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4,4’-METHYLENEDIANILINE
CAS N°: 101-77-9
## SIDS INITIAL ASSESSMENT PROFILE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CAS No.</th>
<th>101-77-9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chemical Name</td>
<td>4,4’-Methylenedianiline (MDA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structural formula</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Chemical Structure" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### RECOMMENDATION

The chemical is a candidate for further work.

### SUMMARY CONCLUSIONS OF THE SIAR

#### Exposure

In 1993 the production volume of 4-4’-Methylenedianiline (MDA) was in the region of 430,000 tons. MDA is produced both as single compound and as the major component of a technical mixture with a varying content of tri- and polynuclear amines. More than 99% of the total production volume of MDA are used as an intermediate for the production of Methylenediphenyldiisocyanate (MDI), which is further processed to polyurethanes. Maximum 4000t MDA, per annum are used as hardners for epoxy resins and adhesives, intermediate in the manufacture of high-performance polymers and processing to 4,4’-Methylenebis (cyclohexaneamine). Significant releases of MDA into the environment occur only during production.

#### Hazards to the Environment

MDA has a log Kow of 1.59, a water solubility of 1.25 g/l and a vapour pressure of 2.87X10^-8hPa. MDA is not expected to be volatile and to undergo hydrolysis. MDA is inherently biodegradable in industrial waste water treatment plants (WWTPs), degradation in municipal WWTPs cannot be deduced from the actual database. The major transformation pathway in the hydrosphere is probably photolysis. MDA forms covalent bounds with the organic matter of sediments and soils. As the reaction product with humic acids is only poorly biodegraded, its accumulation in sediments has to be expected.

MDA is expected to be of low bioaccumulation potential in fish, however, accumulation of reaction products with humic substances in sediment dwelling organisms may occur, although effects data for this end point do not exist.

The following data were selected as lowest acute and long-term effect values for each algae, daphnia and fish: *Scenedesmus subspicatus*: 72h-EC50 = 11 mg/l, 72h-EC10 = 0.3 mg/l; *Moina macrocopa*: 24h-EC50 = 2.3 mg/l, 14d-NOEC = 0.15 mg/l; *Oryzias latipes* 48h-LC50 = 32 mg/l.
With an assessment factor of 50, a PNEC of 3 µg/l was derived from the 14d-NOEC for *Moina macrocopia*.

Release of MDA to the environment during production is mainly via waste water. No significant releases into the atmosphere and soils are expected.

**Human Health Hazards**

MDA is of moderate acute toxicity to rats: LD50oral 350-450 mg/kg, LD50dermal 1000 mg/kg and LC50inhalation >0.837 mg/l (this concentration exceeds the highest attainable concentration at room temperature). Target organs are liver and kidney (and eye in cats and dogs). MDA is slightly irritating to rabbit skin and causes mild to moderate irritation to the eyes of rabbits. Human evidence indicates, that MDA is a skin sensitizer.

MDA has been shown to cause mutations both *in vitro* and *in vivo*, and to be carcinogenic. Chronic oral MDA administration to rats and mice results in tumours of the liver and thyroid, (non-neoplastic LOAEL 9 and 10 mg/kg bw/d, male and female rats, respectively). However, the available human data did not clearly demonstrate carcinogenic activity. Developmental or fertility data in animals or humans does not exist.

**NATURE OF FURTHER WORK RECOMMENDED**

This substance has been agreed in the European Union Risk assessment program under Regulation EEC/793/93 with following conclusions. The EU risk assessment concludes that there are need for specific measures to limit the risks for workers and consumers.

The toxicity of the reaction product of MDA with humic acids on sediment organisms is unknown. Thus no PNECsed could be estimated, and a risk assessment for this sub-compartment is not possible. A test on *Lumbriculus variegatus* with pre-incubated MDA should be performed.
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Preface

This report provides a short summary with conclusions of the risk assessment report of the substance 4,4´-Methyleneedianiline (MDA) that has been prepared by Germany in the context of Council Regulation (EEC) No. 793/93 on the evaluation and control of the risks of existing substances. For detailed information on the risk assessment principles and procedures followed, the underlying data and the literature references the reader is referred to the original risk assessment report.
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1. General Substance Information

Identification of the substance

CAS No.: 101-77-9
EINECS No.: 202-974-4
IUPAC Name: Bis (4-aminophenyl)methane
Synonyma: 4,4’-Methylenedianiline
4,4’-Diaminodiphenylmethane
4,4’-Diphenylmethane diamine
4,4’-Methylendibenzolamine
4,4’-Methylenebisbenzeneamine
4-(4-Aminobenzyl)aniline
MDA

Empirical formula: \( \text{C}_{13}\text{H}_{14}\text{N}_2 \)

Molecular weight: 198.3 g/mol

Purity/impurities, additives

Technical-grade MDA is used as an intermediate in the form of an isomer mixture with a varying content of tri- and polynuclear amines (so-called „polymers“). A typical standard product is liquid at room temperature and comprises the following:

- 4,4’-MDA: 59-61 % w/w *)
- MDA polymers: approx. 36 % w/w
- 2,4’-MDA: approx. 3.5 % w/w
- 2,2’-MDA: < 0.1 % w/w
- water: < 300 ppm
- aniline: < 100 ppm

*) Depending on the production process the content of 4,4’-MDA can vary, the minimum content produced has been 30-40 %.

Pure 4,4’-MDA is also used as an intermediate and has the following composition:

- 4,4’-MDA: ≥ 98 % w/w
- 2,4’-MDA and 2,2’-MDA: max. 2 % w/w
Physico-chemical properties

Pure 4,4’-MDA is at 20 °C and 1013 hPa a colourless to yellowish crystalline powder with a faint amine-like odour.

- Melting point: 89 °C
- Boiling point: 398 - 399 °C at 1013 hPa
- Density: 1.056 at 100 °C
- Vapour pressure: $2.87 \times 10^{-8}$ hPa at 20 °C
- Surface tension: 69.5 mN/m
- Water solubility: 1.25 g/l at 20 °C
- Partition coefficient (log Pow): 1.59
- Flash point: not determined (solid)
- Auto flammability: not flammable
- Flammability: not flammable
- Explosive properties: not explosive
- Oxidizing properties: no oxidizing properties

Classification

- (Classification according to Annex I)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T</th>
<th>Carcinogenic Cat. 2</th>
<th>R 45</th>
<th>May cause cancer.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Xn</td>
<td>Harmful</td>
<td>R 20/21/22</td>
<td>Harmful by inhalation, in contact with skin and if swallowed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R 48/20/21</td>
<td>Harmful: danger of serious damage to health by prolonged exposure through inhalation and in contact with skin.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensitizing</td>
<td></td>
<td>R 43</td>
<td>May cause sensitization by skin contact.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### General Information on Exposure

MDA is synthesized by reaction of formaldehyde and aniline in the presence of hydrochloric acid. In Western Europe, the substance is manufactured at 11 sites. In 1993, the production volume of MDA was about 430,000 t. More than 99% of the total production volume are processed to methylenediphenyl diisocyanate (MDI), exclusively at the same site. MDI is further used for polyurethane production. About 4000 t MDA are annually used as hardener for epoxy resins, hardener in adhesives, intermediate in the manufacture of high-performance polymers, and processed to 4,4'-methylenebis(cyclohexaneamine).

### Environment

#### 3.1 Exposure

During production, 4,4'-MDA is released into the environment mainly via waste water into the hydrosphere, while releases into the atmosphere are not significant. Polyamines (the minor components of the technical product) are emitted in much lower amounts than diamines. It is unlikely that the polyamines will significantly raise the total emissions.

Environmental releases during processing to MDI as well as during the non-MDI uses are not significant.
General characteristics of MDA which are relevant for the exposure assessment are:

- estimated atmospheric half-life 12.8 h,
- no volatilization because of the low Henry’s law constant \((4.4 \cdot 10^{-7} \text{ Pa}\cdot\text{m}^3\cdot\text{mol}^{-1})\),
- no hydrolysis,
- photolysis in surface waters (estimated half-lives 4 - 190 d),
- biodegradation in adapted treatment plants, possibly not in surface waters,
- reaction with humic substances in soils and sediments. The reaction product accumulates due to the very low biodegradation (estimated half-life 1000 d),
- low bioaccumulation in fish. Possibly accumulation of the reaction product with humic substances in sediment dwelling organisms.

### 3.1.1 PECs at production sites

For the environmental exposure assessment site-specific scenarios are used for calculating the PECs in surface waters and sediments. The scenarios are based on actual sewage monitoring data from industry.

Local concentrations in sewage treatment plants are all below 500 µg/l. 7 production sites are emitting into rivers, the aquatic PECs range from \(8 \cdot 10^{-3}\) to 0.4 µg/l. 4 sites are emitting into the sea, their PECs range from 0.047 to 1.0 µg/l. For sediments, PECs in the range from 0.42 to 150 µg/kg ww are estimated.

Concentrations in the atmosphere and soils are negligible.

### 3.2 Effects

Short-term toxicity data for 4,4’-MDA are available for fish, daphnia, algae and bacteriae. Long-term tests are available for daphnia with 4,4’-MDA and for algae with the technical-grade MDA. The aquatic PNEC is extrapolated from a long-term study with *Moina macrocopa* (14 d-NOEC = 0.15 mg/l). Although, other results from long term tests with the pure 4,4’-MDA are not available, the assessment factor is set at \(F = 50\), since the NOEC found for the algae with the technical grade product is additionally used. This leads to a PNEC of 3 µg/l for the aquatic environment.

The PNEC for microorganisms is extrapolated from a respiration test with activated sludge (3h-EC50 = >100 mg/l) using an assessment factor of 100. This leads to a PNEC of \(\geq 1\) mg/l.

For the terrestrial compartment, valid results from short-term tests with species from 2 trophic levels (plants, earthworms) are available. The lowest acute toxicity was recorded for Avena sativa (14 d-EC50 = 128 mg/kg soil, growth). With an assessment factor of 1000, a PNEC of 128 µg/kg is derived.

There are no effect data for the reaction product of MDA with humic substances in sediments. Therefore, a PNEC cannot be derived. A test with sediment organisms is necessary to determine the sediment toxicity.

### 3.3 Risk Characterisation

For the aquatic compartment, the risk characterisation based on site-specific scenarios for MDA production leads to PEC/PNEC ratios in the range from \(9 \cdot 10^{-4}\) to 0.33. For sewage treatment plants,
PEC/PNEC ratios of maximum 0.5 are derived. As no significant releases into the atmosphere and soils are expected, an assessment of these compartments is not necessary.

The risk characterisation for the aquatic compartment, microorganisms, the atmosphere and the terrestrial compartment reveals that there is at present no need for further information and/or testing or for risk reduction measures beyond those which are being applied already (conclusion ii).

As no information on the toxicity of sediment organisms is available, a risk characterisation for this compartment is not possible. There is need for further information and/or testing (conclusion i). A long-term toxicity test on a sediment-dwelling organism is recommended.

4. Human Health

4.1.1 Exposure

4.1.1 Occupational Exposure

MDA is employed as a chemical intermediate, as a curing agent in plastics processing for high-performance polymers, as a curing agent for polyurethane elastomers, foams and special-purpose coatings, for epoxy resins and two-component systems.

Occupational exposure scenarios in the chemical industry, in the industrial area and in skilled trade have to be considered.

The exposure assessment is based on measured data (limited), expert judgement and estimations according to the EASE model.

With regard to inhalative exposure, exposure to MDA in dust form is of primary concern here. Inhalative exposure to MDA vapour is not relevant (vapour pressure << 1Pa).

Concerning dermal exposure investigations have shown that glove material is used which does not provide complete protection and materials for which information about the suitability is not available. Therefore dermal exposures are estimated for all exposure situations.

Azodyes in general could release the amine component unintentionally under special conditions (reductive cleavage). For workers the dermal uptake of the azodye itself, that may occur during dying, has to be considered. Because of reductive conditions in the body (e.g. by bacteria of the intestinal) the dye could lead to an unintentionally release of MDA.

The results for the different scenarios are summarized in table 4.1.1.
### Table 4.1.1: Summary of exposure data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exposure scenario</th>
<th>Form of exposure</th>
<th>Duration and frequency¹</th>
<th>Inhalative exposure shift average [mg/m³]</th>
<th>Dermal exposure shift average [mg/p/d]²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chemical industry</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>manufacturing and further processing as a chemical intermediate</td>
<td>flakes, granules (dust)</td>
<td>shift length, daily</td>
<td>0.52 (workplace measurements)</td>
<td>42 - 420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>liquid (vapour) (approx. 60 %)</td>
<td>shift length, daily</td>
<td>very low (exp. judg.)</td>
<td>25 - 252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>production of preparations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>imid preparations max. 10 % MDA</td>
<td>powder (dust)</td>
<td>batch processing 2 hours/daily</td>
<td>0.05 - 0.125 (EASE)</td>
<td>4 - 42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>curing formulations max. 60 % MDA</td>
<td>flakes; granules (dust)</td>
<td>batch processing 2 hours/daily</td>
<td>lower than above (exp. judg.)</td>
<td>25 - 252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>max. 5 % MDA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>production of preparations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>imid preparations max. 10 % MDA</td>
<td>powder (dust)</td>
<td>batch processing 2 hours/daily</td>
<td>0.1 - 1.25 (EASE)</td>
<td>4 - 42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>curing formulations max. 60 % MDA</td>
<td>flakes; granules (dust)</td>
<td>batch processing 2 hours/daily</td>
<td>0 - 0.75 (EASE)</td>
<td>25 - 252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>max. 5 % MDA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mixing curing formulations (max. 60 % MDA) with resin for</td>
<td>flakes, granules (dust)</td>
<td>short-term (0.5 h), daily</td>
<td>0 - 0.2 (EASE, without LEV)</td>
<td>50 - 504</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Exposure frequency: daily
² Expressed as exposure levels (EASE)
### Exposure scenario

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exposure scenario</th>
<th>Form of exposure</th>
<th>Duration and frequency</th>
<th>Inhalative exposure shift average [mg/m³]</th>
<th>Dermal exposure shift average [mg/p/d]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>epoxies handling of formulations containing MDA and epoxid resins (4.5 - 30 %)</td>
<td>liquids</td>
<td>short-term (0.5 h), daily shift length, daily</td>
<td>very low (exp. judg.)</td>
<td>50 - 504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25 - 252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mixing curing formulations (max. 5 % MDA) with resin for polyurethanes handling of formulations containing MDA and polyurethane (2 - 3 %)</td>
<td>flakes, granules (dust)</td>
<td>short-term (0.5 h), daily</td>
<td>0 - 0.02 (EASE, without LEV)</td>
<td>4.2 - 42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>liquid, pastes</td>
<td>shift length, daily</td>
<td>very low (exp. judg.)</td>
<td>2.5 - 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>handling formulations containing MDA (0.1 - 10 %) and imid resins</td>
<td>powder, paste</td>
<td>short-term (0.5 h), daily shift length, daily</td>
<td>0.03 - 0.3 (EASE)</td>
<td>8.4 - 84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>very low (exp. judg.)</td>
<td>8.4 - 84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Skilled trade

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exposure scenario</th>
<th>Form of exposure</th>
<th>Duration and frequency</th>
<th>Inhalative exposure shift average [mg/m³]</th>
<th>Dermal exposure shift average [mg/p/d]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>mixing of formulations containing MDA (9 - 60 %) with epoxid resins handling of formulations containing MDA and epoxid resins (4 - 30 %)</td>
<td>flakes, granules (dust)</td>
<td>short-term (0.5 h), not daily duration and frequency not known assumed: not daily</td>
<td>0 - 0.2 (EASE, without LEV)</td>
<td>504 - 2 520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>very low (exp. judg.)</td>
<td>252 - 1 260</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Information about frequency and duration of exposure not available
2 Estimation according to the EASE model (without PPE)

### 4.1.2 Consumer Exposure

There is no information about the use of MDA in consumer products, hence consumer exposure seems not to exist. Theoretically exposure could be given to residual free MDA through contact with products in whose manufacture process MDA is introduced, but there is no information about levels of free MDA.
From the notified new substance Cartasol Yellow under special chemical conditions (reductive cleavage) MDA may be liberated unintentionally. The quantity of the substance imported to the EU market from a Non-EU country amounts more than 10 tones/year. This substance may be used as a dye for paper, leather, writing inks, and textiles. No further quantitative information on the use of the substance nor on the liberation rate of MDA for the different applications is available. At present there are no predictions on the probability of established reductive conditions during the use of Cartasol Yellow which as a consequence might result in liberation of MDA. Therefore from the possible use pattern it is concluded that if any, only negligible exposure of the consumer to MDA may be expected.

There are reports that trace amounts of free MDA might be released by irradiation sterilization of polyurethane materials which are used in medical devices as potting materials in plasma separators and artificial dialyzers. However, no quantitative data can be derived from the reports because of limited information regarding experimental conditions.

4.1.3 Indirect Exposure via the Environment

Man can be exposed indirectly to MDA via emissions into the hydrosphere from production. The main contribution to the intake at both local and regional scale are drinking water and fish with fractions of about 55% and 45%, respectively, to the total daily dose. The total daily dose is estimated to $2.1 \times 10^{-5}$ mg/kg/d for the local and to $5.4 \times 10^{-7}$ mg/kg/d for the regional scale.

4.2 Effects

The evaluation of the available information shows, that MDA is absorbed by the three routes of intake (dermal, oral, inhalation) in animals and humans. Especially in humans a quantitative assessment of absorption is not possible. There is no evidence for accumulation in the body. MDA and its N-acetylated metabolites are mainly excreted in the urine. The N-acetylation apparently represents the detoxification pathway, whereas the N-hydroxylation being supposed from in vitro studies can lead to potentially toxic intermediates. Although the detection of MDA in the urine gives information on current exposure the formation of adducts with hemoglobin provides the opportunity for biological monitoring of cumulative exposures.

Acute intoxication of humans with MDA is reported after oral, dermal and inhalation exposure, leading to jaundice ("Epping Jaundice"). In addition to acute hepatic illness, in some cases myocardial effects and persistent retinal damage were reported. Acute intoxication of humans did not cause any mortality. Acute toxicity in rats is demonstrated by LD50 values of 350-450 mg/kg bw after oral and 1000 mg/kg bw (vehicle dimethylsulfoxide) after dermal exposure; inhalation LC50 for rats (> 0.837 mg/l) is demonstrated exceeding the highest possible concentration of MDA in air at room temperature. Damage to the liver and kidneys has been reported to be the most prominent toxic effects in rats. Cats and dogs seem to be much more sensitive than rats with fatalities observed after oral application of 25-50 mg/kg bw with liver and kidney damage and blindness due to retinal atrophy as the most severe effects. On the basis of these acute toxicity data MDA is classified as "toxic", risk phrases R 39/23/24/25.

Human data on local irritation or corrosion caused by MDA are not available. The substance causes slight irritation to the skin and mild to moderate irritation to the eyes of rabbits reversible within 3-7 days. According to EU legislation, MDA is not to be classified because of local corrosive properties.
Animal data on skin sensitization do not result in conclusive evidence on the skin sensitization potential of MDA. However, based on the data on humans there is convincing evidence that MDA is a skin sensitizer. MDA also demonstrates cross-reactivity to substances of the para-substituted compound group. Based on the human data the substance is classified as “sensitizing” and labeled with the risk phrase R 43.

Main toxic effects in rats and mice after repeated exposure to MDA were degeneration with consequential bile duct hyperplasia and fibrosis in the liver and a hyperplastic lesion of the thyroid. Further treatment-related effects were anemia, irritation of the stomach, basophilic hypertrophy of the pituitary, and kidney toxicity. The LOAEL (7.5 mg/kg bw/d in male rats and 8 mg/kg bw/d in female rats) representing the most sensitive adverse (nonneoplastic) effect after repeated oral application was derived from a subchronic study which was accepted as valid. This LOAEL is corresponding to the LOAEL on nonneoplastic effects from the 2-year study on rats (9 resp. 10 mg/kg bw/d in male, resp. female rats). Although the NTP-studies had not examined parameters of hematology, bioclinical chemistry, and urinalysis, the LOAEL of 9 mg/kg bw/d from this long term study was considered to be the most appropriate value for quantitative risk assessment. No NOAEL could be derived from these studies on rats. The database of MDA-related toxic effects on mice is more limited than that in rat, because only few drinking water studies are available. A NOAEL can be derived from a 90-day study, which was 11.4 mg/kg bw/d in male mice and 14.4 mg/kg in female mice. No valid repeated dose studies with inhalation and dermal application route were available. According to the severe health effects which occurred after repeated dose administration MDA is classified as „harmful“, risk phrase R48/20/21/22.

MDA induces gene mutations in bacteria. In mammalian cell cultures MDA is an inducer of chromosomal aberrations in the presence of an exogenous metabolisation system. Inconclusive or weak effects were obtained in other cell culture assays. In vivo, slight increases of micronuclei frequencies were found in mice after treatment to high doses. Furthermore, a high MDA dose led to DNA fragmentation in rat liver cells. Weak marginal effects were obtained for induction SCE (mouse bone marrow) and DNA binding (rat liver). In vivo DNA repair tests (UDS) were negative for livers of rats and mice. MDA causes concern for man owing to possible mutagenic effects. There is evidence from in vivo micronucleus tests (although only weakly positive) which is supported by the induction of DNA fragmentation in vivo and chromosomal aberrations in vitro. According to the classification criteria MDA has been classified as category 3 mutagen, risk phrase R 40.

MDA is carcinogenic in experimental animals. Long term studies on rats and mice indicated that oral MDA treatment was associated with tumors of the thyroid and the liver. From animal data there is a concern on a carcinogenic potential of MDA in humans. The results from the reports on human exposure did not show clearly a carcinogenic activity in humans. The available data are not sufficient to justify the classification as an human carcinogen. However, they warrant the classification as category 2 carcinogen, risk phrase R 45.

The mechanism of MDA carcinogenicity is not yet known. Based on the results of carcinogenicity studies in animals and the results of genotoxicity studies and also in absence of evidence that the appearance of thyroid and liver tumors in rats and mice is a consequence of chronic tissue-damaging (liver) or tissue-stimulating (thyroid) effects a genotoxic mechanism cannot be excluded. There are no data available in humans or animals on fertility or on developmental effects caused by MDA.

4.3 Risk Characterisation
4.3.1 Workplace

4.3.1.1 General remarks on calculations and extrapolations relevant for workplace risk assessment

For several estimations human data are not available. The necessary adjustments of animal data to humans follow the idea of central tendency estimate using the default values and assessment factors given in the table 4.3.1.1 The assessment factors are generated from substance specific toxicity data supported by plausibility considerations. Interspecies adjustment is based on metabolic rate scaling.

Table 4.3.1.1: Assessment factors and default values for extrapolation of effect data

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>body weight, human</td>
<td>70 kg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>respiratory volume, human</td>
<td>10 m³/8 h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>factor for route-to-route extrapolation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- oral to dermal</td>
<td>&gt; 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- oral to inhalation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>factor for species extrapolation rat, oral to human, oral</td>
<td>1/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAEL to NAEL</td>
<td>1/3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3.1.2 Occupational risk assessment

Inhalation of dust and skin exposure are the relevant routes of exposure at workplaces.

The following report concentrates on the main points of concern with regard to the risk characterisation at workplaces.

Acute toxicity

Dermal contact

The starting point for the estimation of the NAEL (human, dermal, acute) is the LOAEL of 3 mg/kg (human, oral, acute). A NAEL of greater than 140 mg/person for acute dermal exposure was calculated. A total dermal dose of greater than 420 mg/person is anticipated to result in liver toxicity.

Dermal exposure of a relevant level is assumed for all applications even with PPE. For all workplace scenarios acute dermal exposure is of concern (see table 4.3.1.2).

Conclusion: iii

Sensitization

Dermal contact

MDA is considered to be a human skin sensitizer. There are no valid data on its sensitization potency. Relevant dermal exposure and contact allergies are expected even with use of PPE.
There is a concern with regard to all workplaces.

Conclusion: iii

**Repeated dose toxicity (systemic)**

Risk assessment for repeated dose toxicity relies upon two essential results: Based on a 2-year rat study with liver and thyroid toxicity a LOAEL of 9 mg/kg/d was determined. Human experience of acute liver toxicity at 3 mg/kg proves a higher sensitivity of humans in response to MDA. Based on acute oral toxicity in rats and humans, a rat-to-human extrapolation factor of 1/10 is assumed.

*Inhalation*

The starting point for the NAEC calculation is the LOAEL of 9 mg/kg/d (rat, oral, chronic). For inhalation risk assessment an extrapolated NAEC in the range of 2 mg/m$^3$ was estimated.

The NAEC is compared with the exposure information. Most MOS values are considered of concern (see table 4.3.1.2).

Conclusion: iii

*Dermal contact*

The basis for the extrapolated NAEL is the LOAEL of 9 mg/kg/d (rat, oral, chronic). For dermal risk assessment an extrapolated NAEL of greater than 40 mg/p/d was estimated.

Repeated dermal exposure is assumed in the chemical industry, in all industrial applications even in case of use of PPE. For skilled trade applications intermittent exposure is assumed. However, because shift average values are rather high, conclusion iii is drawn. All MOS are considered to be of concern. In case of relatively low MOS values chronic liver toxicity is anticipated to occur.

Conclusion: iii

*Combined exposure*

For most exposure situations the MOS values for combined exposure show that dermal contact to MDA to a high degree determines risk assessment concerning liver toxicity.

Conclusion: iii (according to conclusion iii for dermal contact)

**Carcinogenicity**

MDA is classified as carcinogenic. Carcinogenicity of MDA was established in rodents. The mechanism of tumour development is not clearly demonstrated. It has to be assumed that a genotoxic mechanism is involved in MDA carcinogenicity.

*Inhalation*

For workplace risk assessment a T25 of 12 mg/m$^3$ was calculated. The starting point for the calculation is the T25-value of 8.4 mg/kg/d for MDA dihydrochloride (continuous life time exposure in animals). For duration adjustment to workplace conditions an adjustment factor of 2.8
is used. It was assumed that the higher sensitivity of humans concerning liver toxicity applies to carcinogenic potency as well. There are no further data to clarify species differences concerning carcinogenicity. If there is no species difference at all the T25 might be up to one order of magnitude greater than calculated.

For purposes of carcinogenic risk assessment a MOE is calculated.

Assuming the involvement of a genotoxic mechanism most MOE values are of concern (table 4.3.1.2). However it should be kept in mind that humans might be less sensitive than assumed.

Conclusion: iiib

*Dermal contact*

For workplace risk assessment a dermal T25 of greater than 250 mg/person/d was calculated. The calculation is based on the T25-value of 8.4 mg/kg/d for MDA dihydrochloride (continuous life time exposure in animals). For duration adjustment to workplace conditions an adjustment factor of 2.8 is used. Again, it was assumed that humans are more sensitive than rats and that there may be a genotoxic mechanism.

Repeated dermal exposure is assumed in the chemical industry, in all industrial and skilled trade applications, even in case of use of PPE.

Most MOE values calculated for dermal exposure are very low resulting in high concern for carcinogenicity due to dermal contact. All scenarios are considered of concern.

Conclusion: iiib

*Combined exposure*

Carcinogenic risk for combined exposure nearly exclusively is determined by the estimates of dermal exposure.

Conclusion: iiib (according to conclusion iiib for dermal contact)

The risk characterisation for acute toxicity (inhalation), irritation/corrosivity, sensitization (inhalation), repeated dose toxicity (local, inhalation and dermal) and mutagenicity reveals that there is at present no need for further information and/or testing and for risk reduction measures beyond those which are being applied already (conclusion ii).

MDA is classified as a carcinogenic agent. Reproductive toxicity testing is not complete. Because of relevant data gaps a corresponding risk assessment cannot be performed.

Risk reduction measures are required in view of the carcinogenic properties of this substance, the need for a test to evaluate the reproductive toxicity will be revisited in the light of the risk reduction strategy.

In the following table 4.3.1.2 results of the occupational risk assessment are presented. Only toxicological endpoints and scenarios leading to conclusion iii are listed.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exposure scenario</th>
<th>Acute toxicity, dermal, MOS (conclusion)</th>
<th>Sensitization, dermal (conclusion)</th>
<th>RDT systemic, inh., MOS (concl.)</th>
<th>RDT systemic, dermal, MOS (conclusion)</th>
<th>Carcinogenicity, inh., MOE (concl.)</th>
<th>Carcinogenicity, dermal, MOE (concl.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chemical industry</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>manufacturing and further processing as a chemical intermediate (methylene diphenyl di-isocyanate, MDI)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- dust</td>
<td>&gt; 0.3 - 3.3 (iii)</td>
<td>ii</td>
<td>4 (iii)</td>
<td>&gt; 0.1 - 1 (iii)</td>
<td>23 (iiib)</td>
<td>&gt; 0.6 - 6 (iiib)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- vapour</td>
<td>&gt; 0.5 - 5.6 (ii)</td>
<td>ii</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>iii</td>
<td>&gt; 1 - 10 (iiib)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>production of powdery preparations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- imid preparations, max. 10 % MDA (dust)</td>
<td>&gt; 3.3 - 35 (iii)</td>
<td>ii</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 - 10 (iii)</td>
<td>96 - 240 (iiib)</td>
<td>&gt; 6 - 62 (iiib)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- curing formulations, max. 60 % MDA (dust)</td>
<td>&gt; 0.5 - 5.6 (ii)</td>
<td>ii</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>96 - 240(iiib)</td>
<td>&gt; 1 - 10 (iiib)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- max. 5 % MDA (dust)</td>
<td>&gt; 6.7 - 70 (iii)</td>
<td>ii</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&gt; 96 - 240(iiib)</td>
<td>&gt; 12 - 125(iiib)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Industrial area</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>manufacturing of formulations using powdery MDA (dust)</td>
<td>&gt; 0.3 - 3.3 (iii)</td>
<td>ii</td>
<td>3 (iii)</td>
<td>&gt; 0.1 - 1 (iii)</td>
<td>20 (iiib)</td>
<td>&gt; 0.6 - 6 (iiib)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>formulating putties: using liquid MDA (approx. 60 %)(vapour)</td>
<td>&gt; 0.5 - 5.6 (ii)</td>
<td>ii</td>
<td>&gt; 0.2 - 2 (iii)</td>
<td>iii</td>
<td>&gt; 1 - 10 (iiib)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>production of powdery preparations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- imid preparations, max. 10 % MDA (dust)</td>
<td>&gt; 3.3 - 35 (iii)</td>
<td>ii</td>
<td>1.6 - 20 (iii)</td>
<td>1 - 10 (iii)</td>
<td>10 - 120 (iiib)</td>
<td>&gt; 6 - 62 (iiib)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- curing formulations, max. 60 % MDA (dust)</td>
<td>&gt; 0.5 - 5.6 (ii)</td>
<td>ii</td>
<td>&gt; 3 (iii)</td>
<td>0.2 - 2 (iii)</td>
<td>&gt; 16 (iiib)</td>
<td>&gt; 1 - 10 (iiib)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- max. 5 % MDA (dust)</td>
<td>&gt; 6.7 - 70 (iii)</td>
<td>ii</td>
<td>&gt; 2 - 20 (iii)</td>
<td>&gt; 150 (iiib)</td>
<td>&gt; 12 - 125 (iiib)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mixing curing formulations (max. 60 % MDA) with resins for epoxies (dust)</td>
<td>&gt; 0.3 - 2.8 (ii)</td>
<td>ii</td>
<td>&gt; 0.1 - 1 (iii)</td>
<td>&gt; 60 (iiib)</td>
<td>&gt; 0.5 - 5 (iiib)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exposure scenario</td>
<td>Acute toxicity, dermal, MOS (conclusion)</td>
<td>Sensitization, dermal (conclusion)</td>
<td>RDT systemic, inh., MOS (concl.)</td>
<td>RDT systemic, dermal, MOS (concl.)</td>
<td>Carcinogenicity, inh., MOE (concl.)</td>
<td>Carcinogenicity, dermal, MOE (concl.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mixing (vapour)</td>
<td>&gt; 0.3 - 2.8 (iii)</td>
<td>iii</td>
<td>&gt; 0.1 - 1 (iii)</td>
<td>iii</td>
<td>&gt; 0.5 - 5 (iiib)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>handling of formulations containing MDA and epoxid resins (4.5 - 30 %) (vapour)</td>
<td>&gt; 0.5 - 5.6 (iii)</td>
<td>iii</td>
<td>&gt; 0.2 - 2 (iii)</td>
<td>iii</td>
<td>&gt; 1 - 10 (iiib)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mixing curing formulations (max. 5 % MDA) with resin for polyurethanes (dust)</td>
<td>&gt; 3.3 - 33.3 (iii)</td>
<td>iii</td>
<td>&gt; 1 - 10 (iii)</td>
<td>&gt; 600 (iiib)</td>
<td>&gt; 6 - 60 (iiib)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>handling of formulations containing MDA and polyurethane (2 - 3 %) (vapour)</td>
<td>&gt; 5.6 - 56 (iii)</td>
<td>iii</td>
<td>&gt; 2 - 16 (iii)</td>
<td>iii</td>
<td>&gt; 10 - 100(iiib)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>handling of formulations containing MDA (0.1 - 10 %) and imid resins</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- dust</td>
<td>&gt; 1.7 - 16.7 (iii)</td>
<td>iii</td>
<td>7 - 67 (iii)</td>
<td>40 - 400 (iiib)</td>
<td>&gt; 3 - 30 (iiib)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- vapour</td>
<td>&gt; 1.7 - 16.7 (iii)</td>
<td>iii</td>
<td>&gt; 0.5 - 5 (iii)</td>
<td>iia</td>
<td>&gt; 3 - 30 (iiib)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Skilled trade</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mixing formulations containing MDA (9 - 60 %) with epoxid resins (dust)</td>
<td>&gt; 0.05 - 0.3 (iii)</td>
<td>iii</td>
<td>&gt; 0.02 - 0.08 (iii)</td>
<td>&gt; 60 (iiib)</td>
<td>&gt; 0.1 - 0.5(iiib)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>handling of formulations containing MDA and epoxid resins (4.5 - 30 %) (vapour)</td>
<td>&gt; 0.1 - 0.5 (iii)</td>
<td>iii</td>
<td>&gt; 0.03 - 0.16 (iii)</td>
<td>iia</td>
<td>&gt; 0.2 - 1 (iiib)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.3.2 Consumers

Risk characterization with respect to a possible impairment of reproduction by MDA cannot be performed due to lack of valid data for the hazard assessment.

Risk reduction measures are required in view of the carcinogenic properties of this substance, the need for a test to evaluate the reproductive toxicity will be revisited in the light of the risk reduction strategy.

Following the exposure assessment, consumer exposure to MDA is generally not expected.

In case of using products, colored with the notified new azodye Cartasol Yellow an exposure of consumers cannot be excluded due to the possibility of liberation of MDA. A health risk regarding Acute toxicity, Irritation, Corrosivity, Sensitization, Repeated dose toxicity, and Mutagenicity is not expected (conclusion ii). Because MDA is considered as a non-threshold carcinogen, for Carcinogenicity conclusion iiib is assigned.

There may be a liberation of MDA from polyurethane-containing medical devices after sterilization by gamma irradiation which cannot be quantified. Therefore, a potential risk of exposure to free MDA cannot excluded for uremic patients or patients who receive blood transfusions frequently. Because MDA is considered as a non-threshold carcinogen, for Carcinogenicity conclusion iiib is assigned.

4.3.3 Man indirectly exposed via the environment

Indirect exposure via the environment which is calculated using data for oral intake via drinking water and food results in an intake of a total daily dose of $2.1 \times 10^{-5}$ resp. $5.4 \times 10^{-7}$ mg/kg bw (local resp. regional scenario). For the derivation of the margin of safety (MOS) the total calculated internal dose at a local exposure of $2.1 \times 10^{-5}$ mg/kg bw/d and at a regional exposure of $5.4 \times 10^{-7}$ mg/kg bw is compared with the oral LOAEL of 9.0 mg/kg bw/d from a long term study. The MOS is considered to be sufficient regarding the non-neoplastic effects (conclusion ii). However, there remains concern due to the carcinogenic properties of MDA (conclusion iii a).

5. Overall Result of the Risk Assessment

Environment

i) There is need for further information and/or testing

This conclusion is reached for sediments. As no information on the toxicity of sediment organisms is available, a risk characterisation for this compartment is not possible. A long-term toxicity test on a sediment-dwelling organism is recommended.

ii) There is at present no need for further information and/or testing or for risk reduction measures beyond those which are being applied already

This conclusion is reached for the aquatic compartment (excluding sediment), microorganisms in treatment plants, the atmosphere and the terrestrial compartment. The environmental risk assessment revealed that a risk related to these compartments is not expected.
**Human Health**

The substance MDA has not been tested for the reproductive toxicity, consequently the risk assessment does not evaluate the risks to any human population for this endpoint.

Risk reduction measures are required in view of the carcinogenic properties of this substance, the need for a test to evaluate the reproductive toxicity will be revisited in the light of the risk reduction strategy.

