

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26

# Toxicological Reviews of Cyanobacterial Toxins: Cylindrospermopsin

National Center for Environmental Assessment  
Office of Research and Development  
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency  
Cincinnati, OH 45268

**DISCLAIMER**

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6

This report is an external draft for review purposes only and does not constitute Agency policy. Mention of trade names or commercial products does not constitute endorsement or recommendation for use.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

	<u>Page</u>
LIST OF TABLES .....	v
LIST OF FIGURES .....	vi
LIST OF ACRONYMS .....	vii
PREFACE .....	viii
AUTHORS, CONTRIBUTORS AND REVIEWERS .....	ix
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS .....	x
1. INTRODUCTION .....	1
2. CHEMICAL AND PHYSICAL INFORMATION .....	3
3. TOXICOKINETICS .....	4
3.1. ABSORPTION .....	4
3.2. DISTRIBUTION .....	4
3.3. METABOLISM .....	5
3.4. ELIMINATION .....	5
3.5. PHYSIOLOGICALLY BASED TOXICOKINETIC MODELS .....	6
4. HAZARD IDENTIFICATION .....	7
4.1. STUDIES IN HUMANS - EPIDEMIOLOGY, CASE REPORTS, CLINICAL CONTROLS .....	7
4.2. ACUTE, SHORT-TERM, SUBCHRONIC AND CHRONIC STUDIES AND CANCER BIOASSAYS IN ANIMALS - ORAL AND INHALATION .....	8
4.2.1. Oral Exposure .....	9
4.2.1.1. Acute Studies .....	9
4.2.1.2. Short-Term Studies .....	10
4.2.1.3. Subchronic Studies .....	11
4.2.1.4. Chronic Studies .....	13
4.2.2. Inhalation Exposure .....	13
4.3. REPRODUCTIVE/DEVELOPMENTAL STUDIES - ORAL AND INHALATION .....	13
4.4. OTHER STUDIES .....	14
4.4.1. Effects by Parenteral Exposure .....	14
4.4.1.1. Studies of Purified Cylindrospermopsin .....	14
4.4.1.2. Cell Extract Studies .....	14
4.4.2. Immunotoxicity .....	15
4.4.3. Tumor Initiation .....	15
4.4.4. Genotoxicity .....	16

**TABLE OF CONTENTS cont.**

1				<u>Page</u>
2				
3				
4				
5				
6	4.5.	MECHANISTIC DATA AND OTHER STUDIES IN SUPPORT OF		
7		THE MODE OF ACTION.....		16
8		4.5.1. Liver Toxicity .....		16
9		4.5.2. Kidney Toxicity .....		18
10		4.5.3. Interactions with DNA and RNA.....		19
11		4.5.4. Structure-Activity Relationships.....		20
12	4.6.	SYNTHESIS AND EVALUATION OF MAJOR NONCANCER		
13		EFFECTS .....		21
14		4.6.1. Oral .....		21
15		4.6.2. Inhalation .....		23
16		4.6.3. Mode of Action Information.....		23
17	4.7.	WEIGHT-OF-EVIDENCE EVALUATION AND CANCER		
18		CHARACTERIZATION .....		24
19		4.7.1. Summary of Overall Weight-of-Evidence .....		24
20		4.7.2. Synthesis of Human, Animal and Other Supporting Evidence.....		24
21	4.8.	SUSCEPTIBLE POPULATIONS AND LIFE STAGES .....		24
22		4.8.1. Possible Childhood Susceptibility .....		24
23		4.8.2. Possible Gender Differences.....		25
24		4.8.3. Other Possible Susceptible Populations.....		25
25				
26	5.	DOSE-RESPONSE ASSESSMENTS.....		26
27	5.1.	NARRATIVE DESCRIPTION OF THE EXTENT OF THE		
28		DATABASE .....		26
29	5.2.	ORAL REFERENCE DOSE (RfD) .....		26
30		5.2.1. Data Considered in Deriving Reference Values .....		26
31		5.2.2. Acute Duration.....		26
32		5.2.2.1. Choice of Principal Study and Critical Effect – with		
33		Rationale and Justification.....		27
34		5.2.3. Short-Term Duration.....		27
35		5.2.3.1. Choice of Principal Study and Critical Effect – with		
36		Rationale and Justification.....		27
37		5.2.4. Subchronic Duration .....		27
38		5.2.4.1. Choice of Principal Study and Critical Effect – with		
39		Rationale and Justification.....		27
40		5.2.4.2. Methods of Analysis – Including Models (PBPK, MBD, etc.) ...		28
41		5.2.4.3. RfD Derivation – Including Application of UFs .....		28
42		5.2.5. Chronic Duration .....		32
43		5.2.5.1. Choice of Principal Study and Critical Effect – with		
44		Rationale and Justification.....		32
45		5.2.6. Route-to-Route Extrapolation.....		33
46	5.3.	INHALATION REFERENCE CONCENTRATION (RfC) .....		33
47	5.4.	CANCER ASSESSMENT .....		33

**TABLE OF CONTENTS cont.**

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11

	<u>Page</u>
6. MAJOR CONCLUSIONS IN THE CHARACTERIZATION OF HAZARD AND DOSE RESPONSE .....	34
6.1. HUMAN HAZARD POTENTIAL.....	34
6.2. DOSE RESPONSE .....	34
7. REFERENCES .....	35

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14

**LIST OF TABLES**

<u>No.</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Page</u>
4-1	Tumor Initiating Activity of <i>C. raciborskii</i> Extracts .....	16
4-2	Summary Results of Major Oral Toxicity Studies of Pure Cylindrospermopsin in Experimental Animals.....	22
5-1	Relative Kidney Weights in Mice Exposed to Purified Cylindrospermopsin for 11 Weeks .....	29
5-2	Summary of Benchmark Dose Modeling (Relative Kidney Weight).....	30

**LIST OF FIGURES**

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9

<u>No.</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Page</u>
2-1	Chemical Structure of Cyindrospermopsin.....	3
5-1	Linear Model Fit to Relative Kidney Weight Data (High Dose Group Dropped).....	31

## LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

1		
2		
3		
4	AIC	Aikake's Information Criteria
5	BMD	Benchmark dose
6	BMDL	Statistical lower confidence limit on the benchmark dose
7	BMDS	Benchmark dose software
8	BMR	Benchmark response
9	CYP450	Cytochrome P-450
10	DMSO	Dimethyl sulfoxide
11	EPA	Environmental Protection Agency
12	GFR	Glomerular filtration rate
13	HPLC	High performance liquid chromatography
14	i.p.	Intraperitoneal
15	LD <sub>50</sub>	Dose lethal to 50% of the population
16	LOAEL	Lowest-observed-adverse-effect level
17	NOAEL	No-observed-adverse-effect level
18	PBPK	Physiologically based pharmacokinetic
19	POD	Point of departure
20	RfC	Reference concentration
21	RfD	Reference dose
22	ROS	Reactive oxygen species
23	THP	Tamm-Harsfall protein
24	TPA	O-Tetradecanoylphorbol 13-acetate
25	UF	Uncertainty factor



1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34

## PREFACE

The Safe Drinking Water Act (SDWA), as amended in 1996, requires the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) to publish a list of contaminants that, at the time of publication, are not subject to any proposed or promulgated national primary drinking water regulations, are known or anticipated to occur in public water systems, and may require regulations under SDWA. This list, known as the Contaminant Candidate List (CCL), was first published in 1998 and then again in 2005. The 1998 and 2005 CCLs include “cyanobacteria (blue-green algae), other freshwater algae, and their toxins” as microbial contaminants.

In 2001, a meeting was held among EPA, researchers from the drinking water industry, academia and government agencies with expertise in the area of fresh water algae and their toxins. The goal of this meeting was to convene a panel of scientists to assist in identifying a target list of algal toxins that are likely to pose a health risk in source and finished waters of the drinking water utilities in the U.S. Toxin selection was based on four criteria: health effects, occurrence in the United States, susceptibility to drinking water treatment and toxin stability. Cylindrospermopsin was identified at this meeting as being a toxin of high priority based on those criteria.

The National Center for Environmental Assessment has prepared this Toxicological Review of Cyanobacterial Toxins: Cylindrospermopsin as one in a series of dose-response assessments to support the health assessment of unregulated contaminants on the CCL. The purpose of this document is to compile and evaluate the available data regarding cylindrospermopsin toxicity to aid the Office of Water in regulatory decision making. It is not intended to be a comprehensive treatise on the chemical or toxicological nature of cylindrospermopsin.

In Section 6, *Major Conclusions in the Characterization of Hazard and Dose Response*, EPA has characterized its overall confidence in the quantitative and qualitative aspects of the hazard and dose response by addressing knowledge gaps, uncertainties, quality of data and scientific controversies. The discussion is intended to convey the limitations of the assessment and to aid and guide the Office of Water in the ensuing steps of the human health risk assessment of cylindrospermopsin.



1 EXTERNAL REVIEWERS

2

3

4 **ACKNOWLEDGMENTS**

5

# 1. INTRODUCTION

This toxicological review presents background and justification for hazard and dose-response assessments of cylindrospermopsin. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) toxicological reviews may include oral reference doses (RfD) and inhalation reference concentrations (RfC) for chronic and less-than-lifetime exposure durations and a carcinogenicity assessment.

The RfD and RfC provide quantitative information for use in risk assessments for health effects known or assumed to be produced through a nonlinear (possibly threshold) mode of action. These reference values are defined as an estimate of an exposure, designated by duration and route, to the human population (including susceptible subgroups), that is likely to be without an appreciable risk of adverse effects. Reference values may be derived for acute ( $\leq 24$  hours), short-term (up to 30 days), subchronic (up to 10% of average lifespan) and chronic (up to lifetime) exposures, all considered to be continuous exposures throughout the duration specified. A reference value is derived from a BMDL (a statistical lower confidence limit on the benchmark dose), a no-observed-adverse-effect level (NOAEL), lowest-observed-adverse-effect level (LOAEL) or other suitable point of departure with uncertainty/variability factors applied to reflect limitations of the data used. The RfD is expressed in units of mg/kg-day, and the RfC in units of mg/m<sup>3</sup>.

The carcinogenicity assessment provides information on the carcinogenic hazard potential of the substance in question and quantitative estimates of risk from oral exposure and inhalation exposure. The information includes a weight-of-evidence judgment of the likelihood that the agent is a human carcinogen and the conditions under which the carcinogenic effects may be expressed. Quantitative risk estimates are presented in three ways. The *slope factor* is the result of application of a low-dose extrapolation procedure and is presented as the risk per mg/kg-day. The *unit risk* is the quantitative estimate in terms of either risk per  $\mu\text{g/L}$  drinking water or risk per  $\mu\text{g/m}^3$  air breathed. Another form in which risk is presented is a drinking water or air concentration providing cancer risks of 1 in 10,000; 1 in 100,000; or 1 in 1,000,000.

Development of these hazard identification and dose-response assessments for cylindrospermopsin has followed the general guidelines for risk assessment as set forth by the National Research Council (NRC, 1983). EPA guidelines that were used in the development of this assessment include the following: *Guidelines for the Health Risk Assessment of Chemical Mixtures* (U.S. EPA, 1986a), *Guidelines for Mutagenicity Risk Assessment* (U.S. EPA, 1986b), *Guidelines for Developmental Toxicity Risk Assessment* (U.S. EPA, 1991), *Guidelines for Reproductive Toxicity Risk Assessment* (U.S. EPA, 1996), *Guidelines for Neurotoxicity Risk Assessment* (U.S. EPA, 1998a), *Guidelines for Carcinogen Assessment* (U.S. EPA, 2005a), *Supplemental Guidance for Assessing Susceptibility from Early-Life Exposure to Carcinogens* (U.S. EPA, 2005b), *Recommendations for and Documentation of Biological Values for Use in Risk Assessment* (U.S. EPA, 1988), (proposed) *Interim Policy for Particle Size and Limit Concentration Issues in Inhalation Toxicity* (U.S. EPA, 1994a), *Methods for Derivation of Inhalation Reference Concentrations and Application of Inhalation Dosimetry* (U.S. EPA, 1994b), *Use of the Benchmark Dose Approach in Health Risk Assessment* (U.S. EPA, 1995),

1 *Science Policy Council Handbook: Peer Review* (U.S. EPA, 1998b, 2000a), *Science Policy*  
2 *Council Handbook: Risk Characterization* (U.S. EPA, 2000b), *Benchmark Dose Technical*  
3 *Guidance Document* (U.S. EPA, 2000c) and *Supplementary Guidance for Conducting Health*  
4 *Risk Assessment of Chemical Mixtures* (U.S. EPA, 2000d) and *A Review of the Reference Dose*  
5 *and Reference Concentration Processes* (U.S. EPA, 2002).

