (1999) E-13
E.2.1.3. Okino et al. (1991) E-14
E.2.1.4. Nunes et al. (2001) E-15
E.2.1.5. Tao et al. (2000) E-16
E.2.1.6. Tucker et al. (1982) E-16
E.2.1.7. Goldsworthy and Popp (1987) E-18
E.2.1.8. Elcombe et al. (1985) E-19
E.2.1.9. Dees and Travis (1993) E-31
E.2.1.10. Nakajima et al. (2000) E-35
E.2.1.11. Berman et al. (1995) E-38
E.2.1.12. Melnick et al. (1987) E-39
E.2.1.13. Laughter et al. (2004) E-42
E.2.1.14. Ramdhan et al. (2008) E-46
E.2.1.15. Ramdhan et al. (2010) E-53
E.2.2. Subchronic and Chronic Studies of TCE E-57
E.2.2.1. Merrick et al. (1989) E-58
E.2.2.2. Goel et al. (1992) E-62
E.2.2.3. Kjellstrand et al. (1981b) E-63
E.2.2.4. Woolhiser et al. (2006) E-67
E.2.2.5. Kjellstrand et al. (1983b) E-68
E.2.2.6. Kjellstrand et al. (1983a) E-72
E.2.2.7. Buben and O'Flaherty (1985) E-76
E.2.2.8. Channel et al. (1998) E-79
E.2.2.9. Dorfmueller et al. (1979) E-82
E.2.2.10. Kumar et al. (2001a) E-83
E.2.2.11. Kawamoto et al. (1988b) E-84
E.2.2.12. NTP (1990) E-85
E.2.2.13. NTP (1988) E-89
E.2.2.14. Fukuda et al. (1983) E-91
E.2.2.15. Henschler et al. (1980) E-92
E.2.2.16. Maltoni et al. (1986) E-94
E.2.2.17. Maltoni et al. (1988) E-98
E.2.2.18. Van Duuren et al. (1979) E-98
E.2.2.19. NCI (1976) E-99
E.2.2.20. Herren-Freund et al. (1987) E-103
E.2.2.21. Anna et al. (1994) E-104
E.2.2.22. Bull et al. (2002) E-106

E.2.3. Mode of Action: Relative Contribution of TCE Metabolites E-108
E.2.3.1. Acute studies of DCA/TCA E-108
E.2.3.2. Subchronic and Chronic Studies of DCA and TCA E-133
E.2.4. Summaries and Comparisons Between TCE, DCA, and TCA Studies E-191
E.2.4.1. Summary of Results For Short-term Effects of TCE E-192
E.2.4.2. Summary of Results For Short-Term Effects of DCA and TCA: Comparisons With TCE E-199
E.2.4.3. Summary of TCE Subchronic and Chronic Studies E-221
E.2.4.4. Summary of Results for Subchronic and Chronic Effects of DCA and TCA: Comparisons With TCE E-232
E.2.5. Studies of CH E-254
E.2.6. Serum Bile Acid Assays E-259

E.3. STATE OF SCIENCE OF LIVER CANCER MODES OF ACTION E-261

E.3.1. State of Science for Cancer and Specifically Human Liver Cancer E-263
E.3.1.1. Epigenetics and Disease States (Transgenerational Effects, Effects of Aging, and Background Changes) E-263
E.3.1.2. Emerging Technologies, DNA and siRNA, miRNA Microarrays—Promise and Limitations for Modes of Action E-270
E.3.1.3. Etiology, Incidence, and Risk Factors for HCC E-279
E.3.1.4. Issues Associated with Target Cell Identification E-282
E.3.1.5. Status of Mechanism of Action for Human HCC E-286
E.3.1.6. Pathway and Genetic Disruption Associated with HCC and Relationship to Other Forms of Neoplasia E-288
E.3.1.7. Epigenetic Alterations in HCC E-290
E.3.1.8. Heterogeneity of Preneoplastic and HCC Phenotypes E-292
E.3.2. Animal Models of Liver Cancer E-299
E.3.2.1. Similarities with Human and Animal Transgenic Models E-302
E.3.3. Hypothesized Key Events in HCC Using Animal Models E-306
E.3.3.1. Changes in Ploidy E-306
E.3.3.2. Hepatocellular Proliferation and Increased DNA Synthesis E-312
E.3.3.3. Nonparenchymal Cell Involvement in Disease States Including Cancer E-315
E.3.3.4. Gender Influences on Susceptibility E-322
E.3.3.5. Epigenomic Modification E-324
E.3.4. Specific Hypothesis for Mode of Action of TCE Hepatocarcinogenicity in Rodents E-326
E.3.4.1. PPARα Agonism as the Mode of Action for Liver Tumor Induction—The State of the Hypothesis E-326
E.3.4.2. Other TCE Metabolite Effects That May Contribute to its Hepatocarcinogenicity E-357

E.4. EFFECTS OF CO-EXPOSURES ON MODE OF ACTION—INTERNAL AND EXTERNAL EXPOSURES TO MIXTURES INCLUDING ALCOHOL E-367

E.4.1. Internal Co-exposures to TCE Metabolites: Modulation of Toxicity and Implications for TCE Mode of Action E-369
E.4.2. Initiation Studies as Co-exposures E-369
E.4.2.1. Herren-Freund et al. (1987) E-370
E.4.2.2. Parnell et al. (1986) E-371