**Workers**

iii) There is a need for limiting the risks; risk reduction measures which are already being applied shall be taken into account.

The main problems are the carcinogenic property of the substance and the dermal exposure situations. Dermal exposure for all scenarios is anticipated at relevant levels because proper use of suitable tested PPE cannot be assumed.

**Consumers**

iii) There is need for limiting the risks; risk reduction measures which are already being applied shall be taken into account.

The conclusion (iii a) is reached because of the risk assessment shows that risks cannot be excluded as the substance is to be considered as a non-threshold carcinogen.

The conclusion (iii b) is reached because
- sterilization of medical devices consisting of polyurethane components by gamma irradiation should be avoided.
- exposure of consumers should be avoided by including the notified new substance Cartasol Yellow in the regulation to restrict azodyes.

**Man exposed via the environment**

iii) There is need for limiting the risks; risk reduction measures which are already being applied shall be taken into account

This conclusion (iii a) is reached because of the risk assessment shows that risks cannot be excluded as the substance is to be considered as a non-threshold carcinogen.
RISK ASSESSMENT

4,4'-Methylenedianiline

CAS-No.: 101-77-9
EINECS-No.: 202-974-4

Draft of 01.12.1999

Information on the rapporteur

Contact point:
Bundesanstalt für Arbeitsschutz und Arbeitsmedizin
Anmeldestelle Chemikaliengesetz (BAuA)
(Federal Institute for Occupational Safety and Health
Notification Unit)
Friedrich-Henkel-Weg 1-25
44149 Dortmund (Germany)

fax: +49(231)9071-679
e-mail: amst@baua.do.shuttle.de

The Risk Assessment Report of the substance MDA was discussed as “last visit” in October 1998. The final draft RAR was distributed for the written procedure in May 1999. This document is the revised final draft taking into account the comments received under written procedure.
0 OVERALL CONCLUSIONS/RESULTS OF THE RISK ASSESSMENT

CAS No.: 101-77-9
EINECS No.: 202-974-4
IUPAC Name 4,4’-Methylenedianiline

Overall results of the risk assessment:

(X) i) There is need for further information and/or testing
( ) ii) There is at present no need for further information and/or testing and for risk reduction measures beyond those which are being applied already
(X) iii) There is a need for limiting the risks; risk reduction measures which are already being applied shall be taken into account

Summary of conclusions:

Environment

Conclusion i)
As no information on the toxicity of sediment organisms is available, a long-term toxicity test on a sediment organism (Lumbriculus variegatus) should be performed.

Human Health

The substance MDA has not been tested for the reproductive toxicity, consequently the risk assessment does not evaluate the risks to any human population for this endpoint.

Risk reduction measures are required in view of the carcinogenic properties of this substance, the need for a test to evaluate the reproductive toxicity will be revisited in the light of the risk reduction strategy.

Workers

Conclusion iii)

With regard to occupational risk assessment the main problems are the carcinogenic property of the substance and the dermal exposure situations. Dermal exposure for all scenarios is anticipated at relevant levels because proper use of suitable tested PPE cannot be assumed.

Further data on biological monitoring (industry, skilled trade, urinary MDA content, haemoglobin adducts) might be useful to assess different exposure situations.

Consumers

Conclusion iiiib)

Uremic patients or patients receiving blood transfusions frequently are identified to be at risk if polyurethanes used in medical devices as potty materials are sterilized by gamma irradiation. Other treatments for sterilization must be used.
Azodyes which can release MDA are recommended to be restricted for the use as dyes for paper, writing inks, leather and textiles.

Man exposed via the environment

Conclusion iii)

The risk assessment shows that the margin of safety can be assumed to be sufficient, but that risks cannot be excluded at any exposure, as the substance is identified as non-threshold carcinogen.

1 GENERAL SUBSTANCE INFORMATION

Identification of the substance

CAS No.: 101-77-9
EINECS No.: 202-974-4
IUPAC Name: Bis (4-aminophenyl)methane
Synonyma:
4,4'-Methylenedianiline
4,4'-Diaminodiphenylmethane
4,4'-Diphenylmethane diamine
4,4'-Methylendibenzolamine
4,4’-Methylenebisbenzeneamine
4-(4-Aminobenzyl)aniline
MDA

Empirical formula: C₁₃H₁₄N₂

Molecular weight: 198.3 g/mol

Purity/impurities, additives

Technical-grade MDA is used as an intermediate in the form of an isomer mixture with a varying content of tri- and polynuclear amines (so-called „polymers“). A typical standard product is liquid at room temperature and comprises the following (BUA, 1994):

4,4’-MDA: 59- 61 % w/w *)
MDA polymers: approx. 36 % w/w
2,4’-MDA: approx. 3.5 % w/w
2,2’-MDA: < 0.1 % w/w
water: < 300 ppm
aniline: < 100 ppm
Depending on the production process the content of 4,4’-MDA can vary, the minimum content produced has been 30-40%.

Pure 4,4’-MDA is also used as an intermediate and has the following composition (BUA, 1994):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Concentration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4,4’-MDA</td>
<td>≥ 98 % w/w</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,4’-MDA and 2,2’-MDA</td>
<td>max. 2 % w/w</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-amino-4’-methylaminodiphenyl methane</td>
<td>traces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aniline</td>
<td>traces</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Physico-chemical properties**

Pure 4,4’-MDA is at 20 °C and 1013 hPa a colourless to yellowish crystalline powder with a faint amine-like odour.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Melting point</td>
<td>89 °C</td>
<td>Moore, 1978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boiling point</td>
<td>398 - 399 °C at 1013 hPa</td>
<td>Windholz, 1976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Density</td>
<td>1.056 at 100 °C</td>
<td>Moore, 1978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vapour pressure</td>
<td>2.87 * 10⁻⁸ hPa at 20 °C</td>
<td>Bayer AG, 1988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface tension</td>
<td>69.5 mN/m</td>
<td>Bayer AG, 1995a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water solubility</td>
<td>1.25 g/l at 20 °C</td>
<td>Bayer AG, 1996a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partition coefficient (log Pow)</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>Hansch &amp; Leo, 1985</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1) Experimental value (vapour pressure balance) measured in the range 63.5 °C-117.2 °C. The value at 20 °C was received by extrapolation from the vapour pressure curve.

2) Experimental value (ring method), concentration of the aqueous test solution c = 918.01 mg/l; T = 20.1°C

3) The water solubility of the technical product, that means the sum of all solved substances, is 1.55 g/l at 20°C (4,4’-MDA = 1372 mg/l, 2,4’-MDA = 127 mg/l, trinuclear MDA = 42.5 mg/l; measured with the flask method, Bayer AG, 1996a)

   The value of 1372 mg/l is the result of the water solubility of the 4,4’-MDA in the technical grade substance.
   The value of 1.25 g/l was determined using the pure substance (purity > 98%) and was used for the calculations.

4) Test according A.16 not conducted, due to the melting point of 89°C an auto-flammability of the substance is not expected.

5) Test according A.10, A.12 and A.13 not conducted because of structural reasons.
Classification

- (Classification according to Annex I)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T</th>
<th>Carcinogenic Cat. 2</th>
<th>R 45</th>
<th>May cause cancer.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Xn</td>
<td>Harmful</td>
<td>R 20/21/22</td>
<td>Harmful by inhalation, in contact with skin and if swallowed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R 48/20/21</td>
<td>Harmful: danger of serious damage to health by prolonged exposure through inhalation and in contact with skin.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sensitizing</td>
<td>R 43</td>
<td>May cause sensitization by skin contact.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Dangerous for the Environment</td>
<td>R 51/53</td>
<td>Toxic to aquatic organisms, may cause long-term adverse effects in the aquatic environment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- (adopted classification)

Revision of classification was finalised in the Commission Working Groups on the Classification and Labelling of Dangerous Substances in September 1998 (environment) and in October 1998 (human health):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T</th>
<th>Toxic</th>
<th>R 39/23/24/25</th>
<th>Toxic: danger of very serious irreversible effects through inhalation, in contact with skin and if swallowed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Carcinogenic Cat. 2</td>
<td>R 45</td>
<td>May cause cancer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xn</td>
<td>Harmful</td>
<td>R 48/20/21/22</td>
<td>Harmful: danger of serious damage to health by prolonged exposure through inhalation, in contact with skin and if swallowed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mutagenic Cat 3</td>
<td>R 40</td>
<td>Possible risks of irreversible effects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sensitizing</td>
<td>R 43</td>
<td>May cause sensitization by skin contact.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Dangerous for the Environment</td>
<td>R 51/53</td>
<td>Toxic to aquatic organisms, may cause long-term adverse effects in the aquatic environment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2 GENERAL INFORMATION ON EXPOSURE

More than 98% of the total production volume of MDA, i.e. the technical-grade MDA, are used as an intermediate (UC = 33, IC = 3) for the production of Methylene(diphenyl)diisocyanate (MDI), exclusively at the same site (BUA, 1994). MDI is further processed to polyurethanes by almost 1000 users in Western Europe (Frey, 1990).

In Western Europe, 540,000 t MDI, the subsequent product of MDA, were manufactured in 1993. For this, in proportion about 432,000 t MDA were needed. The production and processing volumes have an increasing tendency. In 1980, 267,000 t MDI were produced and 215,000 t processed (Frey, 1990; CEH, 1994).
There are no informations about the total EU export and import volumes.

Further uses of MDA are:

- hardener for epoxy resins (UC = 55, IC = 11)
- hardener in adhesives (UC = 2, IC = 11)
- intermediate in the manufacture of high-performance polymers (UC = 33, IC = 11) (Ciba UK, IUCLID)
- processing to 4,4’-Methylenebis(cyclohexaneamine) (UC = 33, IC = 3) (BASF, 1992 a).

The amount for these non-MDI uses is estimated to be maximum 4000 t/a (APME 1995).

Actually there are no direct uses without chemical transformation (BUA, 1994).

In Denmark, 175 t/a are used in hardeners, adhesives, paint, lacquers and varnishes (Danish Product Register; 1995). 21 t/a are used in Norway (Norwegian Product Register; 1995) and 7 t/a in Sweden (Swedish Product Registry; 1992) in the same use categories.

There are information available, that from the notified new substance Cartasol Yellow under special chemical conditions (reductive cleavage) MDA may be liberated unintentionally. The quantity of the substance imported to the EU market from a Non-EU country amounts more than 10 tones/year.

For workers in general the uptake of azodyes (based on MDA) has to be considered because the amine component could be unintentionally released by reductive conditions in the body.

Concerning the environmental risk assessment the possibly released amounts of MDA are estimated to be negligible.

3 ENVIRONMENT

3.1 Environmental exposure

3.1.1 General discussion

a) Releases into the environment

MDA is synthesized by reaction of formaldehyde and aniline in the presence of hydrochloric acid. The condensation reaction may be carried out in a batch reactor or, alternatively, as a continuous process. The reaction product is a mixture of diamino and polyamino compounds. It is neutralised with an excess of caustic soda and allowed to settle into a two layer mixture. The organic layer is separated, washed with hot water and distilled. The water recovered is recycled to provide the wash water for the washing stage. Unreacted aniline is recycled to the condensation reaction stage. The aqueous layer produced after neutralisation is combined with the aqueous washings from the crude MDA washing stage. This mixture is then washed with aniline to remove dissolved MDA. The
remaining aqueous layer is distilled to remove aniline and then discharged into the sewer (HMSO, 1995). As the volume of the wash water and the partitioning of MDA in aniline/water is not known, the emissions can not be estimated on this basis.

After the neutralisation step, the water phase is saturated with MDA. As the polyamines are substantially less soluble than the diamine (4,4’-MDA: 1.25 g/l; 3-core-MDA: 42.5 mg/l; cf. 1.3), and this phase is finally discharged after aniline treatment, it can be concluded that polyamines are emitted in much lower amounts than diamines. If the waste water is monitored, always the 4,4’-MDA is detected only. It is unlikely that the polyamines will significantly raise the total emissions. Therefore, the emissions of polyamines are of less importance in the exposure assessment.

More than 98% of the MDA are processed to methylenediphenyldiisocyanate (MDI) by reaction with phosgene. Releases to water are expected to be not significant, since any application of cleaning water is scrupulously avoided to prevent deleterious effects on product quality (HMSO, 1995; Gilbert International Isocyanates, 1996).

Maximum 4000 t/a of the produced MDA are sold and used for other applications than MDI synthesis (APME 1995).

The releases into the atmosphere during production of MDA and processing to MDI are expected to be not significant for the environmental risk assessment.

MDA can be formed by hydrolysis of MDI under certain conditions. However, this reaction is depending on the ratio of MDI/water mixing: If the pure isocyanate is spilled into water, polyurea is formed as the main product, while with small MDI amounts mixed with a great excess of water MDA will be formed (Hirzy, 1985). These results are confirmed by Gilbert International Isocyanates (1996): In any case the course of reaction of MDI with water depends on the reaction conditions. Generally if the diisocyanate is spilled into water polyurea is formed as the main product with no detectable or only trace amounts of MDA. Only when small amounts of MDI are vigorously mixed with a great excess of water is MDA formed in significant yield, and then of necessity at very low concentrations (Gilbert International Isocyanates, 1996). As polyurea would cause deleterious effects on the equipment, any application of cleaning water is avoided at the technical processes.

 Releases of MDA into the atmosphere during the further (non-MDI) uses do not occur in significant amounts.

 Diffuse releases can occur from MDA or MDI (after hydrolysis) chemically reacted in polyurethane or epoxy matrices during use and disposal of polymer products. Trace amounts of residual monomeres may be released via migration and leaching.

 b) Degradation

 Water
 All available biodegradation tests were performed with the pure 4,4’-MDA.

 As the biodegradation tests clearly show, MDA is not readily biodegradable. The three available tests on ready biodegradation (OECD 301 B and 301 C) indicate 0 to 19 % degradation after 28 days. The used substance concentration of 10, 20 and 100 mg/l could not have inhibiting activity on the microbial population, since the EC50 for activated sludge was determined to > 100 mg/l (Ciba Geigy, 1985; MITI, 1993; Yakabe, 1993, Bayer AG, 1986).
Different tests on inherent biodegradation are available. A modified MITI-II-Test (OECD 302 C) with activated sludge from predominantly municipal source indicates 43 % degradation after 28 days (99.7 % purity, Bayer AG, 1986). The usable substance concentration of 30 mg/l was too low to have inhibiting activity on the microbial population.

A degradation test with activated sludge from an industrial waste water treatment plant (OECD 302 B, "Inherent biodegradability: Modified Zahn-Wellens-Test") indicates 95 % degradation after 14 days and 97 % after 21 days (BASF, 1988). The usable substance concentration in this test was 389 mg/l. This study is confirmed by an other Zahn-Wellens-Test (OECD 302 B) performed also under the use of activated sludge from industrial wastewater treatment plants. The results of this test indicates > 70 % degradation after 3 days (BASF, 1994).

A Coupled Units Test (OECD 303 A, Ciba Geigy, 1986) with activated sludge produced from a mixed inoculum (secondary effluent, Rhine-water, suspension of garden soil) with an adaptation phase of 25 days indicate only 6.5 % biodegradation after 34 days.

These results show very clearly that 4,4'-MDA is not readily biodegradable and fulfils the criteria stated for inherent biodegradation only if an adapted industrial inoculum is used. From the Coupled Units Test can be deduced that an adaptation time of 25 days is not sufficient. Therefore 4,4'-MDA has to be considered as inherently biodegradable in industrial wastewater treatment plants only. Degradation in municipal wastewater treatment plants cannot be deduced from these results, as shown in the test with activated sludge from predominantly municipal or mixed source.

On the basis of the available biodegradation tests it is not possible to conclude that the substance is biodegraded under environmental conditions.

The UV-spectrum ($\lambda_{\text{max}}$ at 289 nm) indicates that direct photolysis in water may occur. In a test on photolytic degradation in aqueous solution, a quantum yield of 0.006 for direct photodegradation in polychromatic light was determined and half-lives were calculated (Bayer, 1996b). According to the GC-SOLAR program, the half-lives are 3.0 d in summer and 52 d in winter (marginal conditions: pure water from close to the surface, 10th degree of longitude, 50th degree of latitude, clear sky, typical ozone concentrations in the atmosphere). According to the Frank & Klöpffer program, the mean values of the half-lives range from 4.0 d in June to 190 d in December (marginal conditions: pure water from close to the surface, stagnant water, geographic and climatic conditions of 50th degree of latitude, no contribution of another mono- or bimolecular elimination process). As the model of Frank & Klöpffer is closer to real environmental conditions, the respective values seem to be more valid. However, dullness and adsorption of surface waters are not considered. Because of these effects, the photolytical active zone is only close to the surface of real surface waters. Considering the total water body, the real environmental half-lives should be at least one order of magnitude higher than the calculated. Therefore a degradation rate constant of $3.6 \times 10^{-4} \text{ d}^{-1}$ ($\text{DT}_{50} = 1900 \text{ d}$) is used in the exposure assessment.

Based on the molecular structure, hydrolysis is not to be expected under environmental conditions.

**Soil**

The microbial degradation of MDA in soil was investigated under aerobic and anaerobic conditions using carbon-14C labeled MDA (International Isocyanate Institute, 1996). The results show, that biodegradation started immediately after mixing with the aerobic soil. With the binding of the amine to soil the degradation rate decreased later. The test indicates biodegradation of 2.9% after 3 days, 9.1 % after 7 days and 11.6 % after 56 days. During the latter period of the incubation some of the 14CO2 was lost, so the results for 210 and 365 days must be rejected. The degradation rates after 7
and 56 days indicate that biodegradation is disrupted after MDA had formed covalent bounds with humic substances (cf 3.1.1.c). From the remaining results it is not possible to calculate a half-life, but it can be assumed that MDA covalently bound to organic matter is degraded almost similar to the humic acids themselves. Analogously to the investigations for 3,4-dichloroaniline, a mean half-life of 1000 d can be assumed (cf. 3.1.1.c).

Under anaerobic methanogen conditions no $^{14}$CH$_4$ or $^{14}$CO$_2$ was recovered after 73 days of incubation (Gilbert International Isocyanates, 1996).

**Sediments**

There are no data available on biodegradation of 4,4’-MDA in sediments. For the oxic sediment layer, the same reaction constant (1000 d) as for soils is used. Thus, in the following exposure calculations a half-life of 10,000 d is assumed for the sediment compartment.

**Atmosphere**

In a test on photochemical-oxidative degradation in the atmosphere the reaction constant with OH-radicals was determined (Becker, 1987), from this a half-life of 12.8 h can be calculated ($C_{\text{OH}} = 5 \cdot 10^5$ molec/cm$^3$).

**Summary**

The following degradation rates are used in the further exposure assessment:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rate</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$k_{\text{bio,air}}$</td>
<td>0.1 h$^{-1}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$k_{\text{bio,water}}$</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$k_{\text{photo,water}}$</td>
<td>$3.6 \cdot 10^{-4}$ d$^{-1}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$k_{\text{deg,water}}$</td>
<td>$3.6 \cdot 10^{-4}$ d$^{-1}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$k_{\text{bio,sed}}$</td>
<td>$6.9 \cdot 10^{-5}$ d$^{-1}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$k_{\text{bio,soil}}$</td>
<td>$6.9 \cdot 10^{-4}$ d$^{-1}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$k_{\text{deg,air}}$</td>
<td>1.3 d$^{-1}$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

c) Distribution

The major releases of MDA occur into the hydrosphere. With a Henry's law-constant of $4.4 \cdot 10^{-7}$ Pa·m$^3$·mol$^{-1}$ no significant volatilisation from water is expected.

Experiments with radiolabelled 4,4’-MDA revealed that the substance forms covalent bonds with the organic fraction in soils. Initial sorption of MDA in silt loam was nearly completed by 4 hours under aerobic conditions. Under anaerobic conditions, sorption appeared to still be proceeding at 7 days. The Koc values were determined to 4,848 l·kg$^{-1}$ after 8 hours and 7,041 l·kg$^{-1}$ after 7 days for aerobic conditions. The values for anaerobic conditions are 3,828 l·kg$^{-1}$ and 10,729 l·kg$^{-1}$ for 8 h and 7 d, respectively. Furthermore, surface adsorption or ion exchange processes were found with minerals without organic content (III, 1996). It should be kept in mind that the term "Koc" generally...
describes the distribution of a substance between the pore water and the organic matter when the substance is physically bound; if chemisorption occurs the use of this term is not quite correct.

The chemical binding effects are already well-known as a property of aniline and 3,4-dichloroaniline and are described in detail in the respective environmental risk assessment reports in the scope of the first EU priority list.

Investigations were carried out on the binding of different aniline derivatives (toluidines, chloroanilines, not MDA) with various humus extracts and model substances. Reaction partners of the amino moiety were found to be aldehyde or keto groups as well as double bonds of quinoid systems which are typically for humic substances (Parris, 1980). Because of the specificity of the reaction partners, chemisorption onto sewage sludge is not expected. The adsorption of MDA onto sludge should only be physisorption, which is described by the TGD models based on the log Pow of 1.59.

There are no empirically determined values for $K_{\text{susp-water}}$ and $K_{\text{sed-water}}$ available.

With a $K_{\text{oct}}$ of 7,041 l kg$^{-1}$, the following distribution constants are calculated in accordance to the TGD models:

\[
\begin{array}{|c|c|}
\hline
K_{\text{soil}} & 141 \text{ l kg}^{-1} \\
K_{\text{susp}} & 704 \text{ l kg}^{-1} \\
K_{\text{sed}} & 352 \text{ l kg}^{-1} \\
K_{\text{soil-water}} & 211 \text{ m}^3 \text{ m}^{-3} \\
K_{\text{susp-water}} & 177 \text{ m}^3 \text{ m}^{-3} \\
K_{\text{sed-water}} & 177 \text{ m}^3 \text{ m}^{-3} \\
\hline
\end{array}
\]

With a concentration of 15 mg suspended matter per liter river water, 1% of the MDA are particle-bound.

The fate of 4,4’-MDA in treatment plants according to the SIMPLETEAT model is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elimination by biodegradation</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emission via effluent</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

d) Accumulation

In a bioaccumulation test on carp BCFs of 3 - 14 resp. <3.1 - 15 were determined after 6 weeks at concentrations of 200 and 20 µg/l (MITI, 1993). These values indicate a low bioaccumulation in fish.

The bioavailability of the reaction product of MDA with humic acids was not examined. In experiments with 3,4-dichloroaniline an extraordinarily high bioaccumulation was found in organisms with sediment ingestion. While BCFs between 4 and 45 l/kg were determined for fish, values up to 800 l/kg for sediment dwelling organisms indicate that the reaction product of 3,4-dichloroaniline with humic acids is bioavailable.

We expect that MDA has similar properties.

3.1.2 Aquatic compartment
There are no monitoring data for the hydrosphere available.

**Estimation of C\textsubscript{local} / Generic approach: production and processing**

In the *Technical Guidance Documents for New and Existing Substances*, a generic exposure scenario for the release of intermediates into surface water during production is proposed. A release factor of 0.3% into the sewage and subsequent purification in a wwtp (41% elimination according to SIMPLETREAT) is assumed. At the largest sites the total production volume or the major part is processed to MDI. For this reaction no releases are expected (cf. 3.1.1).

Using the highest single production quantity of yearly 110,000 t 55% MDA, the C\textsubscript{local} is estimated according to the TGD model:

- **production volume of technical grade MDA**: 110,000 t/a
- **content 55% 4,4’-MDA**: 60,500 t/a
- **release into waste water (0.3%)**: 182 t/a
- **elimination in stp (41%)**: release into hydrosphere = 107 t/a
- **production during 300 d/a**: release into hydrosphere = 357 kg/d
- **river flow 60 m\textsuperscript{3}/s**: C\textsubscript{local} = 69 µg/l

**Estimation of C\textsubscript{local} / Site-specific approach: production and processing**

The MDA emissions during production and processing to MDI have to be assessed as point source emissions as the single production/processing sites are identifiable.

Valid data about the discharges via waste water are available for all production sites. The emission amounts are calculated from the effluent concentrations and the sewage flows.

For calculating of the C\textsubscript{local}, the dilution of the waste water in the river is considered according to

\[
C_{\text{local}} = \frac{C_{\text{eff}}}{D} \quad \text{with } D = \frac{Q_{\text{river}}}{Q_{\text{ww}}}
\]

C\textsubscript{eff} : concentration in wwtp effluent. If measurements are available, they are always related to 4,4’-MDA.

- **D**: dilution factor
- **Q\textsubscript{ww}**: sewage flow
- **Q\textsubscript{river}**: river flow

In the following table, the estimated emissions, C\textsubscripts{local}s and underlying specific data of these sites which are localized at rivers or river mouths are summarized:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company</th>
<th>Specific Data</th>
<th>C\textsubscript{local} [µg/l]</th>
<th>Emission [kg/a]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>effluent concentration, sewage and river flow</td>
<td>8.0 \cdot 10^{-3}</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>effluent concentration, sewage and river flow</td>
<td>2.7 \cdot 10^{-3}</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>effluent concentration, sewage and river flow</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>processing stopped</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>effluent concentration (mean and 90%ile), sewage and river flow</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>effluent concentration, sewage and river flow</td>
<td>0.088</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There are two rivers which receive the effluents from 2 resp. 3 sites. This can lead to environmental concentrations which are higher than the Clocal figures calculated from single site emissions. At the first river, sites F and H are in close vicinity, so the Clocal figures are added as a worst case approach. At the second river, sites A and E are vicinal, and site C is located at a small tributary. As the emission volume of site C (14 kg/a) is relatively small compared with 60 (A) and 360 kg/a (E), only the Clocals of the sites A and E are added in order to prevent an overestimation of the exposure:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sites</th>
<th>Σ Clocal [µg/l]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F, H</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A, E</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5 MDA producers are located at the sea, the waste waters are emitted into the estuary. In the following table, these data are summarized:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company</th>
<th>specific data</th>
<th>Clocal [µg/l]</th>
<th>Emission [kg/a]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>effluent concentration, sewage flow, no wwtp</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>effluent concentration, sewage flow</td>
<td>0.047</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>effluent concentration, sewage flow</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1,870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>production stopped</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>effluent concentration, sewage flow</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Remarks:

Company G:
The end of the sewage pipe is in a distance of 2,000 m from the coast in a depth of 20 m. The local authority accepted a dilution factor of 1:1,400, however it is unknown how this value was derived. Considering the available information a dilution factor of 100 seems to be appropriate for an initial step.

Company J:
The wwtp effluent is added to a cooling water stream where it is diluted 1:105 before entering the sea. For the Clocal calculation a further dilution with seawater of 1:10 is considered.

Company K:
The waste water is emitted into an industrial harbour which contains seawater and which has an open connection to the sea. In 8 measurements, the MDA concentration in the harbour and the connected canal was below the detection limit of 1 µg/l which is chosen as Clocal. A model calculation (which considers the tides) results in dilution factors of 1:10 after 7 m canal length, 1:100 after 500 m and 1:5,000 after 8,000 m.

Company M:
The end of the sewage pipe is in a depth of 18 m. Considering the available information a dilution factor of 100 seems to be appropriate for an initial step.
The total 4,4'-MDA emission volume during production is calculated to 2,830 kg/a.

Releases from use of MDI in polyurethane manufacturing

As MDA can be formed by hydrolysis of MDI under certain conditions (cf. 3.1.1.b), there is the question if there are MDA releases during MDI processing, e.g. during polyurethane production.

Production of polyurethanes on a MDI-basis is essentially an anhydrous process not leading to waste waters that could be contaminated with traces of MDA. Also, PUR-products are not "washed". Generally, equipment cleaning is done predominantly using mechanical procedures, e.g. sand blasting or organic solvents in order to exclude any water from the machinery. Occasionally, sometimes may be cleaned with hot water, possibly containing tensides. This water will not be in contact with MDI, but with polymeric polyurethanes and polyureas, instead. These polymeric materials are not sources of MDA from hydrolysis.

Work area washdowns are always done with water (and tensides) to remove dirt, oil, spots and stains. Again, these spots and stains may be polyurethanes or polyureas, but normally not MDI. In case there was unreacted MDI in the work area, the washdowns may contain detectable amounts of MDA in the lower ppm range (up to approximately 10 ppm, locally). Hirzy (1985) estimated the amount of MDA emitted via wash water to be 5 g/t PUR produced. In the light of explanations above this figure appears not to be applicable to today's production units. Instead, emissions of MDA from polyurethane manufacturing sites into the aquatic compartment may occur in a small number of cases. However, both their concentrations and their absolute masses can reasonably be considered as being negligible (i.e. occasionally occurring traces, certainly lower than 1 µg/l, due to the dilution in the wash water).

Releases from further uses (epoxy hardener, hardener in adhesives, intermediate for polymers)

In this use categories, pure 4,4'-MDA is used in preference. The use amount was estimated to be 4000 t/a.

Generally, dry processes are used. The presence of even trace amounts of water in systems used for any of the applications would inevitably impair performance. In the majority of the applications, totally "100% solids" systems are used, i.e. resin, hardener, viscosity modifier, fillers etc. In some cases (e.g. laminating and surface coating systems), organic solvents may be added in order to reduce viscosity. Water is totally unsuitable as a solvent in this cases. Similarly, equipment used in the processing of such systems (e.g. moulds, mandrels) can not be cleaned after use with water, because water is an ineffective solvent for the systems being processed. Cleaning is always performed with organic solvents, which are then collected and either recycled to recover used solvent, or burned in a "state of the art" incinerator. Thus in summary, all uses of MDA as a hardener for epoxy resins must for technical reasons be totally non-aqueous. The above conditions/reasoning also applies to the use of MDA as a coreactant for polyurethanes, and use in polyimides/bismaleimide (APME, 1995).

As significant MDA releases into the hydrosphere from these uses are not expected, the calculation of a PEC is not necessary.

Releases from polyurethanes and epoxy resins

Several tests on migration of unreacted MDA from polyurethanes and epoxy resins are available. In water extracts from polyurethanes at 47-48°C, no MDA was detected after 2 weeks resp. 6 months. After autoclaving of PU-films, up to 24 µg MDA/l were found in the elution water. The extracted MDA was just formed during the thermal treatment (Ernes & Hanshumaker, 1983).
In a migration test with MDA-cured epoxy resins amounts up to 0.11 µg MDA/dm² were determined (Baumann & Marek, 1980). In different wine simulants which were in contact with epoxy resin barrels, up to 7.6 mg MDA/kg epoxyd migrated (Larroque, 1988). Because of the small amounts there will be no significant pollution of the environment.

**Sediments**

Because of the binding properties of MDA onto humic substances, an accumulation of the substance in sediments is expected. With a $K_{\text{susp-water}}$ of 177 m³.m⁻³ and the Clocalwater values calculated above, the following Clocalsed are calculated:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company</th>
<th>Clocalwater [µg/l]</th>
<th>Clocalsed [µg/kg ww]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>8.0·10⁻³</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>2.7·10⁻³</td>
<td>0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>0.088</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>0.047</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Sigma$ A, E</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Sigma$ F, H</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It has to be kept in mind that in sediments MDA is always covalently bound onto the organic fraction, although the calculated concentrations are related to 4,4’-MDA.

### 3.1.3 Atmosphere

**Production and processing**

The production of MDA and processing to MDI is generally carried out in continuous processes, and no significant MDA releases into the atmosphere are expected.

However, one company which produces MDA for sale to the polymer industry reports emissions from the pastillation unit. The exhaust air is filtered prior to discharge to atmosphere. From monitoring results, the MDA emissions were estimated to 80-140 (± 100) mg/hour (Ciba-Geigy, 1997). Assuming production during 24h/d and 300 d/a, the emissions would be 720 g/a.

**Use in polymer industry**

During processing to epoxy resins, a MDA contamination of the air at working places is reported (Boeniger, 1984; Boeniger & Phillips, 1984). There were no emission data submitted for European plants. For an American plant which processes 1000 t MDA per year, an exposure estimation is available. The room concentration of MDA was measured (17 values) to 0.4-46.1 (± 9.5) µg/m³. With a total air volume (60,000 m³) removed during one day, the emission amount is calculated to 0.57 g/a. This calculation does not take into account that the exhausted air is filtered, which may
reduce the MDA release, therefore it has to be regarded as a worst case estimation (Ciba-Geigy, 1997).

The Technical Guidance Documents propose a release factor of 0.075. For a plant with a consumption of 1000 t/a and a production period of 300 d/a, the emission would amount to 75 t/a or 250 kg/d. Compared with the 0.57 g/a calculated above, this value seems to be unrealistic high and is not used.

Although the representativity of the American plant is not quite clear (other plants may apply other techniques and produce other resins), the emissions of the polymer industry seem to be negligible.

3.1.4 Terrestrial compartment

During production and processing of MDA, no significant releases into the soil are expected. Only trace amounts may be discharged during deposition of polyurethane and epoxy resin wastes on controlled landfills.

As no significant releases into the atmosphere are to be expected, also a relevant deposition into soils will not occur.

Adsorption onto sewage sludge is negligible, thus significant releases into agricultural soils due to the use of sludge as fertilizer will not occur.

Regional exposure

According to the Technical Guidance Document, generally the regional and the local PECs have to be added to calculate the total PEC which is relevant for the environmental risk assessment. This method is not appropriate for MDA, because of the following reasons:

- Point sources which are scattered over a large region cause the major releases into the hydrosphere. The substance is only emitted into surface waters, and it is unlikely that the emission of one site will reach a second source. Thus, it cannot be assumed that the producers are emitting into a pre-polluted environment. Therefore, only local PECs are taken for the aquatic risk assessment.

- The MDA releases from non-MDI uses are relatively small related to the producers emissions. It will give no significant contribution to the total environmental concentrations.

Therefore, for the environmental risk assessment the aqueous PEC\_local are equated with the C\_local. However, regional PECs should be calculated as input parameters for the indirect exposure of human via the environment. The total emissions were estimated to 2,830 kg/a (cf. 3.1.2.2). The input is 2,550 kg/a for the continental and 283 kg/a for the EU standard regional model. The EUSES output is given in Appendix I. The results are:
### Compartments and Concentrations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Compartment</th>
<th>Continental concentration</th>
<th>Regional concentration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Surface water</td>
<td>$2.9 \cdot 10^{-3} \mu g/l$</td>
<td>$0.01 \mu g/l$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sediment</td>
<td>$1.9 \mu g/kg \text{ dw}$</td>
<td>$6.4 \mu g/kg \text{ dw}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atmosphere</td>
<td>$1.3 \cdot 10^{-15} \mu g/m^3$</td>
<td>$4.6 \cdot 10^{-15} \mu g/m^3$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agric. soil</td>
<td>$9.5 \cdot 10^{-9} \mu g/kg \text{ dw}$</td>
<td>$3.2 \cdot 10^{-8} \mu g/kg \text{ dw}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agr. soil, porewater</td>
<td>$6.7 \cdot 10^{-11} \mu g/l$</td>
<td>$2.3 \cdot 10^{-10} \mu g/l$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industr. soil</td>
<td>$3.5 \cdot 10^{-8} \mu g/kg \text{ dw}$</td>
<td>$1.2 \cdot 10^{-7} \mu g/kg \text{ dw}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nat. Soil</td>
<td>$3.5 \cdot 10^{-8} \mu g/kg \text{ dw}$</td>
<td>$1.2 \cdot 10^{-7} \mu g/kg \text{ dw}$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.1.5 Non-compartment specific exposure relevant to the food chain

Because of the low accumulation of MDA in fish via water, the exposure route fish - fish eating bird is likely to be not relevant. However, the reaction product of MDA with sediment organics accumulates in sediments and is probably bioavailable. A biomagnification via the route sediment - sediment dwelling organisms - fish or bird can not be excluded.

### 3.2 Effects assessment: Hazard identification and Dose (concentration) - response (effect) assessment

Most of the available tests were performed with the pure 4,4’-MDA. Limit data are available for the technical grade MDA. The most relevant results from toxicity tests with aquatic organisms are presented below, differentiating the two products.

#### 3.2.1 Aquatic compartment

By validating the ecotoxicological tests, the photolytical degradation of MDA in water (cf. 3.1.1.b) has to be considered. According to experience with other anilines, the test solution is not stable over a few days. Therefore it has to be assumed that tests without analytical control would be not valid. That means, that all tests using nominal concentrations as bases for the derivation of the effects data can not be taken as valid.

In some tests of Ciba-Geigy an analysis was provided, but after 2 or 3 days the substance concentrations were found to be higher than at the beginning of the test; the analytical part of these tests have to be taken as not valid. However, the prepared concentrations are accepted as nominal effect concentrations, and the test results were calculated on this basis.

**Available effects data for 4,4’- MDA:**

**Vertebrates:**

Only results from short-term tests are available. The acute effect concentrations (LC$_{50}$) range from 32 mg/l to 65 mg/l.