6

7 Literature searches were conducted for studies relevant to the derivation of toxicity and  
8 carcinogenicity values for cylindrospermopsin. The following databases were searched:

9 MEDLINE (PubMed), TOXLINE, BIOSIS, CANCERLIT, TSCATS, CCRIS, DART/ETIC,

10 EMIC, GENETOX, HSDB and RTECS. The relevant literature was reviewed through May

11 2006.

## 2. CHEMICAL AND PHYSICAL INFORMATION

Cylindrospermopsin is a naturally occurring toxin produced by particular strains of *Cylindrospermopsis raciborskii* and at least four other freshwater cyanobacterial species, including *Umezakia natans*, *Aphanizomenon ovalisporum*, *Anabaena bergii* and *Raphidiopsis curvata* (Fastner et al., 2003). The chemical structure of cylindrospermopsin was not elucidated until 1992. It consists of a tricyclic guanidine moiety combined with hydroxymethyluracil (Figure 2-1) (Humpage and Falconer, 2003; Ohtani et al., 1992), has a molecular formula of  $C_{15}H_{21}N_5O_7S$  and a molecular weight of 415.43 (Lewis, 2000). It is zwitterionic (i.e., a dipolar ion with localized positive and negative charges) (Ohtani et al., 1992). Deoxycylindrospermopsin, an analog of cylindrospermopsin in which the hydroxyl group on the uracil bridge (C-7) has been removed, has been isolated from *C. raciborskii* and *R. curvata* (Li et al., 2001; Norris et al., 1999). Another structural variant of cylindrospermopsin, 7-epicylindrospermopsin, was isolated from *A. ovalisporum* (Banker et al., 2000).




Figure 2-1. Chemical Structure of Cylindrospermopsin\*

\* Conformations of stereocenters within the structure are indicated as either R or S. The numbers 7 and 12 indicate carbon positions for identification purposes.

Cylindrospermopsin is a white powder that is highly soluble in water (Ohtani et al., 1992; Sigma, 2006). It is also soluble in dimethylsulfoxide (DMSO) and methanol (Sigma, 2006). Cylindrospermopsin is chemically stable in sunlight, at high temperatures and through a wide range of pH values (Chiswell et al., 1999). Additional chemical and physical property data are not available in the open literature for cylindrospermopsin (HSDB, 2006; Lewis, 2000; O'Neil, 2001). This substance is produced on a small scale for research purposes (Sigma, 2006).

### 3. TOXICOKINETICS

#### 3.1. ABSORPTION

No quantitative data were located regarding the rate or extent of absorption of cylindrospermopsin in humans or animals following oral, inhalation or dermal exposure. Absorption of cylindrospermopsin from the gastrointestinal tract of mice is demonstrated by the induction of hepatic and other systemic effects in 14-day and 11-week oral toxicity studies of pure cylindrospermopsin (Humpage and Falconer, 2003; Shaw et al., 2000, 2001) (see Section 4.2.1).

#### 3.2. DISTRIBUTION

No information was located regarding the tissue distribution of cylindrospermopsin following oral, inhalation or dermal exposure. The distribution and elimination of intraperitoneally (i.p.) administered  $^{14}\text{C}$ -cylindrospermopsin (>95% pure; extracted and purified from lyophilized *C. raciborskii* cells) in normal saline was studied in male Quackenbush mice in a series of experiments using sublethal and lethal dose levels of the chemical (Norris et al., 2001). In one experiment, four mice were given a single sublethal dose of 0.1 mg/kg, and urine and feces were collected for the following 48 hours. Most of the  $^{14}\text{C}$  was eliminated in the urine and feces, as discussed in Section 3.4. Analysis of liver, kidneys and spleen at 48 hours showed mean  $^{14}\text{C}$  recovery of 13.1% of the dose in the liver and <1% in the other tissues. Total recovery of radiolabel was 85-90% of the administered dose in each of the four mice.

The second experiment reported by Norris et al. (2001) included 12 mice administered a single 0.2 mg/kg dose of  $^{14}\text{C}$ -cylindrospermopsin, which is the approximate median lethal i.p. dose (Norris et al., 2001).  $^{14}\text{C}$  content was determined in the urine and feces in all animals after 12 and 24 hours, and in the liver, kidneys and spleen in five mice that were euthanized after 5-6 days due to toxicity (effects not specified) and after 7 days in the surviving 7 mice that had no signs of toxicity. Most of the  $^{14}\text{C}$  was eliminated in the urine and feces, as discussed in Section 3.4. The overall mean recoveries of  $^{14}\text{C}$  in the liver, kidneys and spleen after 5-7 days were 2.1, 0.15 and <0.1% of the dose, respectively. Comparison of data from four mice with signs of toxicity and four mice without signs of toxicity showed no clear relationship between toxicity and patterns of tissue distribution, although a trend toward decreased liver retention in the surviving mice was suggested.

Norris et al. (2001) reported a third experiment, in which excretion and tissue distribution were assessed in four mice that were given a 0.2 mg/kg i.p. dose of  $^{14}\text{C}$ -cylindrospermopsin and evaluated after 6 hours (Norris et al., 2001).  $^{14}\text{C}$  was detected in all tissues that were examined (liver, kidney, heart, lung, spleen, blood and bile), but occurred predominantly in the liver and kidneys (20.6 and 4.3% of the dose, respectively). Approximately 60% of the administered dose of  $^{14}\text{C}$  was eliminated in the urine and feces (see Section 3.4).

### 3.3. METABOLISM

The distribution and elimination of i.p administered  $^{14}\text{C}$ -cylindrospermopsin (>95% pure; extracted and purified from lyophilized *C. raciborskii* cells) in saline was studied in a series of mouse experiments (Norris et al., 2001), as detailed in Sections 3.2 and 3.4. Urine, fecal, liver and kidney samples from these studies were extracted with methanol to precipitate proteins, and the  $^{14}\text{C}$  in the supernatant was fractionated using high performance liquid chromatography (HPLC) for the detection of metabolites. No attempt was made to fractionate or otherwise identify the  $^{14}\text{C}$  in the protein precipitate. Analysis of methanol extracts of urine samples collected for 12 hours following a single dose of 0.1 mg/kg (4 mice) or 0.2 mg/kg (12 mice) suggested that a large part (72%) of the excreted  $^{14}\text{C}$  was present as cylindrospermopsin (as determined by retention times). Some (~23.5%) of the urinary  $^{14}\text{C}$  was detected in protein precipitated by the methanol, suggesting the presence of a protein-bound metabolite. The authors did not indicate whether the level of protein in the urine was normal or abnormal. Most (94.3%) of the  $^{14}\text{C}$  in an aqueous extract of the feces had the same retention time as cylindrospermopsin, but only one mouse dosed with 0.2 mg/kg was tested. Analysis of liver tissue showed the presence of  $^{14}\text{C}$  in both methanol extract and protein precipitate. When fractionated by HPLC, the extracted  $^{14}\text{C}$  had the same elution characteristics seen in some of the urine methanol extracts, suggesting the presence of the same metabolite. The authors could not rule out the possibility that the non-extractable  $^{14}\text{C}$  in the liver was protein-bound cylindrospermopsin itself, although the evidence for metabolic activation of cylindrospermopsin in other studies (Runnegar et al., 1995; Shaw et al., 2000) suggested that it might also be a metabolite. The methanol-extractable metabolite was not found in kidney tissue. No identification of metabolites was performed.

There is evidence indicating that the hepatic cytochrome P-450 (CYP450) enzyme system is involved in the metabolism and toxicity of cylindrospermopsin. As discussed in Section 4.5.1, pretreatment of hepatocytes with known inhibitors of CYP450 diminished the *in vitro* cytotoxicity of cylindrospermopsin (Froschio et al., 2003; Runnegar et al., 1995). Similarly, pretreatment of mice with a CYP450 inhibitor protected against the acute lethality of cylindrospermopsin (Norris et al., 2002). Additionally, a main target of cylindrospermopsin toxicity is the peri-acinar region of the liver, which is where CYP450-mediated xenobiotic metabolism occurs (Shaw et al., 2000, 2001).

### 3.4. ELIMINATION

No information was located regarding the elimination of cylindrospermopsin following oral, inhalation or dermal exposure. The elimination of i.p administered  $^{14}\text{C}$ -cylindrospermopsin (>95% pure; extracted and purified from lyophilized *C. raciborskii* cells) in saline was studied in male Quackenbush mice in a series of experiments using sublethal and lethal dose levels of the chemical (Norris et al., 2001). In one experiment, four mice were given a single sublethal dose of 0.1 mg/kg, and urine and feces were collected for the following 48 hours. The mean cumulative excretion of  $^{14}\text{C}$  in the first 12 hours after dosing was 62.8% of the administered dose in the urine and 15.5% in the feces. There was little additional excretion of  $^{14}\text{C}$  in either the urine or feces following 12 additional hours. The 15.5% mean fecal excretion value reflects a very high fecal excretion in one of the four animals (nearly 60% of the dose compared to <5% in



1 the other mice); the authors considered the possibility that the high value in the one animal  
2 resulted from the injection entering the upper gastrointestinal tract, but concluded that this  
3 possibility was unlikely given the injection technique used, the recovery of 4.7% of the injected  
4 dose in the liver after 48 hours and a similarly high fecal excretion of  $^{14}\text{C}$  in another animal in  
5 the third experiment in this study (discussed below). Total mean recovery in the urine, feces,  
6 liver, kidneys and spleen was 85-90% of the  $^{14}\text{C}$  dose in each of the four mice.

7  
8 The second experiment reported by Norris et al. (2001) included 12 mice administered a  
9 single 0.2 mg/kg dose of  $^{14}\text{C}$ -cylindrospermopsin, which is the approximate median lethal i.p.  
10 dose (Norris et al., 2001). Five of the 12 dosed animals died within 5-6 days (signs of toxicity  
11 not reported).  $^{14}\text{C}$  content was determined in the urine and feces in all animals after 12 and 24  
12 hours. Results were similar to those obtained with a sublethal dose (reported above), except that  
13 there was some continued urinary and fecal excretion over the second 12 hours of the monitoring  
14 period. The mean cumulative urinary and fecal excretion of  $^{14}\text{C}$  was 66.0 and 5.7% of the dose  
15 within 12 hours, and 68.4 and 8.5% of the dose within 24 hours, respectively. The mean total  
16 recovery in the urine and feces after 24 hours was 76.9% of the administered dose. The overall  
17 mean recoveries of  $^{14}\text{C}$  in the liver, kidneys and spleen after 5-7 days were 2.1, 0.15 and <0.1%  
18 of the administered dose, respectively. Comparison of data from four mice with signs of toxicity  
19 and four mice without signs of toxicity showed no clear relationship between toxicity and  
20 patterns of excretion, although trends toward increased urinary excretion and decreased fecal  
21 excretion in surviving mice were suggested.

22  
23 Norris et al. (2001) reported a third experiment in which four mice were given a 0.2  
24 mg/kg i.p. dose of  $^{14}\text{C}$ -cylindrospermopsin and evaluated for 6 hours (Norris et al., 2001). The  
25 mean cumulative urinary and fecal excretion of  $^{14}\text{C}$  after 6 hours was 48.2 and 11.9% of the  
26 administered dose, respectively. One of the four mice showed more than 40% of the dose in the  
27 feces (additional data not reported).

### 28 29 **3.5. PHYSIOLOGICALLY BASED TOXICOKINETIC MODELS**

30  
31 No physiologically based toxicokinetic models have been developed for  
32 cylindrospermopsin.