E.4.2.3. Pereira and Phelps (1996) E-372
E.4.2.4. Tao et al. (2000) E-376
E.4.2.5. Latendresse and Pereira (1997) E-377
E.4.2.6. Pereira et al. (1997) E-379
E.4.2.7. Tao et al. (1998) E-381
E.4.2.8. Stauber et al. (1998) E-382
E.4.3. Co-exposures of Haloacetates and Other Solvents E-384
E.4.3.1. Carbon tetrachloride, DCA, TCA: Implications for Mode of Action from Co-exposures E-384
E.4.3.2. Chloroform, DCA, and TCA Coexposures: Changes in Methylation Status E-386
E.4.3.3. Co-exposures to Brominated Haloacetates: Implications for Common Modes of Action and Background Additivity to Toxicity E-388
E.4.3.4. Co-exposures to Ethanol: Common Targets and Modes of Action E-391
E.4.3.5. Co-exposure Effects on Pharmacokinetics: Predictions Using PBPK Models E-392
E.5. POTENTIALLY SUSCEPTIBLE LIFE STAGES AND CONDITIONS THAT MAY ALTER RISK OF LIVER TOXICITY AND CANCER E-395
E.6. UNCERTAINTY AND VARIABILITY E-396
F. NONCANCER DOSE-RESPONSE ANALYSES F-1
F.1. DATA SOURCES F-1
F.2. DOSIMETRY F-1
F.2.1. Estimates of TCE in Air From Urinary Metabolite Data Using Ikeda et al. (1972) F-1
F.2.1.1. Results for Chia et al. (1996) F-1
F.2.1.2. Results for Mhiri et al. (2004) F-4
F.2.2. Dose Adjustments to Applied Doses for Intermittent Exposure F-4
F.2.3. Estimation of the Applied Doses for the Oral Exposures via Drinking Water and Feed F-5
F.2.4. PBPK Model-Based Internal Dose-Metrics F-6
F.3. DOSE-RESPONSE MODELING PROCEDURES F-6
F.3.1. Models for Dichotomous Response Data F-6
F.3.1.1. Quantal Models F-6
F.3.1.2. Nested Dichotomous Models F-7
F.3.2. Models for Continuous Response Data F-7
F.3.3. Model Selection F-7
F.3.4. Additional Adjustments for Selected Data Sets F-8
F.4. DOSE-RESPONSE MODELING RESULTS F-8
F.4.1. Quantal Dichotomous and Continuous Modeling Results F-8
F.4.2. Nested Dichotomous Modeling Results F-9
F.4.2.1. Johnson et al. (2003) Fetal Cardiac Defects F-9
F.4.2.2. Narotsky et al. (1995) F-15
F.4.3. Model Selections and Results F-19

F.5. DERIVATION OF POINTS OF DEPARTURE F-26
F.5.1. Applied Dose Points of Departure F-26
F.5.2. PBPK Model-Based Human Points of Departure F-26
F.6. SUMMARY OF POINTS OF DEPARTURE (PODs) FOR STUDIES AND EFFECTS SUPPORTING THE INHALATION RfC AND ORAL RfD F-27
F.6.1. NTP (NTP, 1988)—BMD Modeling of Toxic Nephropathy in Rats F-27
F.6.1.1. Dosimetry and BMD Modeling F-28
F.6.1.2. Derivation of HEC_{99} and HED_{99} F-28
F.6.2. Woolhiser et al. (2006)—BMD Modeling of Increased Kidney Weight in Rats F-30
F.6.2.1. Dosimetry and BMD Modeling F-30
F.6.2.2. Derivation of HEC_{99} and HED_{99} F-32
F.6.3. Keil et al. (2009)—LOAEL for Decreased Thymus Weight in Mice F-32
F.6.3.1. Dosimetry F-33
F.6.3.2. Derivation of HEC_{99} and HED_{99} F-33
F.6.4. Johnson et al. (2003)—BMD Modeling of Fetal Heart Malformations in Rats F-34
F.6.4.1. Dosimetry and BMD Modeling F-34
F.6.4.2. Derivation of HEC_{99} and HED_{99} F-34
F.6.5. Peden-Adams et al. (2006)—LOAEL for Decreased PFC Response and Increased Delayed-Type Hypersensitivity in Mice F-35
G. TCE CANCER DOSE-RESPONSE ANALYSES WITH RODENT CANCER BIOASSAY DATA G-1
G.1. DATA SOURCES G-1
G.1.1. Numbers at Risk G-1
G.1.2. Cumulative Incidence G-2
G.2. INTERNAL DOSE-METRICS AND DOSE ADJUSTMENTS G-2
G.3. DOSE ADJUSTMENTS FOR INTERMITTENT EXPOSURE G-3
G.4. RODENT TO HUMAN DOSE EXTRAPOLATION G-4
G.5. COMBINING DATA FROM RELATED EXPERIMENTS IN MALTONI ET AL. (1986) G-5
G.6. DOSE-RESPONSE MODELING RESULTS G-10
G.7. MODELING TO ACCOUNT FOR DOSE GROUPS DIFFERING IN SURVIVAL TIMES G-11
G.7.1. Time-to-Tumor Modeling G-11
G.7.2. Poly-3 Calculation of Adjusted Number at Risk G-12
G.8. COMBINED RISK FROM MULTIPLE TUMOR SITES G-13
G.8.1. Methods G-13
G.8.1.1. Single Tumor Sites G-13
G.8.1.2. Combined Risk From Multiple Tumor Sites G-14
G.8.2. Results G-15
G.9. PBPK-MODEL UNCERTAINTY ANALYSIS OF UNIT RISK ESTIMATES ... G-34