*Brachydanio rerio*  
$96 \text{ h-LC}_{50} = 42.0 \text{ mg/l}$  
(static, nominal concentration, DMF, 95.5-98 % purity, Ciba-Geigy 1985a)
Brachydanio rerio
96 h-LC\textsubscript{50} = 65.0 mg/l
(static, nominal concentration, 99.7 % purity, Bayer 1986)

Leuciscus idus
96 h-LC\textsubscript{50} = 53.0 mg/l
96 h-NOEC = 10.0 mg/l
(static, nominal concentration, 96 % purity, BASF 1988a)

Oryzias latipes
48 h-LC\textsubscript{50} = 32.0 mg/l
(static/semi-static, MITI 1993)

Oncorhynchus mykiss
96 h-LC\textsubscript{50} = 39.0 mg/l
(static, nominal concentration, DMF, 95.5-98 % purity, Ciba-Geigy 1985b)

Invertebrates (daphnia)

Results from short-term tests:
Moina macrocopa
24 h-EC\textsubscript{50} = 2.3 mg/l
(effect: immobilisation, static, nominal concentration, extra pure, Fujiwara 1982)

Results from long-term toxicity tests:
Moina macrocopa
14 d-NOEC = 0.15 mg/l
(effect: reproduction, semi-static, test solution renewed every 48 h, nominal concentration, extra pure, Fujiwara 1982)

Moina macrocopa STRAUS belongs to the daphnids. The difference is that Moina macrocopa has a shorter generation time than Daphnia magna. So, it is possible by using of M. macrocopa to examine the effects of MDA on the reproduction of daphnids in three generations within two weeks. The reproduction test was performed according OECD guidlines 202, part II using at the beginning of the test less than 24 hours old daphnids. The daphnids were fed once daily with unicellular green algae. Under this semi-static condition the test solutions were renewed every 48 hours. The newborn young of the F1 generation are counted every two days.

Plants:
Scenedesmus subspicatus
72 h-EC\textsubscript{50} = 21 mg/l
(effect: growth inhibition, nominal concentration, DMF, 95.5-98 % purity, Ciba-Geigy 1985c)

As shown in a laboratory test, an aqueous solution of 4,4’-MDA can be photolytically degraded (cf. 3.1.1.b). In fact, calculation of the half-life according to Frank & Klöpffer shows a lowest half-life of 3 days. In the long-term invertebrate test (Moina macrocopa), solutions were replaced every 48 h, which means 37\% loss of concentrations between renewal (worst-case assumption: the degradation rate is similar as estimated by Frank & Klöpffer). That also means for all available short-term test with duration times of 96 h a loss of concentration of 60\%. The loss of concentration more than 20 \% is not valid anymore in the understanding of all available test guidelines.

We don’t know the degradation rate under the real test conditions, as the test protocols give no sufficient information about the light conditions. Therefore, we feel that the worst-case-reflection is appropriate at this stage.
Having in mind the facts, that none of the available tests for MDA were done under analytical control, the tests can only be accepted as range-finding tests, but not as a precise determination of the ecotoxicity. The two tests presented by Ciba-Geigy for *Brachydanio rerio* (1985a) and *Scenedesmus subspicatus* (1985c) were indeed performed with analytical control, but from our point of view the analytical part of these tests is not valid as the substance concentration was sometimes higher at the end of the test than at the beginning.

**Microorganisms:**

*Photobacterium phosphoreum*  
30 min-EC\textsubscript{50} = 6.6 mg/l  
(effect: inhibition, nominal concentration, 99% purity, Kaiser 1991)

*Pseudomonas fluorescens*  
16 h-TGK \( \geq 15.0 \) mg/l  
(effect: inhibition of glucose degradation; Bringmann & Meinck 1964)

*Escherichia coli*  
10 d-EC\textsubscript{0} \( \geq 100.0 \) mg/l  
(effect: growth, nominal concentration, purity not specified, Fujiwara 1981)

Activated sludge  
3 h EC\textsubscript{50} \( > 100 \) mg/l  
(effect: inhibition of respiration, nominal concentration, OECD 209, Bayer AG, 1987)

**Determination of PNEC\textsubscript{wwtp}**

For the determination of PNEC\textsubscript{wwtp}, the test result with activated sludge (3 h-EC\textsubscript{50} \( > 100 \) mg/l) is used. The results with *Pseudomonas fluorescens* (TGK = NOEC = 15 mg/l) and with *Photobacterium phosphoreum* (EC\textsubscript{50} = 6.6 mg/l) can not be used according to TGD and the test with *Escherichia coli* (10 d-EC\textsubscript{50} \( \geq 100.0 \) mg/l) is considered as less relevant.

With an assessment factor F = 100, the PNEC is calculated as

\[
\text{PNEC}_{\text{wwtp}} \geq 1 \text{ mg/l}
\]

**Determination of PNEC\textsubscript{aqua} for the 4,4’-MDA**

For the 4,4’-MDA, results from acute tests with species from 3 trophic levels without valid analytical control are available. The lowest acute toxicity was recorded for the daphnid *Moina macrocopa* (24 h-EC\textsubscript{50} = 2.3 mg/l). For the most sensitive species also a long-term study is available (*Moina macrocopa* 14 d-NOEC = 0.15 mg/l). Although, other results from long term tests with the pure 4,4’-MDA are not available, the assessment factor is set at F = 50, since the NOEC found for the algae with the technical grade product will be additionally used.

Therefore:

\[
\text{PNEC}_{\text{aqua}} = 150 \mu \text{g/l} / 50 = 3 \mu \text{g/l}
\]

The long term tests with *Moina macrocopa* is a semi-static one done with a renewing of the test solution every 48 hour, but without analytical control. Because of the photodegradation of MDA during the test time, the PNEC based on effective concentrations should be lower. However, it is ensured that daphnids are the most sensitive species, and the application of an assessment factor of 50 will cover this uncertainty.

The determination of the PNEC based on the acute test on *Moina* and an assessment factor of 1000 would lead to a similar result (2.3 \( \mu \text{g/l} \)).
**Determination of PNEC \textsubscript{sed}**

A determination of a PNEC sediment is not possible, because there are no data with sediment dwelling organisms available. The equilibrium partitioning method is not applicable due to the binding of MDA to the humic substances of the sediment (cf. 3.1.1.c). Sediment organisms will be exposed both to MDA dissolved in the porewater and to the reaction product of MDA with humic acids.

An investigation with other aniline derivatives indicates that the reaction product of anilines with humic acids could be bioavailable. Similar as MDA, 4-chloroaniline and 3,4-dichloroaniline form covalent bounds to the humic fraction of soils and sediments. In a plant-uptake test, radiolabelled chloroanilines were preincubated into soils until the covalent bounds had been formed. Then different plants were sowed and the radioactivity was measured. It was shown that radioactivity was taken up by the plants indicating that the complexes of the humic substances with aniline derivatives are bioavailable (Fuchsbichler, 1978 a,b). This point is elaborated more precisely in the RAR „3,4-dichloroaniline“.

In single species tests and a microcosm experiment, an extraordinary high bioaccumulation of radiolabelled 3,4-dichloroaniline was found. The tests give strong indication that the reaction product of 3,4-dichloroaniline with humic acids is bioavailable. We expect that MDA has similar properties.

A reproduction test with sediment organisms with pre-incubated MDA is necessary to determine the toxicity to sediment organisms.

**Available effects data for technical-grade MDA**

For the technical product (technical-grade MDA 70 - phenylbase MDA 70), only test results based on nominal concentrations for algae are available.

**Plants:**

*Scenedesmus subspicatus*

- 72 h-EC\textsubscript{10} = 2.4 mg/l
- 72 h-EC\textsubscript{50} = 9.8 mg/l

(Effect: biomass, nominal concentration, Bayer AG, 1992b)

*Scenedesmus subspicatus*

- 72 h-EC\textsubscript{10} = 0.3 mg/l
- 72 h-EC\textsubscript{50} = 11.0 mg/l

(Effect: growth rate, nominal concentration, Bayer AG, 1992b)

**Determination of PNEC\textsubscript{aqua} for the technical-grade MDA**

For the technical-grade MDA only tests on algae are available. So, it is not possible to derive a special PNEC on the basis of this few data. Because there is no significant exposure of the polyamine compounds (cf. 3.1.1) the derivation of a PNEC for the technical grade MDA is not necessary.

**3.2.2 Atmosphere**

There are no data available.

**3.2.3 Terrestrial compartment**

For the 4,4’-MDA, valide results from the following tests are available:
### Invertebrates:

**Eisenia fetida**
- 14 d-LC50 = 444.0 mg/kg dw soil
- 14 d-NOEC = 32.0 mg/kg dw soil

(effect: weight increase)

14 d-NOEC = 56 mg/kg dw soil

(effect: behavior and appearance, 99.5% purity, nominal concentrations, TNO 1992a)

### Plants:

**Avena sativa**
- (>99.5% purity, nominal concentrations, TNO 1992 b)
- (Effect: emergence) 17 d-NOEC = 320.0 mg/kg dw soil
- (Effect: growth) 14 d-EC50 = 353.0 mg/kg dw soil
- (Effect: growth) 14 d-NOEC = 100.0 mg/kg dw soil
- (Effect: survival, 14 d after germination) 14 d-NOEC ≥ 1000.0 mg/kg dw soil

**Lactuca sativa**
- (>99.5% purity, nominal concentrations, TNO 1992 b)
- (Effect: emergence) 17 d-NOEC = 100.0 mg/kg dw soil
- (Effect: growth) 14 d-EC50 = 128.0 mg/kg dw soil
- (Effect: growth) 14 d-NOEC = 10.0 mg/kg dw soil
- (Effect: survival, 14 d after germination) 14 d-NOEC ≥ 1000.0 mg/kg dw soil

### Determination of the PNECsoil

For the 4,4’-MDA valid results from short-term tests with species from 2 trophic levels (plants, earthworms) are available. The lowest acute toxicity was recorded for *Avena sativa* (14 d-EC50 = 128 mg/kg soil, growth). As results from long-term tests are not available, the assessment factor is set at F = 1000.

\[
PNEC_{\text{soil}} = \frac{128 \text{ mg/kg}}{1000} = 128 \mu\text{g/kg}
\]

Applying the equilibrium partitioning approach (TGD, eq. 56), a PNECsoil of 370 µg/kg is calculated from a PNECaqua of 3 µg/l. However, this approach is not appropriate for the MDA assessment as the plants are exposed both to "free" MDA in the porewater and the reaction product of MDA with humic acids (which is a different compound!). The last is assumed to be taken up by the plant (see above), but not considered by the model.

### 3.2.4 Non compartment specific effects relevant to the food chain

**Vertebrates: (bird)**

*Agelaius phoeniceus*  
LC50 = 148 mg/kg body weight  
(Schafer et al. 1983)

As there are no indications of a bioaccumulation potential for MDA, an effect assessment for secondary poisoning is not required.

### 3.3 Risk characterisation

#### 3.3.1 Aquatic compartment
Surface water
The PEC/PNEC ratios for the MDA emissions during production for the sites emitting into rivers or river mouths are given in the following table (PNEC = 3 µg/l):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company</th>
<th>PEC_{local} [µg/l]</th>
<th>PEC / PNEC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Generic</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>8.0 \cdot 10^{-3}</td>
<td>0.0027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>2.7 \cdot 10^{-3}</td>
<td>0.0009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>0.088</td>
<td>0.029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.0067</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The PEC/PNEC ratios for the sites emitting into the sea are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company</th>
<th>PEC_{local} [µg/l]</th>
<th>PEC / PNEC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>0.047</td>
<td>0.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.022</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The PEC/PNEC ratios for the rivers polluted from several sites are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sites</th>
<th>Σ C_{local} [µg/l]</th>
<th>PEC/PNEC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A, E</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F, H</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The result is that the PEC/PNEC ratios for all sites are clearly below 1. Thus, no risk to aquatic organisms is expected.

During polyurethane manufacturing and the use of MDA as epoxy hardener, no significant releases are expected. The PEC/PNEC ratios are considered to be negligible.

Sewage treatment plants
The highest submitted wwtp effluent concentration is below 500 µg/l. Compared with the PNEC_{wwtp} of 1 mg/l (cf. 3.2.1), a PEC/PNEC ratio of maximum 0.5 is derived. This value indicates that no hazard onto sewage sludge has to be expected.

Sediment
As no PNEC_{sed} could be estimated, a risk assessment for this sub-compartment is not possible. A test on sediment organisms (Lumbriculus variegatus) with pre-incubated MDA should be performed.

3.3.2 Atmosphere
As no significant releases into the atmosphere are expected, an assessment for this compartment is not necessary.
3.3.3 Terrestrial compartment

As no significant releases into soils are expected, an assessment for this compartment is not necessary.

3.3.4 Non compartment specific effects relevant to the food chain

Because of the low accumulation of MDA in fish via water, the exposure route fish - fish eating bird is likely to be not relevant. However, the reaction product of MDA with sediment organics accumulates in sediments and is probably bioavailable. A biomagnification via the route sediment - sediment dwelling organisms - fish or bird can not be excluded.

Because of missing experimental data, this issue can not be assessed.

4 Human Health

4.1 Human Health (Toxicity)

4.1.1 Exposure assessment

General discussion

Approximately 98 - 99 % of all 4,4’-methylene dianiline (MDA) produced is used in the chemical industry as an intermediate which is further processed to methylene diphenyl di-isocyanate (MDI).

Approximately 2 % of MDA is employed as a chemical intermediate and as a cross-linking agent

- in plastics processing for high-performance polymers
- as a co-reactant for polyurethane elastomers, foams (used as insulating material for walls and roofs, for containers and tubing, or for filling of cavaties and as upholstering material for furniture, cars and mattresses) and special-purpose coatings, and for epoxy resins and two-component adhesives.

The use of MDA as a hardener is declining, since the development of substitutes is strengthened.

Further it is possible to use the raw material for processing azodyes; at present it does not correspond to the state of the art in Germany and in UK.

Azodyes in general could release the amine component unintentionally under special conditions (reductive cleavage). The import of azodyes to the EU-market from a Non-EU country cannot be excluded, as the notification of the new substance Cartasol Yellow shows (import of more than 10 tones/year). Azodyes could be used as dyes for paper, leather, writing inks and textiles. Quantitative information on the use of the substances are normally not available. The extent of decomposition under use conditions (e.g. dying) is assumed to be not significant. But for workers the dermal uptake of the azodye itself, that may occur during dying, has to be considered. Because of reductive conditions in the body (e.g. by bacteria of the intestinal) the dye could lead to an unintentionally release of MDA.
On account of the physicochemical properties of the pure substance (solid, vapour pressure $<< 1$ Pa), inhalative exposure to dust at the workplace during the handling of the substance in solid form (flakes, granules and crystals) must be taken into consideration.

The occupational exposure limits (OELs) are in the Netherlands, Denmark, Belgium, Italy, Switzerland, Australia and USA (ACGIH) 0.8 mg/m$^3$, in Germany 0.1 mg/m$^3$ (TRK, technical based occupational exposure limit) and in the United Kingdom 0.08 mg/m$^3$ (ILO, 1994; BAuA, 1997; HSE, 1997).

In the Swedish Product Register (1995) two out of 36 products containing MDA are noted to be consumer products. No further information is given.

The Swedish „National Chemicals Inspectorate“ stated that in 1996 hardeners for paint containing 35-49% of MDA were not imported to Sweden. MDA could be used also in paints, but there is no information available indicating that such paints are offered in Europe.

**Occupational exposure**

**Occupational exposure during production and further processing in the chemical industry**

**Production and further processing as a chemical intermediate**

MDA is produced continuously at about 90 - 100 °C in closed systems. The reaction product is a liquid mixture (technical grade) rich in methylene dianiline isomers which typically contains about 60% 4,4'-methylene dianiline (4,4'-MDA). The main by-products are other polynuclear amines together with smaller quantities of 2,4'-MDA and 2,2'-MDA. Pure 4,4'-MDA (approx. 99%) is recovered from this mixture in flake form by distillation. The liquid isomer mixture and also pure MDA are placed on the market; pure MDA is sold in flake or granulate form or as a prill (Hirzy, 1985; Layer, 1991; Fairhurst, 1993).

For the production of methylene di-isocyanate, mainly the liquid isomer mixture is employed, though pure MDA is used for particular applications.

MDA is further used in the production of dicyclohexyl methane-4-4'-di-isocyanate, which is of importance as a special component of polyurethane lacquers, (2K-lacquers, automobile and buildings, Baumann et al, 1997 a) and it is used as a cross-linking agent in the manufacture of high-performance polymers such as polyester imides, polyamide imides and polybismalein-imides. The latter are sold as resins (e.g. polyamide imides, bismaleinimides) with a free MDA content of 0.1 - 10% (APME 1995).

Inhalative and dermal exposure is possible during handling of the flakes e.g. sampling and analysis, filling and drumming, repair, maintenance and cleaning activities. In dependence on these activities, differing levels of exposure are to be expected. Dermal exposure is also possible during handling of the technical grade MDA and other mixtures.

In the state of knowledge of one german producer samples are taken in closed sample equipments with exhaustion. Pumps for MDA are leak-proof, as shut-off devices special values are used. As a rule MDA is transported through pipes directly to further processing. In very few cases tank trucks are loaded using gas displacement device.
All employees are supplied with work dress, safety shoes, protecting glasses. At some occupations e. g. coupling or decoupling of tanks, taking samples, repairing, chloroprene-gloves are worn. Chloroprene and other materials like rubber, PVC and other plastics are recommended by the producers, but there are no information about the suitability of these materials.

**Measuring results**

Several approved methods for measuring 4,4'-MDA in air in working areas are known. Here four methods are described.

Determination limit for method 1 (sampling is carried out by adsorption on acid-treated silicagel, elution and diazotation followed by photometric determination) is 0.1 mg MDA/m³ at 80 l air sampled, and 0.025 mg MDA/m³ at 320 l air (in 8 hours).

Method 2 (sampling by adsorption on acid-treated filter and processing as described above) has a determination limit of 0.008 mg MDA/m³ at 500 l air sampled.

In method 3 determination is carried out without derivatisation by liquid chromatography. The determination limit is also 0.008 mg/m³ at 500 l air sampled.

For Method 4 absorption in 0.05 M sulphuric acid and gas chromatography with a nitrogen selective detector is used. Determination limit is 0.001 mg/m³ for two hours (BG Chemie, 1997).

For the methods described, sampling was in accordance with the total dust definition. The methods 1 and 2 are not specific for 4,4'-MDA; aryl amines and aromatic isocyanates are determined also, phenol disturbs. If a selective method is needed the third and fourth one are recommended. The results of workplace measurements in the field of production and further processing in the chemical industry submitted by several companies are presented in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>job category / activities</th>
<th>comp any</th>
<th>year of measurement</th>
<th>number of samples</th>
<th>range of measurement data [mg/m³]</th>
<th>geometric mean [mg/m³]</th>
<th>95 % value [mg/m³]</th>
<th>duration and frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8h TWA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>manufacture</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>'91 - '94 '90 - '94</td>
<td>4 (p.s. 5)</td>
<td>&lt; 0.021(2)</td>
<td>0.021(2)</td>
<td>0.01(2)</td>
<td>no information available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>production /processing plant</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>no information available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>production/non isolated to MDI</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>1993 - 1994</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>&lt; 0.01</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td></td>
<td>no information available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>production3)</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>no information available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>production3)</td>
<td>Q(1)</td>
<td>1993 - 1997</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>&lt; 0.033)</td>
<td>0.033)</td>
<td></td>
<td>no information available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plant operator and technicians6)</td>
<td>R(1)</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>0.002 - 0.083</td>
<td>0.002 - 0.083</td>
<td></td>
<td>no information available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant operator 6)</td>
<td>R(2)</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>65, 52, 20, 5, 5</td>
<td>&lt; 0.001-0.314, &lt; 0.001-0.118, &lt; 0.001-0.084, &lt; 0.001-0.024, &lt; 0.001-0.003</td>
<td>0.021, 0.012, 0.011, 0.011, 0.0024</td>
<td></td>
<td>no information available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>senior operator 6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>work-up operator6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>maintenance worker6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>process technicians6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>manufacture MDA 6)</td>
<td>R(3)</td>
<td>'89 - '90 '91 - '94</td>
<td>21, 39</td>
<td>0 - 4.95, 0 - &lt; 0.044)</td>
<td>0.43, 0.002)</td>
<td></td>
<td>no information available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>job category / activities</td>
<td>company</td>
<td>year of measurement</td>
<td>number of samples</td>
<td>range of measurement data [mg/m³]</td>
<td>geometric mean [mg/m³]</td>
<td>95 % value [mg/m³]</td>
<td>duration and frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plant worker</td>
<td>R(4)</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>&lt;0.0002 (det.limit)</td>
<td>no information available</td>
<td>no information available</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>production(^3)</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>1992 1995</td>
<td>8 9</td>
<td>analytical result(^3); not used</td>
<td>no information available</td>
<td>no information available</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>production(^3)</td>
<td>Q(2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>biol. monitoring(^3); not used</td>
<td>no information available</td>
<td>no information available</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>manufacture of MDA(^6)</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>1993 1994</td>
<td>10 3</td>
<td>&lt;0.09 &lt;0.025</td>
<td>no information available</td>
<td>no information available</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reactor floor(^6)</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>'93 - '95</td>
<td>50 (f.p.m.)</td>
<td>&lt; 0.001 - 0.179(^{1(2)})</td>
<td>0.029(^{1(2)})</td>
<td>no information available</td>
<td>no information available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDA manufacture(^5)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>'89 - '90</td>
<td>10 (p.s.)</td>
<td>nd - 0.003</td>
<td>no information available</td>
<td>no information available</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reactor operation, drumming liquid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>manufacture</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>'81 - '93</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>&lt; 0.005 - &lt; 0.05(^2)</td>
<td>0.007(^1) (50%)</td>
<td>0.01(^1) (90%)</td>
<td>no information available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pastillator floor(^5)</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>'93 - '95</td>
<td>36 (f.p.m.)</td>
<td>&lt; 0.001 - 0.085(^{1(2)})</td>
<td>0.027(^1)</td>
<td>no information available</td>
<td>no information available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDA packaging floor(^6)</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>'93 - '95</td>
<td>26 (f.p.m.)</td>
<td>&lt; 0.001 - 0.08(^{1(2)})</td>
<td>0.016(^1)</td>
<td>no information available</td>
<td>no information available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>laboratory work</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>'90 - '94</td>
<td>9 (p.s.)</td>
<td>&lt; 0.01 - 0.04(^{1(2)})</td>
<td>no information available</td>
<td>no information available</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>'91 '94</td>
<td>1 (p.s.) 3 (f.p.m.)</td>
<td>0.13(^1) &lt; 0.01(^{1(2)})</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QC laboratory(^6)</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>'93 - '95</td>
<td>4 (p.s.)</td>
<td>&lt; 0.001(^{1})</td>
<td>no information available</td>
<td>no information available</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>residue drumming area(^6)</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>'93 - '95</td>
<td>4 (f.p.m.)</td>
<td>&lt; 0.001(^{1})</td>
<td>no information available</td>
<td>no information available</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>filling/tank truck</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>'94</td>
<td>1 (p.s.)</td>
<td>&lt; 0.01(^{1})</td>
<td>no information available</td>
<td>no information available</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>warehouse area(^6)</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>'93 - '95</td>
<td>3 (p.s.)</td>
<td>&lt; 0.001(^{1})</td>
<td>no information available</td>
<td>no information available</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bagging flake MDA(^5)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>'89 - '90</td>
<td>3 (p.s.)</td>
<td>0.004 - 0.012</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>no information available</td>
<td>no information available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>further processing(^3)</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>1990 - 1998</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.008 - 0.01(^{1})</td>
<td>no information available</td>
<td>very short; not daily</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conversion to MDI</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>'90 - '94</td>
<td>7 (p.s.) 3 (f.p.m.)</td>
<td>&lt; 0.02(^{1}) &lt; 0.01(^{1})</td>
<td>no information available</td>
<td>no information available</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDA operator(^9)</td>
<td>R(2)</td>
<td></td>
<td>46</td>
<td>&lt;0.001 - 0.52</td>
<td>0.027</td>
<td>no information available</td>
<td>no information available</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^*)\) p.s. = personal sampling; f.p.m. = fixed point measurement

1) Sampling was in accordance with the total dust definition; no information has been provided concerning the other measurements.
2) Measurement of total aromatic amines.
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3) New measurements
4) The reduction in exposure (from a mean value of 0.434 mg/m³ to 0.002 mg/m³) can probably be attributed to modifications made to the technical ventilation systems
5) Data from literature (Fairhurst, 1993)
6) particulate MDA; for R(1), R(2) and R(3) unknown, but assumed

The measurement results which were submitted for inhalative exposure during the continuous manufacture and further processing of MDA as a chemical intermediate are to be regarded as valid. But only for a few results details regarding activity-related data on the duration and frequency of exposure, the 90th - or 95th -percentile of the measurement results as well as information on the activities of cleaning and maintenance and on the collective of exposed persons are submitted.

Up to now two companies had not submitted data or detailed information. Furthermore it is not clear, which company has submitted their data anonymous (see company R in the table above).

In the majority of cases, the measurement results are located below the technical occupational exposure limit (TRK) of 0.1 mg/m³ which at present is valid in the Federal Republic of Germany. But for most of the measurements detailed information are missing, especially the 90th - or 95th percentile, which is necessary to describe the reasonable worst case for a collective of measurement results. It is not possible to calculate it on the basis of the submitted data (see above).

As far as it is known 6 of 14 companies/sites produce the liquid isomer mixture containing app. 60% 4,4’-MDA, 5 companies/sites produce pure 4,4’-MDA (but only in one case it is mentioned by the company), for one company it is unknown, one company processed the pure substance in a molten form and two companies stopped their production in 1997. The measurement data are assigned to dust exposure if no information is available or if they are submitted anonymous and the exposure results exceed the detection limit (see R(1), R(2) and R(3) in the table above), because it is unlikely that the exposure to MDA-vapour was measured (vapour pressure <<1Pa).

At present four companies of six had submitted data for exposure to dust, two submitted measurement results (see above U, W) the other (see above Q, S) more general information. Additionally the measurement data of three companies (or sites) which had submitted their data anonymous are assigned to dust exposure. The corresponding results show large differences from < 0.001 to 0.52 mg/m³. Some of them show that efforts are made to reduce the exposure (e.g. from mean 0.434 in ‘89 - ’90 to 0.002 mg/m³ in ‘91 - ’94) by technical means which may be a result of the implementation of (lower) OELs. According to the information of one company the duration and frequency of further processing is very short and not daily which is regarded as a particular case. The high production volume gives rise to the assumption that a daily exposure over the full shift is prevailed during production and further processing.

Because the implementation of OELs could lead to the decreasing of exposure levels by improving the technical means, it has to be taken into account, that in the member states the OELs differ about a factor of ten (0.08 mg/m³, 0.1 mg/m³ to 0.8 mg/m³) and that not every member state, where MDA is produced, has established one (see chap. 4.1.1.1).

Because of the circumstances mentioned above and the lack of information it is very difficult to fix one value as a reasonable worst case on the basis of the submitted data.

Production of preparations within the chemicals industry
For the manufacture of high-performance polymers such as speciality epoxies, polyester imides, polyamide imides and polybismaleinimides and for polyurethane foams and elastomers 4,4’-MDA
is used as a curing agent. The imid formulations are sold as resins (e.g. polyamide imides, bismaleimides) with a free MDA content of 0.1 - 10% (APME 1995). Furthermore curing formulations containing MDA together with other ingredients like solvents or accelerators etc. are placed on the market. They are produced in form of liquids, pastes and granules. Imid formulations with a content of free MDA between 4 - 9 % (APME 1995) are also produced in form of powders. With regard to this further processing in the area of the large-scale chemical industry it is assumed that, as a rule, closed systems are used and that partially open systems are covered and equipped with suitable exhaust ventilation systems.

Activities relevant to exposure are transfer, weighing, filling and drumming and cleaning and maintenance work. The drumming of powdery imid preparations has to be taken into account as an additional exposure scenario compared to the production of the substance (liquid, flakes). Because of the lack of workplace measurements and information for assessing the risks for inhalative exposure the estimation according to the EASE-model is used (see chap. 4.1.1.2.5).

Workplace measurements
Workplace measurements and information on the duration and frequency of exposure as well as on the collective of exposed persons are missing.

Dermal exposure within the chemical industry
As a protection against dermal exposure materials like rubber, PVC, other plastics and chloroprene are recommended by the producers without testing. The dermal exposure of the hands during manufacturing and further processing of 4,4'-MDA has been investigated by HSE in 1989 -'90 as a function of glove material (Fairhurst 1993). Besides of chloroprene, the study shows that materials like PVC gauntlets, PVC coated fabric, natural rubber heavy- and lightwise and polyethylene mitts do not provide complete protection. In the area of manufacturing after drumming off crude liquid MDA with PVC gauntlets during 91 min the MDA contamination on the cotton gloves underneath was 1.1 mg; the highest exposure after packing flakes with gloves of natural rubber was 0.54 mg (max. 216 min). It is not known, whether the contamination is a result of penetration or permeation through the outer gloves or a low standard of hygiene. Information about the suitability of materials like chloroprene and other plastics are not available. Other investigations show that without gloves higher levels (app 4.2 - 42 mg) were reached (Cocker et al 1988 in BUA 1994; EPA 1985 in EPA 1992). Because occlusion of the substance underneath the gloves cannot be excluded, when unsuitable gloves are worn, the estimation according to the EASE-model is used for assessing the risks for dermal exposure (see chap. 4.1.1.2.3).

Occupational exposure in fields of application outside the chemical industry (industrial and skilled trade sectors)
4,4’-MDA is used as a curing agent in one-component preparations with resins such as speciality epoxies or polyester imides, polyamide imides and polybismaleimides for high performance composites. These preparations are combined with a reinforcing fiber as for example for prepregs, molding compounds or reinforced film adhesives.

Furthermore epoxies and polyurethanes can be sold as one- or two-component systems. Two-component systems are generally mixed immediately before use with the liquid, pasty or granulated curing formulation containing MDA or with MDA in pure form, which is assumed to be more seldom (Hirzy, 1985).

Production of preparations in the industrial sector
The processing of formulations with 4,4'-MDA as a curing agent (e.g. imid resins formulations containing 0.1-10% MDA, formulations for curing epoxid resins 9 - 60% MDA and formulations for polyurethane curing 4 - 5% MDA) is principal possible in the large-scale chemical industry (see chap. 4.1.1.2.1) and also in formulating companies. For formulating companies in the industrial area the high standard of occupational hygiene cannot be assumed generally. It cannot be excluded that workplaces exist which are not adequate to the state of the art (e.g. inadequate local exhaust ventilation). Activities relevant to exposure are transfer, weighing, filling and drumming and cleaning and maintenance work. The drumming of powdery imid preparations has to be taken into account as an additional exposure scenario compared to the production of the other preparations (liquid, flakes).

Handling of preparations in the industrial sector

The differentiation between the scenarios is because of the use as ready-to use system or as one-respectively two-component systems and the form of the MDA-containing component.

One-component systems

One-component systems can be distinguished in ready-to-use systems (liquid or pasty) and systems which has to be prepared by mixing with water or solvents before use.

1. If it is a ready-to-use one-component system which is liquid or more or less pasty then only handling will be the right scenario (dermal exposure);

2. If the one-component system is in flake or granulated form then before handling mixing with water or solvents is necessary to prepare a ready-to-use formulation. Mixing may include the activities weighing and filling. During mixing inhalation exposure (low dust technique) and dermal exposure is considered; during handling only dermal exposure.

3. If the one-component system is in powdery form then before handling mixing with water or solvents is necessary to prepare a ready-to-use formulation. Mixing may include the activities weighing and filling. During mixing inhalation exposure (dry manipulation) and dermal exposure is considered; during handling only dermal exposure.

Two-component systems

Two-component systems always have to be prepared by mixing the two-components together before use.

4. If it is a two-component system and both components are liquid or pasty then only dermal exposure is to be expected.

5. If it is a two-component system and the MDA-containing component is in flake or granulated form then during mixing which includes the activities weighing and filling inhalative (low dust technique) and dermal exposure has to be considered; during handling only dermal exposure.

6. If it is a two-component system and the MDA-containing component is in powdery form then during mixing which includes the activities weighing and filling inhalation (dry manipulation) and dermal exposure has to be considered; during handling only dermal exposure.

For epoxy systems the scenarios 1, 2 and 4, 5 are taken into account; for polyurethane systems the scenarios 4, 5; for imid polymers scenario 3. There is no information which gives rise to consider scenario 6.
**Epoxy resins**

Epoxy resins which are used with 4,4’-MDA as the hardener component have applications in many fields. These extend from the production of structured laminates for heat- or chemical-resistant pipes and containers to corresponding coatings (e.g. for concrete floors). These epoxy resins are sold as one- and two-component systems. Two-component systems are generally mixed immediately before use, and the curing formulations may be liquids, pastes or granules (containing MDA between 9 - 60 %, APME, 1995), or MDA in pure form, which is assumed to be more seldom (Hirzy, 1985).

**Polyurethane foams and elastomer**

4,4’-MDA is employed as a curing additive (preparation containing 4-5%; APME, 1995) for two-component high-performance polyurethane foams and elastomer systems based on aliphatic isocyanates (Hirzy, 1985). For one-component solvent free PU-lacquer systems masked polyamines are used together with masked NCO-prepolymeres. By the occurrence of humidity the amine is released and react with the isocyanate to a high-molecular polyurethane-polyurea (Baumann und Muth, 1997, Goldschmidt et al., 1984, Biethan et al., 1979). With regard to a comprehensive publication about 1800 chemicals which are used in paints and lacquers, where MDA is not mentioned (Baumann und Muth, 1997), the use of 4,4’-MDA as a masked polyamine for lacquers seems to be not relevant.

**High-performance imid polymers**

Resins for high-performance polymers are used for example in the electrical industry, e.g. as high-temperature cable insulation (polyester imides, polyamide imides), and also in aircraft construction (polybismaleimides) (Hirzy, 1985). The free MDA content is between 0.1 - 10 % (APME, 1995).

The application methods include both closed, fully automatic processes and also partially open manual processes depending on the purpose of application e.g. prepregging, hand lay up of prepreg, wet filament winding, resin transfer molding (for detailed descriptions see: Hirzy, 1985; SACMA, 1991). Inhalative exposure is possible particularly during mixing when the substance/formulation is handled openly in granulated, flake or powder form (filling activities). Specialised coating procedures (e.g. spray painting) are assumed to be more seldom. Dermal exposure is possible during mixing and also filling activities and when non-automated coating procedures (e.g. painting concrete floors) are in use. Because of the lack of workplace measurements and information for assessing the risks for inhalative exposure the estimation according to the EASE-model is used (see chap. 4.1.1.2.5).

According to one manufacturer one-way protective clothing and breathing mask are worn if open handling is necessary. To avoid skin contact gloves made of rubber, PVC and other plastics are recommended by the producers. There are no information about the test of suitability of the materials available.

**Workplace measurements**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>job category / activities</th>
<th>year of measurement</th>
<th>number of samples</th>
<th>range of measurement data [mg/m³]</th>
<th>geometric mean [mg/m³]</th>
<th>95 % value [mg/m³]</th>
<th>duration and frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8h TWA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>using flake MDA</td>
<td>1989 - 19990</td>
<td>3 (p.s.)</td>
<td>0.002 - 0.185&lt;sup&gt;1)&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0.112&lt;sup&gt;1)&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>further processing of synthetic resin (in total)&lt;sup&gt;2)&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1992-1997</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>&lt;0.02 (to 1993)&lt;sup&gt;3)&lt;/sup&gt; &lt; 0.001 (50th-%)</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job category / activities</td>
<td>Year of measurement</td>
<td>Number of samples</td>
<td>Range of measurement data [mg/m³]</td>
<td>Geometric mean [mg/m³]</td>
<td>95 % value [mg/m³]</td>
<td>Duration and frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With LEV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Without LEV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Further processing ³)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt; 0.025</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PU-components spraying ⁴)</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.045</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Background</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.0005 - 0.132</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PU-components laminating (hand) ⁵)</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>&lt; 0.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the non-chemical industries, especially for the further processing of synthetic resins (see the table above), the workers compensation funds have submitted actual 8h TWA values (BG Chemie, 1997). During further processing of epoxy and polyurethane resins and coatings for solder-masks, the values were determined for the activities preparing and mixing of the components, gluing, spraying, pouring, pressing and painting of the mixtures. Two of the results were determined when powders are used; the corresponding exposure levels were below the limit of determination (< 0.001 mg/m³).

In the scope of the implementation of TRK-values for 4,4’-MDA, results of workplace measurements are published also. In the area of further processing 12 shift average values are measured below the detection limit (0.025 mg/m³). During batchwise filling of a reaction vessel with powdery 4,4’-MDA the value of 2.5 mg/m³ (duration of exposure: 2h) was measured. At this time the workplace was not in accordance with the state of the art (TRK-Wert Begründung Nr.24, 1989). Comparable measurement results (n = 2) are published by Fairhurst during sack emptying flake MDA with inadequate LEV (Fairhurst, 1993).