1  
2  
3  
4 **4. HAZARD IDENTIFICATION**

5 **4.1. STUDIES IN HUMANS - EPIDEMIOLOGY, CASE REPORTS, CLINICAL**  
6 **CONTROLS**

7 An outbreak of a hepatoenteritis-like illness occurred in 148 residents of aboriginal  
8 descent in the Palm Island community in Queensland, Australia, in 1979 (Blyth, 1980; Griffiths  
9 and Saker, 2003). The total number of people exposed was not reported. Of the 148 cases, 138  
10 were children (mean age 8.4 years, range 2-16 years, 41% male and 59% female) and 10 were  
11 adults (sex and age not reported). The majority of the cases in the outbreak, called the “Palm  
12 Island mystery disease,” required hospitalization. The clinical symptoms included fever,  
13 headache, vomiting, profuse bloody diarrhea, hepatomegaly and renal damage as indicated by  
14 loss of water, electrolytes, proteins, ketones and carbohydrates. Many of the individuals required  
15 intravenous therapy for electrolyte imbalance and, in some cases, for hypovolemic and acidotic  
16 shock. The findings may indicate increased susceptibility of children unless the 138 children  
17 were from the households of the 10 adults (not indicated) or if there was differential exposure  
18 between the children and the adults (not indicated); the child:adult ratio is approximately 14:1.  
19 A few days prior to the outbreak, the major drinking water supply for the island, Solomon Dam  
20 reservoir, had been treated with unreported levels of copper sulfate to control a dense algal  
21 bloom; only households connected to the reservoir were affected by the illness. Retrospective  
22 analyses, including epidemiological and ecological assessments, implicated the predominant  
23 cyanobacterial species in the reservoir, *C. raciborskii*, as the likely source of the illness (Griffiths  
24 and Saker, 2003; Hawkins et al., 1985). Intraperitoneal injection of cell extracts of *C. raciborskii*  
25 from the reservoir caused damage to the liver, kidneys and other organs in mice (Hawkins et al.,  
26 1985), and the toxin was later identified as cylindrospermopsin (Ohtani et al., 1992). Some  
27 symptoms of acute oral exposure to high concentrations of copper sulfate, including headache,  
28 nausea, vomiting and diarrhea (HSDB, 2006), are similar to those observed during the outbreak.  
29 The only information that was located regarding a potential role of the copper sulfate treatment  
30 in the outbreak is an indication that its algalcidal mode of action, cell lysis, could have  
31 contributed to the release of cylindrospermopsin and other cellular toxins into the water  
32 (Griffiths and Saker, 2003).

33  
34 Hayman (1992) investigated reports of disease (sometimes called “Barcoo fever”) in the  
35 Australian outback dating back as far as 1887. He concluded that the reported symptoms were  
36 similar to those of the Palm Island mystery disease and that they might have been caused by  
37 exposure to *C. raciborskii*. No additional information was located regarding effects in humans  
38 known or suspected to be associated with exposure to cylindrospermopsin.

39  
40 An outbreak of acute liver failure occurred in patients at a renal dialysis clinic in Caruaru,  
41 Brazil (Carmichael et al., 2001). Following routine hemodialysis treatment during a week in  
42 February 1996, 116 of 131 patients experienced headache, eye pain, blurred vision, nausea and  
43 vomiting. Subsequently, 100 of the affected patients developed acute liver failure and, of these,  
44 76 died. Analysis of the clinic’s water treatment system (samples of carbon, sand and  
45 cation/anion exchange resin from in-house filters) for microcystins and cylindrospermopsin  
46 showed the presence of both cyanotoxins. Analyses of blood sera and liver samples revealed

1 microcystins, but not cylindrospermopsin, although the method used to extract  
2 cylindrospermopsin from these samples may have been inadequate. Based on a comparison of  
3 victims' symptoms and liver pathology using animal studies of microcystins and  
4 cylindrospermopsin, it was concluded that the major contributing factor to death of the dialysis  
5 patients was intravenous exposure to microcystins.

6  
7 The skin irritant potential of cylindrospermopsin was evaluated using skin-patch testing in  
8 humans (Pilotto et al., 2004). Both whole and lysed preparations of laboratory-grown *C.*  
9 *raciborskii* cells were applied to the skin of 50 adult volunteers using adhesive patches divided  
10 into 10 individual filter pad-containing chambers. Each volunteer was exposed to one patch for  
11 whole cells and one patch for lysed cells with each patch containing six cell concentrations, two  
12 positive controls (1 and 5% solutions of sodium lauryl sulfate), and two negative controls  
13 (culture media and an empty patch). The concentrations (densities) of cells were consistent with  
14 those found in *C. raciborskii*-containing water bodies used for recreational water activities.  
15 Patches were removed after 24 hours and erythematous reactions were graded as 0 (no reaction  
16 or erythema), 1 (minimal or very weak spotty erythema), 2 (mild diffuse erythema), 3 (moderate  
17 diffuse erythema) or 4 (severe diffuse erythema with edema) by a dermatologist blinded to the  
18 cell type and concentration. The distribution of clinical gradings by patch type (control/active),  
19 cell type and cell concentration was assessed using logistic regression modeling. Due to a  
20 relatively small number of high-level gradings, each observation was dichotomized into no  
21 reaction (grade 0) and a positive reaction (1, 2, 3 or 4) prior to modeling. The subjects were  
22 more likely to have skin reactions to the active patches than to the negative control patches for  
23 both whole cells (odds ratio (OR) = 2.13, 95% confidence interval (CI) 1.79-4.21, p<0.001) and  
24 lysed cells (OR = 3.41, 95% CI 2.00-5.84, p<0.001). The mean percentages of subjects having a  
25 reaction were 20% (95% CI 15-31%) for all subjects (n=50) and 11% (95% CI 6-18%) for  
26 subjects not reacting to negative controls (n=39). The irritation was mild and resolved within 24  
27 to 72 hours. There was no evidence of a statistically significant increasing dose-response  
28 relationship between skin reactions and increasing cell concentrations for either whole or lysed  
29 cells, although there was a slight reduction in response with increasing cell concentration for the  
30 whole cells (OR = 0.966, 95% CI 0.936-0.997, p = 0.03). Additionally, there was no evidence  
31 for a threshold effect (i.e., a particular concentration above which there were frequent or strong  
32 reactions).

#### 33 34 **4.2. ACUTE, SHORT-TERM, SUBCHRONIC AND CHRONIC STUDIES AND** 35 **CANCER BIOASSAYS IN ANIMALS - ORAL AND INHALATION**

36  
37 Toxicity studies in animals have been performed using pure cylindrospermopsin isolated  
38 and purified from cell extracts of *C. raciborskii* or other cylindrospermopsin-producing  
39 cyanobacteria. Studies have also been performed in which the administered material consisted of  
40 whole cell extracts, lyophilized (freeze-dried) cells in suspension and cell-free extracts of  
41 sonicated freeze-dried cells. These studies are included in this report because they contribute  
42 salient information to the overall toxicological database for cylindrospermopsin. However, due  
43 to confounding factors discussed below, the studies of cell extracts are not useful for dose-  
44 response assessment of cylindrospermopsin and are considered supplemental information for  
45 hazard identification.

1 Most of the cell extract studies were performed using laboratory cultures of  
2 cyanobacterial cells, but there is no clear means of predicting the cylindrospermopsin content in  
3 a particular extract. Studies with cylindrospermopsin and other cyanobacterial toxins indicate  
4 that growth conditions can significantly contribute to the level of toxin produced by a given  
5 species and strain, and that toxin concentration can also vary depending on the method used to  
6 produce a material for toxicological testing (Chiswell et al., 1999; WHO, 1999). The  
7 extracellular fraction of cylindrospermopsin can sometimes exceed the intracellular fraction  
8 (Griffiths and Saker, 2003). For example, at different stages of a *C. raciborskii* bloom,  
9 extracellular cylindrospermopsin ranged from 19 to 98% of the total amount in water (Chiswell  
10 et al., 1999). Similarly, during a bloom of *A. ovalisporum*, >85% of the cylindrospermopsin was  
11 extracellular (Shaw et al., 1999). In these studies, intracellular concentration of  
12 cylindrospermopsin was determined by taking the difference between the concentration in a  
13 sample of filtered water and the concentration in a sample of water that was frozen to release the  
14 toxin contained in the cells. Extracts obtained by removing intact cells may or may not contain  
15 toxin or may have variable amounts of toxin. For example, Falconer et al. (1999) found that the  
16 cylindrospermopsin content in four different batches of cell-free extracts of *C. raciborskii* varied  
17 from 1.3 to 5.4 mg/g extract. Additionally, cell extracts containing cylindrospermopsin can also  
18 contain other potentially toxic substances. The 24-hour i.p. LD<sub>50</sub> (dose lethal to 50% of the  
19 population) of purified cylindrospermopsin in male CH3 mice was 2.1 mg/kg (Ohtani et al.,  
20 1992), whereas the value for a cell extract in male Swiss mice was 0.29 mg/kg (Hawkins et al.,  
21 1997), nearly an order of magnitude lower. Hawkins et al. (1997) proposed that the difference in  
22 potency could reflect the presence of other toxins in the cell extract that were not present in the  
23 purified cylindrospermopsin (see Section 4.4.1).

#### 24 **4.2.1. Oral Exposure**

##### 25 **4.2.1.1. Acute Studies**

##### 26 **4.2.1.1.1. Studies of Purified Cylindrospermopsin**

27 No information regarding the acute oral toxicity of purified cylindrospermopsin was  
28 identified in the materials reviewed for this document.

##### 29 **4.2.1.1.2. Cell Extract Studies**

30 Twelve male MF1 mice were administered a saline suspension of freeze-dried *C.*  
31 *raciborskii* cells (strains PHAWT/M or PHAWT/1) by gavage in single reported doses ranging  
32 from 4.4 to 8.3 mg/kg (cylindrospermopsin-equivalent), and observed for the following 8 days  
33 (Seawright et al., 1999). The following dose levels were tested (one mouse per level except as  
34 noted): 4.4, 5.3, 5.7 (two mice), 5.8, 6.2, 6.5, 6.7, 6.8, 6.9, 8.0 and 8.3 mg/kg; there was no  
35 control group. Eight of the 12 mice died. The lowest lethal dose was 4.4 mg/kg, the highest  
36 nonlethal dose was 6.9 mg/kg and the average lethal dose was approximately 6 mg/kg. Deaths  
37 occurred 2-6 days after treatment, and histological examinations showed effects that included  
38 fatty liver with periacinar coagulative necrosis, acute renal tubular necrosis, atrophy of the  
39 lymphoid tissue of the spleen and thymus, subepicardial and myocardial hemorrhages in the  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45

1 heart and ulceration of the esophageal section of the gastric mucosa. Some of the animals also  
2 developed thrombohemorrhagic lesions in one or both eye orbits.

3  
4 An aqueous suspension of a cell-free extract of freeze-dried and sonicated *C. raciborskii*  
5 cells (strain AWT 205) was administered to an unspecified number of male Swiss mice in a  
6 single gavage dose of 1400 mg extract/kg (Falconer et al., 1999). The cylindrospermopsin  
7 content of the extract was not specified, but ranged from 1.3 to 5.4 mg/g extract in concurrent i.p.  
8 experiments, indicating that the cylindrospermopsin-equivalent gavage dose was likely in the  
9 range of 1.8-7.6 mg/kg. This dose level was not fatal, but caused severe liver and kidney  
10 pathology. Histological changes were not detailed, but patterns of damage were reported to be  
11 similar to those observed following i.p. administration (see Section 4.4.1). Additional  
12 information on the design and results of the oral study were not provided.

13  
14 Another gavage study reported that the minimum lethal dose of a saline extract of freeze-  
15 dried *C. raciborskii* cells (strain AWT 205) in Swiss mice was 2500 mg extract/kg (Falconer and  
16 Humpage, 2001). Based on a reported cylindrospermopsin content of 5.5 mg/g extract, the  
17 equivalent dose of cylindrospermopsin was 13.8 mg/kg.