H. LIFETABLE ANALYSIS AND WEIGHTED LINEAR REGRESSION BASED ON RESULTS FROM CHARBOTEL ET AL. (2006) H-1
H.1. LIFETABLE ANALYSIS H-1
H.2. EQUATIONS USED FOR WEIGHTED LINEAR REGRESSION OF RESULTS FROM CHARBOTEL ET AL. (2006) [source: Rothman (1986), p. 343–344] H-1
I. EPA Response to Major Peer Review and Public Comments I-1
I.1. PBPK Modeling (SAB Report Section 1): Comments and EPA Response I-1
I.1.1. SAB Overall Comments: I-1
I.1.2. Major SAB Recommendations and EPA Response: I-1
I.1.2.1. PBPK Model Structure (SAB Report Section 1a) I-1
I.1.2.2. Bayesian Statistical Approach (SAB Report Section 1b) I-2
I.1.2.3. Parameter Calibration (SAB Report Section 1c) I-2
I.1.2.4. Model Fit Assessment and Dose-Metric Projections (SAB Report Section 1d) I-3
I.1.2.5. Lack of Adequate Sensitivity Analysis (SAB Report Section 1e) I-4
I.1.3. Summary of Major Public Comments and EPA Responses: I-4
I.2. Meta-Analyses of Cancer Epidemiology (SAB Report Section 2): Comments and EPA Response I-5
I.2.1. SAB Overall Comments: I-5
I.2.2. Major SAB Recommendations and EPA Response: I-5
I.2.3. Summary of Major Public Comments and EPA Responses: I-7
I.3. NonCancer Hazard Assessment (SAB Report Section 3): Comments and EPA Response I-8
I.3.1. SAB Overall Comments: I-8
I.3.2. Major SAB Recommendations and EPA Response: I-8
I.3.3. Summary of Major Public Comments and EPA Responses: I-9
I.4. Carcinogenic Weight of Evidence (SAB Report Section 4): Comments and EPA Response I-9
I.4.1. SAB Overall Comments: I-9
I.4.2. Major SAB Recommendations and EPA Response: I-10
I.4.3. Summary of Major Public Comments and EPA Responses: I-11
I.5. Role of Metabolism (SAB Report Section 5): Comments and EPA Response I-11
I.5.1. SAB Overall Comments: I-11
I.5.2. Major SAB Recommendations and EPA Response: I-12
I.5.2.1. Mediation of TCE-Induced Liver Effects by Oxidative Metabolism (SAB Report Section 5a) I-12
I.5.2.2. Contribution of TCA to Adverse effects on the Liver (SAB Report Section 5b) I-12
I.5.2.3. Role of GSH-Conjugation Pathway on TCE-Induced Kidney Effects (SAB Report Section 5c) I-13
I.5.3. Summary of Major Public Comments and EPA Responses: I-14

I.6. Mode of Action (SAB Report Section 6): Comments and EPA Response I-14

I.6.1. SAB Overall Comments: I-14
I.6.2. Major SAB Recommendations and EPA Response: I-15
I.6.2.1. Hazard Assessment and Mode of Action (SAB Report Section 6a) I-15
I.6.2.2. Mode of Action for TCE-Induced Kidney Tumors (SAB Report Section 6b) I-16
I.6.2.3. Inadequate Support for PPARα Agonism and its Sequellae Being Key Events in TCE-Induced Liver Carcinogenesis (SAB Report Section 6c) I-16
I.6.2.4. Inadequate Data to specify Key Events and Modes of Action Involved in Other TCE-Induced Cancer and Noncancer Effects (SAB Report Section 6d) I-16
I.6.2.5. Human Relevance of TCE-Induced Cancer and Noncancer Effects in Rodents (SAB Report Section 6e) I-16
I.6.3. Summary of Major Public Comments and EPA Responses: I-17

I.7. Susceptible Populations (SAB Report Section 7): Comments and EPA Response I-17

I.7.1. SAB Overall Comment: I-17
I.7.2. Major SAB Recommendations and EPA Response: I-18
I.7.3. Summary of Major Public Comments and EPA Responses: I-19

I.8. NonCancer Dose-Response Assessment (SAB Report Section 8): Comments and EPA Response I-20

I.8.1. SAB Overall Comments I-20
I.8.1.1. Selection of Critical Studies and Effects I-20
I.8.1.2. Derivation of RfD and RfC I-20
I.8.1.3. UFs I-21
I.8.2. Major SAB Recommendations and EPA Response: I-21
I.8.2.1. The Screening, Evaluation, and Selection of Candidate Critical Studies and Effects (SAB Report Section 8a) I-21
I.8.2.2. The PODs, Including those Derived from BMD Modeling (e.g., Selection of Dose-Response Models, BMR Levels) (SAB Report Section 8b) I-22
I.8.2.3. The Selected PBPK-Based Dose-Metrics for Inter-Species, Intra-Species, and Route-to-Route Extrapolation, Including the Use of Body Weight to the ¾ Power Scaling for Some Dose-Metrics (SAB Report Section 8c) I-22
I.8.2.4. UFs (SAB Report Section 8d) I-23
I.8.2.5. The Equivalent Doses and Concentrations for Sensitive Humans Developed from PBPK Modeling to Replace Standard Ufs for Inter- and Intra-Species Toxicokinetics, Including Selection of the 99th Percentile for Overall Uncertainty and Variability to Represent the Toxicokinetically-Sensitive Individual (SAB Report Section 8e) I-24
I.8.2.6. The Qualitative and Quantitative Characterization of Uncertainty and Variability (SAB Report Section 8f) I-24