Again detailed information are missing, especially for the handling of solids. In total 6 measurements are made of dust exposure. Some of the descriptions indicate, that also powders are used. Probably the flakes are pulverised before use (Hirzy, 1985) or imid preparations are used. It can not be excluded, that the LEV may work insufficient as 3 of these measurements show (Fairhurst, 1993; TRK-Wert Begründung Nr.24, 1989). Because of the small number of measuring results, the highest measurement result of 2.5 mg/m³ (duration of exposure: 2h), respectively 0.63 mg/m³ (8h-TWA) is used for assessing the risks for inhalative exposure (see chap. 4.1.1.2.3 and 4.1.1.2.5).

In one case of using specialised coating procedures (spray painting, without LEV), the exposure to aerosols was found to be 0.045 mg/m³ with background concentrations between 0.0005 - 0.132 mg/m³.
mg/m³ (HSE, 1995). It is not known, which analytical method is used. Two methods are not specific for 4,4’-MDA aryl amines and aromatic isocyanates are determined also and phenol disturbs (see chap.4.1.1.2.1). Because of the high background concentrations the measured exposure is not regarded as significant.

**Dermal exposure in the industrial area**

In various working areas (MDA manufacturing and further processing of liquid/putty-like formulation) HSE has investigated in 1989 - ‘90 the dermal exposure of the hands as a function of glove material for a defined time of exposure [Fairhurst, 1993]. The result is that the materials investigated do not provide complete protection. The absolute quantity of MDA which reaches the skin decreases if the gloves are regularly changed. The highest values within the gloves - approx. 8 and 5 mg MDA - were determined during handling liquid crude MDA to formulate putties (exposure duration: 90 and 42 min; 2 hands). During extrusion of the product without gloves, exposure was 2 000 mg (exposure duration: 110 min; 2 hands). It is not known, whether the contamination is a result of penetration or permeation through the outer gloves or a low standard of hygiene. Other investigations [Cocker et al 1988 in BUA, 1994] in the field of manufacture and processing without gloves amount measurement results of the dermal exposure levels in the range 5 -50 µg/cm² (no information on exposure duration or the form in which the substance was handled). If the total surface area of both hands is assumed to be 840 cm², (EPA 1985 in EPA 1992), the dermal exposure is thus calculated to be 4.2 - 42 mg. During the production of reinforced plastic pipes the dermal exposure was investigated by measuring 4,4’-MDA in hand washing and on cotton gloves underneath protective gloves made of natural rubber on a cotton matrix (Hoogendoorn et al in 1995, The Netherlands, comments 1997). In dependence of the tasks different material strength was used. The measuring results for actual exposure on the cotton gloves underneath ranges from not detected to 3.3 mg and agree with the study of Fairhurst.

**Handling of epoxy resins in the skilled trade sector**

In the skilled trade sector, too, the substance is handled in open systems. In the buildingtrade, MDA is used as a hardener for two-component epoxy resins in special cases (e.g. coating concrete floors). It may be assumed that the material is mixed on site lasting app. 0.5 hours. Hardener formulations are sold in liquid, pasty and granulated forms (with an MDA content up to 60 %), and possibly also as pure MDA but this is assumed more seldom; the available documents do not indicate in what form the hardener is used in the buildingtrade. About the frequency of exposure no information is available. Not daily is assumed, more detailed assumptions whether it is every second or third day is not possible.

Inhalative exposure is possible particularly during mixing when the substance/formulation is handled openly in granulated and flake form (filling activities). Dermal exposure is also possible during mixing and filling activities and when non-automated coating procedures (e.g. painting concrete floors) are in use.

Estimation of the exposure according to the EASE model

Estimation of the inhalative exposure level performed in accordance with the EASE model produces the following results:

**Inhalative exposure**

Inhalative exposure to dust during manufacture and processing of flakes or granulates in the chemical industry and in the industrial area with local exhaust ventilation (LEV)
Inhalative exposure to dust during drumming of powdery imid preparations in the chemical industry and in the industrial area with local exhaust ventilation (LEV)

Input parameters:  
T = 20 °C  
low dust technique  
LEV present

estimated exposure level: 0 - 1 [mg/m³]

Inhalative exposure to dust during processing of preparations in the industrial area and skilled trades without local exhaust ventilation (LEV)

Input parameters:  
T = 20 °C  
dry manipulation  
LEV absent

estimated exposure level: 0 - 5 [mg/m³]

considering the content of MDA in curing formulations for epoxy resins is max. 60%, the exposure level is estimated to 0 - 3 mg/m³

considering the content of MDA in curing formulations for polyurethane resins is max. 5%, the exposure level is estimated to 0 - 0.3 mg/m³

Inhalative exposure to dust during drumming of powdery imid preparations in the industrial area without local exhaust ventilation (LEV)

Input parameters:  
T = 20 °C  
dry manipulation  
LEV absent

estimated exposure level: 5 - 50 mg/m³

considering the content of MDA in imid resins is max. 10%, the exposure level is estimated to 0.5 - 5 mg/m³

Dermal exposure
Dermal exposure during manufacture, formulation and handling in the chemical industry and the industrial sector without using gloves
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Input parameters:  
T = 20 °C  
closed system, which is breached  
direct handling  
intermittent

estimated exposure level:  
0.1 - 1 [mg/cm²/day]

considering the content of MDA in crude liquid MDA is app. 60%, the exposure level is estimated to

0.06 - 0.6 mg/cm²/day

considering the content of MDA in curing formulations for epoxy resins is max. 60%, the exposure level is estimated to

0.06 - 0.6 mg/cm²/day

considering the content of MDA in curing formulations for polyurethane resins is max. 5%, the exposure level is estimated to

0.005- 0.05 mg/cm²/day

considering the content of MDA in imid resins is max. 10%, the exposure level is estimated to

0.01 - 0.1 mg/cm²/day

Dermal exposure to dust during mixing and handling of formulations without using gloves

Input parameters:  
T = 20 °C  
wide dispersive use  
direct handling  
intermittent

estimated exposure level:  
1 - 5 [mg/cm²/day]

considering the content of MDA in formulations is max. 60%, the exposure level is estimated to

0.6 - 3 mg/cm²/day

Further exposure data are provided by the federal monitoring authorities. Data from literature (USA, Canada and Sweden) published between 1978 - 1986 are collected in the BUA report No. 132. They correspond to the available data for inhalative exposure (see Chap. 4.1.1.2.1 and 4.1.1.2.2).

Other exposure data

Further exposure data are provided by the federal monitoring authorities. Data from literature (USA, Canada and Sweden) published between 1978 - 1986 are collected in the BUA report No. 132. They correspond to the available data for inhalative exposure (see Chap. 4.1.1.2.1 and 4.1.1.2.2).

Integrated Assessment Summary

General

MDA is employed as a chemical intermediate, as a curing agent in plastics processing for high-performance polymers, as a curing agent for polyurethane elastomers, foams and special-purpose coatings, for epoxy resins and two-component systems. The use of MDA as a curing agent is declining, since the development of substitutes is strengthened. Further it is possible to use the raw
material for processing azo dyes; at present it does not correspond to the state of the art in Germany and in the UK.

MDA is produced continuously as a liquid isomer mixture (technical grade) which typically contains about 60 % 4,4’- MDA or as pure 4,4’-MDA placed on the market in flake or granulate form or as a prill (Hirzy, 1985; Layer, 1991; Fairhurst, 1993).

On account of the low vapour pressure of the pure substance (<< 1 Pa) inhalative exposure at the workplace to MDA vapour is not relevant. Exposure to MDA in dust form is of primary concern here.

**Production and further processing as a chemical intermediate in the chemicals industry**

The measurement results which were submitted for inhalative exposure during the continuous manufacture and further processing of MDA as a chemical intermediate are to be regarded as valid. In the majority of cases, they are located below the technical occupational exposure limit (TRK) of 0.1 mg/m³ which at present is valid in the Federal Republic of Germany.

As far as it is known 6 of 14 companies/sites produce the liquid isomer mixture containing app. 60% 4,4’-MDA, 5 companies/sites produce pure 4,4’-MDA (but only in one case it is mentioned by the company), for one company it is unknown, one company processed the pure substance in a molted form and two companies stopped their production in 1997.

The measurement data are assigned to dust exposure if no further specific information about the form is available or if they are submitted anonymous and the exposure results exceed the detection limit (see R(1), R(2) and R(3) in the table in chap. 4.1.1.2.1), because it is unlikely that the exposure to MDA-vapour was measured (vapour pressure <<1Pa). The 90th - or 95th percentile of the collective of the measurement results is missing and cannot be calculated on the basis of the submitted data (see chap.4.1.1.2.1).

Therefore the highest measuring result of 0.52 mg/m³ is used for assessing the risks for inhalative exposure to dust on the basis of the presented measuring data. It is in good agreement with the estimated value of 0 - 1 mg/m³ according to the EASE-model.

The high production volume gives rise to the assumption that a daily exposure over the full shift is prevailed during production and further processing.

**Production of preparations within the chemical industry**

For the manufacture of high-performance polymers such as speciality epoxies, imides and polyurethane foams and elastomers 4,4’-MDA is used as a curing agent. The imid formulations (free MDA content of 0.1 - 10% (APME 1995)) and curing formulations for epoxies and polyurethanes containing MDA (free MDA content of max. 60% (APME 1995)) together with other ingredients like solvents or accelerators etc. are placed on the market. They are produced in form of liquids, pastes and granules; imid formulations also in form of powders (APME 1995). With regard to this further processing in the area of the large-scale chemical industry it is assumed that, as a rule, closed systems are prevailed and that partially open systems are covered and equipped with suitable exhaust ventilation systems (see chap. 4.1.1.2.1).
For drumming of curing formulations (flakes, pastes or granules) the assessment of the risks for inhalative exposure to dust the exposure level is assumed to be lower than for the drumming of the pure substance during production.

The drumming of powdery imid preparations has to be taken into account as an additional exposure scenario compared to the production of the substance. Because of the lack of workplace measurements and information for assessing the risks for inhalative exposure the estimation according to the EASE-model is used (see chap. 4.1.1.2.4).

For drumming of powdery imid preparations the assessment of the risks for inhalative exposure to dust is estimated to 2-5 mg/m³ (EASE-model) respectively 0.2 - 0.5 mg/m³ (8h -TWA for MDA content of max. 10 % for imid formulations). Assuming batch processing over 2 hours the daily exposure of 0.05 - 0.125 mg/m³ has to be taken for assessing the risk.

**Dermal exposure in the chemical industry**

In assessing the risks of dermal exposure, it is to be assumed that, in the chemical industry, MDA is manufactured and further processed primarily in closed systems.

For Personal Protective Equipment (PPE) several materials like chloroprene, rubber, PVC and other plastics are recommended by the producers without testing. The study by Fairhurst shows that materials like PVC, PVC coated fabric, natural rubber heavy- and lightweight and polyethylene mitts do not provide complete protection (Fairhurst 1993). About the suitability of the other materials (chloroprene and other plastics) no information are available.

The dermal exposure level for the handling of crude liquid MDA with PVC gauntlets was 1.1 mg (91 min); the highest exposure after packing flakes with gloves of natural rubber was 0.54 mg (max. 216 min; see chap. 4.1.1.2.1). It is not known, whether the contamination is a result of penetration or permeation through the outer gloves or a low standard of hygiene. Other investigations show that without gloves higher levels (app. 4.2 - 42 mg) were reached (Cocker et al 1988 in BUA 1994; EPA 1985 in EPA 1992).

The estimation of daily dermal exposure according to the EASE-model (without PPE) results in a dermal exposure range of 0,1-1 mg/cm²/day. For the handling of the crude MDA the exposure is reduced to 0.06-0.6 mg/cm²/day with respect to the percentage of 4,4’-MDA in the liquid (app. 60%). It is further assumed, that the use of gloves has a high acceptance within the chemical industry. Because occlusion of the substance underneath the gloves cannot be excluded, when unsuitable gloves are worn, the estimation according to the EASE-model is used (see chap. 4.1.1.2.3). For assessing the risks for daily dermal exposure (EASE: 0.1-1 mg/cm²/day with regard to an exposed area of 420 cm² (palms of two hands) an exposure level of 42 - 420 mg/p/day respectively 25 - 252 mg/p/day is used.

For the drumming of the imid and curing formulations the daily dermal exposure estimated with the EASE-model (EASE: 0.1-1 mg/cm²/day) with regard to an exposed area of 420 cm² (palms of two hands) and the percentage of 4,4’-MDA in the preparations is used. For the curing formulations for epoxies with max. 60% free MDA the resulting dermal exposure level is about 25 - 252 mg/p/day, for imid formulations with max. 10% free MDA it is about 4 - 42 mg/p/day and for the curing formulations for polyurethanes with max. 5% free MDA it is about 2 - 21 mg/p/day.

**Use of 4,4’-MDA in other sectors (industrial and skilled trade)**
pasty MDA (typical content: 60 % or less) as a curing agent for various plastics systems. Furthermore curing formulations with MDA as ingredient for epoxies and polyurethanes and imid formulations containing MDA are placed on the market. Depending on the purpose of application e.g. manufacturing of formulations, prepregging, hand lay up of prepreg, wet filament winding, resin transfer molding both fully automatic processes and also partially open manual processes are used (for detailed descriptions see: Hirzy, 1985; SACMA, 1991).

The dermal exposure of the hands has been investigated during further processing of 4,4’-MDA (Fairhurst, 1993; Hoogendoorn et al, 1995 in: The Netherlands, comments 1997). The measurement results are in the range from 0.01 to 8 mg MDA when protective gloves are worn, and from 6 - 2000 mg MDA (n = 2) when the hands are unprotected. With regard to the studies, the use of gloves is common, but for some tasks the gloves seems not to be suitable. Additionally several materials are recommended by the producers without testing. As far as it is known, occlusion of the substance underneath the gloves cannot be excluded, when they are taken off for a special task or when unsuitable gloves are worn (see chap. 4.1.1.2.3). The estimation of daily dermal exposure according to the EASE-model (without PPE) is used (see below).

Production of formulations in the industrial area

Curing formulations for epoxies and polyurethanes and imid formulations are assumed to be produced also in companies in the industrial area. For epoxies and polyurethanes low dust techniques prevailed, imid formulations are also produced as powders.

Again detailed information is missing, especially for the handling of solids. In total 6 measurements are made of dust exposure. Some of the descriptions indicate, that powders are also used for the production of preparations. Probably the flakes are pulverised before the process (Hirzy, 1985).

For formulating companies in this area the high standard of occupational hygiene cannot be assumed generally. It cannot be excluded that workplaces exist which are not adequate to the state of the art (e.g. inadequate local exhaust ventilation) or that the LEV works insufficient as 3 of these measurements show (Fairhurst, 1993; TRK-Wert Begründung Nr.24, 1989).

Assuming batch processing with an exposure duration shorter than shift length (approx. 2 h) daily exposures to MDA dust are to be expected when storage bins or reaction vessels are filled or when formulations are drummed.

For assessing the risks for inhalative exposure on the basis of the presented measuring data the highest measuring result (for batchwise filling of a reactor with powdery MDA) of 2.5 mg/m³ for 2h is used to calculate an 8 h - TWA of 0.6 mg/m³ .

For the drumming of formulations no measurement data are available. Therefore the estimation according to the EASE-model is used. For the drumming of curing formulations for epoxies (containing 60 % MDA) and polyurethanes (containing 5 % MDA) the corresponding estimated exposure levels are 0 - 3 mg/m³ and 0 - 0.08 mg/m³ and 0.5 - 5 mg/m³ for the drumming of powdery imid formulations (containing max. 10 % MDA). With respect to the shortened exposure time of 2 h (batch processing) the following exposure levels of 0 - 0.75 mg/m³ (for epoxies), 0 - 0.08 mg/m³ (for polyurethanes) and 0.1 - 1.25 mg/m³ for imid formulations are used for the assessment of the risks.

For the dermal exposure of 0.1- 1 mg/cm²/day (EASE, dust) and 0.06 -0.6 mg/cm²/day (EASE, liquid containing app.60% MDA) with regard to an exposed area of 420 cm² (palms of two hands) an exposure level of 42 - 420 mg/p/day respectively of 25 - 250 mg/p/day is used. With regard to an
exposed area of 420 cm² (palms of two hands) for the drumming of curing formulations for epoxies (containing 60 % MDA) and polyurethanes (containing 5 % MDA) and imid formulations (containing max. 10 % MDA) an exposure level of 25 - 252 mg/p/day, 2 - 21 mg/p/day, respectively 4 - 42 mg/p/day is used.

**Handling in the industrial area**

**Epoxy resins**

Epoxy resins which are used with 4,4’-MDA as the hardener component (preparations containing 9-60% 4,4’-MDA; APME, 1995) have applications in many fields. These extend from the production of structured laminates for heat- or chemical-resistant pipes and containers to corresponding coatings (e.g. for concrete floors). These epoxy resins are sold as one- and two-component systems. Two-component systems (curing preparations, resin) are generally mixed immediately before use (ratio 1:1), and the hardener formulations may be liquid, pastes or granules, or MDA in pure form, which is assumed to be more seldom (Hirzy, 1985). For assessing the risks for inhalative exposure during mixing of the (dusty) formulation containing MDA (9-60%) with the epoxy resin the estimation according to the EASE-model of 0 - 0.2 mg/m³ (EASE 0 - 3 mg/m³; exposure duration 0.5h) is used and for dermal exposure 0.06 - 0.6 mg/cm²/day (EASE) with regard to an exposed area of 840 cm² (two hands) an exposure level of 50 - 504 mg/p/day. The exposure during handling only is assessed to be lower (proportion of mixture 1:1): inhalative exposure is assumed to be very low; the dermal exposure of 0.03 - 0.3 mg/cm²/day (EASE) results with regard to an exposed area of 840 cm² (two hands) in an exposure level of 25 - 252 mg/p/day.

**Polyurethane foams and elastomer systems**

4,4’-MDA is employed as a curing agent (formulation containing 4-5%; APME, 1995) for high-performance polyurethane (PU) foams and elastomer systems based on aliphatic isocyanates (Hirzy, 1985). For use of the two-component systems (curing formulation, polyurethane) the components are mixed in a ratio of 1:1 in general immediately before use. The curing formulations may be liquid, pastes or granules, or MDA in pure form, which is assumed to be more seldom.

For assessing the risks for inhalative exposure during mixing of the (dusty) formulation containing MDA (4-5%) the estimation according to the EASE-model of 0 - 0.02 mg/m³ (EASE 0 - 0.3 mg/m³, exposure duration of 0.5h) is used and for dermal exposure 0.005 - 0.05 mg/cm²/day (EASE) with regard to an exposed area of 840 cm² (two hands) an exposure level of 4.2 - 42 mg/p/day. The exposure during handling only is assessed to be lower: inhalative exposure is assumed to be very low; the dermal exposure of 0.003 - 0.03 mg/cm²/day (EASE) results with regard to an exposed area of 840 cm² (two hands) in an exposure level of 2.5 - 25 mg/p/day.

For one-component solvent free PU-lacquer systems masked polyamines are used together with masked NCO-prepolymers. By the occurrence of humidity the amine is released and react with the isocyanate to a high-molecular polyurethane-polyurea (Baumann und Muth, 1997, Goldschmidt et al., 1984, Biethan et al., 1979). With regard to a comprehensive publication about 1800 chemicals which are used in paints and lacquers, where MDA is not mentioned (Baumann und Muth, 1997), specialised coating procedures (e.g. spray painting) which use 4,4-MDA are assumed to be more seldom.

In one case of using spray painting (without LEV), the exposure to aerosols was found to be 0.045 mg/m³ with background concentrations between 0.0005 - 0.132 mg/m³ (HSE, 1995). It is not known, which analytical method is used. Three methods are not specific for 4,4’-MDA aryl amines and aromatic isocyanates are determined also and phenol disturbs (see chap.4.1.1.2.1). Because of the high background concentrations the measured exposure is not regarded as significant.
**High-performance imid polymers**

Resins for high-performance polymers are used for example in the electrical industry, e.g. as high-temperature cable insulation (polyester imides, polyamide imides), and also in aircraft construction (polybismaleimides) (Hirzy, 1985). The free MDA content is between 0.1 - 10 % (APME, 1995).

The application methods include both closed, fully automatic processes and also partially open manual processes depending on the purpose of application e.g. prepregging, hand lay up of prepreg, wet filament winding, resin transfer molding (for detailed descriptions see: Hirzy, 1985; SACMA, 1991).

The handling of powdery imid preparations has to be taken into account as an additional exposure scenario.

For assessing the risks for inhalative exposure during handling of the powdery imid preparation the estimation according to the EASE-model is used: Considering a content of max. 10 % MDA an exposure level of 0.2 - 0.5 mg/m³ (EASE) results. With regard to a shortened exposure duration of 0.5 h an exposure level of 0.03 - 0.3 mg/m³ and for dermal exposure (0.01 - 0.1 mg/cm²/day (EASE)) with regard to an exposed area of 840 cm² (two hands) an exposure level of 8.4 - 84 mg/p/day is used.

**Handling of epoxy resins in the skilled trade**

In the skilled trade sector, too, the substance is handled in open systems. In the buildingtrade, MDA is used as a hardener for epoxy resins in special cases (e.g. coating concrete floors). It may be assumed that the material is mixed on site lasting app. 0.5 hours. Hardener formulations are sold in liquid, pasty and solid forms (with an MDA content up to 60 %), and possibly also as pure MDA but this is assumed more seldom; the available documents do not indicate in what form the hardener is used in the buildingtrade. About the frequency of exposure no information is available. Not daily is assumed, more detailed assumptions whether it is every second or third day is not possible.

For assessing the risks during mixing of the components using pure 4,4’-MDA the estimation according to the EASE-model of max. 0.2 mg/m³ (8h-TWA;0.5h) is used and for dermal exposure 0.6 - 3 mg/cm²/day (EASE) with regard to an exposed area of 840 cm² (palms of two hands) an exposure level of 504 - 2520 mg/p/day is used.

The exposure levels during handling only is assessed to be lower (proportion of mixture 1:1): inhalative exposure is assumed to be low; the dermal exposure of 0.3 - 1.5 mg/cm²/day (EASE) results with regard to an exposed area of 840 cm² (two hands) in an exposure level of 252 - 1260 mg/p/day.

**Summary of exposure data relevant for workplace risk assessment**

The following table shows the exposure data of MDA which are relevant for occupational risk assessment.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exposure scenario</th>
<th>Form of exposure</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Duration and frequency</th>
<th>Inhalative exposure shift average</th>
<th>Dermal exposure</th>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Level of exposure [mg/cm²/day]</th>
<th>exposed area [cm²]</th>
<th>shift average [mg/p/day]</th>
<th>Method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chemical industry</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>manufacturing and further processing as a chemical intermediate (methylene diphenyl di-isocyanate, MDI)</td>
<td>flakes, granules (dust)</td>
<td>drumming transfer cleaning maintenance</td>
<td>shift length, daily</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>workplace measurement</td>
<td>0.1 - 1</td>
<td>420 (palms of two hands)</td>
<td>42 - 420</td>
<td>EASE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>liquid (vapour) (approx. 60 %)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>very low</td>
<td>exp. judg.</td>
<td>0.06 - 0.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>production of preparations</td>
<td>powder (dust)</td>
<td>drumming transfer cleaning maintenance</td>
<td>batch processing 2 hours/daily</td>
<td>0.05 - 0.125</td>
<td>EASE</td>
<td>0.01 - 0.1</td>
<td>420 (palms of two hands)</td>
<td>4 - 42</td>
<td>EASE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>imid preparations max. 10 % MDA</td>
<td>flakes; granules (dust)</td>
<td>drumming transfer cleaning maintenance</td>
<td>batch processing 2 hours/daily</td>
<td>lower than above</td>
<td>exp. judg.</td>
<td>0.06 - 0.6</td>
<td></td>
<td>25 - 252</td>
<td>EASE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>curing formulations max. 60 % MDA</td>
<td>powder (dust)</td>
<td>drumming transfer cleaning maintenance</td>
<td>batch processing 2 hours/daily</td>
<td>lower than above</td>
<td>exp. judge.</td>
<td>0.005 - 0.05</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 - 21</td>
<td>EASE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>max. 5 % MDA</td>
<td>flakes; granules (dust)</td>
<td>drumming transfer cleaning maintenance</td>
<td>batch processing 2 hours/daily</td>
<td>lower than above</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Industrial area</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>manufacturing of formulations using</td>
<td>powder (dust)</td>
<td>transfer weighing</td>
<td>batch processing 2 hours/daily</td>
<td>0.6 (workplace was not)</td>
<td>workplace measurement</td>
<td>0.1 - 1</td>
<td>420 (palms of two hands)</td>
<td>42 - 420</td>
<td>EASE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exposure scenario</td>
<td>Form of exposure</td>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Duration and frequency</td>
<td>Inhalative exposure shift average</td>
<td>Dermal exposure</td>
<td>Method</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>powdery MDA</td>
<td>liquid MDA</td>
<td>filling drumming</td>
<td>at the state of the art) very low</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>0.06 - 0.6</td>
<td>two hands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>formulating putties using liquid MDA (approx. 60 %)</td>
<td>powder (dust)</td>
<td>drumming transfer cleaning maintenance</td>
<td>0.1 - 1.25</td>
<td>EASE</td>
<td>0.01 - 0.1</td>
<td>420 (palms of two hands)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>production of preparations</td>
<td>flakes; granules (dust)</td>
<td>batch processing 2 hours/daily</td>
<td>0 - 0.75</td>
<td>EASE</td>
<td>0.06 - 0.6</td>
<td>25 - 252</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>imid preparations max. 10 % MDA</td>
<td>powder (dust)</td>
<td>drumming transfer cleaning maintenance</td>
<td>0 - 0.08</td>
<td>EASE</td>
<td>0.005 - 0.05</td>
<td>2 - 21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>curing formulations max. 60 % MDA</td>
<td>flakes; granules (dust)</td>
<td>batch processing 2 hours/daily</td>
<td>0 - 0.2 (without LEV)</td>
<td>EASE</td>
<td>0.06 - 0.6</td>
<td>840 (two hands)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>max. 5 % MDA</td>
<td>liquids</td>
<td>transfer weighing filling</td>
<td>very low</td>
<td>exp. judg.</td>
<td>0.06 - 0.6</td>
<td>50 - 504</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mixing curing formulations (max. 60% MDA) with resin for epoxies</td>
<td>flakes, granules (dust)</td>
<td>handling</td>
<td>very low</td>
<td>exp. judg.</td>
<td>0.03 - 0.3</td>
<td>25 - 252</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>handling of formulations containing MDA and epoxid resins (4.5 - 30 %)</td>
<td>liquids</td>
<td>short-term (0.5 h), daily</td>
<td>0.06 - 0.6</td>
<td>EASE</td>
<td>50 - 504</td>
<td>EASE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>shift length,daily</td>
<td>[mg/m³]</td>
<td>Method</td>
<td>[mg/cm²/day]</td>
<td>[cm²]</td>
<td>shift average [mg/p/day]</td>
<td>Method</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Level of exposure</td>
<td>Method</td>
<td>Level of exposure</td>
<td>exposed area</td>
<td>Method</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[mg/cm²/day]</td>
<td>[cm²]</td>
<td>[mg/p/day]</td>
<td>[mg/m³]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exposure scenario</td>
<td>Form of exposure</td>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Duration and frequency</td>
<td>Inhalative exposure shift average</td>
<td>Dermal exposure</td>
<td>Method</td>
<td>Level of exposure [mg/m³]</td>
<td>Method</td>
<td>Level of exposure [mg/cm²/day]</td>
<td>Method</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mixing curing formulations (max. 5 % MDA) with resin for polyurethanes</td>
<td>flakes, granules (dust)</td>
<td>transfer weighing filling</td>
<td>short-term (0.5h), daily</td>
<td>0 - 0.02 (without LEV)</td>
<td>EASE</td>
<td>0.005 - 0.05</td>
<td>840 (two hands)</td>
<td>4.2 - 42</td>
<td>EASE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>handling of formulations containing MDA and polyurethane (2 - 3 %)</td>
<td>liquid, pastes</td>
<td>handling</td>
<td>shift length,daily</td>
<td>very low</td>
<td>exp. judg.</td>
<td>0.003 - 0.03</td>
<td>2.5 - 25</td>
<td>EASE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>handling formulations containing MDA (0.1 - 10 %) and imid resins</td>
<td>powder</td>
<td>weighing filling</td>
<td>short-term (0.5h), daily</td>
<td>0.03 - 0.3</td>
<td>EASE</td>
<td>0.01 - 0.1</td>
<td>840 (two hands)</td>
<td>8.4 - 84</td>
<td>EASE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>paste</td>
<td>handling</td>
<td>shift length,daily</td>
<td>very low</td>
<td>exp. judg</td>
<td>0.01 - 0.1</td>
<td>8.4 - 84</td>
<td>EASE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>skilled trade</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mixing of formulations containing MDA (9 - 60 %) with epoxid resins</td>
<td>flakes, granules( dust)</td>
<td>transfer weighing filling drumming</td>
<td>short-term (0.5h), not daily*</td>
<td>0 - 0.2 (without LEV</td>
<td>EASE</td>
<td>0.6 - 3</td>
<td>840 (two hands)</td>
<td>504 - 2 520</td>
<td>EASE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>handling of formulations containing MDA and epoxid resins (4 - 30 %)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>very low</td>
<td>exp. judg.</td>
<td>0.3 - 1.5</td>
<td>840 (two hands)</td>
<td>252 - 1 260</td>
<td>EASE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Information about frequency of exposure not available
Consumer exposure

Theoretically exposure could be given to residual free MDA through contact with products in whose manufacture process MDA is introduced, but there is no information about levels of free MDA.

There is no information about MDA in consumer products, hence consumer exposure seems not to exist.

However, ATSDR (1996) reports an exposure to trace amounts of MDA through medical devices like polyurethane cushioning or epoxy-containing products.

Polyurethane is widely used in such medical devices as potting materials used in plasma separators and artificial dialyzers. Polyurethane in these materials contains methylene diphenylisocyanate, from which a release of 4,4’-methylenedianiline has been reported due to sterilization by gamma irradiation. Autoclave sterilization did not promote MDA formation (Shintani and Nakamura, 1991). However, no quantitative conclusion can be derived from this paper because of limited information regarding experimental conditions (e.g. amount of samples on a weight basis, extraction temperature, kind of extraction device). Furthermore, the interpretation of experimental data is unclear. Some findings reported in the paper may indicate an effect caused by the solvent methanol, used in these experiments. A correlation is observed between radiation dose and measured MDA by a second-order equation when using the methanol extraction. Thus a methanolic reesterification resulting in the liberation of MDA cannot be excluded. Although unresolved questions remain when weighting the findings; nevertheless for uremic patients or patients who receive frequent blood transfusions using devices being sterilized by gamma-irradiation a potential exposure cannot be excluded at present.

The Food and Drug Administration (FDA) reports that the level of exposure to MDA through food, food additives, and food packaging is virtually zero (ATSDR, 1996). It is also noted that consumers may be exposed to very minor amounts/traces of MDA via drinking water (cf. 4.1.1.4).

There are information available, that from the notified new substance Cartasol Yellow under special chemical conditions (reductive cleavage) MDA may be liberated unintentionally. The quantity of the substance imported to the EU market from a Non-EU country amounts more than 10 tones/year. This substance may be used as a dye for paper, leather, writing inks, and textiles. No further quantitative information on the use of the substance nor on the liberation rate of MDA for the different applications is available. At present there are no predictions on the probability of established reductive conditions during the use of Cartasol Yellow which as a consequence might result in liberation of MDA. Therefore from the possible use pattern it is concluded that if any, only negligible exposure of the consumer to MDA may be expected.

Indirect exposure via the environment

Based on the environmental concentrations in the different compartments, the indirect exposure to humans via the environment through food, drinking water and air is estimated.

On the local scale, the human intake is calculated on the basis of the exposure in the vicinity of the greatest point source which is emitting into a river (site C, cf. 3.1.2.2). The sites emitting into the sea are not considered here.
On the regional scale, the average intake due to exposure via the regional background concentration (cf. 3.1.5) is estimated.

The calculation according to the TGD model (Appendix I and II) is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>local</th>
<th>regional</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\text{PEC}_{\text{water}}$ [µg/l]</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\text{PEC}_{\text{air}}$ [g/m³]</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.6 \times 10^{-21}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\text{PEC}_{\text{soil}}$ [g/kg]</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.3 \times 10^{-14}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\text{PEC}_{\text{groundwater}}$ [g/l]</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.3 \times 10^{-16}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| $\text{DOSE}_{\text{tot}}$ [mgchem·kgbw⁻¹·d⁻¹] | $2.1 \times 10^{-5}$ | $5.4 \times 10^{-7}$ |
| $\text{DOSE}_{\text{drw}}$                   | $1.1 \times 10^{-5}$ | $2.9 \times 10^{-7}$ |
| $\text{DOSE}_{\text{fish}}$                  | $9.2 \times 10^{-6}$ | $2.5 \times 10^{-7}$ |
| $\text{DOSE}_{\text{stem}}$                  | 0                     | $6.2 \times 10^{-14}$ |
| $\text{DOSE}_{\text{root}}$                  | 0                     | $1.8 \times 10^{-15}$ |
| $\text{DOSE}_{\text{meat}}$                  | $9.2 \times 10^{-11}$ | $2.3 \times 10^{-12}$ |
| $\text{DOSE}_{\text{milk}}$                  | $1.4 \times 10^{-9}$  | $3.5 \times 10^{-11}$ |
| $\text{DOSE}_{\text{air}}$                   | 0                     | $9.8 \times 10^{-19}$ |

The main contribution to the intake at both local and regional exposure are the $\text{DOSE}_{\text{drw}}$ and the $\text{DOSE}_{\text{fish}}$ with fractions of about 55% and 45%, respectively, to the total daily dose.

(Combined exposure)

4.1.2 Effects assessment: Hazard identification and Dose (concentration) - response (effect) assessment

Toxico-kinetics, metabolism and distribution

The solid substance MDA has no practically measurable vapour pressure. Therefore, inhalative exposure can be anticipated only as dust particles. Water solubility (1.0-1.25 g/l) at 20°C and partition coefficient (log $P_{ow}$) of 1.59 indicate good bioavailability of the substance.

Animal data

MDA is absorbed via skin as well as from the gastrointestinal tract.

To investigate the percutaneous absorption of MDA Hotchkiss et al. (1993) used full-thickness rat and human skin in vitro. In this study MDA was topically applied (17.7 - 40.6 µg/cm² in ethanol) to unoccluded skin, using a flow-through diffusion cell. After 72 hours the absorption into the receptor fluid reached 6.1 ± 2.0% for rat skin and 13.0 ± 4.3% for human skin related to applied dose. When the skin was occluded, the absorption of MDA was significantly enhanced reaching approx. 13.3% and 33% for rat and human skin, respectively. At the end of each experiment, considerable residual material remained with the skin (about 23-58%).
El-Hawari et al. (1986) performed studies in male rats, guinea pigs and monkeys treated topically with a low (2 mg/kg bw) or high (20 mg/kg bw) dose of 14C-MDA. In rats, 43% and 10% of the low dose was recovered in urine and feces during a 96 hours period; 2% remained in tissues and skin washing removed 25% of dose. The remainder (26%) was recovered by skin extraction and solubilisation. The percentage of dose absorbed decreased by increasing the dose, but the total amount absorbed (approx. 0.225 mg/rat) was similar after both doses. In guinea pigs, 10% and 18% of the low dose was excreted in urine and feces; 1% was recovered in tissue, 41% in the skin wash and 29% from the application area. The percent of dose absorbed decreased following the high dose, but the amounts absorbed (in mg/animal) doubled (El-Hawari et al. 1986).

The disposition of MDA was also examined following i.v. administration by the same authors (El-Hawari et al., 1986). In rats, 67% and 31% of the low dose (2 mg/kg bw) was recovered in urine and feces by 96 h after dosing. In monkeys, the radioactivity occurred primarily in the urine (85%) by 168 h after dosing (2 mg/kg bw). In guinea pigs, however, 35% and 57% of the dose were eliminated in urine and feces, respectively, during 96 hours.

Morgott (1984) studied the in vivo mass balance of 14C-MDA in rats and rabbits given a single i.p. dose of the compound. Four male rats, and a male rabbit of each acetylator phenotype were administered 30 mg/kg and 50 mg/kg of 14C-MDA, respectively. The excretion of radioactivity into the urine and feces was followed daily for 4 days. Since the compound was administered by the intraperitoneal route, the amount of fecal radioactivity provided an indication of biliary excretion. The results show that both species excrete a majority of the radioactivity within two days. In the rat, the main route of excretion is the feces (55.8%) compared to urine (35.0%); whereas the rabbit, regardless of phenotype, excretes about 80% of the radiolabel in the urine. The total recovery of radioactivity from the rat and slow acetylator rabbit is about 10% less than the recovery from the fast acetylator rabbit. This difference in recovery between fast and slow acetylating rabbits is associated with the greater fecal excretion by the fast acetylator rabbit. The residual radioactivity in the organs tends to localize in the liver, kidney, spleen and thyroid at both 24 and 96 hours.