18  
19 Groups of four Quackenbush mice were administered a cell-free extract of freeze-dried  
20 and sonicated *C. raciborskii* cells (strain AWT 205) in water in a single gavage dose of 0, 1, 2, 4,  
21 6 or 8 mg cylindrospermopsin/kg and observed for the following 7 days (Shaw et al., 2000,  
22 2001). All animals were evaluated for gross pathological and histological (liver, kidney, spleen,  
23 heart, lungs and thymus) changes. Hepatic effects were observed at all dose levels, as shown by  
24 foamy hepatocellular cytoplasmic changes at 1 and 2 mg/kg, lipid infiltration with some  
25 hepatocyte necrosis in the periacinar region at 4 mg/kg, and uniformly pale and mottled livers  
26 with lipid infiltration throughout and cell necrosis mainly in the periacinar region at 6 mg/kg.  
27 Mortality occurred in 2/4 mice at 6 mg/kg (in 5 days) and 4/4 mice at 8 mg/kg (in 24-48 hours).  
28 Additional information on the experimental design and results was not reported.

#### 29 30 **4.2.1.2. Short-Term Studies**

##### 31 32 **4.2.1.2.1. Studies of Purified Cylindrospermopsin**

33  
34 Groups of four Quackenbush mice were administered purified cylindrospermopsin by  
35 daily gavage for 14 days (Shaw et al., 2000, 2001). The cylindrospermopsin was purified (purity  
36 not reported) from an extract of freeze-dried *C. raciborskii* cells (strain AWT 205). All animals  
37 were evaluated for gross pathological and histological (liver, kidney, spleen, heart, lungs and  
38 thymus) changes. The authors identified the following effect levels: a NOAEL of 0.05 mg  
39 cylindrospermopsin/kg-day and a LOAEL of 0.15 mg cylindrospermopsin/kg-day for lipid  
40 infiltration in the liver, and a NOAEL of 0.3 mg cylindrospermopsin/kg-day (highest tested dose)  
41 for lymphophagocytosis in the spleen. Additional information on the experimental design and  
42 results was not reported.

1           **4.2.1.2.2. Cell Extract Studies**

2  
3           Groups of four Quackenbush mice were administered an aqueous cell-free extract of  
4 freeze-dried and sonicated *C. raciborskii* cells (strain AWT 205) by daily gavage for 14 days  
5 (Shaw et al., 2000, 2001). All animals were evaluated for gross pathological and histological  
6 (liver, kidney, spleen, heart, lungs and thymus) changes. The authors identified the following  
7 effect levels: a NOAEL of 0.05 mg cylindrospermopsin/kg-day and a LOAEL of 0.15 mg  
8 cylindrospermopsin/kg-day for lipid infiltration in the liver, and a LOAEL of 0.05 mg  
9 cylindrospermopsin/kg-day for lymphophagocytosis in the spleen. Additional information on the  
10 experimental design and results was not reported.

11  
12           **4.2.1.2.3. Other Studies**

13  
14           Six Quackenbush mice and two Wistar rats were exposed for 21 days to drinking water  
15 containing 800 µg/L cylindrospermopsin (Shaw et al., 2000, 2001). The water was “sourced”  
16 from a dammed impoundment. The reported approximate daily dose based on water  
17 consumption was 0.2 mg cylindrospermopsin/kg-day in both species. Gross pathological and  
18 histological (liver, kidney, spleen, heart, lungs and thymus) examinations showed no effects,  
19 indicating that 0.2 mg/kg-day was a NOAEL in the rats and mice. Additional information on the  
20 experimental design and results was not reported.

21  
22           **4.2.1.3. Subchronic Studies**

23  
24           **4.2.1.3.1. Studies of Purified Cylindrospermopsin**

25  
26           Groups of male Swiss albino mice (10 per dose, 6 in the highest dose group) were  
27 administered purified cylindrospermopsin in water by gavage in doses of 0, 30, 60, 120 or 240  
28 µg/kg-day for 11 weeks (Humpage and Falconer, 2003). The cylindrospermopsin was purified  
29 (purity not reported) from an extract of freeze-dried *C. raciborskii* cells (strain AWT 205).  
30 Endpoints monitored throughout the study included food and water consumption and body  
31 weight. A clinical examination that focused on physiological and behavioral signs of toxicity  
32 was conducted after 9 weeks of exposure. Hematology (all animals; red cell counts, hemoglobin,  
33 packed cell volume, and white cell total and differential counts), serum chemistry (five  
34 mice/group except all six mice at the high dose; total protein, albumin, globulin, glucose,  
35 creatinine, urea, total bilirubin, total bile acids, cholesterol, triglycerides, sodium, potassium,  
36 calcium, bicarbonate, creatinine kinase, alanine and aspartate aminotransferases [ALT and AST,  
37 respectively], and alkaline phosphatase) and urine (five mice/group excluding high dose; specific  
38 gravity, protein, glucose, ketones, creatinine, sodium, potassium, chloride, calcium, bicarbonate,  
39 phosphate, pH, volume and presence of blood ) evaluations were performed near or at the end of  
40 the treatment period. Postmortem examinations included organ weights (liver, spleen, kidneys,  
41 adrenal glands, heart, testis, epididymis and brain) and comprehensive histological evaluations.  
42 The histological examinations were conducted in accordance with Organization for Economic  
43 Cooperation and Development recommendations and performed on the following tissues: liver,  
44 kidney, heart, lungs, thymus, thyroid, trachea, salivary glands, adrenal glands, epididymis, testis,  
45 prostate, gall bladder, esophagus, stomach, duodenum/small intestine, large intestine, pancreas,

1 spleen, urinary bladder, eyes, lymph nodes, aorta, cerebrum, cerebellum, spinal cord (cervical,  
2 thoracic and lumbar) and peripheral nerve.

3  
4 No deaths were reported. The mean final body weight was 7-15% higher than controls in  
5 all dose groups, but the increases were not dose-related and were statistically significant only at  
6 30 and 60  $\mu\text{g}/\text{kg}\text{-day}$  (Humpage and Falconer, 2003). There were no significant changes in food  
7 consumption; however, water intake was significantly reduced in all dose groups (data not  
8 reported). Relative kidney weight was increased in a significant, dose-related manner beginning  
9 at 60  $\mu\text{g}/\text{kg}\text{-day}$  (12-23% greater than controls), while relative liver weight was significantly  
10 increased only at the high dose of 240  $\mu\text{g}/\text{kg}\text{-day}$  (13% greater than controls). Information on  
11 absolute kidney and liver weights was not reported. Absolute testis weights were significantly  
12 increased at  $\geq 60$   $\mu\text{g}/\text{kg}\text{-day}$  (data not reported), but these changes were not significant when  
13 normalized to body weight. The hematology, serum chemistry and urine evaluations showed no  
14 clear exposure-related changes in any endpoint (including serum indicators of liver injury),  
15 except for significant decreases in urine protein concentrations (g/mmol creatinine) at  $\geq 120$   
16  $\mu\text{g}/\text{kg}\text{-day}$  and urine specific gravity at 240  $\mu\text{g}/\text{kg}\text{-day}$  (data presented graphically). The  
17 postmortem examinations showed “minor increases in histopathological damage to the liver” at  
18  $\geq 120$   $\mu\text{g}/\text{kg}\text{-day}$  and proximal renal tubular damage at 240  $\mu\text{g}/\text{kg}\text{-day}$ , but additional information  
19 regarding the type, severity and incidences of the liver and kidney lesions was not reported.

20  
21 Cylindrospermopsin is known to inhibit protein synthesis in the liver (see Section 4.5.1).  
22 Serum albumin, a major product of liver protein synthesis, was not decreased in this study  
23 (Humpage and Falconer, 2003), but the most sensitive effects, decreased urinary protein at  $\geq 120$   
24  $\mu\text{g}/\text{kg}\text{-day}$  and increased relative kidney weight at  $\geq 60$   $\mu\text{g}/\text{kg}\text{-day}$ , are both potential indicators of  
25 suppressed protein synthesis. As hypothesized by the authors, the decrease in urinary protein is  
26 consistent with decreased availability of protein and the increase in kidney weight may reflect a  
27 compensatory hyperplasia, such that the kidney, as a protein-synthesizing organ, is stimulated to  
28 grow in an attempt to maintain homeostasis in response to a chemically-induced decrease in  
29 protein synthesis. Information supporting the hypothesis that the decrease in urinary protein  
30 excretion reflects a specific effect of cylindrospermopsin on protein synthesis, as well as the  
31 possibility that it reflects a functional change in the nephron, is discussed in Section 4.5.2.  
32 Because the renal effects observed by Humpage and Falconer (2003) are consistent with a known  
33 mode of action of cylindrospermopsin, and plausibly represent part of the progression of effects  
34 leading to toxicity (Section 4.5.2), they are considered to be adverse. This study, therefore,  
35 identifies a NOAEL and LOAEL of 30 and 60  $\mu\text{g}/\text{kg}\text{-day}$ , respectively.

#### 36 37 **4.2.1.3.2. Cell Extract Studies**

38  
39 Groups of male Swiss albino mice (10 per dose except 12 controls and 5 at high-dose)  
40 were exposed to a cell-free extract of sonicated and frozen *C. raciborskii* cells (strain AWT 205)  
41 in the drinking water at reported cylindrospermopsin doses of 0, 216, 432 or 657  $\mu\text{g}/\text{kg}\text{-day}$  for  
42 10 weeks (doses based on actual water consumption) (Humpage and Falconer, 2003). Food and  
43 water consumption and body weight were measured throughout the study. Urinalyses (12  
44 unspecified parameters) were performed after 5 and 10 weeks. Serum chemistry (15 unspecified  
45 parameters) evaluations and examinations of unspecified major organs (organ weight, gross

1 pathology and histopathology) were performed at the end of the exposure period. Hematology  
2 was not evaluated.

3  
4 Final body weights were significantly reduced at 432 and 657  $\mu\text{g}/\text{kg}\text{-day}$  (9 and 7% less  
5 than controls, respectively), and relative liver and kidney weights were significantly increased in  
6 a dose-related manner at 216-657  $\mu\text{g}/\text{kg}\text{-day}$  (27-47 and 30-43% greater than controls,  
7 respectively). Other statistically significant effects included increased serum total bilirubin at  
8  $\geq 216 \mu\text{g}/\text{kg}\text{-day}$ , decreased serum total bile acids at  $\geq 216 \mu\text{g}/\text{kg}\text{-day}$  and decreased urine protein  
9 concentration (g/mmol creatinine) at  $\geq 432 \mu\text{g}/\text{kg}\text{-day}$ . There were no clear exposure-related  
10 changes in any other serum or urine endpoints and no additional indicators of liver or kidney  
11 injury. Results of the postmortem pathology examinations were not reported. The low dose of  
12 216  $\mu\text{g}/\text{kg}\text{-day}$  is a LOAEL for this study, based on increased relative liver and kidney weights,  
13 increased serum bilirubin and decreased serum bile acids. An increase in serum bilirubin is  
14 indicative of liver dysfunction or bile duct blockage as it reflects the ability of the liver to take  
15 up, process and secrete bilirubin into the bile. Serum bile acids can be decreased due to an  
16 inhibition of bile acid synthesis or an interference with bile acid resorption in the gastrointestinal  
17 tract; bile acids are synthesized from cholesterol in the liver, conjugated, excreted in the bile and  
18 resorbed in the ileum.

19  
20 Quackenbush mice were administered drinking water containing a cell-free extract of  
21 freeze-dried and sonicated *C. raciborskii* cells (strain AWT 205) for 90 days (Shaw et al., 2000,  
22 2001). Gross pathological and histological (liver, kidney, spleen, heart, lungs and thymus)  
23 examinations showed no effects at dose levels as high as 0.15 mg cylindrospermopsin/kg-day  
24 (the highest tested dose), indicating that a NOAEL of 0.15 mg/kg-day was identified. Additional  
25 information on the experimental design and results was not reported. The 0.15 mg/kg-day  
26 NOAEL in Quackenbush mice is only slightly below the 216  $\mu\text{g}/\text{kg}\text{-day}$  (0.22 mg/kg-day)  
27 LOAEL for liver and kidney effects in the 10-week study with Swiss mice summarized above  
28 (Humpage and Falconer, 2003); however, the LOAEL is based on different measured endpoints  
29 (liver and kidney weights, serum bilirubin and serum bile acids) than the NOAEL  
30 (histopathology).

#### 31 32 **4.2.1.4. Chronic Studies**

33  
34 No information regarding the chronic oral toxicity of cylindrospermopsin was identified  
35 in the materials reviewed for this document.

#### 36 37 **4.2.2. Inhalation Exposure**

38  
39 No information regarding the inhalation toxicity of cylindrospermopsin was identified in  
40 the materials reviewed for this document.