I.8.2.7. The Selection of NTP (1988) [Toxic Nephropathy], NCI (1976) [Toxic Nephrosis], Woolhiser et al. (2006) [Increased Kidney Weights], Keil et al. (2009) [Decreased Thymus Weights and Increased Anti-dsDNA and Anti-ssDNA Antibodies], Peden-Adams et al. (2008) [Developmental Immunotoxicity], and Johnson et al. (2003) [Fetal Heart Malformations] as the Critical Studies and Effects for Noncancer Dose-Response Assessment (SAB Report Section 8g) I-25
I.8.2.8. The Selection of the Draft RfC and RfD on the Basis of Multiple Critical Effects for Which Candidate Reference Values are in a Narrow Range at the Low End of the Full Range of Candidate Critical Effects, Rather than on the Basis of the Single Most Sensitive Critical Effect (SAB Report Section 8h) I-25
I.8.3. Summary of Major Public Comments and EPA Responses: I-25

I.9. Cancer Dose-Response Assessment (Inhalation Unit Risk and Oral Unit Risk) (SAB Report Section 9): Comments and EPA Response I-27

I.9.1. SAB Overall Comment: I-27
I.9.2. Major SAB Recommendations and EPA Response: I-27
I.9.2.1. Estimation of Unit Risks for RCC (SAB Report Section 9a) I-27
I.9.2.2. Adjustment of RCC Unit Risks (SAB Report Section 9b) I-28
I.9.2.3. Estimation of Human Unit Risks from Rodent Bioassays (SAB Report Section 9c) I-28
I.9.2.4. Use of Linear Extrapolation for Cancer Dose-Response Assessment (SAB Report Section 9d) I-29
I.9.2.5. Application of PBPK Modeling (SAB Report Section 9e) I-29
I.9.2.6. Qualitative and Quantitative Characterization of Uncertainty and Variability (SAB Report Section 9f) I-29
I.9.2.7. Conclusion on the Consistency of Unit Risk Estimates Based on Human Epidemiologic Data and Rodent Bioassay Data (SAB Report Section 9g) I-29
I.9.2.8. Preference for the Unit Risk Estimates based on Human Epidemiologic Data (SAB Report Section 9h) I-29
I.9.3. Summary of Major Public Comments and EPA Responses: I-29

I.10. ADAFs (SAB Report Section 10): Comments and EPA Response I-30

I.10.1. SAB Overall Comment: I-30
I.10.2. Major SAB Recommendations and EPA Response: I-30
I.10.3. Summary of Major Public Comments and EPA Responses: I-31

I.11. Additional key studies (SAB Report Section 11) and editorial comments: Comments and EPA Response I-31

LIST OF TABLES

Table A-1. Evaluation of Hack et al. (2006) PBPK model predictions for in vivo data in mice A-9

Table A-2. Evaluation of Hack et al. (2006) PBPK model predictions for in vivo data in rats .. A-16

Table A-3. Evaluation of Hack et al. (2006) PBPK model predictions for in vivo data in humans A-24

Table A-4. PBPK model parameters, baseline values, and scaling relationships A-39

Table A-5. Uncertainty distributions for the population mean of the PBPK model parameters . A-66

Table A-6. Updated prior distributions for selected parameters in the rat and human A-71

Table A-7. Uncertainty distributions for the population variance of the PBPK model parameters A-75

Table A-8. Measurements used for calibration A-79

Table A-9. Posterior distributions for mouse PBPK model population parameters A-84

Table A-10. Posterior distributions for mouse residual errors A-86

Table A-11. Posterior correlations for mouse population mean parameters A-87

Table A-12. Posterior distributions for rat PBPK model population parameters A-94

Table A-13. Posterior distributions for rat residual errors A-96

Table A-14. Posterior correlations for rat population mean parameters A-98

Table A-15. Posterior distributions for human PBPK model population parameters A-105

Table A-16. Posterior distributions for human residual errors A-107

Table A-17. Posterior correlations for human population mean parameters A-108

Table A-18. Summary characteristics of model runs A-185

Table B-1. Description of epidemiologic cohort and PMR studies assessing cancer and TCE exposure B-3

Table B-2. Case-control epidemiologic studies examining cancer and TCE exposure B-9

Table B-3. Geographic-based studies assessing cancer and TCE exposure B-20

Table B-4. Approximate statistical power (%) in cohort and geographic-based studies to detect an RR = 2 ..... B-37

Table B-5. Summary of rationale for study selection for meta-analysis B-54

Table B-6. Characteristics of epidemiologic investigations of Rocketdyne workers B-71

Table C-1. Selected RR estimates for NHL associated with TCE exposure (overall effect) from cohort studies C-6

Table C-2. Selected RR estimates for NHL associated with TCE exposure from case-control studies[a] C-7