The relationship between "free" and conjugated 14C-MDA metabolites excreted in the urine after the administration of a single i.p. dose to the rat (30 mg/kg) and rabbit (50 mg/kg) is shown in Table 4.1.2.1 (Morgott, 1984).

**Table 4.1.2.1: Fractionation of the radioactive metabolites excreted in the urine after i.p. administration of 14C-MDA to rats and rabbits**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fraction</th>
<th>Relative Percentage of Radioactivity in the Urine (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rat (n=4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free</td>
<td>60.4 ± 7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-Glucuronides</td>
<td>3.8 ± 0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-Glucuronides</td>
<td>1.7 ± 0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-Sulfates</td>
<td>1.2 ± 0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acid Labile</td>
<td>2.5 ± 0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>69.7 ± 6.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Renal excretion of MDA and its metabolites dominates in rats (after i.v. administration) and monkeys (El Hawari et al., 1986) and rabbits (Morgott, 1984). However, after i.p. administration of MDA Morgott (1984) reported for rats the excretion via the feces as main way.
In a further in vivo study with oral application of MDA to Sprague-Dawley rats (50 mg/kg bw) N-acetyl-MDA has been shown being the major metabolite (Tanaka et al., 1985). Minor amounts of N,N-diacetyl-MDA and free MDA were also detected in the urine.

Upon a single i.p. administration of MDA to Sprague-Dawley rats (30 mg/kg bw) at least 17 urinary metabolites were found (Morgott, 1984). Mainly, the following acetylated metabolites have been identified: N-acetyl-MDA, N,N-diacetyl-MDA, N,N-diacetyl-3-hydroxy-MDA, N-acetyl-4,4’-diaminobenzophenone, and N,N-diacetyl-4,4’-diamino-benzhydrol.

In vitro metabolism of MDA was investigated using rabbit liver microsomes (Kajbaf et al., 1992). The following three metabolites were detected: azo-MDA, azoxy-MDA, and nitroso-MDA (4-nitroso-4’-aminodiphenylmethane). The azo and azoxy compounds were produced enzymatically, whereas the nitroso compound may have been formed via a non-enzymatic process. The hydroxylamine of MDA could not been detected in this study. However, its initial formation has to be supposed as prerequisite for the formation of the dimeric MDA metabolites azo- and azoxy-MDA.

Although differences in the quantitative aspects of metabolism remains unelucidated, the in vivo biotransformation pathways of MDA involve N-acetylation reactions as well as an oxidation of the central C-atom and conjugation to glucuronides and sulfates.

Binding to macromolecules

24 hours after a single oral or i.p. administration of MDA a dose dependent increase of hemoglobin-adducts could be detected in the rat (Farmer & Bailey, 1989; Bailey et al., 1990). Predominately the monoacetylated MDA seems to react with hemoglobin. In contrast to these results, Neumann et al. (1993) who investigated the binding of MDA to hemoglobin after a single oral administration found more hemoglobin-adducts derived from the parent compound than from the monoacetylated metabolite. In an insufficiently reported study DNA-adducts in the rat liver after a single i.p. injection of 40 mg MDA/kg b.w. were described (Endo & Hara, 1991).

Recent investigations of Schütze et al (1996) confirmed the ability of MDA to bind to hemoglobin and liver-DNA in the rat. After a single i.p. injection of 0.2, 2 and 20 mg MDA/kg bw a dose-dependent increase of Hb- and DNA-adducts was observed. Expressed in ng adduct/g macromolecule the amount of Hb adducts was ca. 10 times higher than the binding to the liver DNA. The DNA and Hb-adduct levels were persistent up to at least for 6 days.

**Human data**

From experience in the workplace and reports concerning consequences of an oral intake, for example consumption of MDA-contaminated bread, the absorption of MDA after inhalation, skin contact, and swallowing in humans have been observed, too. In the urine of exposed workers a renal excretion was demonstrated by determination of MDA and N-Acetyl-MDA, while the metabolized MDA dominates. About 13% of 33 mg MDA (0.5% in petrolatum) applied for 48 hours onto the back skin during patch testing were recovered in the urine within 57 hours. With the work-up procedure of the urine samples MDA and acetylated MDA could be detected (Brunmark et al., 1992). The biological half-time of excretion of these metabolites in urine can be estimated from levels in end-of-shift and next morning pre-shift urine samples to be between 9 and 14 hours.

Excretion of these metabolites occurs fastest when exposure is via inhalation, dermal absorption will result in slower excretion (Cokker et al., 1994). This results from a cross sectional study in which exposure to MDA was assessed in 45 UK factories. Urine samples were collected from 411
workers engaged in various activities. 91% of postshift urine samples and 88% of preshift samples had less than 50 nmol total MDA/mmol creatinine. Some evidence was obtained which showed that when exposure to MDA was through inhalation (as solid material or contaminated dust), postshift urine samples had higher MDA concentrations than samples taken preshift the next day. When exposure was most likely to be through the dermal route, urine samples taken preshift next day tended to have higher MDA concentrations than urine samples collected immediately postshift on the day of exposure. Much slower excretion has been observed in workers with relative high exposures to MDA via the skin, where half lives of approximately 48 hours were seen (Smith et al. 1990). Dermal absorption might here have been the rate limiting step in this instance.

Robert et al. (1995) have investigated the formation of stable urinary metabolites in post-shift urine from 63 workers exposed to MDA. MDA, N-acetyl-MDA (MAMDA) and N,N'-diacetyl-MDA (DAMDA) were determined in non-hydrolyzed urine samples, and that of total MDA on urine samples after alkaline hydrolysis. Their relative concentrations (arithmetic means) were found to be in the following order: total MDA > MAMDA > MDA > DAMDA. While MAMDA represented more than 50% of total MDA, MDA and DAMDA were lower than 15% and 3% respectively. Acetylation of MDA, described as a possible way of detoxication, is confirmed to be an important metabolization route in humans, essentially through the monoacetylated metabolite. However, the individual ratio MAMDA/total MDA was found to vary widely (roughly from 0% to 100%). The half-life was found to be between 9 and 14 hours.

In a further study by the same authors (Robert et al., 1996) the exposure to MDA was assessed in workers in 10 French firms by measuring urinary MDA excretion levels. Analysis of 368 postshift urine samples collected from 133 workers reveals that urinary excretion of MDA is much higher in workers handling flaked MDA than in those handling MDA in solution (44% and 8% of values, respectively, in excess of 50 µg/l). The mean rates were 140 µg/l for the four factories using flaked MDA and 13 µg/l for the six factories using liquid formulations, with values ranging from 58 to 197 µg/l and from <2 to 33 µg/l respectively.

Brunmark et al. (1995) exposed five healthy volunteers dermally for 1 h to 0.75-2.25 µmol MDA dissolved in isopropanol, by use of a patch-test technique. Determination of MDA remaining in the patch units after exposure showed that a median of 28% (range 25-29%) was absorbed. After hydrolyzing MDA has been determined in plasma with an initial peak and a decline after removing the patch. MDA was also detected in hydrolyzed urine. The maximum rate of MDA excretion in urine was found 6-11 hours after the onset of exposure. Within two subjects studied at three doses, the urinary excretion was proportional to the exposure. The elimination half-lives in plasma and urine had medians at 13 and 7 hours, respectively. In eight out of nine exposures, the elimination half-life was longer in plasma than in urine. Slow acetylation seemed to be associated with short elimination half-life in urine. The median of total MDA amount excreted in urine during 48 hours, was 33 nmol for the five subjects exposed to 0.75 µmol, which corresponds to roughly 16% (range 2%-26%) of the absorbed dose.

Biological monitoring

In addition to the analysis of urine samples for MDA and acetylated metabolites, the ability of MDA to bind to hemoglobin is used for biological monitoring (Bailey et al., 1990; Greim & Lehnert, 1994). Both methods give a useful estimate of the internal dose of MDA absorbed via all routes of exposure. Determination of the hemoglobin-adducts has the advantage over monitoring MDA excretion in the urine because not only the current exposure but repeated exposures dated back can be determined (Greim & Lehnert, 1994).
Schuetze et al. (1995) published the results of biomonitored workers exposed to low levels of MDA. Adducts and metabolites were analyzed by gas chromatography-mass spectrometry after hydrolysis, extraction and derivatization. Hb adducts of MDA were detected in 31 out of the 33 MDA workers and both MDA and N-acetyl-MDA (AcMDA) were found in 20 of these individuals. In the urine of workers exposed to MDA both MDA and AcMDA were found in all samples, with the exception of five where only MDA was detected. Acid hydrolysis of the urine samples yielded an approximately 3-fold higher concentration of MDA than the sum of MDA and AcMDA found after base hydrolysis. MDA but not AcMDA found in urine and in Hb correlate well, except for three outliers. In one worker the Hb adduct level of MDA was very low compared to the urine levels. Two workers had very high levels of MDA as Hb adducts but very low levels as urine metabolites. The former case indicates that the workers were recently exposed to higher levels of MDA. The latter case suggests a relatively low recent exposure. The air levels of MDA, monitored using personal air monitors, were below the detection limit. It was possible, however, to determine exposure to MDA for all workers with the methods presented in this publication.

**Conclusion:**

The evaluation of the available information shows, that MDA is absorbed by the three routes of intake (dermal, oral, inhalation) in animals and humans. Especially in humans a quantitative assessment of absorption is not possible. There is no evidence for accumulation in the body. MDA and its N-acetylated metabolites are mainly excreted in the urine. The N-acetylation apparently represents the detoxification pathway, whereas the N-hydroxylation being supposed from in vitro studies can lead to potentially toxic intermediates. Although the detection of MDA in the urine gives information on current exposure the formation of adducts with hemoglobin provides the opportunity for biological monitoring of cumulative exposures.

**Acute toxicity**

**Animal data:**

Most of the animal tests on acute toxicity are not performed with pure MDA but with technical products containing MDA or with test substances not precisely defined. The tests performed with pure MDA demonstrate the substance to be harmful or clearly toxic depending on the animal species tested: Mice, guinea pigs, and rabbits exhibit moderate toxic effects after oral application of MDA (Fairhurst et al., 1993). The oral LD50 of MDA for rats is found in the range of 350-450 mg/kg body weight (Bayer, 1974, and BASF, 1975). Damage to the liver and kidneys has been reported to be the most prominent toxic effect occurring at doses of 100 mg/kg and above.

The acute hepatotoxicity of orally administered MDA was characterized in rats, indicating dose- and time-related toxicity classed as multifocal, cholangiolitic hepatitis, the lesions of which are distributed in portal and midzonal regions of liver lobules. Male Sprague-Dawley rats were fasted for 24 hours before and after receiving several doses within 25-225 mg/kg body weight (2 ml/kg volume each). At 24 hours after treatment the common bile duct was cannulated, and bile was collected for 30 min. The rats were then exsanguined and blood collected. Oral administration of the substance caused a dose-dependent change in all markers of liver injury: The threshold for toxicity was between 25 and 75 mg/kg substance. Methylene dianiline caused concomitant changes in all markers of liver injury measured, including serum ALT, bile flow, serum bilirubin concentration, GGT activity, and liver weight. Liver sections from animals that received a dose of 100 mg/kg had multifocal lesions consisting of hepatocellular necrosis with hemorrhage and moderate neutrophil infiltration. The necrosis involved segments of periportal hepatocytes but did not surround portal tracts. Frequently, the parenchymal insult extended into the midzonal regions of
hepatic lobules. The lesions associated with the portal triad consisted of bile neutrophil infiltration. A segmental necrotizing vasculitis of the portal vein was also evident. The earliest change identified with the hepatotoxicity of methylene dianiline was bile ductular necrosis, and histologic markers of liver injury continued to increase in severity over the course of 16 hours. Histologic analysis of livers from animals receiving corn oil vehicle demonstrated normal hepatic histology with no apparent lesions (Bailie et al., 1993).

Cats and dogs appear to be more sensitive than rats to the effects of single oral exposure to MDA. In briefly reported studies, 1/3 cats died after oral application of 25 mg/kg body weight and 1/3 dogs died after application of 50 mg/kg body weight MDA. Liver and kidney damage was noted at 10 mg/kg and above, and doses of 25-100 mg/kg produced blindness due to retinal atrophy in cats (BASF AG, 1961).

The inhalative LC50 for rats is demonstrated to exceed the highest possible concentration of MDA in air at room temperature: No mortalities were caused by a 4-hour single dose of 0.837 mg/l applied to 18 rats, exposing only the snouts and nostrils to a dust containing 66% particles at < 7 micron. The rats showed exophthalmus, tremors, curved hunched body position, and ruffled fur, but recovered within 2 days (CIBA-GEIGY, 1976). In an inhalation risk test 3 rats were subjected to an atmosphere saturated with MDA by heating a bath of the compound to 200°C; all rats survived, showing moderate congestion of lungs and testes at necropsy (Dow Chemical Company, 1954a).

Dermal application of 2500 mg/kg body weight of a 50% solution of MDA in water caused no mortalities and no clinical signs in 20 rats. But 1000 mg/kg of a 50% solution of MDA in dimethylsulfoxide killed 5/10 female rats within 7 days, demonstrating apathy, hyperchromodacryorrhea, and jaundice as clinical signs (BASF AG, 1976).

**Human data:**

The most notable instance of MDA poisoning was the so called „Epping Jaundice“, in which 84 people living in the Epping area, England, in 1965 suffered ill effects caused by eating bread baked with a flour contaminated by MDA (Kopelman et al. 1966a, 1966b). From analysis of the MDA content of bread samples it has been estimated that the dose of MDA received by these individuals was about 3 mg/kg (Fairhurst et al., 1993).

Symptoms appeared within hours to a few days of eating the bread; they were somewhat variable, but in most cases comprised upper abdominal pain, followed by aches and jaundice. Serum clinical chemistry measurements indicated elevated levels of bilirubin, alkaline phosphatase and aspartate aminotransferase. Liver biopsy revealed damage to the parenchyma and the biliary tree. In the early stages the characteristic lesion was inflammation, which progressed later to centrilobular cholestasis and hepatocellular necrosis and degeneration. There were no fatalities, all patients recovering within a period of several weeks.

Between 1966 and 1972 acute febrile illness associated with jaundice and rash developed in 12 young male workers who added powdered MDA to an epoxy resin formulation in a hot roller mill. Experience before and after the provision of respiratory protection equipment suggested that percutaneous absorption was the primary route of exposure in these cases. A further case was also reported: an employee of another company contracted to pulverize the flake form of MDA. Hepatitis developed within 3 days of commencing this type of work. In all these cases the subjects appeared to make a complete recovery and returned to work within 10 weeks of the onset of symptoms. When re-examined 9 months to 5.5 years later, all were apparently in good health (McGill and Motto, 1974).
In another case report of accidental drinking of an unknown quantity of a solution of MDA in potassium carbonate and butyrolactone (Roy et al., 1985), myocardial effects (ECG changes, bradycardia, hypotension) were indicated. Furthermore, jaundice with elevated serum aminotransferase and bilirubin levels, haematuria and glycosuria were reported. The particular, persistent retinal damage in the eyes were also noted.

A further acute oral intoxication with MDA is reported by Tillmann et al. (1997). Six participants of a technoparty (1 female, 5 males, ages 17-25) showed severe colicky abdominal pain and subsequently developed symptoms of hepatotoxicity after ingestion of an alcoholic beverage spiked erroneously with MDA instead of methylenedioxyamphetamine. All of them showed similar clinical symptoms, with an identical time course. Acute jaundice developed within 2 days after ingestion. Enzymes indicating cholestasis increased steadily over 7 days and reached peak values of 800 U/l (AP) and 380 U/l (GGT), whereas transaminases remained moderately elevated. Between days 5 and 7, all patients became febrile for one day, their body temperatures rising up to 40 °C. There was no evidence for hemolysis or an infectious hepatitis. Toxicological analysis revealed the presence of MDA at a concentration of 130 mg/l in one of two urine extracts examined.

An Australian journal reports the case of 6 workmen engaged in laying an epoxy resin based floor: Four of these men developed an acute hepatic illness after a single exposure, in two of them recurring on re-exposure to MDA a few months later. Again they were most severely affected with nausea, myalgia, pain in the chest and abdomen, and showed dark urine. Liver function tests gave grossly abnormal results. One of these man, when examined after 14 months, and after a further 4 months, still complained of a variety of symptoms, and his liver was palpable (Bastian, 1984). In a further case report on absorption of MDA through the skin of workers, exhibition and severity of jaundice was said to be definitely related to the degree of exposure: There were 11 cases of jaundice within the same factory, exposure ranging from 1 day to 3 weeks with skin absorption as major route of entry into the body (Dunn and Guirguis, 1979).

In a last case a young man suffered an acute exposure to MDA dust with oral, dermal, and inhalative absorption of the substance due to an air filter malfunction: The next morning he had severe supraumbilical pain, and proritic macular rash encircling both forearms up to sleeve level. He exhibited jaundice and electrocardiogram abnormalities suggesting myocardial injury, both effects resulting from the MDA exposure. After 3 months the clinical asymptomatic patient still gave ECG evidence of myocardial residua, and after 1 year the ECG was normal (Brooks et al., 1979).

Conclusion:

Acute intoxication of humans with MDA is reported after oral, dermal and inhalation exposure, leading to jaundice ("Epping Jaundice"). In addition to acute hepatic illness, in some cases myocardial effects and persistent retinal damage were reported. Acute intoxication of humans did not cause any mortality in humans.

Acute toxicity in rats is demonstrated by LD50 values of 350-450 mg/kg bw after oral and 1000 mg/kg bw (vehicle dimethylsulfoxide) after dermal exposure; inhalation LC50 for rats is demonstrated exceeding the highest possible concentration of MDA in air at room temperature. Damage to the liver and kidneys has been reported to be the most prominent toxic effects in rats. Cats and dogs seem to be much more sensitive than rats with fatalities observed after oral application of 25-50 mg/kg bw, liver and kidney damage and blindness due to retinal atrophy being the most severe effects.
On the basis of these acute toxicity data MDA is classified as “toxic”, risk phrases R39/23/24/25

**Irritation**

*Animal data:*

No oedema and no (International Isocyanate Institute, unpublished report 1978a) or only slight (Industrial BIO-TEST Laboratories, unpublished report 1973) erythema reactions were observed on intact rabbit skin up to 48 hours after patch removal following a 24-hour application of 500 mg moistened MDA under occlusion. Little enhancement of the reaction was seen with application to abraded skin.

Only a mild eye reaction was observed in rabbits following instillation of 100 mg MDA into the conjunctival sac. The effects reversed within 3-7 days after instillation of the substance (Industrial Biotest Laboratories, unpublished report 1973; International Isocyanate Institute, unpublished report 1978a).

*Human data:*

Data on local irritating effects to skin and eyes of humans are not available.

*Conclusion:*

Human data on local irritation caused by MDA are not available. The substance causes slight irritation to the skin and mild to moderate irritation to the eyes of rabbits reversible within 3-7 days. According to EU legislation, MDA is not to be classified because of local irritation properties.

**Corrosivity**

*Animal data:*

MDA has proven to exhibit no corrosive effects on skin and eyes of rabbits (Industrial BIO-Test Laboratories, unpublished report 1973; International Isocyanate Institute, unpublished reports 1978b).

*Human data:*

Data on corrosive effects to skin and eyes of humans are not available.

*Conclusion:*

Human data on local irritation or corrosion caused by MDA are not available. The substance causes slight irritation to the skin and mild to moderate irritation to the eyes of rabbits. According to EU legislation, MDA is not to be classified because of local corrosive properties.

**Sensitisation**

*Animal data:*

The potential of MDA to produce delayed contact hypersensitivity in guinea pig was evaluated with the Guinea Pig Maximisation Test. The study was performed with 15 animals per group and using
a 5% concentration at each induction phase and a 2% concentration at challenge, 3/15 (20 %, mild) of the test group animals showed a skin reaction to MDA at challenge.

The test concentrations used were selected on the basis of the systemic toxicity of MDA (Thorgerisson, 1978). Results from a guinea pig skin hypersensitization test, a slightly modified version of the Landsteiner-Draize technique, were considered to be positive on the basis of the increase of size and redness around the site of the injections in the test group. In this non validated test a total of 10 intradermal injections were made during the induction phase followed by one intradermal injection two weeks later during challenge. The concentration was 0.1% MDA in polyethyleneglycol. Ten animals were used in each the treated and control group (Dunn, 1978).

A further study has been conducted using a "repeated insult" technique, a modification of the Sterner technique involving nine topical applications of 1% MDA in Dowanol 50B during the induction phase and of a "challenge"-dose. When tested on the skin of guinea pigs using a "repeated insult" technique, MDA did not cause a sensitization reaction in any of the nine test animals (Dow Chemical Company, 1954b).

**Human data:**

There is convincing evidence that MDA can cause skin sensitization in humans. A considerable number of individuals have been shown to exhibit a positive skin reaction on challenge with MDA in skin sensitization tests, including reaction to cross-sensitizing groups (para-group sensitivity).

From 8247 patients tested in the years from 1975 to 1984 in standard patch test showed 7.1-15 % contact allergy to MDA (Gailhofer and Ludvan, 1987).

In an other study Gailhofer and Ludvan, (1989) examined the significance of positive patch test reactions to 0.5% MDA. Data of 202 MDA-positive patients concerning age, sex and profession, type, localisation and duration of eczema and combined allergens were evaluated. The results were compared with those of 3397 consecutive, unselected, contact dermatitis patients with negative reactions to MDA. Van Joost et al. (1987) reported a case of skin reaction induced by MDA in a man who cleaned a gutter in a chemical plant which contained MDA. He developed an extensive red, itchy, papular, and vesicular eruption, with a toxic/allergic appearance involving the face, neck and wrists. A broad spectrum of reactions was obtained, apparently based on cross-sensitizing groups (para-group sensitivity). All test concentrations of MDA revealed a positive reaction. Emmet (1976) reported a case of two women employed in a small polyurethane moulding plant who developed extensive pruritic, papular, and/or vesicular eruption on face and neck, when moulding polyurethan plastic. Patch tests gave positive reactions to prepolymer based on methylene bis (4-cyclohexylisocyanate), and also to MDA which was used as a catalyst.

Patch testing indicated that a large number of patients with contact dermatitis were sensitized to MDA. Primary contact dermatitis due to hair cosmetics was diagnosed in 52 from a total of 8230 patients with eczematous dermatitis. Positive patch tests were obtained in 34 cases, of which 15 were positiv patch-tested with MDA. The remaining 18 cases were considered as likely instances of contact irritation (Angelini et al., 1985).

Of 2490 patients tested, 212 gave a positive result to an MDA patch test, and 130 of these were also positive to p-phenylenediamine (Romaguera et al., 1981). In an other investigation revealed a high incidence of sensitization with several common contact allergens, after standard patch tests. When 362 patients with hand dermatitis were patch-tested with MDA, 17 gave positive reaction to the substance (Agrup, 1968).
From 445 patients with contact dermatitis gave 13 (2.9 %) a positive reaction to MDA (De Agostini et al., 1987). In a joint study MDA was tested at six European clinics. A total of 2772 patients were patch-tested with 1% MDA in white petrolatum. 136 patients (4.9 %) showed positive reactions (Breit, 1969).

In 1988, 576 consecutive patients of the Allergology Center in Italy were tested with the standard series: 22 (3.8 %) positive patch-test results to MDA were noted. MDA was the fourth most common allergen after nickel, cobalt and potassium dichromate (Massone et al., 1990). 4140 patients from eight skin hospitals were patch tested. A sensitization was found in 47 % of the people tested. 3.3 % of 4140 patients with contact dermatitis gave positive patch tests with MDA (Schnuch et al., 1993).

There is a single case report of a worker handling an MDA-containing insulating material who developed an apparent skin photosensitivity to MDA, observed during diagnostic photopatchtesting. A 39-year-old telephone service installer, skin type IV, who works outdoors climbing telephone poles, developed an erythematous, pruritic dermatitis. This occurred on his uncovered arms and forearms, but not on his hands which were covered by gloves, in the summer month, and cleared when he was not working. Phototesting revealed a decreased minimal erythema dose, and no abnormal reaction or erythema to UVA. Photopatch tests were positive for MDA (Le Vine, 1983).

Conclusion:

Animal data on skin sensitization do not result in conclusive evidence on the skin sensitization potential of MDA. However, based on the data on humans there is convincing evidence that MDA is a skin sensitizer. MDA also demonstrates cross-reactions to para-groups. Based on human data MDA is already classified as "sensitizing" and labeled with R 43 (may cause sensitization by skin contact).

Repeated dose toxicity

Animal data:

Oral route
In a subchronic study which was accepted as valid (validity restricted by missing ophthalmo-logy examination). MDA (> 99%) was administered in the drinking water for 3 months to 80 male rats and 80 female rats (strain: Tif:RALf (SPF)) at doses of 0, 80, 400, and 800 ppm (equivalent to approximately 7.5, 23 and 31 mg/kg bw/d in males and 8, 22 and 32 mg/kg bw/d in females) (Ciba-Geigy, 1982). 20 out of 80 animals of each sex and each group were used for a 4-week recovery period. Laboratory investigations were carried out in 10 rats of each sex and group after completion of the treatment and after recovery period. An autopsy was done on 20 animals at the end of the test period and on 10 animals after recovery. One high dose female was sacrificed after the 53rd day of treatment with trembling and in a emaciated condition. Rats receiving 400 and 800 ppm MDA showed depressed food consumption, water consumption and body weight gain in males and females during the test period and at the end of the treatment. Water und food uptake normalised during recovery, whereas body weight did not recover in the recovery period. No clinical signs were observed in the low dose groups. Anemia was seen in males and females of the mid and high dose groups at the end of treatment and after recovery. The number of RBC was decreased, the concentrations of hemoglobin and hematokrit were reduced, in response to this MCV, MCH and the number of reticulocytes were elevated. In high dose animals, the number of leukocytes were higher than in control groups, the relative amount of neutrophils increased in high dose males and females at the end of treatment and in males of the mid and high dose groups of the recovery groups. High
dose females had lower percentages of lymphocytes at the end of the test period. The prothrombin time was prolonged in high dose males and females of the high dose group. Methemoglobin levels were not determined in this study.

Elevated serum concentrations of alkaline phosphatase, ALAT, ASAT, urea, bilirubin, choles-terol were observed in males and females of the mid and high dose groups at the end of the test period. After recovery the concentrations of alkaline phosphatase, ASAT (males only) and urea remained still elevated. Total proteins had higher concentrations in males of the mid and high dose groups at the end of treatment and afterwords decreased at the end of recovery in males and females of the mid and high dose groups. Levels of potassium were decreased in mid and high dose males at the end of test period and increased in mid and high dose females after recovery. No treatment-related changes were observed in urinalysis.

Corresponding to the lower body weight in males and females of the mid and high dose group the absolute weights of several organs were lower than controls at the end of treatment and recovery influencing also the relative organ body or brain ratios.

Rats treated with 800 ppm developed a hyperplasia of small biliary ducts with initial fibrosis in the peripheral parts of the liver lobules, a hypertrophy of the thyroid follicular epithelial cells and diffuse hyperplasia of the glandular structures with marked colloid depletion. At the end of the recovery period the liver lesions persisted and the thyroid stimulation was much less pronounced. Only 3/10 males and 2/10 females showed slight stimulation of the follicular epithelium. Rats receiving 400 ppm MDA displayed similar histopathological changes of a less severe nature. After recovery liver lesions persisted, but no thyroid changes were noted.

One male rat of the high dose group and one male and one female of the mid dose groups showed a focal nodular hyperplasia of the thyroid.

In the 80 ppm group no liver lesions were noted, but a slight stimulation of the follicular epithelium in the thyroids was observed in 2/20 males and 2/20 females.

Whereas nephrocalcinosis was evident in all females of treatment and control groups, mineralisation was seen in all males of the mid dose group and in 21 of 30 males of the high dose groups. One male of the 80 ppm group and none of the control males showed kidney mineralisation. A NOAEL could not be derived from this study. The LOAEL (due to the thyroid lesions observed) is 80 ppm (equiv. to 7.5 mg/kg bw/d in male rats and 8 mg/kg bw/d in female rats).

Another study was performed in B6C3F1 mice and F344/N rats receiving MDA as the dihydrochloride in drinking water for 14 days resp. 90 days (NTP, 1983). In the 14-day study five rats/sex/group received 0, 200, 400, 800, 1600, and 3200 ppm (equivalent to approx. 0, 17.6, 32.8, 36.5, 78.4, 89.2 in male rats, and 0, 16.6, 33.2, 51.2, 80, 128 mg/kg bw/d in female rats, calculated on an assumed water uptake of 100 g/kg bw/d, taking into account the drastical reduce of water consume up to 72% in males and 60% in females). Five mice/sex/group received the same MDA concentrations in the drinking water (equivalent to approx. 0, 31.8, 77.6, 135.6, 170.4, 100.8 mg/kg bw/d in male mice, and 0, 29.7, 57, 102, 132, 100.8 mg/kg bw/d in female mice, calculated on an assumed water uptake of 150 g/kg bw/d, taking into account the reduced water consume up to 79% in both sexes). Water consumption was lowered in all dosed rat groups and in male mice that received 1600 ppm or more and in female mice at 800 ppm or higher. Mean body weight gain was depressed dose-related in all rat groups and in mice that received 800 ppm or more. In some rats receiving 1600 or 3200 ppm, crater-like foci with black content in the cardiac part of the stomach were noted. No premature deaths occurred in rats. Survival was reduced in some mice at 800 ppm
or higher, all mice died at 3200 ppm. No compound-related lesions were identified in mice at necropsy. Hematology, clinical biochemistry and histopathological examinations were not performed in any species. A NOAEL was not determined in the rat study, whereas in mice the NOAEL was 400 ppm (equiv. to 77.6 mg/kg bw/d in males, resp. 57 mg/kg bw/d in females).

In the 90-day studies 10 mice/sex/group were treated with 0, 25, 50, 100, 200, and 400 ppm (equiv. to approx. 0, 2.5, 5.7, 11.4, 26.5, 54.9 mg/kg bw/d for male mice, 0, 3.5, 7.6, 14.4, 25.9, 52 mg/kg bw/d for female mice) and 10 rats/sex/group received 0, 50, 100, 200, 400, and 800 ppm (equiv. to approx. 0, 3.8, 7.1, 13.2, 25.7, 38.7 mg/kg bw/d in male rats and 0, 3.7, 7.1, 12.7, 20.4, 44.4 mg/kg bw/d in female rats). This study did not include parameters of hematology and clinical biochemistry, but full histopathological examination of control animals and high dose animals was done. Liver, pituitary and thyroid of rats receiving 400 ppm, and liver and thyroid of rats receiving 200 ppm were also examined histologically. No animal died. The mean final body weight was depressed in male rats receiving 800 ppm and in female rats receiving 400 ppm. Water consumption was depressed 10% or more in both sexes of rats receiving 200 ppm MDA or more. In a dose-related fashion in rats getting 400 or 800 ppm bile duct hyperplasia and an adenomatous goiter was observed. Some rats receiving 400 ppm and one male rat in the 800 ppm group developed thyroid follicular hyperplasia. In all male rats and 5/9 female rats getting 800 ppm a pituitary basophil hypertrophy was found. In mice, mean body weight was depressed in males (200 ppm) and in females (400 ppm). Water consumption of dosed male mice was greater than that in controls and in female mice it was comparable to controls. Bile duct hyperplasia was found in 5/10 male mice and in 4/10 female mice that received 400 ppm. Adenomatous goiters less severe than that observed in high dose rats were observed in one high dose male and female mouse. The NOAEL in both studies was identified to be 100 ppm (equivalent to 11.4 mg/kg bw/d in male mice and 14.4 mg/kg bw/d in female mice, the NOAEL in rats was 7.1 mg/kg bw/d in males and 7.5 mg/kg bw/d in females).

In a 14-day study (BASF 1977a), 10 male and female Sprague-Dawley rats were treated by gavage with 0,25 mg and 50 mg/kg bw/d of MDA on 5 days/week. Anemia with decreased numbers of red blood cells and reduced levels of hemoglobin and hematokrit and increased numbers of leukocytes were registered in high dose males and females. In rats of this dose group clinical chemistry revealed an increase of serum enzymes (ALAT, alkaline phosphatase), total proteins (males only), total lipids and total bilirubin. Levels of calcium increased and anorganic phosphorus levels were decreased. Low dose animals had only lower values of total lipids and increased concentrations of alkaline phosphatases. High dose males and females showed elevated organ weights (abs/rel) of the liver, kidneys, spleen and thyroid. Mean liver weight was also increased in 25 mg-females.

Urinalysis yielded effects in females of both dose groups. Isolated renal cells and cylinder in the urinary sediment were evident. Histopathology showed dose related mild-moderate lesions in both dose groups consisting in proliferation of bile ducts with initial fibrosis and inflammatory reactions of the liver, enlargement of the spleen due to extramedullary hematopoiesis, hyperplasia of of the thyroid epithelium. Minimal renal tubular cell desquamation was evident in the kidneys of 3 control males, 4 males and 1 female at 25 mg/kg and 6 males and 1 female at 50 mg/kg. The low dose of 25 mg/kg represented the LOAEL of this study, a NOAEL was not derived.

The livers of male Wistar rats fed in groups of 3-8 animals/dose with a diet containing 0 or 1000 ppm MDA (≥70 mg/kg bw/d) for 8 weeks (plus recovery of 8, 16, 24, 32 weeks), 16-weeks (plus recovery of 8, 16, and 24 weeks), 24 weeks (with recovery of 8 and 16-weeks), 32-weeks (plus 8 weeks of recovery) or 40 weeks (without recovery) were examined at the end of the treatment and recovery periods (Fukushima et al., 1979). A proliferation of bile ducts, oval cell infiltration, fibrosis and hepatocellular necrosis of the livers were seen. The hepatic parenchym was replaced by proliferating bile ducts and portal cirrhosis developed. The severity of the lesions gradually
increased with the treatment periods and regressed with prolongation of the observation time, but did not achieve complete reversibility.

Histopathology revealed a periportal proliferation of bile ducts, oval cell infiltration, focal necrosis and fatty change of hepatocytes and fibrosis. Liver lesions showed a gradual increase from mild severity after 8 weeks of treatment to marked severity with longer treatment duration, the lesions were most prominent at the end of the treatment duration and showed regression during recovery time. At 40 weeks of treatment, the hepatic parenchyma was replaced by proliferating bile ducts and portal cirrhosis. The activity of ASAT was increased in rats at study termination at weeks 8, and 16, levels were normalized within one week of recovery. Only at the end of 8 weeks of treatment higher activities of ALAT and alkaline phosphatase were seen. Increased levels of gamma-glutamic transpeptidase was observed at the end of all treatment periods, levels showed a tendency to normalization during recovery.

MDA-related toxic effects in the liver and thyroid were also seen in 2-year studies on F344 rats and B6C3F1 mice (NTP, 1983, see Table in 4.1.2.8). Rats and mice treated with 150 and 300 ppm MDA in drinking water (equivalent to 9 and 16 mg/kg bw/d for male rats and 10 and 19 mg/kg bw/d for female rats, 25 and 57 mg/kg bw/d for male mice and 19 and 43 mg/kg bw/d for female mice) showed increased incidences of nonneoplastic liver changes. Nonneoplastic lesions observed at the end of treatment including unspecified dilatation (males only), fatty metamorphosis and focal cellular change were observed in rats of each dose groups (without a clear dose relationship). Liver cell degeneration was evident in most male mice of both dose groups and in 7/50 high dose females. An increase of cystic and hyperplastic follicular cell changes were seen in the thyroid of the rats, follicular cell hyperplasia occurred in mice. In both species thyroid effects were evident with a slightly elevated frequency in the low dose groups of male and female rats and of male mice compared to the control groups, alterations occurred more frequently in all high dose groups of each species. Mineralisation of the kidney was seen in increased incidences in high dose male rats. In male and female mice higher incidences of renal nephropathy in the mid and high dose groups and papillary mineralisation in high dose group than in controls were observed.

Liver and thyroid changes were consistent to MDA-related effects observed in other studies in rats and mice. A clear dose relationship of the liver and thyroid changes was lacking. However this may be explanable due to simultaneous or overlapping processes of degeneration/preneoplastic changes and tumor growth.

The LOAEL of nonneoplastic lesions, derived from toxic liver effects were estimated to be 150 ppm in rats and mice (equiv. to 9, resp. 10 mg/kg bw/d in male, resp. female rats, and 25 resp. 19 mg/kg bw/d in male, resp. female mice). A NOAEL was not estimated in this study.