### 41 42 **4.3. REPRODUCTIVE/DEVELOPMENTAL STUDIES - ORAL AND INHALATION**

43  
44 No information regarding the reproductive or developmental toxicity of  
45 cylindrospermopsin was identified in the materials reviewed for this document.



## 4.4. OTHER STUDIES

### 4.4.1. Effects By Parenteral Exposure.

#### 4.4.1.1. Studies of Purified Cyndrospermopsin

Acute lethality values have been determined for cyndrospermopsin purified from extracts of cultured *C. raciborskii* or *U. natans* cells (Ohtani et al., 1992; Shaw et al., 2000, 2001; Terao et al., 1994). In male CH3 mice, 24-hour and 5- to 6-day LD<sub>50</sub> values of 2.1 and 0.2 mg/kg, respectively, have been reported for a single i.p. dose of purified cyndrospermopsin (purity not reported) (Ohtani et al., 1992). Another study found that a single 0.2 mg/kg i.p. dose of purified cyndrospermopsin (purity not reported) caused 50% moribundity after 31 hours in Quackenbush mice (Shaw et al., 2000, 2001). The main pathological findings in the moribund animals were lipid infiltration and cell necrosis in the liver. Terao et al. (1994) also found that the liver was the main target of toxicity in male ICR mice administered a single 0.2 mg/kg i.p. dose of purified cyndrospermopsin (purity not reported), although treatment-related lesions were additionally noted in the thymus, kidney and heart. A time series of ultrastructural tissue examinations indicated four sequential phases of liver changes: inhibition of protein synthesis, membrane proliferation, fat droplet accumulation and cell death.

#### 4.4.1.2. Cell Extract Studies

The results of acute i.p. studies of extracts of freeze-dried and sonicated *C. raciborskii* cells are generally similar to those of the i.p. studies of purified cyndrospermopsin. A single 0.2 mg/kg cyndrospermopsin-equivalent dose caused 50% moribundity in Quackenbush mice after 98 hours (Shaw et al., 2000, 2001). Other single-dose LD<sub>50</sub> values, expressed as cyndrospermopsin-equivalent doses, included 24-hour and 7-day values of 0.29 and 0.18 mg/kg, respectively, in male Swiss mice (Hawkins et al., 1997). This 24-hour LD<sub>50</sub> was lower than the 24-hour i.p. LD<sub>50</sub> of 2.1 mg/kg for purified cyndrospermopsin in mice (Ohtani et al., 1992), leading the authors to suggest that the extract contained more than one toxin. The liver was the main target organ in the extract studies, although lesions also occurred in other tissues, including kidney, adrenal gland, lung and intestine (Hawkins et al., 1985, 1997; Shaw et al., 2000, 2001).

A single dose i.p. LD<sub>50</sub> value of 64 mg freeze-dried culture/kg was determined in mice observed for 24 hours (Hawkins et al., 1985). Falconer et al. (1999) assessed the acute lethality and liver and kidney effects of four different batches of cell-free extracts of sonicated freeze-dried *C. raciborskii* cells in male Swiss albino mice treated by single i.p. injection. Reported 24-hour and 7-day LD<sub>50</sub> values for the four batches were 50-110 and 20-65 mg extract/kg, respectively. The cyndrospermopsin content in the four batches varied from 1.3 to 5.4 mg/g extract, indicating that the cyndrospermopsin-equivalent LD<sub>50</sub> values were 0.07-0.6 mg/kg (24-hour) and 0.03-0.4 mg/kg (7-day). Liver damage was characterized by cellular vacuolation, intercellular spaces and darker nuclear and cytoplasmic staining. Kidney damage included proximal tubule epithelial necrosis and presence of proteinaceous material in the distal tubules. There was no clear correlation between cyndrospermopsin batch concentration and the LD<sub>50</sub>

1 values or severity of liver or kidney lesions, leading the study authors to suggest that more than  
2 one toxin was present in the extract.

#### 3 4 **4.4.2. Immunotoxicity**

5  
6 No information was located regarding effects of cylindrospermopsin on immune  
7 function, although immune system tissues appear to be a target of short-term, high-level  
8 exposures. Massive necrosis of lymphocytes occurred in the cortical layer of the thymus of male  
9 ICR mice given a single 0.2 mg/kg i.p. dose of cylindrospermopsin purified (purity not reported)  
10 from cultured *U. natans* cells (Terao et al., 1994). Effects observed in MF1 mice administered a  
11 single gavage dose of a suspension of freeze-dried *C. raciborskii* cells, in the lethal dose range of  
12 4.4-8.3 mg cylindrospermopsin/kg, included atrophy in lymphoid tissue of the spleen (follicular  
13 lymphocyte loss due to lymphophagocytosis) and thymus (degeneration and necrosis of cortical  
14 lymphocytes) (Seawright et al., 1999). These effects were considered by the study authors to be  
15 normal responses of the immune system to the stress of severe intoxication. Lympho-  
16 phagocytosis was observed in the spleen of Quackenbush mice exposed to a cell-free extract of  
17 freeze-dried and sonicated *C. raciborskii* cells by gavage at a nonlethal dose level of 0.05 mg  
18 cylindrospermopsin/kg-day for 14 days (Shaw et al., 2000, 2001).

#### 19 20 **4.4.3. Tumor Initiation**

21  
22 The tumor initiating activity of cylindrospermopsin was tested in male Swiss mice using  
23 O-tetradecanoylphorbol 13-acetate (TPA) as the promoter (Falconer and Humpage, 2001). Mice  
24 were administered a gavage dose of saline (27 mice) or 500 mg/kg of a saline extract of freeze-  
25 dried *C. raciborskii* cells (strain AWT 205) (34 mice) every other week for three doses. Other  
26 groups received a single dose of 1500 mg extract/kg (14 mice) or two doses of 1500 mg  
27 extract/kg separated by 2 weeks (17 mice). Most (70%) of the 2 x 1500 mg extract/kg group  
28 died within 1 week of the second dose, leaving five survivors for use in the rest of the study.  
29 Based on a reported cylindrospermopsin content of 5.5 mg/g extract, the cylindrospermopsin-  
30 equivalent doses in the 500 and 1500 mg extract/kg groups were 2.75 and 8.25 mg/kg,  
31 respectively. Two weeks after the final dose, the saline and 500 mg extract/kg groups were  
32 divided into subgroups of 13-18 mice that were fed liquid food containing TPA dissolved in  
33 DMSO, or food containing DMSO alone, for 24 hours twice weekly for 30 weeks. All of the  
34 mice in both 1500 mg extract/kg groups were similarly exposed to TPA-containing liquid food  
35 (no 1500 mg/kg mice were exposed to food containing DMSO alone). Histological examinations  
36 of the liver, kidneys, spleen and grossly abnormal organs were performed on all groups at the  
37 end of the 30-week promotion period. Neoplastic changes were found in none of the 27 control  
38 mice and in a total of 5 cylindrospermopsin-treated mice, a difference that was not statistically  
39 significant. There was no pattern to the neoplastic changes, as they occurred in different animals,  
40 target organs and treatment groups, as detailed in Table 4-1.

Table 4-1. Tumor Initiating Activity of <i>C. raciborskii</i> Extracts		
Oral Treatment (mg extract/kg)	Number of Mice	Histological Finding*
Saline/DMSO	14	No neoplasia observed
Saline/TPA	13	No neoplasia observed
3 x 500/DMSO	18	1 hepatocellular carcinoma 1 lymphoma
3 x 500/TPA	16	No neoplasia observed
1 x 1500/TPA	14	2 hepatocellular dysplastic foci 1 fibroblastic osteosarcoma
2 x 1500/TPA	5	No neoplasia observed

\* All findings were in different animals  
Source: Falconer and Humpage (2001)

#### 4.4.4. Genotoxicity

Purified cylindrospermopsin caused an increase in the frequency of micronuclei in the human lymphoblastoid cell line WIL2-NS (Humpage et al., 2000). Both centromere-positive and centromere-negative micronuclei were induced, suggesting that whole chromosome loss, as well as DNA strand breaks, contributed to the *in vitro* cytogenetic damage. DNA strand breakage was also observed in the liver of Balb/c mice following a single 0.2 mg/kg i.p. dose of purified cylindrospermopsin (Shen et al., 2002). Covalent binding of cylindrospermopsin or a metabolite to DNA (adduct not identified) was detected in the liver of Quackenbush mice given a single i.p. injection of a cell-free extract of *C. raciborskii* (dose levels not reported) (Shaw et al., 2000). Purified cylindrospermopsin caused cell growth inhibition and altered cell morphology, but no apoptosis or DNA strand breaks, in Chinese hamster ovary K1 cells *in vitro* (Fessard and Bernard, 2003).

#### 4.5. MECHANISTIC DATA AND OTHER STUDIES IN SUPPORT OF THE MODE OF ACTION

##### 4.5.1. Liver Toxicity

The liver is widely regarded as the main target of cylindrospermopsin toxicity, and consequently, most mechanistic studies have assessed hepatic endpoints. The specific mechanism for the liver toxicity is not clearly understood, although it has generally been considered to involve cylindrospermopsin-induced inhibition of protein synthesis.

1 Cylindrospermopsin was shown to be a potent inhibitor of protein synthesis in an *in vitro* rabbit  
2 reticulocyte globin synthesis assay (Terao et al., 1994). Ultrastructural liver changes in mice  
3 treated with a single 0.2 mg/kg i.p. dose of purified cylindrospermopsin had features in common  
4 with those dosed with the protein synthesis inhibitor cycloheximide, particularly detachment of  
5 ribosomes from the rough endoplasmic reticulum, suggesting that protein synthesis inhibition  
6 plays a role in cylindrospermopsin hepatotoxicity *in vivo* (Terao et al., 1994). However, unlike  
7 the liver in the cycloheximide-dosed mice, the liver of those treated with cylindrospermopsin  
8 showed membrane proliferation, fat droplet accumulation and reduced amount of total P450 in  
9 microsomes, indicating that mechanisms other than protein synthesis inhibition must also  
10 contribute to cylindrospermopsin toxicity.

11  
12 Cylindrospermopsin-induced depletion of mouse hepatic glutathione was demonstrated *in*  
13 *vivo* (Norris et al., 2002), although the study authors did not consider the effect to be of sufficient  
14 magnitude to represent the primary mechanism of cylindrospermopsin toxicity.

15 Cylindrospermopsin also caused decreased glutathione levels, as well as decreased synthesis of  
16 glutathione and protein, in cultured rat hepatocytes (Runnegar et al., 1994, 1995, 2002).  
17 Inhibition of glutathione synthesis was the predominant mechanism for the reduction in  
18 glutathione; other mechanisms, including increased consumption of glutathione, increased  
19 formation of oxidized glutathione, increased glutathione efflux, hidden forms of glutathione,  
20 decreased glutathione precursor availability and decreased cellular ATP were effectively ruled  
21 out (Runnegar et al., 1995). Glutathione depletion occurred at non-toxic cylindrospermopsin  
22 concentrations and preceded the onset of observable toxicity at higher concentrations (Runnegar  
23 et al., 1994). Pretreatment with the CYP450 inhibitor,  $\alpha$ -naphthoflavone, partially protected  
24 against cytotoxicity and cellular glutathione depletion, indicating involvement of the CYP450  
25 enzyme system in cylindrospermopsin metabolism and that one or more metabolites might be  
26 more active than the parent compound in inhibiting glutathione synthesis (Runnegar et al., 1995).  
27 *In vitro* studies in mouse hepatocytes provided no indication that reductions in glutathione levels  
28 by cylindrospermopsin led to increased levels of reactive oxygen species (ROS) (Humpage et al.,  
29 2005).