Table C-3. Summary of some meta-analysis results for TCE (overall) and NHL C-13
Table C-4. Selected RR estimates for NHL risk in highest TCE exposure groups C-18
Table C-5. Summary of some meta-analysis results for TCE (highest exposure groups) and NHL C-23
Table C-6. Selected RR estimates for kidney cancer associated with TCE exposure (overall effect) from cohort studies C-29
Table C-7. Selected RR estimates for RCC associated with TCE exposure from case-control studies[a] C-30
Table C-8. Summary of some meta-analysis results for TCE (overall) and kidney cancer C-35
Table C-9. Selected RR estimates for kidney cancer risk in highest TCE exposure groups ... C-39
Table C-10. Summary of some meta-analysis results for TCE (highest exposure groups) and kidney cancer C-45
Table C-11. Selected RR estimates for liver cancer associated with TCE exposure (overall effect) from cohort studies C-50
Table C-12. Summary of some meta-analysis results for TCE and liver cancer C-54
Table C-13. Selected RR estimates for liver cancer risk in highest TCE exposure groups C-58
Table C-14. Selected RR estimates for lung (& bronchus) cancer associated with TCE exposure (overall effect) from cohort studies C-64
Table C-15. Summary of some meta-analysis results for TCE and lung cancer C-69
Table C-16. Selected RR estimates for lung cancer risk in highest TCE exposure groups C-72
Table C-17. Summary of some meta-analysis results for TCE (highest exposure groups) and lung cancer C-75
Table D-1. Epidemiological studies: Neurological effects of TCE D-28
Table D-2. Epidemiological studies: neurological effects of TCE/mixed solvents D-64
Table D-3. Literature review of studies of TCE and domains assessed with neurobehavioral/neurological methods D-82
Table D-4. Summary of mammalian in vivo trigeminal nerve studies D-103
Table D-5. Summary of mammalian in vivo ototoxicity studies D-104
Table D-6. Summary of mammalian sensory studies—vestibular and visual systems D-106
Table D-7. Summary of mammalian cognition studies D-107
Table D-8. Summary of mammalian psychomotor function, locomotor activity, and RT studies D-108
Table D-9. Summary of mammalian in vivo dopamine neuronal studies D-110
Table D-10. Summary of neurochemical effects with TCE exposure D-111
Table D-11. Summary of in vitro ion channel effects with TCE exposure D-113
Table D-12. Summary of mammalian in vivo developmental neurotoxicity studies—oral exposures D-114
Table E-1. Mice data for 13 weeks: mean body and liver weights E-85

Table E-2. Prevalence and multiplicity data from DeAngelo et al. (1999) E-146
Table E-3. Difference in pathology by inclusion of unscheduled deaths from DeAngelo et al. (1999).....E-146
Table E-4. Comparison of data from Carter et al. (2003) and DeAngelo et al. (1999) E-151
Table E-5. Prevalence of foci and tumors in mice administered NaCl, DCA, or TCA from Pereira (1996).....E-156
Table E-6. Multiplicity of foci and tumors in mice administered NaCl, DCA, or TCA from Pereira (1996).....E-157
Table E-7. Phenotype of foci reported in mice exposed to NaCl, DCA, or TCA by Pereira (1996) E-158
Table E-8. Phenotype of tumors reported in mice exposed NaCl, DCA, or TCA by Pereira (1996).....E-158
Table E-9. Multiplicity and incidence data (31 week treatment) from Pereira and Phelps (1996) E-159
Table E-10. Comparison of descriptions of control data between George et al. (2000) and DeAngelo et al. (2008).....E-175
Table E-11. TCA-induced increases in liver tumor occurrence and other parameter over control after 60 weeks (Study #1) E-182
Table E-12. TCA-induced increases in liver tumor occurrence after 104 weeks (Studies #2 and #3) E-185
Table E-13. Comparison of liver effects from TCE, TCA, and DCA (10-day exposures in mice) E-202
Table E-14. Liver weight induction as percent liver/body weight fold-of-control in male $B6C3F_1$ mice from DCA or TCA drinking water studies.....E-205
Table E-15. Liver weight induction as percent liver/body weight fold-of-control in male $B6C3F_1$ or Swiss mice from TCE gavage studies E-206
Table E-16. $B6C3F_1$ and Swiss (data sets combined).....E-207
Table E-17. Power calculations[a] for experimental design described in text, using Pereira and colleagues (1996) as an example E-242
Table E-18. Comparison between results for Yang et al. (2007) and Cheung et al. (2004)[a]..E-350
Table F-1. Dose-response data from Chia et al. (1996).....F-1
Table F-2. Data on TCE in air (ppm) and urinary metabolite concentrations in workers reported by Ikeda et al. (1972) F-2
Table F-3. Estimated urinary metabolite and TCE air concentrations in dose groups from Chia et al. (1996).....F-4
Table F-4. Data on fetuses and litters with abnormal hearts from Johnson et al. (2003) F-9
Table F-5. Comparison of observed and predicted numbers of fetuses with abnormal hearts from Johnson et al. (2003), with and without the high-dose group, using a nested model F-10

