



**Committee for Risk Assessment**  
**RAC**

Annex 2  
**Response to comments document (RCOM)**  
to the Opinion proposing harmonised classification and  
labelling at EU level of  
**methyl 2,5-dichlorobenzoate**

**EC number: 220-815-7**  
**CAS number: 2905-69-3**

CLH-O-0000003156-78-01/A2

**Adopted**  
**28 November 2012**

**COMMENTS AND RESPONSE TO COMMENTS ON CLH: PROPOSAL AND JUSTIFICATION**

*[ECHA has compiled the comments received via internet that refer to several hazard classes and entered them under each of the relevant categories/headings as comprehensive as possible. Please note that some of the comments might occur under several headings when splitting the given information is not reasonable.]*

**Substance name: Methyl 2,5-dichlorobenzoate**

**EC number: 220-815-7**

**CAS number: 2905-69-3**

**General comments**

<b>Date</b>	<b>Country / Organisation / MSCA</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Dossier submitter's response to comment</b>	<b>RAC's response to comment</b>
2011/09/29	United Kingdom / UK CLP CA HSE / Member State	<p>Page 10: Labelling. Whilst precautionary statements have been included in the proposal, we note that these will not be included in the Annex VI entry and that the final choice of P statements is at the discretion of the supplier.</p> <p>Page 12: S phrases. The dossier submitter has proposed the S-phrases S22 (Do not breathe dust). This phrase is applicable to solid substances with an Xn classification that are supplied in the form of an inhalable dust and for which the health hazards following inhalation are not known. However, Table 7 (physico-chemical properties) indicates that the substance is a yellow crystal at room temperature, and, further, section 4.2.1.2. (acute toxicity: inhalation) states that it was not feasible to obtain a dust of the substance. We would therefore request that the dossier submitter reassesses the need to include S22 as an S phrase.</p>	<p>Concerning AS for biocides and PPP are not P statements at the discretion of the RMS (Authorisation procedure)?</p> <p>The choice of an appropriate S-phrase is here quite complex. The state of the substance at 20°C is described as solid (yellow crystals). We assume nevertheless that there might be some dust formed by abrasion. Furthermore the substance is quite volatile (vapour pressure: 370 Pa at 25°C) and has a relatively low melting</p>	<p>Precautionary statements are to be assigned by the supplier and are not included in Annex VI of Regulation EC 1272/2008.</p> <p>Since it was not feasible to obtain a dust of the substance in the acute toxicity study and the fact that the substance is used in a wax, S phrase S22 is considered not necessary.</p>

ANNEX 2 - COMMENTS AND RESPONSE TO COMMENTS ON CLH PROPOSAL ON METHYL 2,5-DICHLOROBENZOATE

Date	Country / Organisation / MSCA	Comment	Dossier submitter's response to comment	RAC's response to comment
		<p>Page 17: Classification for physico-chemical properties. This section has been left blank. However, since this substance is a pesticide, all end-points should be assessed; therefore this section should be completed.</p> <p>Page 25: Editorial comment: from section 4.2.1. to section 4.4.2.4., the table numbers in the text are incorrect. For example, in section 4.2.1. the text refers to Table 11, whereas the table is actually numbered 9.</p>	<p>point (34,6°C). Having no test regarding acute toxicity (inhalation) and a classification as "Xn; R22" we feel bound to give some safety advice under these circumstances (S22 or, if considered applicable, S23).</p> <p>Page 17: Correct. Due to the phys.-chem. properties of Methyl 2,5-dichlorobenzoate a classification is not necessary in this area (data conclusive, but not sufficient for classification)</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p>
2011/09/28	France / Member State	France agrees with the classification proposal.	Thank you for the support.	Noted
2011/09/12	Spain / Member State	We are in agreement with the classification proposal submitted by DE.	Thank you for the support.	Noted