30  
31 Cylindrospermopsin induced time- and concentration-dependent toxicity and inhibition of  
32 protein synthesis in hepatocytes isolated from male Swiss mice (Froscio et al., 2003). The  
33 broad-spectrum CYP450 inhibitors proadifen (SKF525A) and ketoconazole diminished the  
34 induction of cytotoxicity by cylindrospermopsin, but did not diminish the inhibition of protein  
35 synthesis. These findings suggest that the cytotoxic effects of cylindrospermopsin might be  
36 linked more to CYP450-mediated bioactivation than to inhibition of protein synthesis by the  
37 parent compound. Similarly, pretreatment of male Quackenbush mice with the broad-spectrum  
38 CYP450 inhibitor piperonyl butoxide protected against the acute lethality of cylindrospermopsin  
39 (Norris et al., 2002). In a study using inhibitors of specific CYP450 isoforms, furafylline  
40 (CYP1A2) and omeprazole (CYP3A4 and CYP2C19) protected against cylindrospermopsin  
41 cytotoxicity in an *in vitro* mouse hepatocyte system; unspecified inhibitors of CYPs 2A6, 2D6  
42 and 2E1 were not found to be cytoprotective (Humpage et al., 2005). Additional support for the  
43 involvement of CYP450 in the hepatotoxicity of cylindrospermopsin is the finding that liver  
44 histopathology is mainly induced in the region (periacinar) where CYP450-catalyzed xenobiotic  
45 metabolism occurs (Shaw et al., 2000, 2001).

## 4.5.2. Kidney Toxicity

No studies were located that specifically investigated the involvement of protein synthesis inhibition or other modes of action in cylindrospermopsin-induced toxicity in the kidney or other non-hepatic target tissues (e.g., spleen and thymus). As detailed in Section 4.2.1.3.1, the kidney was the most sensitive target in mice that were exposed to cylindrospermopsin by daily gavage for 11 weeks (Humpage and Falconer, 2003). Renal effects in the mice included increased relative kidney weight at  $\geq 60$   $\mu\text{g}/\text{kg}\text{-day}$ , decreased urinary protein at  $\geq 120$   $\mu\text{g}/\text{kg}\text{-day}$  and decreased urine specific gravity and proximal renal tubular lesions at 240  $\mu\text{g}/\text{kg}\text{-day}$ . The authors hypothesized that the decrease in urinary protein is consistent with decreased availability of protein and that the increase in kidney weight may reflect a compensatory hyperplasia, such that the kidney, as a protein-synthesizing organ, is stimulated to grow in an attempt to maintain homeostasis in response to a cylindrospermopsin-related decrease in protein synthesis. Information supporting the hypothesis that the decrease in urinary protein excretion reflects a specific effect of cylindrospermopsin on protein synthesis, as well as the possibility that it reflects a functional change in the nephron, is discussed below. Also discussed is evidence suggesting a dose-severity progression of kidney effects.

Potential mechanisms for a decrease in urinary protein include a decrease in glomerular filtration (i.e., filtered load) of protein, an increase in resorption of filtered protein and a decrease in secretion of nephrogenic protein. A decrease in glomerular filtration of protein (e.g.,  $\mu\text{g}$  protein/day) could result from a decrease in serum protein concentration or a decrease in glomerular filtration rate (mL/day, GFR). The predominant serum protein in urine of healthy animals (e.g., mice, rats and humans) is albumin (~50% of serum proteins in urine). In the Humpage and Falconer (2003) study, serum albumin concentration increased in mice exposed to cylindrospermopsin, and serum creatinine (a marker of GFR) apparently was unchanged; it was measured but not discussed in the results. Therefore, it is unlikely that glomerular filtration of serum proteins decreased in response to cylindrospermopsin (if a change occurred, it is likely to have been an increase in the rate of filtration of albumin). Furthermore, serum proteins normally account for approximately 15% of total urinary protein (Pesce and First, 1979). The decrease in urinary excretion of protein observed in Humpage and Falconer (2003) was substantially larger than this (~50%), indicating that the decrease in urinary protein cannot derive solely from a decrease in excretion (i.e., glomerular filtration) of serum proteins.

No information is presented in Humpage and Falconer (2003) that would allow an assessment of tubular resorption of filtered protein (e.g., plasma-to-urine clearance of protein, excretion of low-molecular weight proteins such as  $\beta_2\mu$ globulin or retinal binding protein).

In healthy mammals, the dominant protein in urine (~50%) is the nephrogenic Tamm-Horsfall protein (THP, uromucoid) (Bachmann et al., 1991, 2005). In the absence of a decrease in filtration or increased resorption of filtered serum protein, the substantial decrease in urinary protein (i.e., ~50%) observed by Humpage and Falconer (2003) would almost certainly have to involve decreased excretion of THP, since it is the predominant protein in urine. Although there are numerous possible mechanisms for an acute change in THP excretion (Bachman et al., 1991), long-term maintenance of lower (i.e., steady-state) rate of urinary excretion of THP requires a decreased rate of synthesis of THP (Bachman et al., 1991, 2005; Schoel and Pfeleiderer, 1987).

1 THP is synthesized exclusively in the thick ascending limb of the loop of Henle (TAL);  
2 therefore, a sustained change in THP excretion is likely to reflect a functional change in this  
3 region of the nephron. Increases and decreases in THP have been observed in various kidney  
4 diseases, and in association with experimental treatments that induce hypertrophy of the TAL,  
5 including increased dietary protein (Bachmann et al., 1991). Depletion of THP from the kidney  
6 may, in itself, be adverse. Mice deficient in THP (i.e., THP knockout mice) display impaired  
7 urine concentrating ability, up-regulation of distal nephron electrolyte transport proteins and  
8 increased susceptibility to urinary tract infections (Bachmann et al., 2005; Bates et al., 2004).  
9 The decrease in urine specific gravity in animals exposed to cylindrospermopsin in the Humpage  
10 and Falconer (2003) study may be indicative of impaired urine concentrating ability and,  
11 possibly, related to impaired function of the TAL (i.e., impairment of transport activity in this  
12 region of the nephron impairs urine concentrating ability) and/or decreased synthesis of THP.  
13

14 Additional kidney effects in the Humpage and Falconer (2003) mouse study included  
15 proximal renal tubular damage (type and severity of lesions not reported) at the high dose.  
16 Clinical effects in the Palm Island outbreak in which humans apparently ingested drinking water  
17 containing elevated levels of cylindrospermopsin included renal damage, as indicated by loss of  
18 water, electrolytes, proteins, ketones and carbohydrates (Blyth, 1980; Griffiths and Saker, 2003)  
19 (Section 4.1). Proteinuria would be expected with proximal tubular damage, as this is the site of  
20 resorption of filtered protein. Proteinuria was not observed by Humpage and Falconer (2003),  
21 but information on the type and severity of the tubular damage was not reported. Proteinuria did  
22 occur in the humans, although other mechanisms could have caused it (e.g., glomerular injury  
23 will produce high molecular weight proteinuria). The evidence for proximal tubular damage and  
24 functional impairment (e.g., proteinuria, glucosuria) together strengthen the argument that the  
25 kidney is a target of cylindrospermopsin and, when considered with decreased protein excretion  
26 at lower doses, suggests a dose-severity progression.  
27

#### 28 **4.5.3. Interactions with DNA and RNA**

29

30 Based on structural characteristics of cylindrospermopsin (its nucleoside structure and  
31 potentially reactive guanidine and sulfate groups), it has been speculated that cylindrospermopsin  
32 may exert its toxic effects via pathways that include reactions with DNA and/or RNA (see  
33 Humpage et al., 2000; Shen et al., 2002). Covalent binding between DNA and  
34 cylindrospermopsin, or a metabolite, occurred in mouse liver *in vivo* (Shaw et al., 2000). DNA  
35 adducts were detected, but not identified, using the <sup>32</sup>P-postlabeling assay; this involved  
36 extraction of the DNA, hydrolysis into individual nucleotides, labeling of the nucleotides using  
37 <sup>32</sup>P-ATP, separation of adducted nucleotides using two-dimensional thin layer chromatography  
38 and visualization of adduct spots by autoradiography. Cylindrospermopsin also induced DNA  
39 strand breakage in mouse liver *in vivo* (Shen et al., 2002) and increases in micronuclei occurred  
40 in treated binucleated cells of the WIL2-NS lymphoblastoid cell-line (Humpage et al., 2000).  
41 Two mechanisms were suggested for causing the cytogenetic damage: one at the level of DNA to  
42 induce strand breaks and the other at the level of kinetochore/spindle function to induce loss of  
43 whole chromosomes (Humpage et al., 2000; Shen et al., 2002). The broad-spectrum CYP450  
44 inhibitors omeprazole and SKF525A inhibited cylindrospermopsin-induced DNA damage in  
45 primary cultured mouse hepatocytes at subcytotoxic concentrations, suggesting that CYP-derived

1 metabolites are responsible for cylindrospermopsin genotoxicity and that genotoxicity is a  
2 primary effect of the chemical (Humpage et al., 2005).

3  
4 Cylindrospermopsin-induced up-regulation of the tissue transglutaminase (tTGase) gene  
5 was demonstrated in liver RNA of Balb/c mice following i.p. injection of a single 100 µg/kg  
6 dose of cylindrospermopsin (Shen et al., 2003). tTGase is a unique member of the TGase (EC  
7 2.3.2.13) family that catalyzes the post-translational modification of proteins via Ca<sup>2+</sup>-dependent  
8 cross-linking reactions (Shen et al., 2003). The up-regulation of tTGase can lead to liver injury  
9 (Grenard et al., 2001; Mirza et al., 1997), and has been implicated in diverse biological  
10 processes, such as induction of apoptosis (Piacentini et al., 2002; Zhang et al., 1995), cell death  
11 and differentiation (Shen et al., 2003; Fesus et al., 1987) and adhesion and morphological  
12 changes of cells (Shen et al., 2003; Akimov and Belkin, 2001).

#### 13 14 **4.5.4. Structure-Activity Relationships**

15  
16 Natural cylindrospermopsin, synthetic (racemic) cylindrospermopsin and selected  
17 synthetically-produced cylindrospermopsin structural analogues were assessed for effects on  
18 protein synthesis in both the rabbit reticulocyte lysate system and cultured rat hepatocytes  
19 (Runnegar et al., 2002). No significant differences were observed in levels of protein synthesis  
20 inhibition elicited by natural cylindrospermopsin and its diol analogue, indicating that the sulfate  
21 group might not be a necessary component of cylindrospermopsin-induced protein synthesis  
22 inhibition. Additionally, the orientation of the hydroxyl group at C7 in the carbon bridge does  
23 not appear to be important, since the C7 epimer of cylindrospermopsin and its corresponding diol  
24 exhibited protein synthesis inhibition similar to that elicited by synthetic (racemic)  
25 cylindrospermopsin. The cyclopentyl ring and the methyl and hydroxyl groups on the adjacent  
26 hexyl ring may be important structural features, because the analogue lacking these features was  
27 500-1000-fold less effective in the inhibition of protein synthesis.

28  
29 The uracil portion of cylindrospermopsin appears to play an important role in  
30 cylindrospermopsin toxicity. Banker et al. (2001) found that the acute lethality of  
31 cylindrospermopsin to mice was eliminated by chlorination or partial cleavage of the uracil  
32 moiety (resulting in 5-chloro-cylindrospermopsin and cylindrospermic acid, respectively), as  
33 shown by a 5-day i.p. LD<sub>50</sub> value of 0.2 mg/kg for cylindrospermopsin and 10-day i.p. LD<sub>50</sub>  
34 values of >10 mg/kg for 5-chloro-cylindrospermopsin and >10 mg/kg for cylindrospermic acid.

35  
36 Deoxycylindrospermopsin, an analogue of cylindrospermopsin isolated and purified from  
37 *C. raciborskii*, was tested for toxicity in male white Quackenbush mice treated by i.p. injection  
38 (Norris et al., 1999). Deoxycylindrospermopsin did not appear to be toxic during 5 days  
39 following administration of a 0.8 mg/kg dose, whereas Ohtani et al. (1992) reported a 5- to 6-day  
40 i.p. LD<sub>50</sub> value of 0.2 mg/kg for cylindrospermopsin in male CD3 mice. Although this  
41 comparison suggests that deoxycylindrospermopsin is significantly less toxic than  
42 cylindrospermopsin, differences in study designs (e.g., the use of different strains of mice) could  
43 have contributed to the difference in toxicity.