Table F-6. Results of nested log-logistic model for fetal cardiac anomalies from Johnson et al. (2003) without the high-dose group, on the basis of applied dose (mg/kg/day in drinking water) F-10
Table F-7. Results of nested log-logistic model for fetal cardiac anomalies from Johnson et al. (2003) without the high-dose group, using the TotOxMetabBW34 dose-metric F-12
Table F-8. Results of nested log-logistic model for fetal cardiac anomalies from Johnson et al. (2003) without the high-dose group, using the AUCCBld dose-metric F-14
Table F-9. Analysis of LSCs with respect to dose from Narotsky et al. (1995) F-15
Table F-10. Results of nested log-logistic and Rai-VanRyzin model for fetal eye defects from Narotsky et al. (1995), on the basis of applied dose (mg/kg/day in drinking water) F-16
Table F-11. Comparison of results of nested log-logistic (without LSC or IC) and quantal log-logistic model for fetal eye defects from Narotsky et al. (1995) F-18
Table F-12. Results of nested log-logistic and Rai-VanRyzin model for prenatal loss from Narotsky et al. (1995), on the basis of applied dose (mg/kg/day in drinking water) F-19
Table F-13. Model selections and results for noncancer dose-response analyses F-22
Table G-1. Internal dose-metrics used in dose-response analyses, identified by "X" G-2
Table G-2. Experiments BT304 and BT304bis, female Sprague-Dawley rats, Maltoni et al. (1986). Number alive is reported for week of first tumor observation in either males or females.[a] These data were not used for dose-response modeling because there is no consistent trend (for the combined data, there is no significant trend by the Cochran-Armitage test, and no significant differences between control and dose groups by Fisher's exact test). G-6
Table G-3. Experiments BT304 and BT304bis, male Sprague-Dawley rats, Maltoni et al. (1986): leukemias. Number alive is reported for week of first tumor observation in either males or females.[a] G-7
Table G-4. Experiments BT304 and BT304bis, male Sprague-Dawley rats, Maltoni et al. (1986): kidney adenomas + carcinomas. Number alive is reported for week of first tumor observation in either males or females.[a] G-8
Table G-5. Experiments BT304 and BT304bis, male Sprague-Dawley rats, Maltoni et al. (1986): testis, Leydig cell tumors. Number alive is reported for week of first tumor observation.[a] G-9
Table G-6. Rodent to human conversions for internal dose-metric TotOxMetabBW34 ..... G-14
Table G-7. Rodent to human conversions for internal dose-metric TotMetabBW34 ..... G-14
Table G-8. Female B6C3F$_1$ mice—applied doses: data G-16
Table G-9. Female B6C3F$_1$ mice—applied doses: model selection comparison of model fit statistics for multistage models of increasing order G-16
Table G-10. Female B6C3F$_1$ mice—applied doses: BMD and risk estimates (inferences for BMR of 0.05 extra risk at 95% confidence level) G-17

Table G-11. $B6C3F_1$ female mice inhalation exposure—applied doses G-19
Table G-12. $B6C3F_1$ female mice—applied doses: model selection comparison of model fit statistics for multistage models of increasing order G-19
Table G-13. $B6C3F_1$ female mice inhalation exposure—applied doses (inferences for 0.05 extra risk at 95% confidence level) G-20
Table G-14. Maltoni Sprague-Dawley male rats—applied doses G-22
Table G-15. Maltoni Sprague-Dawley male rats—applied doses: model selection comparison of model fit statistics for multistage models of increasing order G-22
Table G-16. Maltoni Sprague-Dawley male rats—applied doses G-23
Table G-17. Female $B6C3F_1$ mice—internal dose-metric (total oxidative metabolism): data G-25
Table G-18. Female $B6C3F_1$ mice—internal dose: model selection comparison of model fit statistics for multistage models of increasing order G-25
Table G-19. Female $B6C3F_1$ mice—internal dose-metric (total oxidative metabolism): BMD and risk estimates (values rounded to 4 significant figures) (inferences for BMR of 0.05 extra risk at 95% confidence level) G-26
Table G-20. $B6C3F_1$ female mice inhalation exposure—internal dose-metric (total oxidative metabolism) G-28
Table G-21. $B6C3F_1$ female mice—internal dose: model selection comparison of model fit statistics for multistage models of increasing order G-28
Table G-22. $B6C3F_1$ female mice inhalation exposure—internal dose-metric (total oxidative metabolism) (inferences for 0.05 extra risk at 95% confidence level) G-29
Table G-23. Maltoni Sprague-Dawley male rats—internal dose-metric (total metabolism)... G-31
Table G-24. Maltoni Sprague-Dawley male rats—internal dose model selection comparison of model fit statistics for multistage models of increasing order G-31
Table G-25. Maltoni Sprague-Dawley male rats—internal dose-metric (total metabolism) (inferences for 0.01 extra risk at 95% confidence level) G-32