**Carcinogenicity: No comments received.**

**Mutagenicity: No comments received.**

**Toxicity to reproduction: No comments received.**

**Respiratory sensitisation: No comments received.**

**Other hazards and endpoints**

Date	Country / Organisation / MSCA	Comment	Dossier submitter's response to comment	RAC's response to comment
2011/09/30	Sweden / Member State	<p>As we understand, due to a very specific use of the substance, the PPP regulation did not require new tests on acute and long-term toxicity to the aquatic species. Although we sympathize with the proposal to classify on the available information, we wonder whether it would be possible to strengthen the proposal.</p> <p>For example, it would be valuable to calculate hydrolysis DT50 at a pH value that was relevant also for testing of aquatic species to show the fast degradation of the substance. Also, if the substance degrades very fast and builds metabolites it would be valuable to know the aquatic toxicity of the metabolites and assess whether the classification for the parent compound could be based on the classification of its metabolites (i.e. classification in analogy with).</p> <p>The data on the metabolites could further be used for assessment of whether the substance is or is not readily biodegradable. According to the guidance, if the hydrolysis products are classifiable the substance is regarded as not readily biodegradable. On the contrary, if they are not</p>	<p>Thank you for the support. Yes, the process in accordance with the PPP directive did not require new tests on aquatic toxicity. Nevertheless a correct classification and labelling has to be done. As we do not expect new data in the foreseeable future (for reasons see comment to UK), we propose to classify as H411 based on the available data. The test data clearly indicates toxicity in this range.</p> <p>In general we agree that the approach to use data on the toxicity of metabolites could be used to further assess the ready biodegradability of the substance, but there is no such data available.</p>	<p>Unfortunately the data to do the suggested assessments are not available.</p> <p>See above.</p>

ANNEX 2 - COMMENTS AND RESPONSE TO COMMENTS ON CLH PROPOSAL ON METHYL 2,5-DICHLORO BENZOATE

Date	Country / Organisation / MSCA	Comment	Dossier submitter's response to comment	RAC's response to comment
		classifiable, the substance could be regarded as readily biodegradable.		
2011/09/29	United Kingdom / UK CLP CA HSE / Member State	<p>Page 21: section 4.3. The report states that there are no relevant data to discuss specific target organ toxicity. However, there is information in section 4.2.1.1. on the effects observed following a single dose, which included sedation and coma. These findings should be discussed in the context of the criteria for STOT-SE.</p> <p>Page 22: Table 12. The table enables a useful comparison between the study findings and the classification criteria. However, only one criterion for classification as a Category 2 Irritant according to CLP is given; it would be more accurate to also include the other criteria, particularly the one that</p>	<p>Effects were observed in oral studies. The Guidance Document on CLP states that for STOT-SE 3 (narcotic effects) human data or inhalative studies should be considered (p. 338 GD, point 3.8.2.1.2). Hence, a respective classification is not proposed. However, final decision is up to RAC.</p> <p>Agreed. See amended table below.</p> <p>Thank you.</p> <p>The respective section is providing a conclusive summary of repeated dose toxicity as foreseen for section 4.7.1.7.</p> <p>Since effects were fully reversible and not severe, a classification for STOT-RE is not proposed by the dossier submitter (i.e. signs of neurotoxicity occurred from day one on directly after gavage and lasted from ten minutes to a few hours). Furthermore guidance values are not to be regarded as strict demarcation values but have to be seen in context with other aspects.</p>	<p>After careful consideration of the data available, RAC judged the narcotic/neurotoxic effects observed in the oral acute studies (<i>and</i> those in the repeated dose toxicity studies), to fulfil the criteria for STOT SE 3.</p> <p>Noted</p>