## 4.6. SYNTHESIS AND EVALUATION OF MAJOR NONCANCER EFFECTS

### 4.6.1. Oral

Information on the health effects of cylindrospermopsin in humans is limited to observations on the Australian Palm Island poisoning incident that involved acute and/or short-term drinking water exposure to *C. raciborskii*, a non-infectious cyanobacterium (Blyth, 1980; Griffiths and Saker, 2003). The clinical picture of the illness is well-defined and includes fever, headache, vomiting, bloody diarrhea, hepatomegaly and kidney damage with loss of water, electrolytes and protein, but no data are available on exposure levels of cylindrospermopsin that induced these effects.

The preponderance of information on noncancer effects of cylindrospermopsin in animals is available from oral and i.p. administration studies in mice that were exposed to purified compound or extracts of *C. raciborskii* cells. These studies indicate that the liver and kidneys are main targets of toxicity and that cylindrospermopsin also causes significant lesions in other organs, particularly the spleen and thymus. Considering both animal and human kidney data, the evidence suggests a dose-severity progression of renal effects ranging from decreased protein synthesis at low doses to functional impairment at high doses. The cell extract studies provide limited dose-response information for cylindrospermopsin because concentrations vary between cultures and strains and, in some cases, may contain other toxins, as discussed in the introduction to Section 4.2. The available oral toxicity studies of purified cylindrospermopsin are summarized in Table 4-2.

No studies have been performed assessing the acute oral toxicity of purified cylindrospermopsin. Studies in which mice were administered single gavage doses of suspensions or cell-free extracts of *C. raciborskii* cells at near-lethal to lethal levels found severe damage to the liver (fatty and necrotic changes), kidneys (acute tubular necrosis), spleen and thymus (atrophy of lymphoid tissue), heart (hemorrhages) and gastric mucosa (ulceration of the esophageal section) (Falconer et al., 1999; Seawright et al., 1999; Shaw et al., 2000, 2001).

A limited amount of information on the short-term oral toxicity of cylindrospermopsin is available from inadequately reported 14- and 21-day studies.

Histological examinations of small numbers of mice that were administered daily gavage doses of purified cylindrospermopsin for 14 days showed effects in the liver (fatty infiltration) and spleen (lymphophagocytosis) (Shaw et al., 2000, 2001). Fatty infiltration in the liver was the more sensitive effect based on a reported NOAEL of 0.05 mg/kg-day and LOAEL of 0.15 mg/kg-day. Small numbers of mice and rats were exposed to cylindrospermopsin for 21 days in drinking water from a dammed impoundment at a reported approximate dose of 0.2 mg/kg-day (Shaw et al., 2000, 2001). No histopathological changes were noted, indicating a NOAEL of 0.2 mg/kg-day in drinking water. The adequacy of the 14- and 21-day effect levels cannot be assessed due to a lack of any additional reported information on the design and results of these studies.



Table 4-2. Summary Results of Oral Toxicity Studies of Pure Cylindrospermopsin in Experimental Animals\*

Species	Sex	Average Daily Dose (mg/kg-day)	Exposure Duration	NOAEL (mg/kg-day)	LOAEL (mg/kg-day)	Responses	Comments	Reference
<b>Acute Exposure</b>								
No suitable acute studies are available								
<b>Short-Term Exposure</b>								
Mouse	NR	0.05, 0.15, 0.3 (gavage)	14 days	0.05	0.15	Lipid infiltration in liver.	Low confidence in NOAEL and LOAEL. A full report of this study has not been published; this table provides essentially all available information on experimental design and results.	Shaw et al., 2000, 2001
<b>Subchronic Exposure</b>								
Mouse	M	0, 0.03, 0.06, 0.12, 0.24 (drinking water)	11 weeks	0.03	0.06	Increased relative kidney weight with decreased urinary protein at $\geq 0.12$ mg/kg-day.	Well-designed study with endpoints that included food and water consumption, body weight, clinical signs, hematology, serum chemistry, urinalysis, organ weights (eight organs) and histology (comprehensive). Ten mice/level (six in high dose group).	Humpage and Falconer, 2003
<b>Chronic Exposure</b>								
No suitable chronic studies are available.								

\* Oral studies using suspensions or cell-free extracts of *C. raciborskii* cells are discussed in Section 4.2.1.

NR = Not reported

1 A comprehensive subchronic toxicity study was conducted in which mice were exposed  
2 to five dose levels of purified cylindrospermopsin (0, 30, 60, 120 or 240 µg/kg) by daily gavage  
3 for 11 weeks (Humpage and Falconer, 2003). Histopathological effects were observed in the  
4 liver at ≥120 µg/kg-day (“minor increases in histopathological damage”) and kidneys at 240  
5 µg/kg-day (proximal tubular damage), but no other information on the lesions, including  
6 incidence data, was reported. There were no changes in liver weight at doses below 240  
7 µg/kg-day or serum indices of liver damage (e.g., serum ALT, AST and alkaline phosphatase) in  
8 any of the dose groups. Relative kidney weight was increased at ≥60 µg/kg-day and urine  
9 protein was decreased at ≥120 µg/kg-day. These effects are considered to be adverse because  
10 they are consistent with a known mode of action of cylindrospermopsin (inhibition of protein  
11 synthesis) and represent part of the spectrum of effects leading to toxicity, as discussed in  
12 Section 4.5.2. Based on the increase in kidney weight, the subchronic NOAEL and LOAEL  
13 values are 30 and 60 µg/kg-day, respectively.

14  
15 No information was located regarding the chronic toxicity, neurotoxicity or  
16 developmental/reproductive toxicity of cylindrospermopsin.

#### 17 18 **4.6.2. Inhalation**

19  
20 No information was located regarding the inhalation toxicity of cylindrospermopsin.

#### 21 22 **4.6.3. Mode of Action Information**

23  
24 The liver and kidneys appear to be the main targets of cylindrospermopsin toxicity. The  
25 mechanism for liver toxicity is incompletely characterized, but involves inhibition of protein  
26 synthesis (Froscio et al., 2003; Terao et al., 1994). Available evidence indicates that the protein  
27 synthesis inhibition is not decreased by broad-spectrum CYP450 inhibitors, suggesting that it is  
28 mediated by the parent compound (Froscio et al., 2003). Hepatocytotoxicity occurs at higher  
29 levels of cylindrospermopsin and appears to be CYP450-dependent, indicating the involvement  
30 of metabolites and other mechanisms (Froscio et al., 2003; Humpage et al., 2005; Norris et al.,  
31 2002). Studies specifically investigating the inhibition of protein synthesis in the kidneys are not  
32 available, although the results of the 11-week oral toxicity study in mice (Humpage and  
33 Falconer, 2003) are consistent with an inhibition of protein synthesis. Effects in this study  
34 included decreased urinary protein and, at a higher dose, proximal renal tubular lesions. As  
35 discussed in Section 4.5.2, the decrease in urinary protein excretion at low doses could reflect a  
36 specific effect of cylindrospermopsin on protein synthesis or, possibly, a functional change in the  
37 nephron. The proximal renal tubular damage in mice (Humpage and Falconer, 2003), as well as  
38 the clinical findings of renal insufficiency in the Palm Island human poisoning incident (Blyth,  
39 1980; Griffiths and Saker, 2003), suggest that cytotoxic mechanisms may predominate in the  
40 kidney at higher doses.

41  
42 Genotoxic effects of cylindrospermopsin include DNA adduction and strand breakage in  
43 mouse liver (Shaw et al., 2000; Shen et al., 2002) and micronuclei formation in a lymphoblastoid  
44 cell line (Humpage et al., 2000). Broad spectrum CYP450 inhibitors inhibited  
45 cylindrospermopsin-induced DNA damage in mouse hepatocytes at sub-cytotoxic concentrations

1 (Humpage et al., 2005), suggesting that metabolites are responsible for cylindrospermopsin  
2 genotoxicity and that genotoxicity is a primary effect of the chemical.

#### 3 4 **4.7. WEIGHT-OF-EVIDENCE EVALUATION AND CANCER** 5 **CHARACTERIZATION**

##### 6 7 **4.7.1. Summary of Overall Weight-of-Evidence** 8

9 No information is available on the carcinogenicity of cylindrospermopsin in humans, and  
10 no cancer studies of purified cylindrospermopsin have been conducted in animals. A test of an  
11 extract of *C. raciborskii* cells suggests that cylindrospermopsin has no tumor initiating activity in  
12 mice (Falconer and Humpage, 2001). A limited amount of data indicate that cylindrospermopsin  
13 or a metabolite can covalently bind to DNA (Shaw et al., 2000) and cause cytogenetic damage,  
14 as shown by induction of micronuclei (Humpage et al., 2000) and DNA strand breakage (Shen et  
15 al., 2002). In accordance with the *Guidelines for Carcinogen Risk Assessment* (U.S. EPA,  
16 2005a), the weight of evidence descriptor for the carcinogenic hazard potential of  
17 cylindrospermopsin is “*Inadequate Information to Assess Carcinogenic Potential.*”  
18

##### 19 **4.7.2. Synthesis of Human, Animal and Other Supporting Evidence** 20

21 No information was located regarding the carcinogenicity of purified cylindrospermopsin  
22 in humans or animals. There was no indication that cylindrospermopsin had tumor initiating  
23 activity in a test in which mice were administered a cell-free extract of freeze-dried *C.*  
24 *raciborskii* cells by gavage followed by oral exposure to the tumor promoter TPA (Falconer and  
25 Humpage, 2001).  
26

27 The nucleotide structure of cylindrospermopsin, as well as the presence of potentially  
28 reactive guanidine and sulfate groups, suggests the possibility of interference with DNA and/or  
29 RNA synthesis and induction of mutations. Covalent binding between DNA and  
30 cylindrospermopsin (or a metabolite) (Shaw et al., 2000, 2001) and DNA strand breakage (Shen  
31 et al., 2002) have been demonstrated in mouse liver, and micronuclei were induced in human  
32 WIL2-NS lymphoblasts (Humpage et al., 2000). Although the available data indicate that DNA  
33 strand breakage could be a key mechanism for cylindrospermopsin-induced cytogenetic damage  
34 (Humpage et al., 2000; Shen et al., 2002), insufficient data are available to speculate on the  
35 carcinogenic potential of cylindrospermopsin.  
36

#### 37 **4.8. SUSCEPTIBLE POPULATIONS AND LIFE STAGES** 38

##### 39 **4.8.1. Possible Childhood Susceptibility** 40

41 As discussed in Section 4.1, cylindrospermopsin has been implicated in the Palm Island  
42 outbreak of a hepatoenteritis-like illness in 148 Australians (Blyth, 1980; Griffiths and Saker,  
43 2003). Of the 148 cases, 138 were children (mean age 8.4 years, range 2-16 years, 41% male  
44 and 59% female) and 10 were adults (sex and age not reported). There are no reported  
45 indications that the 138 children were from the households of the 10 adults or that the children

1 and adults received different exposures, suggesting a possible increased sensitivity of children  
2 (the child:adult ratio is approximately 14:1).

#### 3 4 **4.8.2. Possible Gender Differences**

5  
6 There is no information on possible gender differences in the disposition of, or response  
7 to, cylindrospermopsin.

#### 8 9 **4.8.3. Other Possible Susceptible Populations**

10  
11 No data were located regarding populations that might be unusually susceptible to  
12 cylindrospermopsin. It is conceivable that individuals with liver and/or kidney disease might be  
13 more susceptible than the general population because of compromised detoxification  
14 mechanisms in the liver and impaired excretory mechanisms in the kidney.

## 5. DOSE-RESPONSE ASSESSMENTS

### 5.1. NARRATIVE DESCRIPTION OF THE EXTENT OF THE DATABASE

Studies on the absorption, tissue distribution, metabolism and elimination of cylindrospermopsin following oral, inhalation or dermal exposure have not been performed. Gastrointestinal absorption of cylindrospermopsin is indicated by the induction of systemic effects in oral toxicity studies. Studies in which cylindrospermopsin was administered to mice by acute i.p. injection indicate that it is largely distributed to the liver and rapidly eliminated in the urine as unmetabolized compound. The liver and kidneys are the main targets of cylindrospermopsin toxicity. Possible modes of action include inhibition of protein synthesis, CYP450-mediated bioactivation to a reactive intermediate and covalent binding between parent compound or a metabolite and DNA and/or RNA.

The only information on the toxicity of cylindrospermopsin in humans is from reports of a poisoning outbreak that is attributed to the consumption of drinking water containing toxin-producing *C. raciborskii*. Although the clinical picture of this hepatoenteritis-like illness is well defined and includes bloody diarrhea, swollen liver and impaired kidney function, there are no data on exposure levels that induced these effects.