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure A-1. Hierarchical population statistical model for PBPK model parameter uncertainty and variability. A-2
Figure A-2. Schematic of how posterior predictions were generated for comparison with experimental data. A-8
Figure A-3. Limited optimization results for male closed-chamber data from Fisher et al. (1991) without (top) and with (bottom) respiratory metabolism. A-35
Figure A-4. Limited optimization results for female closed-chamber data from Fisher et al. (1991) without (top) and with (bottom) respiratory metabolism. A-36
Figure A-5. Respiratory metabolism model for updated PBPK model. A-37
Figure A-6. Submodel for TCE gas exchange, respiratory metabolism, and arterial blood concentration. A-50
Figure A-7 Submodel for TCE oral absorption, tissue distribution, and metabolism. A-51
Figure A-8. Submodel for TCOH. A-55
Figure A-9. Submodel for TCOG. A-58
Figure A-10. Submodel for TCA. A-60
Figure A-11. Submodel for TCE GSH conjugation metabolites. A-63
Figure A-12. Updated hierarchical structure for rat and human models. A-81
Figure A-13. Prior and posterior mouse population mean parameters (Part 1). A-88
Figure A-14. Prior and posterior mouse population mean parameters (Part 2). A-89
Figure A-15. Prior and posterior mouse population mean parameters (Part 3). A-90
Figure A-16. Prior and posterior mouse population variance parameters (Part 1). A-91
Figure A-17. Prior and posterior mouse population variance parameters (Part 2). A-92
Figure A-18. Prior and posterior mouse population variance parameters (Part 3). A-93
Figure A-19. Prior and posterior rat population mean parameters (Part 1). A-99
Figure A-20. Prior and posterior rat population mean parameters (Part 2). A-100
Figure A-21. Prior and posterior rat population mean parameters (Part 3). A-101
Figure A-22. Prior and posterior rat population variance parameters (Part 1). A-102
Figure A-23. Prior and posterior rat population variance parameters (Part 2). A-103
Figure A-24. Prior and posterior rat population variance parameters (Part 3). A-104
Figure A-25. Prior and posterior human population mean parameters (Part 1)..... A-109
Figure A-26. Prior and posterior human population mean parameters (Part 2)..... A-110
Figure A-27. Prior and posterior human population mean parameters (Part 3)..... A-111
Figure A-28. Prior and posterior human population variance parameters (Part 1)..... A-112
Figure A-29. Prior and posterior human population variance parameters (Part 2)..... A-113
Figure A-30. Prior and posterior human population variance parameters (Part 3)..... A-114

Figure A-31. Comparison of mouse calibration data (boxes) and PBPK model predictions (red line: using the posterior mean of the subject-specific parameters; + with error bars: single data points; or shaded regions: 2.5, 25, 50, 75, and 97.5% population-based predictions). A-116
Figure A-32. Comparison of rat calibration data (boxes) and PBPK model predictions (red line: using the posterior mean of the subject-specific parameters; + with error bars: single data points; or shaded regions: 2.5, 25, 50, 75, and 97.5% population-based predictions)..... A-126
Figure A-33. Comparison of rat evaluation data (boxes) and PBPK model predictions (+ with error bars: single data points or shaded regions: 2.5, 25, 50, 75, and 97.5% population-based predictions)..... A-137
Figure A-34. Comparison of human calibration data (boxes) and PBPK model predictions (red line: using the posterior mean of the subject-specific parameters; + with error bars: single data points; or shaded regions: 2.5, 25, 50, 75, and 97.5% population-based predictions). A-140
Figure A-35. Comparison of human evaluation data (boxes) and PBPK model predictions (+ with error bars: single data points or shaded regions: 2.5, 25, 50, 75, and 97.5% population-based predictions)..... A-165
Figure A-36. Comparison of Kim et al. (2009) mouse data (boxes) and PBPK model predictions (+ with error bars: single data points or shaded regions: 2.5, 25, 50, 75, and 97.5% population-based predictions)..... A-175
Figure A-37. Comparison of best-fitting (out of 50,000 posterior samples) PBPK model prediction and Kim et al. (2009) TCA blood concentration data for mice gavaged with 2,140 mg/kg TCE. A-176
Figure A-38. Comparison of best-fitting (out of 50,000 posterior samples) PBPK model prediction and Kim et al. (2009) DCVG blood concentration data for mice gavaged with 2,140 mg/kg TCE. A-177
Figure A-39. PBPK model predictions for the fraction of intake undergoing GSH conjugation in mice continuously exposed orally to TCE. A-178
Figure A-40. PBPK model predictions for the fraction of intake undergoing GSH conjugation in mice continuously exposed via inhalation to TCE. A-179
Figure A-41. Comparison of Liu et al. (2009) rat data (boxes) and PBPK model predictions (+ with error bars: single data points or shaded regions: 2.5, 25, 50, 75, and 97.5% population-based predictions). A-180
Figure A-42. Assumed drinking water patterns as a function of time since beginning of exposure. A-184
Figure A-43. PBPK model predictions for TCA in blood and liver of male B6C3F$_1$ mice from Mahle et al. (1999). A-186

Figure A-44. PBPK model predictions for TCA in blood and liver of male B6C3F$_1$ mice from Green (2003a, 2003b). A-187
Figure A-45. Distribution of fractional absorption fit to each TCA drinking water kinetic study group in mice, using LHL drinking water intake patterns. A-188
Figure C-1. Meta-analysis of NHL and overall TCE exposure. Rectangle sizes reflect relative weights of the individual studies. The bottom diamond represents the summary RR estimate. C-11
Figure C-2. Funnel plot of SE by log RR estimate for TCE and NHL studies. C-16
Figure C-3. Cumulative meta-analysis of TCE and NHL studies, progressively including studies with increasing SEs. C-17
Figure C-4. Meta-analysis of NHL and TCE exposure—highest exposure groups. Rectangle sizes reflect relative weights of the individual studies. The bottom diamond represents the RRm estimate. C-24
Figure C-5. Meta-analysis of kidney cancer and overall TCE exposure. Random-effects model; fixed-effect model same. Rectangle sizes reflect relative weights of the individual studies. The summary estimate is in the bottom row, represented by the diamond. ... C-36
Figure C-6. Funnel plot of SE by log RR estimate for TCE and kidney cancer studies..... C-37
Figure E-1. Comparison of average fold-changes in relative liver weight to control and exposure concentrations of ≤2 g/L in drinking water for TCA and DCA in male B6C3F$_1$ mice for 14–30 days E-209
Figure E-2. Comparisons of fold-changes in average relative liver weight and gavage dose of (top panel) male B6C3F$_1$ mice for 10–28 days of exposure and (bottom panel) in male B6C3F$_1$ and Swiss mice. E-211
Figure E-3. Comparison of fold-changes in relative liver weight for data sets in male B6C3F$_1$, Swiss, and NRMI mice between TCE studies [duration 28–42 days]) and studies of direct oral TCA administration to B6C3F$_1$ mice [duration 14–28 days]). E-214
Figure E-4. Fold-changes in relative liver weight for data sets in male B6C3F$_1$, Swiss, and NRMI mice reported by TCE studies of duration 28–42 days using internal dose-metrics predicted by the PBPK model described in Section 3.5: (A) dose-metric is the median estimate of the daily AUC of TCE in blood, (B) dose-metric is the median estimate of the total daily rate of TCE oxidation. E-216
Figure E-5. Comparison of Ito et al. and David et al. data for DEHP tumor induction from (Guyton et al., 2009). E-335
Figure F-1. Regression of TCE in air (ppm) and TCA in urine (mg/g creatinine) based on data from Ikeda et al. (1972). F-3
Figure F-2. BMD modeling of Johnson et al. (2003) using nested log-logistic model, with applied dose, without LSC, with IC, and without the high-dose group, using a BMR of 0.05 extra risk (top panel) or 0.01 extra risk (bottom panel). F-11