ANNEX 2 - COMMENTS AND RESPONSE TO COMMENTS ON CLH PROPOSAL ON METHYL 2,5-DICHLOROBENZOATE

Date	Country / Organisation / MSCA	Comment	Dossier submitter's response to comment	RAC's response to comment
		<p>gives a threshold irritation score so that this can be compared with the score obtained in the study.</p> <p>Page 25: section 4.4.2.5. We agree with the conclusion not to classify for eye irritation.</p> <p>Page 30: section 4.7.1.7. This section is almost a complete copy of section 4.7.1.1 and so repeats the findings of the studies rather than summarising the findings and discussing their relevance. Please consider providing a more succinct summary of the available data, highlighting the key toxicological effects and their relevance (or not) to the classification criteria.</p> <p>Page 31: sections 4.7.1.8. to 4.8.3. These sections all state that there are no findings that are relevant to classification. However, in the 28-day study, there were some (seemingly transient) neurotoxic effects from 300 mg/kg/d; these effects therefore occurred at the threshold guidance value for classification as STOT-RE 2 when the value for a 90-day study (100 mg/kg/d) is converted to one for a 28-day study (300 mg/kg/d). The findings should be discussed in relation to the classification criteria and the adjusted guidance value.</p>	<p>We agree that the used approach for the proposed classification as H400 and H410 might not be appropriate according to the CLP Regulation. However, although the studies are not valid, they are acceptable for the purpose of classification and labelling as they are the only available information. Therefore we have changed the proposal to classify as H411 based on the available information.</p> <p>Due to the specific use of the substance the process according to the PPP Directive 91/414/EEC did not require new tests and the substance is already listed in Annex I. As the substance is not placed on the German market and there is no obligation to produce new data according to the CLP Regulation, we do not expect to receive new valid data in the foreseeable future. As a consequence, we now propose a classification based on the available data, which clearly indicates toxicity in the range of H411. Although the exposure concentrations might not be clear, the use of nominal effect concentrations represents a minimum classification. Hence, we do not think it is premature to classify this substance as H411, because otherwise a substance with a clear toxic effect would be listed in Annex VI without an environmental classification.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Based on an overall weight of evidence, taking a.o. into consideration the onset and duration of the neurotoxic effects in the 28-day study, RAC concluded that the observed neurotoxicity in this study is acute in nature, thereby not justifying classification for STOT RE.</p>

ANNEX 2 - COMMENTS AND RESPONSE TO COMMENTS ON CLH PROPOSAL ON METHYL 2,5-DICHLORO BENZOATE

Date	Country / Organisation / MSCA	Comment	Dossier submitter's response to comment	RAC's response to comment
		<p>Environmental Hazard Assessment</p> <p>We do not agree with the approach used to derive the proposed environmental classification. Although acute toxicity was observed in the aquatic tests, the rapporteur has determined these to be unacceptable, so we do not think it is robust to use these data for classification. In addition we do not feel the extrapolation and assumptions for the nominal concentrations are appropriate as the exposure concentrations are unclear. As we note that requirements for repeat testing of acute toxicity to algae, Daphnia and fish are outstanding under Directive 91/414/EEC we would suggest waiting until these studies are available before proposing a harmonised environmental classification. At present we do not think an environmental classification can be made</p>		<p>As no new data are to be expected, a decision has to be made on the basis of the data available. The way forward and the new proposal as suggested by the DS are considered acceptable.</p>
2011/09/29	Belgium / Member State	<p>Environment :</p> <p>Due to the inconclusive results for the aquatic acute and chronic toxicity ,ascribed to the hydrolysis of the substance and the many inconsistencies with the test protocols, we</p>	<p>We agree that a classification as H400 und H410 might not be appropriate according to the CLP Regulation.</p>	<p>See response above.</p>