Other application routes

Leong et al. (1987) investigated the effect of inhaled aerosols of MDA in polyethylene glycol 200 (PEG) solution in male guinea pigs of albino Hartley strain and pigmented guinea pigs of mixed variety. The study was not reliable with respect to toxic effects on the respiratory tract (only few organs were investigated, no histopathology on the upper respiratory tract). Although an effect of MDA (0.44 mg/l) occurred in this 14-day inhalation study (4 h/d, 5 d/wk) in the eyes of eight exposed animals (the retinas of all animals showed a degeneration of the inner and outer segments of the photoreceptor cells and the pigmented epithelial cell layer, not due to an interaction with melanin).
To determine the maximum tolerated dose, Holland et al. (1987) reported that 4/9 female and 1/9 male C3Hf/Bd mice died after a 14-day dermal exposure (5 d/week) to 50 µl of 1 10% (w/v, corresponding to approx. 100-150 mg/kg bw/d) MDA solution in methanol. when acetone was the solvent, 3/10 females and 3/10 males died within two weeks.

No valid repeated dose study with inhalation and dermal application route was available.

Summary on nonneoplastic lesions:
Primary target organs in rats and mice after repeated oral exposure to MDA are the liver and the thyroid. Main effects were liver cell degeneration in the mouse at doses from 25 mg/kg bw/d (150 ppm, 2-year study, NTP, 1983), bile duct hyperplasia in rats at 20.4 mg/kg bw/d or higher (14-d or 90-d studies, Ciba-Geigy, 1982, BASF, 1977a, NTP, 1983) and bile duct hyperplasia in mice receiving 52 mg/kg bw/d (400 ppm, 90-d study, NTP, 1983). Elevated liver transaminase activities were observed in rats which received doses of 22 mg/kg bw/d or higher in subacute or subchronic tests (Ciba-Geigy, 1982, BASF, 1977a). In rats, liver lesions were not or not fully reversible (Ciba-Geigy, 1982, Fukushima et al., 1979), no data on recovery of liver effects were available in mice. The severity of microscopic lesions observed in the rat liver were reported to increase with the dosage (90-d studies, NTP, 1983, BASF, 1977a).

In the thyroid, the prominent effect of MDA treatment was follicular cell hyperplasia/hypertrophy and diffuse glandular hyperplasia with colloid depletion occurring at dose levels from 7.5 mg/kg bw/d (90-d study, Ciba-Geigy, 1982) or 9 mg/kg bw/d (2-year study; NTP, 1983). In mice, thyroid follicular cell hyperplasia was also observed in 2-year study (NTP, 1983) in males treated from 25 mg/kg bw/d and in females at 43 mg/kg bw/d. Adenomatous goiter was observed in a male mouse receiving 54.9 mg/kg bw/d and a female mouse receiving 52 mg/kg bw/d on 90 days (NTP, 1983).

Comparing the effect levels inducing thyroid lesions in the long term studies (NTP, 1983), rats seem to be more sensitive than mice without any clear sex preference, and male mice showed a higher sensitivity than female mice. Although a dose-relationship was not obviously present for liver effects in rats of the 2-year study, sensitivity for liver damage seemed to be higher in rats than in mice and male mice were more sensitive than females. The similarities in the target organ sensitivity may lead to the assumption that the thyroid effects were possibly associated to the effects on the liver.

Furthermore hemotoxic effects indicated by anemia and extramedullary hemopoiesis in the spleen were evident from 90-day studies in rats at MDA concentrations equivalent to 22 mg/kg bw/d (Ciba-Geigy, 1982). Increased splenic hemopoiesis was also reported in the 14-day rat study at dosages from 25 mg/kg bw/d (BASF, 1977a), depressed red cell parameters were seen at 50 mg/kg bw/d of MDA. Microscopic lesions indicating anemia was not found in the mouse studies available, red cell parameters were not examined. Methemoglobin levels were not examined in any of the repeated dose studies cited. However, methemoglobinemia was found in cats which received single oral MDA doses or 4 times 8-hours applications of MDA solutions on the dermis (Hofmann et al., 1966, cited in BUA, 1994).

Some studies gave indications that MDA has nephrotoxic properties. Mild renal and urinary findings in some rats treated by gavage administration were reported to be related to subacute MDA treatment (BASF, 1977a). Results from subacute and subchronic drinking water studies did not endorse nephrotoxicity, possibly due to the different application routes. In long term studies, there was a higher rate of kidney mineralisation in treated male rats (Ciba-Geigy, 1982, NTP, 1983). In male and female mice, a higher rate of nephropathy was registered in both dosed groups and a higher rate of papillary mineralisation did occur at the high dose level (NTP, 1983).
At present no adequate test on the effects after repeated inhalative exposure exists, in a 14-day inhalation study nonreliable to its inhalation testing procedures guinea pigs developed retina degeneration. MDA was not investigated to its effects after repeated dermal application.

**NOAEL/LOAEL**

Repeated dose oral studies - rat
The LOAEL representing the most sensitive adverse (nonneoplastic) effect after repeated oral application was derived from the Ciba-Geigy study (1982) which was accepted as valid. It was 7.5 mg/kg bw/d in male rats and 8 mg/kg bw/d in female rats. This LOAEL is corresponding to the level of LOAEL from the 2-year study on rats on nonneoplastic effects (9, resp. 10 mg/kg bw/d in male, resp. female rats). Although the NTP-studies had not examined parameters of hematology, bioclinical chemistry and urinalysis, the LOAEL of 9 mg/kg bw/d from the long term study was considered to be the most appropriate value for quantitative risk assessment. From the studies available no NOAEL could be derived for the rat.

Repeated dose oral studies - mouse
The database of MDA-related toxic effects on mice was less than that in rat, because only few drinking water studies existed. A NOAEL can be derived from the 90-day study (NTP, 1983), which was 11.4 mg/kg bw/d in male mice and 14.4 mg/kg bw/d in female mice.

**Human data**

Little information with limited validity is available on the toxic effect after repeated exposure to humans. Bastian (1984) reported four cases of acute intoxications with MDA in workers resulting in an acute hepatic illness. In two of these men the illness recurred on re-exposure a few months later and their reconvalescence period was prolonged.

Clinical hepatitis related to MDA exposure was reported in a letter to the editor from Williams et al. (1974). Six cases out of 300 men who applied epoxy resins as a surface coat at a plant construction site showed elevated serum transaminases and bilirubin. The liquid epoxide was mixed with a dry powder containing methylenedianiline (no further details available).

**Classification**

Rat liver and thyroid lesions as well as the anemia were considered to represent severe health effects which occurred below the critical dose level of 50 mg/kg bw/d for the oral 90-day test. Also, premature deaths in mice receiving oral doses from 78 mg/kg bw/d MDA for 14 days efforts the R 48/22.

According to the severe health effects which occurred after repeated dose administration MDA is classified as “harmful”, risk phrase R48/20/21/22.

**Mutagenicity**

All genotoxicity tests were conducted with pure MDA or MDA dihydrochloride (not with technical-grade MDA). In all reports (except the SCE in vivo assay) test methodologies and description of data were adequate. However, some findings did not allow clear conclusions. An overview on genotoxicity data is given in Table 4.1.2.7.

**Bacterial systems**
With S-9 mix, bacterial mutation tests were positive in a dose-dependent manner in Salmonella typhimurium strains TA100 and TA98 in doses ranging from 3.0 to 333 µg/plate (Zeiger et al., 1988; rat and hamster liver S-9 mix) or in doses from 30 µg/plate upwards (BASF, 1977; rat liver S-9 mix). Without S-9 mix, negative results were observed in both studies.

In vitro systems with mammalian cells
A chromosomal aberration test with CHO cells was positive with S-9 mix and equivocal without (Gulati et al., 1989). With S-9 mix, 3 experiments were performed with 2 h exposure and 13.5 h to 15.0 h sampling; in the dose range 500 to 1000 µg/ml aberration frequencies ranging from 14.0% to 85.0% were induced. Without S-9 mix, 2 experiments were performed with 2 h exposure and 15 h or 18 h sampling; one trial was negative for doses up to 500 µg/ml; in the second trial doses up to 600 µg/ml were negative and an increased aberration frequency of 15% was found for the highest tested dose of 800 µg/ml. Since cytotoxicity data are lacking, the findings cannot be interpreted adequately. It seems that clastogenic effects were limited to doses with strong cytotoxic effects.

In a mouse lymphoma assay which was done only without metabolic activation a weak positive result was obtained (McGregor et al., 1988). Three experiments were performed; in 2 of them 2- to 3-fold increases of mutant frequencies were induced by the highest tested doses of 500 µg/ml or 700 µg/ml; 1000 µg/ml were totally cytotoxic.

A test for induction of sister chromatid exchanges (SCE) was marginally positive with and without S-9 mix; data on cytotoxicity were not given (Gulati et al., 1989). With S-9 mix, one experiment was performed with 2 h exposure and 24 h sampling; in doses ranging from 160 to 1600 µg/ml marginal increases of SCE frequencies were found; the maximum effect was ca. 1.3-fold as compared to the negative control. Without S-9 mix, two experiments were performed with 2 h exposure; in the first experiment with 24 h sampling, for doses ranging from 16 to 160 µg/ml marginal increases of SCE frequencies were found; the maximum effect was ca. 1.4-fold as compared to the negative control; in a second experiment prolonged sampling times were included, again marginal increases of SCE frequencies were found.

Tests for induction of DNA excision-repair (unscheduled DNA synthesis, UDS) in primary rat hepatocytes led to controversial findings, although - with the exception of rat strains - similar experimental conditions were used with an autoradiographic methodology and analysis of net nuclear grains. Mori et al. (1988) reported on a clear and dose-dependent effect for doses ranging from 1.0 to 100 µmol/l (19.8 to 19800 µg/ml) with hepatocytes from male ACI/N rats; a dose of 1000 µmol/l was totally cytotoxic. According to Shaddock et al. (1989) there was no effect with hepatocytes from Sprague-Dawley rats for doses up 100 µg/ml; higher doses could not be analysed due to toxicity. With hepatocytes from rats which were induced by Aroclor or phenobarbitone very weak effects were observed for doses from 25 to 100 µg/ml.

In vivo systems with mammals
In two investigations on the potential of MDA for induction of micronuclei in vivo, weak effects were obtained after i.p.-administrations of high doses.

In two bone marrow experiments with 5 male B6C3F1 mice per group, 3 daily doses of 9.3, 18.5 or 37.0 mg/kg led to increased micronucleus frequencies which were less than 2-fold (0.23 to 0.35 %) as compared to concurrent negative controls (0.17 and 0.19 %) (Shelby et al., 1993). Micronucleus frequencies in treated animals were within the range of negative control values obtained for the 49 chemicals which were tested in the described investigation.
In experiments with reticulocytes of CD-1 mice again weak effects were obtained (Morita et al., 1997). In two experiments with single treatment, a weak but dose-dependent increase was observed in one experiment (doses 28 to 112 mg/kg) and a marginal increase in the other (28 to 140 mg/kg). Two daily doses ranging from 22.8 to 90 mg/kg were negative. In all three experiments highest doses were near to LD50 values.

In vivo UDS tests with liver cells from male Fischer-344 rats or B6C3F1 mice were negative (Mirsalis et al., 1989). Oral doses (gavage) up to the LD50 range were used (rats, 20, 80, 350 mg/kg; mice, 50, 200, 500, 1000 mg/kg); sampling times were 2 and 12 h after treatment.

In an in vivo bone marrow SCE test with male Swiss mice marginally increases in SCE frequencies were obtained after intraperitoneal administration of 9 and 18 mg/kg (Parodi et al., 1983). The maximum SCE frequency was 1.4-fold as compared to the concurrent negative control group. The investigation suffers from methodological insufficiencies (only 3 animals with 15 to 20 analysed cells per group, no toxicity data) and the 'effect' might well be unspecific.

An in vivo alkaline elution assay with liver DNA from Sprague-Dawley rats led to a positive result (Parodi et al., 1981). Single intraperitoneal administrations of the LD50 dose 74 mg/kg (0.37 mmol/kg) induced clear increases in DNA fragmentation 4 h and 24 h after treatment. Since elution was run under pH 12.3, primarily single and double strand breaks in DNA were detected (not alkali-labile sites).

In order to evaluate the DNA-binding capacity of MDA, radiolabeled (³H)MDA was administered intraperitoneally to groups of 6 male Wistar rats at single doses of 5.6 and 116.5 µmol/kg (corresponding to 1.1 and 23.1 mg/kg; Schütze et al., 1996). In the liver relatively low covalent binding indices of 1.05 (low dose) and 2.3 (high dose) were determined [CBI = (µmol of MDA bound / mol of DNA) / (mmol of MDA applied / kg bodyweight)].

Conclusion

MDA induces gene mutations in bacteria. In mammalian cell cultures in the presence of an exogenous metabolism system, MDA is an inducer of chromosomal aberrations. Inconclusive or weak effects were obtained in other cell culture assays.

In vivo, slight increases of micronuclei frequencies were found in mice after treatment to high doses. Furthermore, a high MDA dose led to DNA fragmentation in rat liver cells. Weak marginal effects were obtained for induction SCE (mouse bone marrow) and DNA binding (rat liver). In vivo DNA repair (UDS) tests were negative for livers of rats and mice.

MDA causes concern for man owing to possible mutagenic effects. There is evidence from in vivo micronucleus tests (although only weakly positive) which is supported by the induction of DNA fragmentation in vivo and chromosomal aberrations in vitro. On the other hand, there is no sufficient evidence to place the substance in category 2. Therefore, according to the classification criteria MDA has been classified as category 3 mutagen.
Table 4.1.2.7: Overview on genotoxicity data of MDA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test system</th>
<th>Negative effects</th>
<th>Questionable or weak effects</th>
<th>Positive effects</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bacterial gene mutations test</td>
<td>without S-9 mix</td>
<td></td>
<td>dose-dependent effect with S-9 mix</td>
<td>BASF, 1977; Zeiger et al., 1988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chromosomal aberration test in vitro</td>
<td>CHO cells without S-9 mix negative after 2-h exposure to doses up to 600 µg/ml, positive in 1 expt. at 800 µg/ml; no toxicity data</td>
<td></td>
<td>CHO cells with S-9 mix after 2-h exposure to 500 - 1000 µg/ml</td>
<td>Gulati et al., 1989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mouse lymphoma assay</td>
<td>without S-9 mix 2- to 3-fold increases in 2 out of 3 expts. at highest analysable doses of 500 or 700 µg/ml; no toxicity data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>McGregor et al., 1988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCE test in vitro</td>
<td>in CHO cells with and without S-9 mix marginal increases (up to 1.4-fold), doses 160-1600 (+S9), 16-160 µg/ml (-S9)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gulati et al., 1989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UDS test in vitro (DNA repair test)</td>
<td>controversial findings for rat hepatocytes: dose-dependently positive in one investigation, negative and marginal effects in another</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mori et al., 1988; Shaddock et al., 1989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Micronucleus test in vivo (bone marrow)</td>
<td>weak effects (&lt;2-fold) in male mice after 3 i.p.-adm. of 9.3 to 37.0 mg/kg, no dose-dependency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Shelby et al., 1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Micronucleus test in vivo</td>
<td>equivocal effects in male mice after 1 or 2 i.p.-adm. of 22.5 to 140 mg/kg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Morita et al., 1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assay Type</td>
<td>Experimental Details</td>
<td>Results</td>
<td>References</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UDS test in vivo (DNA repair test)</td>
<td>Rodent liver cells, single oral exposure, doses up to 350 mg/kg (rats) or 1000 mg/kg (mice)</td>
<td>Marginal effects (up to 1.4-fold) in bone marrow cells of male mice after i.p.-doses of 9 or 18 mg/kg; low reliability, methodological insufficiencies</td>
<td>Mirsalis et al., 1989</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCE test in vivo</td>
<td>Marginal effects (up to 1.4-fold) in bone marrow cells of male mice after i.p.-doses of 9 or 18 mg/kg; low reliability, methodological insufficiencies</td>
<td>Parodi et al., 1983</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alkaline elution assay in vivo</td>
<td>Rat liver cells, i.p.-dose of 74 mg/kg (=LD$_{50}$), sampling times 4 and 24 h</td>
<td>Parodi et al., 1981</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DNA-binding assay in vivo</td>
<td>Low binding capacity in rat liver cells, single i.p.-doses of 1.1 and 23.1 mg/kg</td>
<td>Schütze et al., 1996</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Carcinogenicity

Experimental animal data

In two-year studies in F344 rats and B6C3F1 mice (NTP, 1983; Weisburger et al., 1984; Lamb et al., 1986), 150 and 300 ppm MDA administered in drinking water (equiv. to 9 and 16 mg/kg bw/d for male rats and 10, resp. 19 mg/kg bw/d for female rats, 25, resp. 58 mg/kg bw/d for male mice, and 19, resp. 43 mg/kg bw/d for female mice) was clearly carcinogenic, producing thyroid and liver tumors in both species. Survival was comparable among all groups. High dose female rats had lower mean body weights than those of the controls. No consistent effects on body weights were identified in the low dose females or either in dosed group of males. The average daily water consumption per rat by low- and high dose rats was 87% and 75% that of the controls for males and 93% and 82% for females. No compound-related clinical signs were observed. No significant differences in survival were observed between any groups of either sex of rats.

In rats, the incidence of thyroid follicular cell carcinoma was significantly higher in high dose males than in controls (Table 4.1.2.8A). High dose female rats showed a significant higher rate of follicular cell adenomas than in the controls. Neoplastic nodules in the liver showed a significantly higher incidence in low and high dose males than in controls. One bile duct adenoma was found in one high dose male rat. Transitional cell papillomas of the urinary bladder were found in 2/50 low dose and 1/50 high dose rats.

In mice, the incidences of follicular cell adenomas gained significance in high dose males and females (Table 4.1.2.8B). Hepatocellular carcinomas were significantly higher in males of each dose group and in high dose females. Hepatocellular adenomas occurred with significant higher incidence in high dose females.

Cystic and/or hyperplastic follicular thyroid lesions were increased in high dose female rats and mice of each sex. Rats and mice of each dose group showed toxic liver effects. An increased incidence of kidney nephropathy was evident in both dose groups in mice, high dose male rats showed a higher incidence of renal mineralisation (see 4.1.2.6).

Table 4.1.2.8A: Number of rats with non-neoplastic and neoplastic lesions in the thyroid and liver

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Dose in ppm</th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Females</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thyroid:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follicular cysts</td>
<td>1/49</td>
<td>2/47</td>
<td>3/48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follicular cell adenoma</td>
<td>1/49</td>
<td>4/47</td>
<td>3/48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follicular cell carcinoma</td>
<td>0/49</td>
<td>0/47</td>
<td>7/48*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-Cell adenoma</td>
<td>0/49</td>
<td>0/47</td>
<td>0/48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liver:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unspecified dilatation</td>
<td>1/50</td>
<td>6/50</td>
<td>10/50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fatty metamorphosis</td>
<td>14/50</td>
<td>28/50</td>
<td>33/50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focal cellular change</td>
<td>14/50</td>
<td>38/50</td>
<td>36/50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neoplastic nodules</td>
<td>1/50</td>
<td>12/50*</td>
<td>25/50*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Tumor incidences indicated as statistically significant; no statistics available on the nonneoplastic lesion
Table 4.1.2.8B: Number of mice with non-neoplastic and neoplastic lesions in the thyroid and liver

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Dose in ppm</th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Females</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thyroid:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follicular cell hyperplasia</td>
<td>0/47</td>
<td>3/49</td>
<td>18/49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follicular cell adenoma</td>
<td>0/47</td>
<td>3/49</td>
<td>16/49*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follicular cell carcinoma</td>
<td>0/47</td>
<td>0/49</td>
<td>0/49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liver:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liver cell degeneration</td>
<td>0/50</td>
<td>40/50</td>
<td>30/50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liver cell adenoma</td>
<td></td>
<td>3/50</td>
<td>9/50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liver cell carcinoma</td>
<td>10/49</td>
<td>33/50*</td>
<td>29/50*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Tumor incidences indicated as statistically significant; no statistics available on the nonneoplastic lesion

A number of other studies on carcinogenicity in rats and mice have been reported, however they were not well performed or documented (Steinhoff and Grundmann, 1970; Schoental, 1968; Griswold et al., 1968).

**Human data**

Data on the carcinogenic potency in humans are of limited quality (e.g. no data on confounding factors, no data on exposure to other substances).

In a Swedish retrospective study Selden et al., (1992) tried to investigate the state of health of 197 power generator workers, who were exposed to MDA between 1963 and 1968. Neither the concentration of MDA nor the exposure route and time of exposure was registered. The number of the finally examined persons was not mentioned. Although one case of bladder cancer occurred in this group, they concluded that there was no statistically significant evidence of an increased overall or bladder cancer risk compared to the total population.

Liss and Giurguis (1994) followed a group of 10 workers exposed to MDA for 7 days to 2.5 months between 1967 and 1976. The concentration supposed to be inhaled ranged from 0.04-3.11 mg/m3. After developing an acute jaundice the workers left the factory, 23 years after intoxication in one of the workers bladder cancer was diagnosed. For the average latency period for aromatic amine-induced cancers has been suggested to be about 20 years, occurrence of bladder cancer has been observed in other persons occupationally exposed to MDA, and because of animal datas they concluded, that these finding adds weight to the suggestion that MDA is carcinogenic in humans.

On instruction of the U.S. National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH) Liss and Chrostek (1983) conducted a follow-up investigation of 179 white male deaths among employees with potential exposure to epoxy resins and amine hardeners who had ever worked for more than 1 month in areas with potential exposure to MDA. 46 persons of this group died with malign neoplasms. The proportional mortality rate amongst these persons revealed a statistically significant excess for cancer of large intestine, cancer of bladder, lymphosarcoma and reticulo-sarcoma compared to the whole population. In a proportional cancer mortality ratio analysis only the excess of bladder cancer remained significantly elevated. On the basis of these findings NIOSH suggests an association between bladder cancer and work in areas with past or present potential exposure to MDA.
Summary

Various reports of limited reliability describing effects after repeated exposures of humans showed a coincidence of bladder cancers and work in areas with exposure to MDA.

Considerations on the mechanism of action

MDA obviously influences the function of the thyroid gland resulting in hypothyroidism. Some of the induced adverse effects, e.g. the depressed food consumption, lower body weight gain, effects on red cells, lymphocytes, and clotting parameters were explainable as secondary responses. However, the mechanisms by which MDA produced the nonneoplastic and neoplastic lesions are still unknown. At present, there are no data on the thyroid and pituitary hormone status. Besides of the thyroid effects, the mechanism of liver tumor development remains unclear, too. Cell injury may give indications on a nongenotoxic mechanism, however it is still unproved. Therefore, based on the results of carcinogenicity studies in animals and the results of genotoxicity studies and in absence of evidence that the appearance of thyroid and liver tumors in rats and mice is a consequence of chronic tissue-damaging (liver) or tissue-stimulation (thyroid) effects for the moment it has to be assumed that a genotoxic mechanism is involved.

MDA induced tumors were observed in livers and in thyroid of male and female rats and mice. This coincidence may lead to an assumption that theoretically thyroid tumors may be associated to liver tumors. Until now the pathomechanism of tumor growth in the thyroid is not investigated. It is not known whether MDA acts indirectly on the thyroid, e.g. inducing microsomal enzymes of the liver cell resulting in an increased glucuronidation and a secondary chronic stimulation of the thyroid, or whether MDA may act directly on the follicular cell. At present there are no data which give reasons for a species specific phenomenon. Tumor induction after cell injury in the liver may be interpreted to give indication for a nongenotoxic mechanism of action. On the other hand there are positive genotoxic data in vitro and in vivo. Therefore a genotoxic mechanism can not be excluded for the tumor response of each target organ.

At present there are no data which give reasons to assume a species specific mechanism. Considering the tumor types, thyroid follicular adenomas/carcinomas and liver cell adenomas/carcinomas are tumors which occur in rats, mice and man with similar cellular morphology and growth pattern. Spontaneous thyroid tumors in rats were infrequent, incidences ≤1% for follicular cell adenomas or carcinomas were reported for untreated male and female F344 rats (Boorman and Elwell, 1996). None of the rat control groups of this study had thyroid follicular tumors except one out of 49 males with a follicular cell adenoma. Also, it is known that B6C3F1 mice have low spontaneous rates of thyroid follicular adenomas (≤1%) and of follicular carcinomas (≤0.5%) (Heath, 1996). No tumor was observed in the thyroid of the control mice of the carcinogenicity study on MDA.

In general, chemical induced thyroid carcinogenesis are considered to have relevance for the risk evaluation on human health. Species-related quantitative differences in substance-induced thyroid hormonal responses should be well investigated to claim that rodents are more sensitive than humans. As no specific data on disturbances on thyroid hormone homeostasis were known for MDA exposed rats, mice or other species, risk assessment should be based on a conservative position. The absence of equivalent human data is not suitable to negate positive animal findings. MDA induces thyroid tumors in rats and mice and may also pose a carcinogenic hazard for the human thyroid. Similarly, liver tumors in rats and (because of higher spontaneous tumor rates to lower extent) also liver tumors in mice were considered to have potential relevance for humans. The
consistency of findings between two rodent species is an additional argument to postulate a relevant carcinogenic potential.

From the cancer study in rats (NTP, 1983), where 2 low dose and 1 high dose rat developed bladder tumors, it can not surely be excluded that these tumors were associated to MDA-treatment: bladder transitional cell papillomas were reported to be very rare in untreated animals. The incidence of bladder tumors did not show dose relationship, and there were no cases in the control groups of the study. Human data have led to a suggestion that bladder cancer may be associated to occupational MDA-exposure, but no clear conclusion could be drawn from human data. Together with the rat data, biological plausibility was not sufficient to conclude that MDA induce bladder tumors.

Another extremely rare tumor, a bile duct adenoma was observed in 1/50 high dose rat of the NTP cancer study. Although the incidence is very low, the authors discussed a possible association to the MDA treatment. This tumor was not observed in 3 633 control rats of this strain in the NTP Bioassay Program and the bile duct hyperplasia may be discussed as the corresponding preneoplasia.

**Conclusion**

MDA is carcinogenic in experimental animals. Longterm studies on rats and mice indicated that oral MDA treatment was associated with tumors of the thyroid and the liver.

From animal data there is a concern on a carcinogenic potential of MDA in humans. The results from the reports on human exposure did not show clearly the presence of a carcinogenic activity in humans. The available data are not sufficiently to justify the evaluation as an human carcinogen according to the criteria of the Directive 67/548/EEC. However, they warrant the classification of a carcinogen of category 2.

**Toxicity for reproduction**

*Animal data:*

Fertility impairment: no data available

Developmental toxicity: no valid data available

*Human data:*

no data available

*Other information:*

Data from a subchronic study (3 months drinking water study in rats, Ciba-Geigy, 1982) were also considered. However, in view of the fact of severely reduced body weight of less than 50% compared to the controls and of drastically reduced waterintake (resp. substance-intake) in the mid and higher dose groups in this study, informations concerning gonads (e.g. reduced weight) are not considered of special value for the evaluation of possible effects on reproductive organs.

There is insufficient information on a possible toxic potential of MDA concerning reproduction.
4.1.3 Risk characterisation

General aspects

MDA is used industrially as an intermediate product. Use of the substance itself or as a component of consumer products is unknown. Exposure of the general population is not assumed to exist. However, in case of using products, colored with the recently notified azodye Cartasol Yellow an exposure of consumers cannot be excluded due to the possibility of liberation of MDA. In addition, there may be a potential exposure to MDA for uremic patients or patients who receive frequent blood transfusions from gamma-ray irradiated polyurethane-containing medical devices.

The evaluation of the available information shows, that MDA is absorbed by the three routes of intake (dermal, oral, inhalation) in animals and humans. Especially in humans a quantitative assessment of absorption is not possible. There is no evidence for accumulation in the body. MDA and its N-acetylated metabolites are mainly excreted in the urine. Although the detection of MDA in the urine gives information on current exposure the formation of adducts with hemoglobin provides the opportunity for biological monitoring of cumulative exposures.

Acute intoxication of humans with MDA is reported after oral, dermal and inhalation exposure, leading to jaundice ("Epping Jaundice"). In addition to acute hepatic illness, in some cases myocardial effects and persistent retinal damage were reported. Acute intoxication of humans did not cause any mortality. Acute toxicity in rats is demonstrated by LD50 values of 350-450 mg/kg bw after oral and 1000 mg/kg bw (vehicle dimethylsulfoxide) after dermal exposure; inhalation LC50 for rats (> 0.837 mg/l) is demonstrated exceeding the highest possible concentration of MDA in air at room temperature. Damage to the liver and kidneys has been reported to be the most prominent toxic effects in rats. Cats and dogs seem to be much more sensitive than rats with fatalities observed after oral application of 25-50 mg/kg bw with liver and kidney damage and blindness due to retinal atrophy as the most severe effects.

Human data on local irritation or corrosion caused by MDA are not available. In rabbits, slight irritation to the skin and mild irritation to the eyes and no local corrosive effects are demonstrated.

Animal data on skin sensitization do not result in conclusive evidence on the skin sensitization potential of MDA. However, based on the data on humans there is convincing evidence that MDA is a skin sensitizer. MDA also demonstrates cross-reactivity to substances of the para-substituted compound group.

Main toxic effects in rats and mice after repeated exposure to MDA were degeneration with consequential bile duct hyperplasia and fibrosis in the liver and a hyperplastic lesion of the thyroid. Further treatment-related effects were anemia, irritation of the stomach, basophilic hypertrophy of the pituitary, and kidney toxicity. A LOAEL (7.5 mg/kg bw/d in male rats and 8 mg/kg bw/d in female rats) representing the most sensitive adverse (nonneoplastic) effect after repeated oral application was derived from the subchronic Ciba-Geigy study (1982). This LOAEL is corresponding to the LOAEL on nonneoplastic effects from the 2-year study on rats (9 resp. 10 mg/kg bw/d in male, resp. female rats). Although the NTP-studies had not examined parameters of hematology, bioclinical chemistry, and urinalysis, the LOAEL of 9 mg/kg bw/d from this long term study was considered to be the most appropriate value for quantitative risk assessment. No NOAEL could be derived from these studies on rats.

The database of MDA-related toxic effects on mice is more limited than that in rat. A NOAEL can be derived from the 90-day study (NTP, 1983), which was 11.4 mg/kg bw/d in male mice and 14.4
mg/kg in female mice. No valid repeated dose studies with inhalation and dermal application route were available.

MDA causes concern for man owing to possible mutagenic effects. There is evidence from an in vivo micronucleus test (although only weakly positive) which is supported by the induction of DNA fragmentation in vivo and chromosomal aberrations in vitro.

MDA is carcinogenic in experimental animals. Long term studies on rats and mice indicated that oral MDA treatment was associated with tumors of the thyroid and the liver. The results from the reports on human exposure did not show clearly a carcinogenic activity in humans.

The mechanism of MDA carcinogenicity is not yet known. Based on the results of carcinogenicity studies in animals and the results of genotoxicity studies and also in absence of evidence that the appearance of thyroid and liver tumours in rats and mice is a consequence of chronic tissue-damaging (liver) or tissue-stimulating (thyroid) effects a genotoxic mechanism cannot be excluded.

Risk characterization with respect to a possible impairment of reproduction cannot be performed due to lack of data for hazard assessment.

Workers

Toxicological endpoints relevant for workplace risk assessment

Introductory remarks

MDA is absorbed via the oral, dermal and inhalation route. As to the extrapolation steps a central tendency estimate is intended. A higher sensitivity of a subpopulation (intraspecies variability) is possible.

Acute toxicity

The inhalative LC50 (4 h) in rats is higher than 0.837 mg/l (837 mg/m³). After dermal exposure 50% of rats died at 1 000 mg/kg with DMSO as vehicle. No rats died at 2 500 mg/kg with water as vehicle. LD₅₀ (oral) in rats is found in the range of 350 - 450 mg/kg with damage to the liver and kidney at doses of 100 mg/kg and above. In another study of acute oral toxicity in rats a threshold for liver effects was found between 25 and 75 mg/kg. At 100 mg/kg liver necrosis was observed. In humans 3 mg/kg (estimated acute oral dose) resulted in hepatocellular toxicity (e. g. necrosis and degeneration). A NOAEL was not determined. A quantitative comparison of rat and human data is complicated by the different way of administration (gavage versus diet (bread)) and the missing dose response relationship of the human data. But it might be assumed that one order of magnitude lies between the effect levels of rats and humans for acute oral liver toxicity. As a quantitative estimate a 10-fold higher sensitivity of humans is assumed. Since there are no quantitative human data as to the dermal and inhalation exposure, the evaluation of dermal and inhalation toxicity should be based on oral human data.

Inhalation (estimation of NAEC)

Starting with the LOAEL of 3 mg/kg (human, oral, acute) the following extrapolation is performed. For a route-to-route extrapolation a body weight of 70 kg, a respiratory volume of 10 m³/8 h and an equivalent inhalatory and oral uptake are assumed. A LAEC (human, inhalation, acute) in the range of 21 mg/m³/8 h with liver toxicity is calculated. For a LAEC/NAEC-extrapolation a default factor...
of 1/3 is used. A NAEC (human, inhalation, acute) in the range of 7 mg/m^3/8 h is estimated. However, concerning the LAEC/NAEC-extrapolation it has to be mentioned, that a dose-response relationship in humans is not available and the effects at 3 mg/kg were marked. So it is not excluded, that the factor of 1/3 is not sufficient.

**Dermal (estimation of NAEL)**

Starting with the LOAEL of 3 mg/kg (human, oral, acute) the following extrapolation is performed. For a route-to-route extrapolation the data from rat acute toxicity (oral/dermal) are compared to estimate the relation of oral and dermal absorption. The oral LD50 for rats is found in the range of 350 - 450 mg/kg. Toxicity after dermal exposure seems to depend on the vehicle. A LD50 in the range of 1 000 mg/kg can be estimated for a vehicle that supports dermal absorption and a value higher than 2 500 mg/kg for a non-supporting vehicle. For a route-to-route extrapolation the factor "> 2" is assumed. Supposing that this is also relevant to humans (body weight: 70 kg) the LOAEL of 3 mg/kg (human, oral, acute) is equivalent to a dose higher than 420 mg/person (LAEL, human, dermal, acute). For a LAEL/NAEL-extrapolation a factor of 1/3 is used. A NAEL (human, dermal, acute) higher than 140 mg/person is estimated.

**Irritation/Corrosion**

*Inhalation:* No data available; not suspected to be a respiratory tract irritant

*Dermal:* No skin/eye irritant (not corrosive)

**Sensitization**

*Inhalation:* No data available concerning respiratory sensitization

*Dermal:* MDA is considered as a skin sensitizer (mainly based on human data)

**Repeated dose toxicity**

Because of the lack of other relevant data acute human data and results of a 2-year oral rat study are used for an estimate of chronic inhalatory and dermal toxicity in humans. Several studies in rats and mice revealed the liver and the thyroid as the main target organs. Based on a 2-year oral rat study (liver and thyroid effects) a LOAEL of 9 mg/kg/d was determined (see 4.1.2.6). A NOAEL was not found. A comparison with the acute human toxicity data (marked liver toxicity at 3 mg/kg) shows the higher sensitivity of humans mentioned under "Acute toxicity".

**Inhalation (estimation of NAEC)**

Starting with the LOAEL of 9 mg/kg/d (rat, oral, chronic) the following extrapolation is performed. For a species extrapolation the factor of 1/10, derived from the acute oral data (rat and human), is used to calculate a LAEL (human, oral, chronic) in the range of 0.9 mg/kg/d. For a route-to-route extrapolation a body weight of 70 kg, a respiratory volume of 10 m^3/8 h and an equivalent inhalatory and oral uptake are assumed. A LAEC (human, inhalation, chronic) in the range of 6 mg/m^3/8 h is calculated. For a LAEC/NAEC-extrapolation a factor of 1/3 is used. A NAEC (human, inhalation, chronic) in the range of 2 mg/m^3/8 h is estimated.

For reasons of comparability the NAEC without consideration of the anticipated higher human sensitivity is calculated as well: a NAEC in the range of 20 mg/m^3/8 h results. This NAEC is 10-
fold higher than the adjusted NAEC of 2 mg/m$^3$/8 h, the latter being considered more relevant and therefore used for risk assessment.

*Dermal (estimation of NAEL)*

Starting with the LOAEL of 9 mg/kg/d (rat, oral, chronic) the following extrapolation is performed. For a species extrapolation the factor of 1/10, derived from the acute oral data (rat and human), is used to calculate a LAEL (human, oral, chronic) in the range of 0.9 mg/kg/d. For a route-to-route extrapolation the factor >2 is used as described under "Acute toxicity (Dermal)" leading to a LAEL (human, dermal, chronic) >1.8 mg/kg/d. For a body weight of 70 kg results a LAEL (human, dermal, chronic) >130 mg/person/d. For a LAEL/NAEL-extrapolation a factor of 1/3 is used. A NAEL (human, dermal, chronic) >40 mg/person/d is estimated.

For reasons of comparability the NAEL without consideration of the anticipated higher human sensitivity is calculated as well: a LAEL >400 mg/person/d results. This LAEL is 10-fold higher than the adjusted NAEL of >40 mg/person/d, the latter being considered more relevant and therefore used for risk assessment.