Figure F-3. BMD modeling of Johnson et al. (2003) using nested log-logistic model, with TotOxMetabBW34 dose-metric, without LSC, with IC, and without the high-dose group, using a BMR of 0.01 extra risk. F-13
Figure F-4. BMD modeling of Johnson et al. (2003) using nested log-logistic model, with AUCCBld dose-metric, without LSC, with IC, and without the high-dose group, using a BMR of 0.01 extra risk. F-14
Figure F-5. BMD modeling of fetal eye defects from Narotsky et al. (1995) using nested log-logistic model, with applied dose, with both LSC and IC, using a BMR of 0.05 extra risk F-17
Figure F-6. BMD modeling of fetal eye defects from Narotsky et al. (1995) using nested log-logistic model, with applied dose, without either LSC or IC, using a BMR of 0.05 extra risk F-17
Figure F-7. BMD modeling of fetal eye defects from Narotsky et al. (1995) using nested Rai-VanRyzin model, with applied dose, without either LSC or IC, using a BMR of 0.05 extra risk F-18
Figure F-8. BMD modeling of prenatal loss reported in Narotsky et al. (1995) using nested log-logistic model, with applied dose, without LSC, with IC, using a BMR of 0.05 extra risk (top panel) or 0.01 extra risk (bottom panel). F-20
Figure F-9. BMD modeling of prenatal loss reported in Narotsky et al. (1995) using nested Rai-VanRyzin model, with applied dose, without LSC, with IC, using a BMR of 0.05 extra risk (top panel) or 0.01 extra risk (bottom panel). F-21
Figure F-10. BMD modeling of NTP (1988) toxic nephropathy in female Marshall rats. F-29
Figure F-11. Derivation of HEC_{99} and HED_{99} corresponding to the rodent idPOD from NTP (1988) toxic nephropathy in rats. F-30
Figure F-12. BMD modeling of Woolhiser et al. (2006) for increased kidney weight in female Sprague-Dawley rats. F-31
Figure F-13. Derivation of HEC_{99} and HED_{99} corresponding to the rodent idPOD from Woolhiser et al. (2006) for increased kidney weight in rats. F-32
Figure F-14. Derivation of HEC_{99} and HED_{99} corresponding to the rodent idPOD from Keil et al. (2009) for decreased thymus weight in mice. F-33
Figure F-15. Derivation of HEC_{99} and HED_{99} corresponding to the rodent idPOD from Johnson et al. (2003) for increased fetal cardiac malformations in female Sprague-Dawley rats using the total oxidative metabolism dose-metric. F-35
Figure G-1. Female $B6C3F_1$ mice—applied doses: combined and individual tumor extra-risk functions. G-18
Figure G-2. Female $B6C3F_1$ mice—applied doses: posterior distribution of BMDc for combined risk G-18

Figure G-3. B6C3F$_1$ female mice inhalation exposure—applied doses: combined and individual tumor extra-risk functions. G-21
Figure G-4. B6C3F$_1$ female mice inhalation exposure—applied doses: posterior distribution of BMDc for combined risk. G-21
Figure G-5. Maltoni Sprague-Dawley male rats—applied doses: combined and individual tumor extra-risk functions. G-24
Figure G-6. Maltoni Sprague-Dawley male rats—applied doses: posterior distribution of BMDc for combined risk. G-24
Figure G-7. Female B6C3F$_1$ mice—internal dose-metric (total oxidative metabolism): combined and individual tumor extra-risk functions. G-27
Figure G-8. Female B6C3F$_1$ mice—internal dose-metric (total oxidative metabolism): posterior distribution of BMDc for combined risk. G-27
Figure G-9. B6C3F$_1$ female mice inhalation exposure—internal dose-metric: combined and individual tumor extra-risk functions G-30
Figure G-10. B6C3F$_1$ female mice inhalation exposure—internal dose-metric: posterior distribution of BMDc for combined risk. G-30
Figure G-11. Maltoni Sprague-Dawley male rats—internal dose-metric: combined and individual tumor extra-risk functions G-33
Figure G-12. Maltoni Sprague-Dawley male rats—internal dose-metric: posterior distribution of BMDc for combined risk. G-33