ANNEX 2 - COMMENTS AND RESPONSE TO COMMENTS ON CLH PROPOSAL ON METHYL 2,5-DICHLORO BENZOATE

Date	Country / Organisation / MSCA	Comment	Dossier submitter's response to comment	RAC's response to comment
		<p>believe it is premature to classify the substance with acute 1, H400 and Chronic 1, H410. We agree with your conclusion that the substance is not rapidly degradable and that the real EC50 and NOEC values will be lower than the reported nominal concentrations (48hECDaphnia = 7.5 mg/l ; 72hNOECalgae = 1.4 mg/l). But, owing to the lack of clear scientific evidence, the CLP criteria cannot be applied as such.</p> <p>Importing the known physicochemical data into EPISUITE 4. provides an estimate where the substance is not rapidly degradable, is highly volatile, is expected to be immobile/slightly immobile and shows no real potential to bioaccumulate :</p> <p>Log BCF from regression-based method = 1.950 (BCF = 89.11 L/kg wet-wt)                      Log Koc = 2.247 (MCI method)                      Log Koc = 2.773 (Kow method)                      Henry laws cste = 0.00861 atm-m<sup>3</sup>/mole</p>	<p>However, based on the available information, which clearly indicates toxicity in the relevant range of H411, we think it is not premature to classify as H411. For information concerning the availability of data please see also the previous comments.</p> <p>Thank you for the additional information. This supports our new proposal to classify as H411 based on the available information.</p> <p>This has been changed in the CLH-report.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>The ECOSAR predictions support classification in category 2.</p> <p>Noted</p>



ANNEX 2 - COMMENTS AND RESPONSE TO COMMENTS ON CLH PROPOSAL ON METHYL 2,5-DICHLORO BENZOATE

Date	Country / Organisation / MSCA	Comment	Dossier submitter's response to comment	RAC's response to comment
		<p>ECOSAR version1.00                      96hLC50fish =6,404 mg/l                      48hEC50Daphnid = 11.397 mg/l                      96hEC50green algae = 4,307 mg/l</p> <p>Some editorial or/and minor comments:                      5.5 Comparison with criteria for environmental hazards (section 5.1-5.4)                      The trigger for log Kow is independent of whether the substance is degradable or not.</p>		
2011/09/28	France / Member State	Environmental hazards: France agrees with the classification proposal for environment since it is the most conservative category and because the poor quality of the available data did not allow further assessment on the M factor.	Thank you for the support. However, taking into account that the studies are not valid we agree with the other comments that a worst-case classification might not be appropriate according to the CLP Regulation. We now propose a minimum classification as H411, which is clearly indicated based on the available information.	Noted
2011/09/12	Spain / Member State	Some editorial changes should be done in page 40 section 5.4.2.1 Evaluation of the study (Daphnia) of the report, since this paragraph is practically the same that in page 39 section 5.4.1.1 Evaluation of the study (fish).	Small corrections have been made. However, for rapidly degraded or highly volatile substances a flow-through or at least semi-static test system is appropriate rather than a static test like used for the provided tests. Hence, for both studies the wrong test system was chosen. As the same problem applies to both sections, we think there is no real need to change the wording.	Noted

**ATTACHMENTS RECEIVED: No attachments received**

**Amended table 12:**

Toxicological result	DSD criteria	CLP criteria
<p>After 24 hours a erythema score of 1 was observed in 5/8 animals on the shaved skin.</p> <p>At the reading 72 h and 7 d post application, all scores were 0.</p> <p>Edema scores were 0 at all reading times.</p>	<p>R38 Irritating to skin:</p> <p>Significant inflammation of the skin which persists for at least 24 hours after an exposure period of up to four hours;</p> <p>mean value of the scores for either erythema and eschar formation or oedema formation, calculated over all the animals tested, is 2 or more</p>	<p>Category 2 Irritant:</p> <p>Mean value of <math>\geq 2,3 - \leq 4,0</math> for erythema/eschar or for oedema in at least 2 of 3 tested animals from gradings at 24, 48 and 72 hours after patch removal or,</p> <p>if reactions are delayed, from grades on 3 consecutive days after the onset of skin reactions; or Inflammation that persists to the end of the observation period normally 14 days in at least 2 animals, particularly taking into account alopecia (limited area), hyperkeratosis, hyperplasia, and scaling; or</p> <p>very definite positive effects related to chemical exposure in a single animal but less than the criteria above.</p>