**Mutagenicity**

Following the conclusion of chapter 4.1.2.7 MDA has a mutagenic potential to mammalian cells. Small increases of micronuclei were observed in mouse bone marrow cells with repeated intraperitoneal administrations of doses probably near to the LD50.

**Carcinogenicity**

There is no clear evidence of carcinogenicity in humans. The carcinogenicity of MDA was demonstrated in drinking-water studies on rats and mice. MDA caused thyroid and liver tumours in both species. The T25-value of 8.4 mg/kg/d describes the carcinogenic potency in animals (continuous life time exposure) (Dybing et al., 1997). It was calculated for MDA-dihydrochloride (molecular weight: 269.2 g/mol). For MDA (molecular weight: 198.3 g/mol) a T25 of 6.2 mg/kg/d results. The mechanism of tumor formation is discussed in chapter 4.1.2.8. On the one hand the carcinogenicity studies may be interpreted to indicate a nongenotoxic mechanism of action based on nonneoplastic effects. But considering on the other hand the genotoxicity data it has to be assumed that a genotoxic mechanism without a threshold for tumor formation is involved.

*Ihalation*

The T25-value (6.2 mg/kg/d) is extrapolated to a modified value assumed to be relevant to humans (workplace time schedule, inhalation) by the following steps. Based on the assumption, that a 10-fold higher sensitivity of humans concerning carcinogenicity has to be regarded a value of 0.62 mg/kg/d is calculated for humans. For a route-to-route extrapolation a body weight of 70 kg, a respiratory volume of 10 m$^3$/8 h and an equivalent inhalatory and oral uptake are assumed. A value of 4.3 mg/m$^3$ results. A final adjustment to workplace conditions is done below (constants are taken from DECOS, 1995).

\[
4.3 \text{ mg/m}^3 \times \frac{75 \text{ years} \times 52 \text{ weeks} \times 7 \text{ days}}{40 \text{ years} \times 48 \text{ weeks} \times 5 \text{ days}} = \text{ca. 12 mg/m}^3
\]

A modified T25-value (inhalation, workplace time schedule) in the range of 12 mg/m$^3$ is estimated.
For reasons of comparability the modified T25-value without consideration of the anticipated higher human sensitivity is calculated as well: a value in the range of 120 mg/m$^3$ results. This value is 10-fold higher than the modified T25-value of 12 mg/m$^3$. There are uncertainties as to the use of a species factor derived from acute toxicity, but there are at present no clear reasons excluding a higher sensitivity of humans concerning carcinogenicity.

Since it has to be assumed that a genotoxic mechanism is involved a linear dose response cannot be excluded.

**Dermal**

The T25-value (6.2 mg/kg/d) is extrapolated to a modified value assumed to be relevant to humans (workplace time schedule, dermal) by the following steps. Based on the assumption, that a 10-fold higher sensitivity of humans concerning carcinogenicity has to be regarded a value of 0.62 mg/kg/d is calculated for humans. For a route-to-route extrapolation the factor >2 is used as described under "Acute toxicity (Dermal)". For a body weight of 70 kg results a value >90 mg/person/d. A final adjustment to workplace conditions is done below (constants are taken from DECOS, 1995).

\[
\begin{align*}
&\frac{75 \text{ years} \times 52 \text{ weeks} \times 7 \text{ days}}{40 \text{ years} \times 48 \text{ weeks} \times 5 \text{ days}} \times 90 \text{ mg/person/d} = > 250 \text{ mg/person/d}
\end{align*}
\]

A modified T25-value (dermal, workplace time schedule) of >250 mg/person/d is estimated.

For reasons of comparability the modified T25-value without consideration of the anticipated higher human sensitivity is calculated as well: a value of >2500 mg/kg/d results. This value is 10-fold higher than the modified T25-value of >250 mg/kg/d. There are uncertainties as to the use of a species factor derived from acute toxicity, but there are at present no clear reasons excluding a higher sensitivity of humans concerning carcinogenicity.

Since it has to be assumed that a genotoxic mechanism is involved a linear dose response cannot be excluded.

**Reproductive toxicity**

There are no specific studies on developmental toxicity or fertility impairment. The data from repeated dose toxicity are not considered to be relevant for the assessment (see 4.1.2.9).

**Summary of effects relevant for workplace risk assessment**
Table 4.1.3.2.1: Summary of effects relevant for workplace risk assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Inhalation</th>
<th>Dermal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Acute toxicity</strong></td>
<td>extrapolated NAEC: 7 mg/m³</td>
<td>extrapolated NAEL: &gt; 140 mg/person/extrapolated LAEL: &gt; 420 mg/person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>extrapolated LAEC: 21 mg/m³</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>liver toxicity</td>
<td>liver toxicity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Irritation</strong></td>
<td>no data: not suspected to be a respiratory tract irritant</td>
<td>not classified as irritating to skin or eyes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Corrosivity</strong></td>
<td>---</td>
<td>not corrosive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sensitization</strong></td>
<td>no data concerning respiratory sensitization</td>
<td>skin sensitizer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Repeated dose toxicity</strong> (systemic)</td>
<td>extrapolated NAEC: 2 mg/m³</td>
<td>extrapolated NAEL: &gt; 40 mg/person/d extrapolated LAEL: &gt; 130 mg/person/d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>extrapolated LAEC: 6 mg/m³</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>liver and thyroid toxicity</td>
<td>liver and thyroid toxicity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Repeated dose toxicity</strong> (local)</td>
<td>Not considered to be a respiratory tract irritant</td>
<td>Not classified as ‘irritating to skin or eyes’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mutagenicity</strong></td>
<td>suspected to be mutagenic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Carcinogenicity</strong></td>
<td>extrapolated &quot;T25&quot; (workplace time schedule): 12 mg/m³</td>
<td>extrapolated &quot;T25&quot; (workplace time schedule): &gt; 250 mg/person/d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fertility impairment</strong></td>
<td>incomplete data base</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Developmental toxicity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Occupational risk assessment
For the purpose of risk assessment it is assumed that inhalation of dust and skin exposure are the main routes of exposure. Oral exposure is not considered to be a significant route of exposure under normal working practices.

Acute toxicity
Risk assessment for acute health effects directly relies on human experience. In humans the estimated oral dose of 3 mg/kg resulted in liver toxicity.

Inhalation
For acute inhalation exposure a NAEC in the range of 7 mg/m³ (8 h) is estimated. At 21 mg/m³ acute inhalation exposure is anticipated to result in acute liver toxicity in humans. The maximum level of exposure is calculated to be 0.1 - 1.25 mg/m³ (EASE) for the production of preparations in the industrial area resulting in a MOS of 6 to 70.

This acute risk situation is considered to be a borderline situation for „no concern“.

Conclusion: ii

Dermal contact
For acute dermal exposure a NAEL of greater than 140 mg/person was estimated. A total dermal dose of greater than 420 mg/person is anticipated to result in liver toxicity.

These data are compared with the exposure information (see table at the end of chapter 4.1.1.4).

Because investigations of dermal exposure have shown that glove materials used do not provide complete protection and information about the suitability of these materials which are recommended by the producers is not available, dermal exposure of a relevant level is assumed for all applications even with PPE. The exposure calculations by the EASE model are used for risk assessment purposes. For skilled trade applications the highest dermal exposure values are calculated. The standard of hygiene in skilled trade, e. g. on building sites is assumed to be low: protective gloves are not always worn and not regularly changed (MOS: > 0.05 - 0.3). This risk situation is the most critical one and clearly of concern. If a worker is dermally exposed to such high levels, acute liver toxicity is anticipated.

In the chemical industry PPE is highly accepted. Because it is not proved that protective gloves are of suitable material. MOS-values of > 0.3 - 3.3 cannot be excluded. This situation is critical too. For all other workplace scenarios acute dermal exposure is of concern as well.

Conclusion: iii

Irritation/Corrosivity

Inhalation
There are no data available concerning respiratory tract irritation. MDA is not suspected to be a respiratory tract irritant. With regard to this toxicological endpoint inhalation exposure is not of concern.
Conclusion: ii

*Dermal contact*

MDA is not classified as irritating to skin or eyes. Dermal exposure of workers is therefore not anticipated to result in irritant effects.

Conclusion: ii

*Sensitization*

*Dermal contact*

MDA is considered to be a human skin sensitizer. There are no valid data on its sensitization potency. Estimates of dermal exposure without PPE for different exposure scenarios clearly demonstrate that there may be a substantial risk of skin sensitization resulting in contact allergies. Because investigations have shown that glove materials used do not provide complete protection and information on suitability of glove materials is not available, relevant dermal exposure and contact allergies are expected even with use of PPE.

Conclusion: iii

*Inhalation*

There are no data available on respiratory sensitization. For preliminary risk assessment inhalation exposure is not suspected to result in respiratory tract sensitization.

Conclusion: ii

**Repeated dose toxicity (systemic)**

The relevant information (exposure, toxicity, MOS) is listed in table 4.1.3.2.2.A.
### Table 4.1.3.2.2.A: MOS values [repeated dose toxicity (systemic)] of MDA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exposure scenario</th>
<th>Duration and frequency</th>
<th>Inhalation</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Dermal contact</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Shift average value [mg/m³]</td>
<td>NAEC [mg/m³]</td>
<td>MOS (extrap.)</td>
<td>Conclusion</td>
<td>Shift average value [mg/cm²/d]</td>
<td>Shift average value [mg/p/d]</td>
<td>NAEL [mg/p/d]</td>
<td>MOS (extrap.)</td>
<td>Conclusion</td>
<td>Shift average value [mg/cm²/d]</td>
<td>Shift average value [mg/p/d]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chemical industry</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>manufacturing and further processing as a chemical intermediate (methylene diphenyl di-isocyanate, MDI) activity: drumming, transfer, cleaning, maintenance</td>
<td>dust: shift length, daily, very low³</td>
<td>0.52¹</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>iii</td>
<td>0.06 - 0.6²</td>
<td>25 - 252</td>
<td>&gt; 40</td>
<td>&gt; 0.2 - 2</td>
<td>iii</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>vapour: shift length, daily, very low³</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>very high</td>
<td>ii</td>
<td>0.1 - 1²</td>
<td>42 - 420</td>
<td>&gt; 40</td>
<td>&gt; 0.1 - 1</td>
<td>iii</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exposure scenario</td>
<td>Duration and frequency</td>
<td>Inhalation</td>
<td>Dermal contact</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Shift average value [mg/m³]</td>
<td>NAEC [mg/m³]</td>
<td>MOS (extrap.)</td>
<td>Conclusion</td>
<td>Shift average value [mg/cm²/d]</td>
<td>Shift average value [mg/p/d]</td>
<td>NAEL [mg/p/d]</td>
<td>MOS (extrap.)</td>
<td>Conclusion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>production of preparations activity: drumming, transfer, cleaning, maintenance imid preparations, max. 10 % MDA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– dust (powder)</td>
<td>batch processing, 2hours/daily</td>
<td>0.05-0.125³</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16-40</td>
<td>ii</td>
<td>0.01-0.1²</td>
<td>4-42</td>
<td>&gt; 40</td>
<td>&gt; 1-10</td>
<td>iii</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>curing formulations, max. 60 % MDA</td>
<td>batch processing, 2hours/daily</td>
<td>lower than above³</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>&gt; 16-40</td>
<td>ii</td>
<td>0.06-0.6²</td>
<td>25-252</td>
<td>&gt; 40</td>
<td>&gt; 0.2-2</td>
<td>iii</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– dust</td>
<td>batch processing, 2hours/daily</td>
<td>lower than above³</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>&gt; 16-40</td>
<td>ii</td>
<td>0.005-0.05²</td>
<td>2-21</td>
<td>&gt; 40</td>
<td>&gt; 2-20</td>
<td>iii</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>max. 5 % MDA</td>
<td>batch processing, 2hours/daily</td>
<td>lower than above³</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>&gt; 16-40</td>
<td>ii</td>
<td>0.01-0.1³</td>
<td>4-42</td>
<td>&gt; 40</td>
<td>&gt; 1-10</td>
<td>iii</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exposure scenario</td>
<td>Duration and frequency</td>
<td>Inhalation</td>
<td>Dermal contact</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shift average value [mg/m³]</td>
<td>NAEC [mg/m³]</td>
<td>MOS (extrap.)</td>
<td>Conclusion</td>
<td>Shift average value [mg/cm²/d]</td>
<td>Shift average value [mg/p/d]</td>
<td>NAEL [mg/p/d]</td>
<td>MOS (extrap.)</td>
<td>Conclusion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Industrial area</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>manufacturing of formulations using powdery MDA activity: transfer, weighing, filling, drumming</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– dust</td>
<td>batch processing, 2hours/daily</td>
<td>0.6¹</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>iii</td>
<td>0.1 - 1²</td>
<td>42 - 420</td>
<td>&gt; 40</td>
<td>&gt; 0.1 - 1</td>
<td>iii</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>formulating putties using liquid MDA (approx. 60 %)</td>
<td>very low³</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>very high</td>
<td>ii</td>
<td>0.06 - 0.6²</td>
<td>25 - 252</td>
<td>&gt; 40</td>
<td>&gt; 0.2 - 2</td>
<td>iii</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exposure scenario</td>
<td>Duration and frequency</td>
<td>Inhalation</td>
<td>Dermal contact</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>production of preparations activity: drumming, transfer, cleaning, maintenance</td>
<td></td>
<td>Shift average value [mg/m^3]</td>
<td>NAEC [mg/m^3]</td>
<td>MOS (extrap.)</td>
<td>Conclusion</td>
<td>Shift average value [mg/cm^2/d]</td>
<td>Shift average value [mg/p/d]</td>
<td>NAEL [mg/p/d]</td>
<td>MOS (extrap.)</td>
<td>Conclusion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>imid preparations max. 10 % MDA</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.1 - 1.25^4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.6 - 20</td>
<td>iii</td>
<td>0.01 - 0.1^2</td>
<td>4 - 42</td>
<td>&gt; 40</td>
<td>&gt; 1 - 10</td>
<td>iii</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– dust (powder)</td>
<td>batch processing, 2hours/daily</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>curing formulations max. 60 % MDA</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 - 0.75^4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>&gt; 3</td>
<td>iii</td>
<td>0.06 - 0.6^2</td>
<td>25 - 252</td>
<td>&gt; 40</td>
<td>&gt; 0.2 - 2</td>
<td>iii</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– dust</td>
<td>batch processing, 2hours/daily</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>max. 5 % MDA</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 - 0.08^4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>&gt; 25</td>
<td>ii</td>
<td>0.005 - 0.05^2</td>
<td>2 - 21</td>
<td>&gt; 40</td>
<td>&gt; 2 - 20</td>
<td>iii</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– dust</td>
<td>batch processing, 2hours/daily</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exposure scenario</td>
<td>Duration and frequency</td>
<td>Inhalation</td>
<td>Dermal contact</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mixing curing formulations (max. 60% MDA) with resin for epoxies activity: transfer, weighing, filling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dust</td>
<td>short term (0.5 h), daily</td>
<td>0 - 0.24</td>
<td>&gt; 10</td>
<td>ii</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>very low</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vapour</td>
<td>short term (0.5 h), daily</td>
<td>very high</td>
<td></td>
<td>ii</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>handling of formulations containing MDA and epoxid resins (4.5 - 30 %)</td>
<td>shift length, daily</td>
<td>very low</td>
<td></td>
<td>ii</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vapour</td>
<td>shift length, daily</td>
<td>very high</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Inhalation**

- **Shift average value [mg/m³]**:
- **NAEC [mg/m³]**:
- **MOS (extrap.)**:
- **Conclusion**:

**Dermal contact**

- **Shift average value [mg/cm²/d]**:
- **Shift average value [mg/p/d]**:
- **NAEL [mg/p/d]**:
- **MOS (extrap.)**:
- **Conclusion**:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exposure scenario</th>
<th>Duration and frequency</th>
<th>Inhalation</th>
<th>Dermal contact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>mixing curing formulations (max. 5 % MDA) with resin for polyurethanes activity: transfer, weighing, filling</td>
<td>short term (0.5 h), daily</td>
<td>shift average value [mg/m³]</td>
<td>NAEC [mg/m³]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- dust</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 - 0.02⁴</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>handling of formulations containing MDA and polyurethane (2 - 3 %)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- vapour</td>
<td></td>
<td>very low³</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Inhalation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAEL [mg/p/d]</th>
<th>MOS (extrap.)</th>
<th>Conclusion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.005 - 0.05²</td>
<td>4.2 - 42</td>
<td>&gt; 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 2 - 16</td>
<td>&gt; 1 - 10</td>
<td>iii</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Dermal contact**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAEL [mg/p/d]</th>
<th>MOS (extrap.)</th>
<th>Conclusion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.003 - 0.03²</td>
<td>2.5 - 25</td>
<td>&gt; 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 2 - 16</td>
<td>&gt; 1 - 10</td>
<td>iii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exposure scenario</td>
<td>Duration and frequency</td>
<td>NAEC [mg/m³]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>handling of formulations containing MDA (0.1-10 %) and imid resins activity: weighing, filling</td>
<td>short term (0.5 h), daily</td>
<td>0.03 - 0.3²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dust (powder)</td>
<td>short term (0.5 h), daily</td>
<td>0.03 - 0.3²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vapour</td>
<td>short term (0.5 h), daily</td>
<td>0.03 - 0.3²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled trade</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mixing formulations containing MDA (9 - 60 %) with epoxid resins activity: transfer, weighing, filling, drumming</td>
<td>short term (0.5 h), not</td>
<td>0 - 0.24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Exposure scenario

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exposure scenario</th>
<th>Duration and frequency</th>
<th>Shift average [mg/m³]</th>
<th>NAEC [mg/m³]</th>
<th>MOS (extrap.)</th>
<th>Conclusion</th>
<th>Shift average value [mg/cm²/d]</th>
<th>Shift average value [mg/p/d]</th>
<th>NAEL [mg/p/d]</th>
<th>MOS (extrap.)</th>
<th>Conclusion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>daily⁵</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>handling of formulations containing MDA and epoxid resins (4 - 30 %)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vapour</td>
<td>duration and frequency not known, assumed: not daily⁵</td>
<td>very low³</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>very high</td>
<td>ii</td>
<td>0.3 - 1.5²</td>
<td>252 - 1 260</td>
<td>&gt; 40</td>
<td>&gt; 0.03 - 0.16</td>
<td>iii</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1. workplace measurements
2. EASE
3. expert judgement
4. EASE (without LEV)
5. information about frequency of exposure not available
Risk assessment for repeated dose toxicity relies upon two essential results: Based on a 2-year rat study with liver and thyroid toxicity a LOAEL of 9 mg/kg/d was determined. Human experience of acute liver toxicity at 3 mg/kg proves a higher sensitivity of humans in response to MDA. Based on acute oral toxicity in rats and humans, a rat-to-human extrapolation factor of 1/10 is assumed.

**Inhalation**

For inhalation risk assessment an extrapolated NAEC in the range of 2 mg/m³ was calculated. The NAEC is compared with the exposure information. For details see table 4.1.3.2.2.A. The critical scenarios with repeated inhalation exposure of workers are in the chemical industry (MOS 4) during production and in the industrial area during manufacturing of formulations (MOS 3), drumming of powdery imid preparations (10 % MDA) and curing formulations (60 % MDA) (MOS 1.6 - 20, >3), handling of powdery imid preparations (MOS 7 - 67). These MOS values are considered of concern.

It has to be mentioned that the MOS without consideration of the anticipated higher human sensitivity is greater than the extrapolated MOS used for risk characterisation.

Conclusion: iii

**Dermal contact**

For dermal risk assessment an extrapolated NAEL of greater than 40 mg/p/d was calculated. Repeated dermal exposure is assumed in the chemical industry, in all industrial applications even in case of use of PPE (see chapter 4.1.1.2). MOS-values in the range of > 0.1 - 1 to > 2 - 20 are calculated. For skilled trade applications intermittent exposure is assumed. However, because shift average values are rather high, conclusion iii is drawn. For details see table 4.1.3.2.2.A. These MOS are considered to be of concern. In case of relatively low MOS-values chronic liver toxicity is anticipated to occur.

It has to be mentioned that the MOS without consideration of the anticipated higher human sensitivity is 10 times the MOS (extrap.).

Conclusion: iii

Combined exposure
Systemic health effects due to combined exposure have to be assessed in addition to route-specific risk assessment.

Combined exposure is calculated by the formula:

\[
\frac{1}{MOS_{\text{comb.}}} = \frac{1}{MOS_{\text{inh.}}} + \frac{1}{MOS_{\text{derm.}}}
\]

The results of the calculations for combined exposure are presented in the following table 4.1.3.2.2.B.

For most exposure situations the MOS values for combined exposure show that dermal contact to MDA to a high degree determines risk assessment concerning liver toxicity. For details see table 4.1.3.2.2.B.
Conclusion: iii (according to conclusion iii for dermal contact)

**Table 4.1.3.2.2. B: Combined exposure (repeated dose toxicity (systemic))**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exposure scenario</th>
<th>MOS\textsubscript{inhalativ}</th>
<th>MOS\textsubscript{dermal}</th>
<th>MOS\textsubscript{combined}</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chemical industry</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>manufacturing and further processing as a chemical intermediate (methylene diphenyl di-isocyanate, MDI)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– dust</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– vapour</td>
<td>very high</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>production of preparations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>imid preparations, max. 10 % MDA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– dust</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>curing formulations, max. 60 % MDA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– dust</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>max. 5 % MDA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– dust</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Industrial area</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>manufacturing of formulations using powdery MDA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– dust</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>formulating putties using liquid MDA (approx. 60 %)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– vapour</td>
<td>very high</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>production of preparations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>imid preparations max. 10 % MDA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– dust</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>curing formulations max. 60 % MDA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– dust</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>max. 5 % MDA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– dust</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mixing curing formulations (max. 60 % MDA) with resin for epoxies resins</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– dust</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Exposure scenario

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exposure scenario</th>
<th>MOS\textsubscript{inhalativ}*</th>
<th>MOS\textsubscript{dermal}*</th>
<th>MOS\textsubscript{combined}</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>– vapour handling of formulations containing MDA and epoxid resins (4.5 - 30 %)</td>
<td>very high</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– vapour mixing curing formulations (max. 5 % MDA) with resin for polyurethanes</td>
<td>very high</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– dust handling of formulations containing MDA and polyurethane (2 - 3 %)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– vapour handling of formulations containing MDA (0.1-10 %) and imid resins</td>
<td>very high</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– dust handling of formulations containing MDA (2 - 3 %)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– vapour (paste)</td>
<td>very high</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Skilled trade**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exposure scenario</th>
<th>MOS\textsubscript{inhalativ}*</th>
<th>MOS\textsubscript{dermal}*</th>
<th>MOS\textsubscript{combined}</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>mixing formulations containing MDA (9 - 60 %) with epoxid resins</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– dust</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>handling of formulations containing MDA and epoxid resins (4 - 30 %)</td>
<td>very high</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* lowest MOS values of ranges are used

### Repeated dose toxicity (local)

**Inhalation**

MDA is not considered to be a respiratory tract irritant. Repeated inhalation exposure is not anticipated to result in relevant respiratory tract irritation.

Conclusion: ii

**Dermal contact**

MDA is not classified as ‘irritating’ to skin or eyes. Repeated dermal contact at workplaces is not anticipated to result in skin irritation.

Conclusion: ii

**Mutagenicity**
MDA is suspected to be mutagenic. Because of lack of relevant data germ cell mutagenicity cannot be assessed. However, as long as MDA is assumed to be a genotoxic carcinogen, there is no priority for further mutagenicity testing.

For this reason conclusion i is not recommended. Additionally it is to be assumed that risk reduction measures for germ cell mutagens and genotoxic carcinogens will be quite similar. Therefore conclusion iii seems not to be adequate.

Overall, because MDA is assumed to be a genotoxic carcinogen implying far-reaching risk reduction measures, conclusion ii is formally reached for mutagenic risk assessment.

Conclusion: ii

Carcinogenicity

MDA is classified as carcinogenic. Carcinogenicity of MDA was established in rodents. The mechanism of tumour development is not clearly demonstrated. Based on corresponding discussions in chapter 4.1.2.8 it has to be assumed that a genotoxic mechanism is involved in MDA carcinogenicity.

Inhalation

For workplace risk assessment a T25 of 12 mg/m$^3$ was calculated (see chapter 4.1.3.2.1). It was assumed that the higher sensitivity of humans concerning liver toxicity applies to carcinogenic potency as well. There are no further data to clarify species differences concerning carcinogenicity. If there is no species difference at all the T25 might be up to one order of magnitude greater than calculated above.

For purposes of carcinogenic risk assessment a MOE (margin of exposure) is calculated. Assuming a chronic level of inhalation exposure of 0.52 mg/m$^3$ (chemical industry) a MOE of 23 will result. The MOE for the other exposure scenarios are calculated as well. For details see table 4.1.3.2.2.C.

Assuming the involvement of a genotoxic mechanism most MOE values are of concern. However it should be kept in mind that humans might be less sensitive than assumed.

Conclusion: iiib

Dermal contact

For workplace risk assessment a dermal T25 of greater than 250 mg/person/d was calculated. Again, it was assumed that humans are more sensitive than rats and that there may be a genotoxic mechanism. Repeated dermal exposure is assumed in the chemical industry, in all industrial applications, even in case of use of PPE (see chapter 4.1.1.2).

The MOE for all dermal exposure scenarios are calculated, for details see table 4.1.3.2.2 C.
Table: 4.1.3.2.2.C. MOE values of MDA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exposure scenario</th>
<th>Duration and frequency</th>
<th>Shift average value [mg/m³]</th>
<th>T 25 [mg/m³]</th>
<th>MOE</th>
<th>Conclusion</th>
<th>Shift average value [mg/cm²/d]</th>
<th>Shift average value [mg/p/d]</th>
<th>T 25 [mg/p/d]</th>
<th>MOE</th>
<th>Conclusion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chemical industry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>manufacturing and further processing as a chemical intermediate (methylene diphenyl di-isocyanate, MDI) activity: drumming, transfer, cleaning, maintenance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– dust</td>
<td>shift length, daily</td>
<td>0.52¹</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>iiib</td>
<td>0.1 - 1²</td>
<td>42 - 420</td>
<td>&gt; 250</td>
<td>&gt; 0.6 - 6</td>
<td>iiib</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– vapour</td>
<td>shift length, daily</td>
<td>very low³</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>very high</td>
<td>iiia</td>
<td>0.06 - 0.6²</td>
<td>25 - 252</td>
<td>&gt; 250</td>
<td>&gt; 1 - 10</td>
<td>iiib</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exposure scenario</td>
<td>Duration and frequency</td>
<td>Shift average value [mg/m³]</td>
<td>T 25 [mg/m³]</td>
<td>MOE</td>
<td>Conclusion</td>
<td>Shift average value [mg/cm²/d]</td>
<td>Shift average value [mg/p/d]</td>
<td>T 25 [mg/p/d]</td>
<td>MOE</td>
<td>Conclusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>production of preparations activity: drumming, transfer, cleaning, maintenance imid preparations, max. 10 % MDA</td>
<td>batch processing, 2hours/daily</td>
<td>0.05-0.125²</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>96 - 240</td>
<td>iiib</td>
<td>0.01 - 0.1²</td>
<td>4 - 42</td>
<td>&gt; 250</td>
<td>&gt; 6 - 62</td>
<td>iiib</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>curing formulations, max. 60 % MDA</td>
<td>batch processing, 2hours/daily</td>
<td>lower than above³</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>&gt; 96 - 240</td>
<td>iiib</td>
<td>0.06 - 0.6²</td>
<td>25 - 252</td>
<td>&gt; 250</td>
<td>&gt; 1 - 10</td>
<td>iiib</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>max. 5 % MDA</td>
<td>batch processing, 2hours/daily</td>
<td>lower than above³</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>&gt; 96 - 240</td>
<td>iiib</td>
<td>0.05 - 0.05²</td>
<td>2 - 21</td>
<td>&gt; 250</td>
<td>&gt; 12 - 125</td>
<td>iiib</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exposure scenario</td>
<td>Duration and frequency</td>
<td>Shift average value [mg/m³]</td>
<td>T 25 [mg/m³]</td>
<td>MOE</td>
<td>Conclusion</td>
<td>Shift average value [mg/cm²/d]</td>
<td>Shift average value [mg/p/d]</td>
<td>T 25 [mg/p/d]</td>
<td>MOE</td>
<td>Conclusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Industrial area</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>manufacturing of formulations using powdering MDA activity: transfer, weighing, filling, drumming:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– dust</td>
<td>batch processing, 2hours/daily</td>
<td>0.6¹</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>iiib</td>
<td>0.1 - 1²</td>
<td>42 - 420</td>
<td>&gt; 250</td>
<td>&gt; 0.6 - 6</td>
<td>iiib</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– formulating putties using liquid MDA (approx. 60 %)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– vapour</td>
<td>very low³</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>very high</td>
<td>iiiia</td>
<td>0.06 - 0.6²</td>
<td>25 - 252</td>
<td>&gt; 250</td>
<td>&gt; 1 - 10</td>
<td>iiiib</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>production of preparations activity: drumming, transfer, cleaning, maintenance imid preparations max. 10 % MDA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– dust</td>
<td>batch processing, 2hours/daily</td>
<td>0.1 - 1.25⁴</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10 - 120</td>
<td>iiib</td>
<td>0.01 - 0.1²</td>
<td>4 - 42</td>
<td>&gt; 250</td>
<td>&gt; 6 - 62</td>
<td>iib</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹: Reference value for dust exposure
²: Reference value for dermal exposure
³: Reference value for vapour exposure
⁴: Reference value for combined exposure
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exposure scenario</th>
<th>Duration and frequency</th>
<th>Shift average value [mg/m³]</th>
<th>T 25 [mg/m³]</th>
<th>MOE</th>
<th>Conclusion</th>
<th>Shift average value [mg/cm²/d]</th>
<th>Shift average value [mg/p/d]</th>
<th>T 25 [mg/p/d]</th>
<th>MOE</th>
<th>Conclusion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>curing formulations max. 60 % MDA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dust</td>
<td>batch processing, 2hours/daily</td>
<td>0 - 0.75⁴</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>&gt; 16</td>
<td>iiib</td>
<td>0.06 - 0.6²</td>
<td>25 - 252</td>
<td>&gt; 250</td>
<td>&gt; 1 - 10</td>
<td>iiib</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>max. 5 % MDA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dust</td>
<td>batch processing, 2hours/daily</td>
<td>0 - 0.08⁴</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>&gt; 150</td>
<td>iiib</td>
<td>0.005 - 0.05²</td>
<td>2 - 21</td>
<td>&gt; 250</td>
<td>&gt; 12 - 125</td>
<td>iiib</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mixing curing formulations (max. 60 % MDA) with resin for epoxies activity: transfer, weighing, filling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dust</td>
<td>short term (0.5 h), daily</td>
<td>0 - 0.2⁴</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>&gt; 60</td>
<td>iiib</td>
<td>0.06 - 0.6²</td>
<td>50 - 504</td>
<td>&gt; 250</td>
<td>&gt; 0.5 - 5</td>
<td>iiib</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vapour</td>
<td>short term (0.5 h), daily</td>
<td>very low³</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>very high</td>
<td>iii</td>
<td>0.06 - 0.6²</td>
<td>50 - 504</td>
<td>&gt; 250</td>
<td>&gt; 0.5 - 5</td>
<td>iiib</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>handling of formulations containing MDA and epoxid resins (4.5 - 30 %)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Exposure scenario

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Duration and frequency</th>
<th>Shift average value [mg/m³]</th>
<th>T 25 [mg/m³]</th>
<th>MOE</th>
<th>Conclusion</th>
<th>Shift average value [mg/cm²/d]</th>
<th>Shift average value [mg/p/d]</th>
<th>T 25 [mg/p/d]</th>
<th>MOE</th>
<th>Conclusion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>vapour</strong></td>
<td>shift length, daily</td>
<td>very low³</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>very high</td>
<td>iiia</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.03 - 0.3²</td>
<td>25 - 252</td>
<td>&gt; 250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>mixing curing</strong></td>
<td>formulations (max. 5 % MDA)</td>
<td>with resin for polyurethanes activity: transfer, weighing, filling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>dust</strong></td>
<td>short term (0.5 h), daily</td>
<td>0 - 0.02⁴</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>&gt; 600</td>
<td>iiib</td>
<td>0.005 - 0.05²</td>
<td>4.2 - 42</td>
<td>&gt; 250</td>
<td>&gt; 6 - 60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>handling of</strong></td>
<td>formulations containing MDA and polyurethane (2 - 3 %)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>vapour</strong></td>
<td>shift length, daily</td>
<td>very low³</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>very high</td>
<td>iiia</td>
<td>0.003 - 0.03²</td>
<td>2.5 - 25</td>
<td>&gt; 250</td>
<td>&gt; 10 - 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>handling of</strong></td>
<td>formulations containing MDA (0.1-10 %) and imid resins activity: weighing, filling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>dust</strong></td>
<td>short term (0.5 h), daily</td>
<td>0.03 - 0.3²</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>40 - 400</td>
<td>iiib</td>
<td>0.01 - 0.1²</td>
<td>8.4 - 84</td>
<td>&gt; 250</td>
<td>&gt; 3 - 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exposure scenario</td>
<td>Duration and frequency</td>
<td>Shift average value [mg/m³]</td>
<td>T 25 [mg/m³]</td>
<td>MOE</td>
<td>Conclusion</td>
<td>Shift average value [mg/cm²/d]</td>
<td>Shift average value [mg/p/d]</td>
<td>T 25 [mg/p/d]</td>
<td>MOE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vapour</td>
<td>shift length, daily</td>
<td>very low³</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>very high</td>
<td>iiia</td>
<td>0.01 - 0.1²</td>
<td>8.4 - 84</td>
<td>&gt; 250</td>
<td>&gt; 3 - 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled trade</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mixing formulations containing MDA (9 - 60 %) with epoxid resins activity: transfer, weighing, filling, drumming</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dust</td>
<td>short term (0.5 h), not daily⁵</td>
<td>0 - 0.2⁴</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>&gt; 60</td>
<td>iiib</td>
<td>0.6 - 3²</td>
<td>504 - 2 520</td>
<td>&gt; 250</td>
<td>&gt; 0.1 - 0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>handling of formulations containing MDA and epoxid resins (4 - 30 %)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vapour</td>
<td>duration and frequency not known, assumed: not daily⁵</td>
<td>very low³</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>very high</td>
<td>iiia</td>
<td>0.3 - 1.5²</td>
<td>252 - 1 260</td>
<td>&gt; 250</td>
<td>&gt; 0.2 -1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ workplace measurements ² EASE ³ expert judgement ⁴ EASE (without LEV) ⁵ information about frequency of exposure not available
The MOE values range is from $> 0.5 - 5$ to $> 12 - 125$.

Most MOE-values calculated for dermal exposure are very low resulting in high concern for carcinogenicity due to dermal contact.
Conclusion: iiib

**Combined exposure**

Carcinogenic risks due to combined exposure (inhalation and skin contact) are to be assessed in addition to route-specific estimates. With reference to the corresponding quantitative considerations for the toxicological endpoint ‘Repeated dose toxicity’ for carcinogenic risks it can be concluded as well that inhalation exposure in most cases does not contribute to the overall risk for all exposure scenarios. Carcinogenic risk for combined exposure nearly exclusively is determined by the estimates of dermal exposure.

Combined exposure is calculated by the formula:

\[
\frac{1}{MOS_{\text{comb}}} = \frac{1}{MOS_{\text{inh}}} + \frac{1}{MOS_{\text{derm}}}.
\]

For details see table 4.1.3.2.2. D.

Conclusion: iiib (according to conclusion iiib for dermal contact)

**Table 4.1.3.2.2. D: Combined exposure (carcinogenicity)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exposure scenario</th>
<th>$\text{MOE}_{\text{inh}}$</th>
<th>$\text{MOE}_{\text{derm}}$</th>
<th>$\text{MOE}_{\text{combined}}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chemical industry</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>manufacturing and further processing as a chemical intermediate (methylene diphenyl di-isocyanate, MDI)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– dust</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– vapour</td>
<td>very high</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>production of preparations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>imid preparations, max. 10 % MDA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– dust</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>curing formulations, max. 60 % MDA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– dust</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>max. 5 % MDA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– dust</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Industrial area</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>manufacturing of formulations using powdery MDA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exposure scenario</td>
<td>MOE$_{\text{inhalativ}}$</td>
<td>MOE$_{\text{dermal}}$</td>
<td>MOE$_{\text{combined}}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dust formulating putties using liquid MDA (approx. 60 %)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vapour production of preparations</td>
<td>very high</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>imid preparations max. 10 % MDA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dust curing formulations max. 60 % MDA</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>max. 5 % MDA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dust mixing curing formulations (max. 60 % MDA) with resin for epoxie</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dust handling of formulations containing MDA and epoxid resins (4.5 - 30 %)</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vapour handling of formulations containing MDA and epoxid resins (4.5 - 30 %)</td>
<td>very high</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dust mixing curing formulations (max. 5 % MDA) with resin for polyurethanes</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dust handling of formulations containing MDA and polyurethane (2 - 3 %)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vapour handling of formulations containing MDA (0.1-10 %)and imid resins</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dust handling of formulations containing MDA (0.1-10 %)and imid resins</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vapour handling of formulations containing MDA (0.1-10 %)and imid resins</td>
<td>very high</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled trade</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mixing formulations containing MDA (9 - 60 %) with epoxid resins</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dust mixing formulations containing MDA (9 - 60 %) with epoxid resins (4 - 30 %)</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Reproductive toxicity

As outlined in chapter 4.1.2.9 reproductive toxicity testing is not complete (fertility impairment and developmental toxicity). Because of relevant data gaps a conclusion as to reproductive toxicity of MDA is not possible. A corresponding risk assessment cannot be performed.

MDA is classified as a carcinogenic agent. For carcinogens it should be considered whether testing is necessary at all, as many risk reduction measures are already in place. For MDA it cannot be excluded that there is a genotoxic mechanism leading to tumour development. Thus a no adverse effect level cannot be established. Although it cannot be excluded that possible reproductive toxicity of MDA is judged more relevant than carcinogenicity it is not proposed to fill this data gap since the substance is considered as a genotoxic carcinogen and knowledge of adverse effects on reproduction would as experience shows not impact on risk reduction measures.

Conclusion:
Risk reduction measures are required in view of the carcinogenic properties of the substance, the need for a test to evaluate the reproductive toxicity will be revisited in the light of the risk reduction strategy.

The conclusions of the occupational risk assessment are summarized in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exposure scenario</th>
<th>MOE_{inhalativ}^{*}</th>
<th>MOE_{dermal}^{*}</th>
<th>MOE_{combined}</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>vapour</td>
<td>very high</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Lowest MOE values of ranges are used
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exposure scenario</th>
<th>Acute toxicity (inhalation)</th>
<th>Acute toxicity (dermal)</th>
<th>Irritation/Corrosivity</th>
<th>Sensitization (inhalation)</th>
<th>Sensitization (dermal)</th>
<th>Repeated dose toxicity (systemic, inhalation)</th>
<th>Repeated dose toxicity (systemic, dermal)</th>
<th>Repeated dose toxicity (local, inhalation and dermal)</th>
<th>Mutagenicity</th>
<th>Carcinogenicity (inhalation)</th>
<th>Carcinogenicity (dermal)</th>
<th>Reproductive toxicity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chemical industry</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>manufacturing and further processing as a chemical intermediate (methylenediphenyl di-isocyanate, MDI)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- dust</td>
<td>iii</td>
<td>iii</td>
<td>iii</td>
<td>iii</td>
<td></td>
<td>iiib</td>
<td>iib</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>iiib</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- vapour</td>
<td>iii</td>
<td>iii</td>
<td>iii</td>
<td>iii</td>
<td></td>
<td>iib</td>
<td>iib</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>iiib</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>production of preparations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- imid preparations, max. 10 % MDA</td>
<td>iii</td>
<td>iii</td>
<td>iii</td>
<td>iii</td>
<td></td>
<td>iiib</td>
<td>iib</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>iiib</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- curing formulations, max. 60 % MDA</td>
<td>iii</td>
<td>iii</td>
<td>iii</td>
<td>iii</td>
<td></td>
<td>iiib</td>
<td>iib</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>iiib</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- max. 5 % MDA</td>
<td>iii</td>
<td>iii</td>
<td>iii</td>
<td>iii</td>
<td></td>
<td>iiib</td>
<td>iib</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>iiib</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Industrial area</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>manufacturing of formulations using powdery MDA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>formulating putties: using liquid MDA (approx. 60 %)</td>
<td>iii</td>
<td>iii</td>
<td>iii</td>
<td>iii</td>
<td></td>
<td>iiib</td>
<td>iib</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>iiib</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>production of preparations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- imid preparations, max. 10 % MDA</td>
<td>iii</td>
<td>iii</td>
<td>iii</td>
<td>iii</td>
<td></td>
<td>iiib</td>
<td>iib</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>iiib</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- curing formulations, max. 60 % MDA</td>
<td>iii</td>
<td>iii</td>
<td>iii</td>
<td>iii</td>
<td></td>
<td>iiib</td>
<td>iib</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>iiib</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- max. 5 % MDA</td>
<td>iii</td>
<td>iii</td>
<td>iii</td>
<td>iii</td>
<td></td>
<td>iiib</td>
<td>iib</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>iiib</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mixing curing formulations (max. 60 % MDA) with resins for epoxies (dust)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mixing (vapour)</td>
<td>iii</td>
<td>iii</td>
<td>iii</td>
<td>iii</td>
<td></td>
<td>iiib</td>
<td>iib</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>iiib</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>handling of formulations containing MDA and epoxid resins (4.5 - 30 %)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mixing curing formulations (max. 5 % MDA) with resin for polyurethanes (dust)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>handling of formulations containing MDA and polyurethane (2 - 3 %) (vapour)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>handling of formulations containing MDA (0.1-10 %) and imid resins</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- dust</td>
<td>iii</td>
<td>iii</td>
<td>iii</td>
<td>iii</td>
<td></td>
<td>iiib</td>
<td>iib</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>iiib</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- vapour</td>
<td>iii</td>
<td>iii</td>
<td>iii</td>
<td>iii</td>
<td></td>
<td>iiib</td>
<td>iib</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>iiib</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Skilled trade</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mixing formulations containing MDA (9 - 60 %) with epoxid resins (dust)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>handling of formulations containing MDA and epoxid resins (4.5 - 30 %) (vapour)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

blanc fields: conclusion ii or iiia (negligible risk for carcinogenicity) is applied

iii(b): there is a need for limiting the risk; risk reduction measures which are already being applied shall be taken into account (the risk for carcinogenicity is considered substantial)
Consumers

Exposure of the general population is not assumed to exist.

In case of using products, colored with the recently notified azodye Cartasol Yellow an exposure of consumers cannot be excluded due to the possibility of liberation of MDA.

Free MDA might be released by irradiation sterilization of polyurethanes which are used in medical devices as potting materials used in plasma separators and artificial dialyzers. However, no quantitative data can be derived from the report because of limited information regarding experimental conditions (cf. 4.1.1.3). Therefore, there is a potential risk of exposure to MDA for uremic patients or patients who receive blood transfusions frequently.

Acute Toxicity, Irritation/Corrosivity

Conclusion:
ii) There is at present no need for further information and/or testing or for risk reduction measures beyond those which are being applied already.

Sensitization

There is evidence from a large number of well-conducted studies in humans, that MDA can cause skin sensitization.

Conclusion:
ii) There is at present no need for further information and/or testing or for risk reduction measures beyond those which are being applied already.

Repeated dose toxicity

After repeated exposure by several administration routes of MDA to animals relevant toxic effects were induced mainly in liver and thyroid; furthermore lesions occurred in stomach, kidneys, pituitary gland, erythropoietic system and the retina. In man re-exposure to MDA inducing an acute hepatic illness results in an prolonged reconvalescence period.

A NOAEL is not established. The LOAEL of 9 mg/kg bw/d for the non-neoplastic effects from the 2-year study on rats was considered to be the most appropriate one (cf. 4.1.2.6).

Conclusion:
ii) There is at present no need for further information and/or testing or for risk reduction measures beyond those which are being applied already.

Mutagenicity

MDA causes concern for man owing to possible mutagenic effects. There is evidence from an in vivo micronucleus test (although only weakly positive) which is supported by the induction of DNA fragmentation in vivo and chromosomal aberrations in vitro.

Conclusion:
ii) There is at present no need for further information and testing or for risk reduction measures beyond those which are being applied already.
Carcinogenicity

MDA is carcinogenic in experimental animals. A genotoxic mechanism cannot be excluded. There are no adequate data on the carcinogenicity in humans.

Conclusion:
iiib) There is need for limiting the risks; risk reduction measures which are already being applied shall be taken into account.

Reproductive toxicity

Risk characterization with respect to a possible impairment of reproduction cannot be performed due to the lack of data for hazard assessment of both of the two endpoints. However, MDA is classified as Category 2 carcinogen.

Conclusion:
Risk reduction measures are required in view of the carcinogenic properties of this substance, the need for a test to evaluate the reproductive toxicity will be revisited in the light of the risk reduction strategy.

Man exposed indirectly via the environment

Indirect exposure via the environment is calculated using data for oral intake via drinking water and food. Following worst case scenario (both local and regional exposure) the main contribution to the intake are the \( \text{DOSE}_{\text{drw}} \) and the \( \text{DOSE}_{\text{fish}} \) with fractions of 55% and 45%, respectively, to the total daily dose.

An intake of a total daily dose of \( 2.1 \times 10^{-5} \, \text{mg/kg bw} \) and of \( 5.4 \times 10^{-7} \, \text{mg/kg bw} \) is calculated (local resp. regional scenario).

A NOAEL has not been established; the LOAEL for systemic non-neoplastic toxic effects of 9 mg/kg bw was derived from a long term oral toxicity study (NTP, 1983).

In the following text the data base on repeated dose toxicity of MDA is considered to explain the conclusion about the appropriateness of the MOS for this endpoint.

Repeated dose oral studies - rat

The LOAEL (7.5 mg/kg bw/d in male rats and 8 mg/kg bw/d in female rats) representing the most sensitive adverse (nonneoplastic) effect after repeated oral application was derived from the Ciba-Geigy study (1982) which was accepted as valid. This LOAEL is corresponding to the LOAEL from the 2-year study on rats on nonneoplastic effects (9, resp. 10 mg/kg bw/d in male, resp. female rats). Although the NTP-studies had not examined parameters of hematology, bioclinical chemistry and urinalysis, the LOAEL of 9 mg/kg bw/d from the long term study was considered to be the most appropriate value for quantitative risk assessment. From these studies no NOAEL could be derived for the rat.

Repeated dose oral studies - mouse
The database of MDA-related toxic effects on mice was less than that in rat, because only few drinking water studies existed. A NOAEL can be derived from the 90-day study (NTP, 1983), which was 11.4 mg/kg bw/d in male mice and 14.4 mg/kg in female mice.

For the decision on the appropriateness of MOS, the following aspects have been considered and taken into account:

- overall confidence in the database
  The data taken into account for performing the risk characterisation have been evaluated with regard to their reliability, relevance and completeness according to section 3.2 of the TGD. The data were published in peer reviewed journals or submitted to the Competent Authority in private reports being adequately detailed and in accordance with internationally recognized guidelines and to GLP.

  The findings of all studies are not contradictory so that the judgment can be based on the database (cf. section 4.1.2.6 Summary on nonneoplastic lesions).

  There are no reasons to assume limited confidence.

- uncertainty arising from the variability in the experimental data
  The studies cited above allow to conclude on the LOAEL of severe toxicity (non neoplastic effects and anemia) from five studies on rats and mice. The LOAEL for nonneoplastic effects has been derived from two oral studies on rats which resulted in LOAELs ranging from 7.5 mg/kg bw/d (male rats) to 10 mg/kg bw/d (female rats). No NOAEL could be derived from all rat studies. Although the NTP-studies had not examined parameters of hematology, bioclinical chemistry and urinalysis, the LOAEL of 9 mg/kg bw/d from the long term study was considered to be the most appropriate value for risk assessment.

  The results of this study were in conformity with the findings of the other studies. From the 90-day study on mice a NOAEL of 11.4 mg/kg bw/d (male mice) and 14.4 mg/kg bw/d (female mice) was derived. Comparing the effect levels rats seem to be more sensitive than mice without any clear sex preference.

  There are no reasons to assume a special extent of uncertainty which have to be taken into account.

- intra- and interspecies variation
  Data on kinetics of the substance do not allow to calculate the intraspecies and interspecies variability by applying modern approaches. However, the available data give no hint on a particular high variability in kinetics. The variability of the data on the toxicodynamics has been described above and has been considered to justify an increased MOS.

- the nature and severity of the effect
  The carcinogenic activity of MDA in animals is proven. The effects described as „low observed adverse effect“ are liver and thyroid lesions as well as anemia, these effects are considered to be severe health effects.

  There are no reasons to assume that the effects shown in the animal experiments are limited to the species tested, thus being not of relevance for humans. Therefore there is concern, which has to be expressed in the magnitude of the MOS.

- differences in exposure (route, duration, frequency and pattern)
The estimated total chronic body burden with an assumed absorption of 100% is compared with an oral LOAEL from a 2-year study. There are no reasons to assume that special concern can be derived from this procedure.

- the human population to which the quantitative and/or qualitative information on exposure applies
Following the indirect exposure scenario there is no reason to assume a special risk for elderly, children or other people suffering from liver or thyroid diseases or anemia.

- other factors
There are no other factors known requiring a peculiar margin of safety.

**MOS for the local exposure scenario:**

*Man exposed indirectly via the environment*

The total calculated internal dose at local exposure is $2.1 \times 10^{-5}$ mg/kg bw/d. The margin of safety between the local exposure level of $2.1 \times 10^{-5}$ mg/kg bw/d and the oral LOAEL of 9.0 mg/kg bw/d is judged to be sufficient regarding the non-neoplastic effects, even if special considerations on intra- and interspecies variation, nature and severity of the effect and possible human population at risk have been taken into consideration and being aware that the exposure assessment is based on worst case model calculations. However, there remains concern because MDA is to be considered as a non-threshold carcinogen.

**MOS for the regional exposure scenario:**

*Man exposed indirectly via the environment*

The total calculated internal dose at regional exposure is $5.4 \times 10^{-7}$ mg/kg bw/d. The margin of safety between the estimated regional exposure level of $5.4 \times 10^{-7}$ mg/kg bw/d and the oral LOAEL of 9.0 mg/kg bw/d is judged to be sufficient regarding the non-neoplastic effects, even if special considerations on intra- and interspecies variation, nature and severity of the effect and possible human population at risk have been taken into consideration and being aware that the exposure assessment is based on worst case model calculations. However, there remains concern because MDA is to be considered as a non-threshold carcinogen.

**Conclusion:**

iii a) There is need for limiting the risks; risk reduction measures which are already being applied shall be taken into account.

**(Combined exposure)**
4.2 Human Health (Physico-Chemical Properties)

4.2.1 Exposure assessment

Occupational exposure

See Chapter 4.1.1.2

Consumer exposure

Indirect exposure via the environment

4.2.2 Effects assessment: Hazard identification and Dose (concentration) - response (effect) assessment

Explosivity

Flammability

Oxidising potential

4.2.3 Risk characterisation

Workers

With regard to the physico-chemical properties and with regard to the occupational exposure described in chapter 4.1.1.2 MDA is not expected to cause specific concern relevant to human health.

Consumers

Man exposed indirectly via the environment

5 CONCLUSIONS / RESULTS

Environment

i) There is need for further information and/or testing.

Complexes of MDA with humic substances accumulate in sediments. There are indications that also the bound MDA is bioavailable. For a risk assessment of this sub-compartment, a test on sediment organisms with pre-incubated MDA is necessary. A test with sediment organisms (Lumbriculus variegatus) is proposed.

Human Health

The substance MDA has not been tested for the reproductive toxicity, consequently the risk assessment does not evaluate the risks to any human population for this endpoint.
Risk reduction measures are required in view of the carcinogenic properties of this substance, the need for a test to evaluate the reproductive toxicity will be revisited in the light of the risk reduction strategy.

**Workers**

iii) There is a need for limiting the risks; risk reduction measures which are already being applied shall be taken into account.

With regard to occupational risk assessment the main problems are the carcinogenic property of the substance and the dermal exposure situations. Dermal exposure for all scenarios is anticipated at relevant levels because proper use of suitable tested PPE cannot be assumed. Further data on biological monitoring (industry, skilled trade, urinary MDA content, haemoglobin adducts) might be useful to assess different exposure situations.

**CONSUMERS**

iiib) There is a need for limiting the risks; risk reduction measures which are already being applied shall be taken into account.

Uremic patients or patients receiving blood transfusions frequently are identified to be at risk if polyurethanes used in medical devices as potty materials are sterilized by gamma irradiation. Other treatments for sterilization must be used.

Azodyes which can release MDA are recommended to be restricted for the use as dyes for paper, writing inks, leather and textiles.

**Man exposed via the environment**

iiia) There is a need for limiting the risks; risk reduction measures which are already being applied shall be taken into account.

The risk assessment shows that the margin of safety can be assumed to be sufficient, but that risks cannot be excluded at any exposure, as the substance is identified as non-threshold carcinogen.
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file: 17.01 LEGAL  rn : 100163
systematic name: Benzenamine, 4,4'-methylenebis-
common name : 4,4'-Diaminodiphenylmethane
reported name : Aniline, 4,4'-methylenedi-
cas no : 101-77-9  rtecs no : BY5425000
area : ARG  type : REG

--------------------------------
|subject|specification|descriptor|
|-------+-------------+----------|
| AIR   |    OCC      |   MPC    |
--------------------------------

8H-TWA: 0.8 MG/M3 (0.1PPM). SKIN ABSORPTION, POTENTIAL CARCINOGEN.
entry date: OCT 1991  effective date: 29 MAY 1991

title: LIMIT VALUES FOR CHEMICAL SUBSTANCES IN THE WORKING
SECURITY (AMENDING REGULATION DECREE NO. 351/1979 UNDER LAW NO.
19587/1972: HYGIENE AND SAFETY AT WORK)
original : ARGOB*, BOLETIN OFICIAL DE LA REPUBLICA ARGENTINA (ARGINIAN
OFFICIAL BULLETIN), 24170 , I , 1 , 1979
amendment: ARGOB*, BOLETIN OFICIAL DE LA REPUBLICA ARGENTINA (ARGENTIAN
OFFICIAL BULLETIN), 27145 , I , 4 , 1991

*******

file: 17.01 LEGAL  rn : 300176
systematic name: Benzenamine, 4,4'-methylenebis-
common name : 4,4'-Diaminodiphenylmethane
reported name : 4,4'-METHYLENE DIANILINE
cas no : 101-77-9  rtecs no : BY5425000
area : CAN  type : REG

--------------------------------
|subject|specification|descriptor|
|-------+-------------+----------|
| AIR   |    OCC      |   TLV    |
--------------------------------

(Intended changes - TWA: 0.1 ppm, 0.8 mg/m3; STEL: 0.5 ppm, 4 mg/m3;
skin absorption). Prescribed by the Canada Occupational Safety and
Health Regulations, under the Canada Labour Code (administered by the
Department of Employment and Immigration). The regulations state that no
employee shall be exposed to a concentration of an airborne chemical
agent in excess of the value for that chemical agent adopted by ACGIH
(American Conference of Governmental Industrial Hygienists) in its
publication entitled: "Threshold Limit Value and Biological Exposure
Indices for 1985-86". The regulations also state that the employer
shall, where a person is about to enter a confined space, appoint a
qualified person to verify by means of tests that the concentration of
any chemical agent or combination of chemical agents will not result in
the exposure of the person to a concentration in excess of the value
indicated above. These regulations prescribe standards whose enforcement
will provide a safe and healthy workplace.
entry date: OCT 1994  effective date: 24 MAR 1994

amendment: CAGAAK, CANADA GAZETTE PART II, 128, 7, 1513, 1994

*******

file: 17.01 LEGAL  rn : 304140
systematic name: Benzenamine, 4,4'-methylenediami- 
common name : 4,4'-Diaminodiphenylmethane 
reported name : 4,4'-Diaminodiphenylmethane 
cas no : 101-77-9 
rtecs no : BY5425000 
area : CAN 
type : REG 
-------------------------------- 
| subject| specification| descriptor| 
|-------+-------------+----------| 
| USE   | OCC         | RQR      | 
| STORE |             |          | 
| LABEL |             |          | 
| TRNSP |             | CLASS    | 
| PACK  |             |          | 
|-------+-------------+----------| 

Ingredient Disclosure List - Concentration: 0.1% weight/weight. The Workplace Hazardous Materials Information System (WHMIS) is a national system providing information on hazardous materials used in the workplace. WHMIS is implemented by the Hazardous Products Act and the Controlled Products Regulations (administered by the Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs). The regulations impose standards on employers for the use, storage and handling of controlled products. The regulations also address labelling and identification, employee instruction and training, as well as the upkeep of a Materials Safety Data Sheet (MSDS). The presence in a controlled product of an ingredient in a concentration equal to or greater than specified in the Ingredient Disclosure List must be disclosed in the Safety Data Sheet.

entry date: AUG 1991 
effective date: 31DEC1987 
amendment: CAGAAK, CANADA GAZETTE PART II, 120, 6, 1105, 1986

******

file: 17.01 LEGAL 
rn : 304519 

Schedule II, List II - Dangerous Goods other than Explosives: PIN (Product Identification No.): UN2651. Class (6.1): Poisonous. Packing group III, (I=Great danger, III=Minor danger). Passenger Vehicles: 100 kg. Prescribed by the Transportation of Dangerous Goods Regulations, under the Transportation of Dangerous Goods Act (administered by the Department of Transport). The act and regulations are intended to promote safety in the transportation of dangerous goods in Canada, as well as provide comprehensive regulations applicable to all modes of transport across Canada. These are based on United Nations recommendations. The act and regulations should be consulted for details. Information is entered under the proper shipping name found in the regulations; this may include general groups of chemical substances.

entry date: OCT 1994 
effective date: 02DEC1993 
amendment: CAGAAK, CANADA GAZETTE PART II, 127, 25, 4056, 1993

spg
This substance is classified as severely hazardous to water (Water Hazard Class: WHC 3). (There are 3 water hazard classes: WHC 3 = severely hazardous; WHC 2 = hazardous; WHC 1 = moderately hazardous; and the classification as "not hazardous to water"). The purpose of the classification is to identify the technical requirements of industrial plants which handle substances hazardous to water.

entry date: SEP 2001 effective date: 01JUN1999

title: Administrative Order relating to Substances Hazardous to Water (Verwaltungsvorschrift wassergefaehrdende Stoffe)
original: BUANZ*, Bundesanzeiger, 51, 98a, 1, 1999

It is prohibited to use azo dyes which can form the substance by splitting of one or several azo groups in the production or treatment of consumer products coming into longer contact with the human body (such as clothes, materials for the production of clothes, bed-linen, blankets, pillows, sleeping-bags, towels, mats for the beach, air-mattresses, masks, wigs, synthetic eyelashes, jewels worn on the skin, bracelets, chest-bags, rucksacks, covers for seats and beds for babies and infants, napkins, sanitary pads, tampons).

entry date: APR 2000 effective date: 09MCH2000

title: Ordinance on Consumer Products (Bedarfsgegenstaendeverordnung)
original: BGZBAD, Bundesgesetzblatt, I, 5, 1998
amendment: BGZBAD, Bundesgesetzblatt, I, 179, 2000
file: 17.01 LEGAL  rn : 540258
  !!! WARNING - not original IRPTC record - WARNING !!!
systematic name: Benzenamine, 4,4'-methylenedianiline-
common name : 4,4'-Diaminodiphenylmethane
reported name : 4,4'-Diaminodiphenylmethane
cas no : 101-77-9  rtecs no : BY5425000
area : DEU  type : REC
--------------------------------
|subject|specification|descriptor|
|-------+-------------+----------|
| AIR   |    OCC      |   MAK    |
--------------------------------
No MAK value established. - Danger of cutaneous absorption. Danger of
sensitization of the skin. - Carcinogen category 2: Substance that is
considered to be carcinogenic for man because sufficient data from
long-term animal studies or limited evidence from animal studies
substantiated by evidence from epidemiological studies indicate that it
can make a significant contribution to cancer risk. Limited data from
animal studies can be supported by evidence that the substance causes
cancer by a mode of action that is relevant to man and by results of in
vitro tests and short-term animal studies.
entry date: MAY 2001
title: List of MAK and BAT Values 2000. Maximum Concentrations and
Biological Tolerance Values at the Workplace. (MAK- und BAT-Werte-Liste
2000. Maximale Arbeitsplatzkonzentrationen und Biologische
Arbeitsstofftoleranzwerte.)
original : MPGFDF, Mitteilung der Senatskommission zur Pruefung
gesundheitsschaedlicher Arbeitsstoffe, 36 , , , 2000

*****

file: 17.01 LEGAL  rn : 800365
systematic name: Benzenamine, 4,4'-methylenedianiline-
common name : 4,4'-Diaminodiphenylmethane
reported name : 4,4'-Diaminodiphenylmethane
cas no : 101-77-9  rtecs no : BY5425000
area : JPN  type : REG
--------------------------------
|subject|specification|descriptor|
|-------+-------------+----------|
| CLASS |             |   CLASS  |
| MANUF |             |   RSTR   |
| IMPRT |             |   RSTR   |
--------------------------------
A DESIGNATED CHEMICAL SUBSTANCE (=A SUBSTANCE WHICH, EITHER IN ITSELF OR
ONE OF ITS DEGRADATION PRODUCTS, IS NOT EASILY DEGRADABLE AND WHICH MAY
BE HARMFUL TO HUMAN HEALTH WHEN INGESTED CONTINUOUSLY AND WHICH IS
SPECIFIED BY THE MINISTRY OF HEALTH AND WELFARE AND BY THE MINISTRY OF
INTERNATIONAL TRADE AND INDUSTRY). A PERSON WHO MANUFACTURES OR IMPORTS
THIS SUBSTANCE SHALL FOR EVERY FISCAL YEAR SUBMIT A REPORT ON
MANUFACTURED OR IMPORTED QUANTITIES.
entry date: NOV 1991  effective date: 22MCH1989
title: THE LAW CONCERNING THE EXAMINATION AND REGULATION OF MANUFACTURE
ETC. OF CHEMICAL SUBSTANCES.
original : JPNCO*, LAW CONCERNING THE EXAMINATION AND REGULATION OF
MANUFACTURE ETC.OF CHEMICAL SUBSTANCES (CABINET ORDER), , , ,
1974
OECD SIDS  4,4'-METHYLENEDIANILINE

amendment:  JPNCO*, LAW CONCERNING THE EXAMINATION AND REGULATION OF MANUFACTURE ETC.OF CHEMICAL SUBSTANCES (CABINET ORDER), , , , 1991

******

file: 17.01 LEGAL  rn : 1200181
systematic name:Benzenamine, 4,4'-methylenebis-
common name  :4,4'-Diaminodiphenylmethane
reported name :4,4'-methylenedianiline
cas no       :101-77-9            rtecs no       :BY5425000
area          : SWE                 type          : REG

|subject|specification|descriptor|
|-------+-------------+----------|
| AIR   |    OCC      |   HLV    |
| USE   |    OCC      |   PRO    |
| MANUF |             |   PRO    |

NO EXPOSURE LIMIT ESTABLISHED. CARCINOGENIC SUBSTANCE, GROUP B (= THE SUBSTANCE, ITS SALTS, AND PRODUCTS CONTAINING IT IN CONCENTRATIONS OF 1% OR MORE MAY BE HANDLED ONLY AFTER PERMISSION HAS BEEN GRANTED BY THE LABOUR INSPECTORATE).

title: HYGIENIC LIMIT VALUES.
original : AFS***, ARBETARSKYDDSSTYRELSENS FOERFATTNINGSSAMLING, 1990:13 , , 5-64 , 1990

entry date:     1992                          effective date: 01JUL1991

file: 17.01 LEGAL  rn : 1301098
systematic name:Benzenamine, 4,4'-methylenebis-
common name  :4,4'-Diaminodiphenylmethane
reported name :Benzenamine,4,4'-methylenebis-
cas no       :101-77-9            rtecs no       :BY5425000
area          : USA                 type          : REG

|subject|specification|descriptor|
|-------+-------------+----------|
| MANUF |    REQ      |   PRMT   |
| USE   |    OCC      |   PRMT   |
| SAFTY |    OCC      |   MXL    |

; Summary - THE FOLLOWING CHEMICAL IS INCLUDED ON A LIST OF CHEMICALS AND MIXTURES FOR WHICH REPORTING IS CURRENTLY REQUIRED UNDER THE TOXIC SUBSTANCES CONTROL ACT SECTION 2607A. THIS TOXIC SUBSTANCE IS SUBJECT TO PRELIMINARY ASSESSMENT INFORMATION RULES ON PRODUCT ION QUANTITIES, USES, EXPOSURES, AND ADVERSE EFFECTS. MANUFACTURERS INCLUDING IMPORTERS MUST SUBMIT A REPORT FOR THIS LISTED CHEMICAL MANUFACTURED AT EACH SITE.
entry date: OCT 1991                          effective date:      1982

title: PRELIMINARY ASSESSMENT INFORMATION RULES
original : FEREAC, FEDERAL REGISTER, 47 , , 26998 , 1982
amendment: CFRUS*, CODE OF FEDERAL REGULATIONS, 40 , 712 , 30 , 1990

******
**Summary - FROM A LIST OF POLLUTANTS JUDGED TO BE HAZARDOUS FOR WHICH EMISSION STANDARDS WILL BE DEVELOPED**

**entry date: SEP 1991**  
**effective date: 1985**

**title: CLEAN AIR ACT, 112--NATIONAL EMISSION STANDARDS FOR HAZARDOUS AIR POLLUTANTS**

**original : FEREAC, FEDERAL REGISTER, 50 , , 46290 , 1985**

**amendment: CFRUS*, CODE OF FEDERAL REGULATIONS, 40 , 61 , 1 , 1990**

**Summary - FACILITIES THAT EXCEEDED A MANUFACTURING, IMPORTATION, OR PROCESSING THRESHOLD OF 25,000 LBS OR THE USE OF 10,000 LBS FOR THIS CHEMICAL MUST REPORT TO EPA ANY RELEASES OF THE CHEMICAL (OR CATEGORY CHEMICAL) TO AIR, LAND, WATER, POTW, UNDERGROUND INJECTION N, OR OFF SITE TRANSFER. THIS REGULATION COVERS STANDARD INDUSTRIAL CLASSIFICATION (SIC) CODES 20-39 ONLY).**

**entry date: OCT 1991**  
**effective date: 1987**

**title: SUPERFUND AMENDMENTS AND REAUTHORIZATION ACT, TITLE III. EPCRA SECTION 313 LIST OF TOXIC SUBSTANCES**


### Time Weighted Avg (TWA)

- 0.1 ppm, 0.81 MG/M3, skin A2. A2= Suspected human carcinogen.

**Summary - THIS THRESHOLD LIMIT VALUE IS INTENDED FOR USE IN THE PRACTICE OF INDUSTRIAL HYGIENE AS A GUIDELINE OR RECOMMENDATION IN THE CONTROL OF POTENTIAL HEALTH HAZARDS.**

**entry date: DEC 1991 effective date: 1989**

**title: THRESHOLD LIMIT VALUES**

**original : ACGIH*, AMERICAN CONFERENCE OF GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL HYGIENISTS, 11, 1989**

**amendment: ACGIH*, AMERICAN CONFERENCE OF GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL HYGIENISTS, 11, 1991**

---

### Summary - THIS IS A CHEMICAL OR MIXTURE FOR WHICH REPORTING IS CURRENTLY REQUIRED UNDER THE TOXIC SUBSTANCE CONTROL ACT HEALTH AND SAFETY STUDIES SECTION 2607D. PERSONS WHO CURRENTLY MANUFACTURE OR PROCESS CHEMICAL SUBSTANCES OR MIXTURES FOR COMMERCIAL PURPOSES, THOSE WHO PROPOSE TO DO SO, AND THOSE WHO ARE NOT CURRENTLY INVOLVED WITH A LISTED CHEMICAL BUT WHO MANUFACTURED OR PROCESSED IT OR PROPOSED TO DO SO ANY TIME DURING THE TEN YEAR PERIOD PRIOR TO THE TIME IT BECAME LISTED MUST SUBMIT TO THE ADMINISTRATOR OF THE U.S. EPA STUDIES OR LISTS OF HEALTH AND SAFETY STUDIES CONDUCTED ON THIS SUBSTANCE FOR EVALUATION.

**entry date: OCT 1991 effective date: 1986**

**title: HEALTH AND SAFETY DATA REPORTING RULES SECTION 8(D)**

**original : FEREAC, FEDERAL REGISTER, 51, 32726, 1986**

**amendment: CFRUS*, CODE OF FEDERAL REGULATIONS, 40, 716, 120, 1990**

---

### Summary - THIS IS A CHEMICAL OR MIXTURE FOR WHICH REPORTING IS CURRENTLY REQUIRED UNDER THE TOXIC SUBSTANCE CONTROL ACT HEALTH AND SAFETY STUDIES SECTION 2607D. PERSONS WHO CURRENTLY MANUFACTURE OR PROCESS CHEMICAL SUBSTANCES OR MIXTURES FOR COMMERCIAL PURPOSES, THOSE WHO PROPOSE TO DO SO, AND THOSE WHO ARE NOT CURRENTLY INVOLVED WITH A LISTED CHEMICAL BUT WHO MANUFACTURED OR PROCESSED IT OR PROPOSED TO DO SO ANY TIME DURING THE TEN YEAR PERIOD PRIOR TO THE TIME IT BECAME LISTED MUST SUBMIT TO THE ADMINISTRATOR OF THE U.S. EPA STUDIES OR LISTS OF HEALTH AND SAFETY STUDIES CONDUCTED ON THIS SUBSTANCE FOR EVALUATION.

**entry date: OCT 1991 effective date: 1986**

**title: HEALTH AND SAFETY DATA REPORTING RULES SECTION 8(D)**

**original : FEREAC, FEDERAL REGISTER, 51, 32726, 1986**

**amendment: CFRUS*, CODE OF FEDERAL REGULATIONS, 40, 716, 120, 1990**

---
THE CHEMICAL IS INCLUDED IN THE LIST OF PRIORITY SUBSTANCES FOR RISK EVALUATION TO MAN OR ENVIRONMENT AS GIVEN IN COUNCIL REGULATION (EEC) NO 793/93 (OJEC L84, 5.4.93, P.1). GERMANY HAS RESPONSIBILITY FOR ITS EVALUATION IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE PROCEDURE LAID DOWN IN THE REGULATION MENTIONED ABOVE.

entry date: JUN 1995  
effective date: 15JUN1994


********

file: 17.01 LEGAL  
rn : 1469213

!!! WARNING - not original IRPTC record - WARNING !!!

systematic name: Benzenamine, 4,4'-methylenebis-

common name : 4,4'-Diaminodiphenylmethane

reported name : 4,4'-Diaminodiphenylmethane

cas no : 101-77-9  
rtecs no : BY5425000

area : EEC  
type : REG

--------------------------------
|subject|specification|descriptor|
|-------+-------------+----------|
| USE   |    CONSM    |   RSTR   |
| SALE  |    CONSM    |   RSTR   |
| LABEL |             |   RQR    |

Carcinogen category 2. May not be used in substances and preparations placed on the market for sale to the general public in individual concentration equal to or greater than either the concentration specified in Annex I to Council Directive 67/547/EEC or 0.1 %, where no concentration limit appears in Annex I to Directive 67/548/EEC. The packaging of such substances and preparations must be legibly and indelibly as follows: "Restricted to professional users".

entry date: DEC 2001  
effective date: 19NOV2001


original : OJECFC, Official Journal of the European Communities, L262, , 201, 1976


********

file: 17.01 LEGAL  
rn : 1470285

!!! WARNING - not original IRPTC record - WARNING !!!

systematic name: Benzenamine, 4,4'-methylenebis-

common name : 4,4'-Diaminodiphenylmethane

reported name : 4,4'-methylenedianiline

cas no : 101-77-9  
rtecs no : BY5425000

area : EEC  
type : REG
The substance is included in a list of existing substances produced or imported within the Community in quantities exceeding 1000 tonnes per year. - A system of data reporting by any manufacturer who has produced or any importer who has imported the substance, as such or in a preparation, in quantities exceeding 10 tonnes per year is established.

entry date: AUG 1999 effective date: 04JUN1993

original: OJECFC, Official Journal of the European Communities, L84,, 1, 1993

file: 17.01 LEGAL rn: 1477809
!!! WARNING - not original IRPTC record - WARNING !!!
systematic name: Benzenamine, 4,4'-methylenebis-
common name: 4,4'-Diaminodiphenylmethane
reported name: 4,4'-Diaminodiphenylmethane
cas no: 101-77-9 rtecs no: BY5425000
area: EEC type: REG


entry date: JAN 2002 effective date: 24AUG2001

original: OJECFC, Official Journal of the European Communities, 196,, 1, 1967
amendment: OJECFC, Official Journal of the European Communities, L225,, 1, 2001
### IMDG Code - Dangerous Goods List


**Entry date:** NOV 2000  
**Effective date:** 01JAN2001  
**Title:** IMDG Code - Dangerous Goods List  
**Original:** IMDGC*, International Maritime Dangerous Goods Code, Amendment 30-00, Volume 2, 2000

### UN Orange Book - Dangerous Goods List


**Entry date:** NOV 2000  
**Title:** UN Orange Book - Dangerous Goods List  