Most of the available data on the toxicity of cylindrospermopsin in animals are available from oral and i.p. studies that tested purified compound or extracts of *C. raciborskii* cells. These studies are generally consistent in indicating that cylindrospermopsin causes lesions in the liver and other organs, particularly the kidneys, spleen and thymus. The cell extract studies are not useful for dose-response assessment of cylindrospermopsin due to the confounding factors discussed in the introduction to Section 4.2. The database on oral toxicity of pure cylindrospermopsin is limited by a small number of studies and insufficient reporting. No studies have been performed assessing the acute oral toxicity of pure cylindrospermopsin. Data on the short-term oral toxicity of pure compound are available from inadequately reported 14-day gavage and 21-day drinking water studies in mice and rats. The reports of these studies identify NOAELs and LOAELs for histopathology, but the adequacy of these effect levels cannot be verified due to a virtual lack of any additional information on the experimental designs and results. Data on the subchronic oral toxicity of pure cylindrospermopsin are available from a well-designed and reported 11-week study in mice that provides a suitable basis for derivation of a subchronic oral RfD value. No chronic toxicity, reproductive toxicity, developmental toxicity or carcinogenicity studies of pure cylindrospermopsin have been performed.

No information is available on the inhalation toxicity of cylindrospermopsin.

### 5.2. ORAL REFERENCE DOSE (RfD)

#### 5.2.1. Data Considered in Deriving Reference Values

Data considered in deriving oral RfDs for each duration of exposure are summarized in Table 4-1 (Section 4.6.1).

1 **5.2.2. Acute Duration**

2  
3 **5.2.2.1. Choice of Principal Study and Critical Effect - with Rationale and**  
4 **Justification**

5  
6 Derivation of an acute oral RfD for cylindrospermopsin is precluded by insufficient data.  
7 The only information on the toxicity of cylindrospermopsin in humans is the outbreak of a  
8 hepatoenteritis-like illness that is attributed to the consumption of drinking water containing *C.*  
9 *raciborskii* (Blyth, 1980; Griffiths and Saker, 2003; Hawkins et al., 1985; Ohtani et al., 1992).  
10 Although the clinical picture of the illness is well defined, measured or estimated exposure levels  
11 have not been reported. No acute oral toxicity studies of purified cylindrospermopsin have been  
12 performed in animals. Single-dose studies of suspensions or cell-free extracts of *C. raciborskii*  
13 cells were conducted in mice, but only near-lethal to lethal dose levels were tested (Falconer et  
14 al., 1999; Seawright et al., 1999; Shaw et al., 2000, 2001).  
15

16 **5.2.3. Short-Term Duration**

17  
18 **5.2.3.1. Choice of Principal Study and Critical Effect - with Rationale and**  
19 **Justification**

20  
21 Derivation of a short-term oral RfD for cylindrospermopsin is precluded by insufficient  
22 data. The only information relevant to the short-term toxicity of cylindrospermopsin in humans  
23 is qualitative data on the outbreak of the hepatoenteritis-like illness that is attributed to the  
24 consumption of drinking water containing *C. raciborskii* (Blyth, 1980; Griffiths and Saker, 2003;  
25 Hawkins et al., 1985; Ohtani et al., 1992). As discussed in Sections 4.2.1.2 and 4.5.1, a limited  
26 amount of information is available on the short-term oral toxicity of cylindrospermopsin from  
27 poorly reported 14-day gavage and 21-day drinking water studies (Shaw et al., 2000, 2001). The  
28 14-day study reported a NOAEL of 0.05 mg/kg-day and LOAEL of 0.15 mg/kg-day for liver  
29 fatty infiltration in mice, and the 21-day study reported a free-standing NOAEL of 0.2  
30 mg/kg-day for histopathology in mice and rats. The appropriateness of these effect levels cannot  
31 be assessed due to inadequate information on the design and results of the studies.  
32

33 **5.2.4. Subchronic Duration**

34  
35 **5.2.4.1. Choice of Principal Study and Critical Effect - with Rationale and**  
36 **Justification**

37  
38 The comprehensive 11-week subchronic study in mice (Humpage and Falconer, 2003),  
39 detailed in Section 4.2.1.3, is the only subchronic study of purified cylindrospermopsin and  
40 provides a suitable basis for RfD derivation. The LOAEL was 60 µg/kg-day for increased  
41 relative kidney weight. At 120 µg/kg-day, there was a significant decrease in urinary protein  
42 concentration and minor histopathological changes in the liver. Decreased urinary protein and  
43 increased relative kidney weight are both potential indicators of suppressed protein synthesis, a  
44 known mode of action of cylindrospermopsin. The decrease in urinary protein is consistent with  
45 decreased availability of protein and the increase in kidney weight may reflect a compensatory  
46 hyperplasia, such that the kidney, as a protein-synthesizing organ, is stimulated to grow in an

1 attempt to maintain homeostasis in face of a chemical-related decrease in protein synthesis  
2 (Humpage and Falconer, 2003). Information supporting this hypothesis, as well as the  
3 possibility that the decrease in urinary protein excretion reflects a functional change in the  
4 nephron, is discussed in Section 4.5.2. Because the changes are consistent with a known mode  
5 of action and represent part of the progression of effects leading to toxicity, they are considered  
6 to be adverse and indicate that the LOAEL and NOAEL are 60 and 30 µg/kg-day, respectively.  
7

#### 8 **5.2.4.2. Methods of Analysis - Including Models (PBPK, BMD, etc.)**

9

10 A point of departure (POD) can be determined using the kidney weight data and BMD  
11 modeling, but BMD analysis of the urinary protein and histopathology data is precluded by  
12 insufficient data. In particular, the urinary protein data are limited by inadequate reporting  
13 (mean concentrations and errors are conveyed in a bar graph with no numerical values  
14 specifically reported, no indication if the error bars represent standard deviation or standard  
15 error, and no indication of numbers of animals) and the pathology findings are limited by a lack  
16 of incidence data.  
17

18 In accordance with current BMD technical guidance (U.S. EPA, 2000c), available  
19 continuous-variable models in the EPA Benchmark Dose Software (BMDS version 1.3.2; linear,  
20 polynomial, power and Hill models) were fit to the data for changes in mean relative kidney  
21 weight shown in Table 5-1. Statistical tests in the BMDS showed that variance was  
22 homogeneous across dose groups. BMDs and BMDLs were calculated using 1 standard  
23 deviation above the control mean as the benchmark response level (BMR), while assuming  
24 homogenous variance across groups. Using data from all dose groups, an adequate fit to the data  
25 was obtained with the Hill model (Table 5-2), but the BMDS was not able to compute a BMDL.  
26 After dropping the high dose group, there were insufficient degrees of freedom remaining to fit  
27 the Hill model, but the linear model adequately fit the data and produced an estimated BMD of  
28 43.1 µg/kg-day and BMDL of 33.1 µg/kg-day. The two-degree polynomial and power models  
29 defaulted to the same linear model, albeit with lower p-value and/or higher Aikake's Information  
30 Criteria (AIC) due to the greater number of parameters in these models. The BMD modeling  
31 results are summarized in Table 5-2 and detailed in Appendix A, and the fit of the linear model  
32 to the data is shown in Figure 5-1. The BMDL of 33.1 µg/kg-day is similar to the 30 µg/kg-day  
33 NOAEL for increased kidney weight and is used as the POD for the RfD.  
34

#### 35 **5.2.4.3. RfD Derivation - Including Application of UFs**

36

37 The BMDL of 33.1 µg/kg-day for increased relative kidney weight was used as the point  
38 of departure (POD) for the subchronic RfD. Dividing the BMDL of 33.1 µg/kg-day by a  
39 composite uncertainty factor (UF) of 1000 results in a subchronic RfD for cylindrospermopsin of  
40  $3 \times 10^{-5}$  mg/kg-day.  
41

1

Table 5-1. Relative Kidney Weights in Mice Exposed to Purified Cylindrospermopsin for 11 Weeks					
	Oral Dose (µg/kg-day)				
	0	30	60	120	240
Relative kidney weight (mean ± standard deviation)	1.48 ± 0.10 (10) <sup>a</sup>	1.57 ± 0.14 (10)	1.66 ± 0.16 <sup>b</sup> (9)	1.82 ± 0.12 <sup>c</sup> (9)	1.78 ± 0.17 <sup>c</sup> (6)

2 <sup>a</sup> Values in parentheses are the number of animals evaluated in each group

3 <sup>b</sup> Statistically significant difference from controls (p<0.05)

4 <sup>c</sup> Statistically significant difference from controls (p<0.001)

5 Source: Humpage and Falconer (2003)



Table 5-2. Summary of Benchmark Dose Modeling (Relative Kidney Weight) <sup>a</sup>					
Model Fit to Means	df	p-Value for Model Fit	AIC for Fitted Model	BMD (µg/kg-day)	BMDL (µg/kg-day)
Relative kidney weight, all dose groups (p=0.59 for test of homogenous variance, indicating assumption of homogenous variance is appropriate)					
Linear	3	0.01	-120.85	106.07	76.56
2-Degree polynomial (pos betas)	2	0.003	-120.85	106.07	76.56
Power (power >=1)	2	0.003	-116.85	106.07	76.56
Hill (power >=1)	1	0.21	-124.74	43.19 <sup>b</sup>	NA <sup>c</sup>
Relative kidney weight, high dose group dropped (p=0.52 for test of homogenous variance, indicating assumption of homogenous variance is appropriate)					
Linear	2	0.98	-116.47	43.90	33.07
2-Degree polynomial (pos betas)	1	0.84	-116.47	43.90	33.07
Power (power >=1)	1	0.84	-112.47	43.90	33.07
Hill (power >=1)	0	NA <sup>d</sup>	-110.51	41.20	21.72

2 <sup>a</sup> Modeling conducted assuming homogenous variance and using BMR of 1 standard deviation


3 <sup>b</sup> Optimum BMD may not have been found (i.e. bad completion code in the BMDS optimization  
4 routine)

5 <sup>c</sup> BMDL computation failed

6 <sup>d</sup> The Chi-Square test for fit is not valid due to insufficient degrees of freedom (df)

7 NA = not available

Linear Model with 0.95 Confidence Level



1 22:31 05/12 2005

2

3

4 Figure 5-1. Linear Model Fit to Relative Kidney Weight Data (High Dose Group Dropped)

5 Source: Humpage and Falconer (2003)

$$\begin{aligned}
 \text{Subchronic RfD} &= \text{BMDL} \div \text{UF} \\
 &= 33.1 \text{ } \mu\text{g/kg-day} \div 1000 \\
 &= \mathbf{0.00003 \text{ mg/kg-day or } 3 \times 10^{-5} \text{ mg/kg-day}}
 \end{aligned}$$

The composite UF of 1000 includes a factor of 10 for interspecies extrapolation, a factor of 10 to account for interindividual variability in the human population and a factor of 10 for database limitations, as follows.

- A default 10-fold UF is used to account for the interspecies variability in extrapolating from laboratory animals to humans. No information is available on the toxicity of purified cylindrospermopsin in humans, and no data on toxicokinetic differences between animals and humans in the disposition of ingested cylindrospermopsin are available.
- A 10-fold UF is used to account for variation in sensitivity within human populations because there is insufficient information on the degree to which humans of varying gender, age, health status or genetic makeup might vary in the disposition of, or response to, ingested cylindrospermopsin. As discussed in Section 4.1, data from the Palm Island outbreak of a hepatoenteritis-like illness (Blyth, 1980; Griffiths and Saker, 2003) suggest a possible increased sensitivity of children to cylindrospermopsin.
- A 10-fold UF is used to account for deficiencies in the database. There is no information on the longer-term toxicity of cylindrospermopsin in humans. Other database deficiencies include a lack of particular kinds of animal studies on purified cylindrospermopsin, including a chronic study, subchronic or chronic studies in a second species and reproductive and developmental toxicity studies.

The NOAEL/LOAEL approach and an UF of 1000 would also yield an RfD of 0.00003 mg/kg-day due to the similarity of the NOAEL and BMDL for increased kidney weight (30 and 33.1  $\mu\text{g/kg-day}$ , respectively).

## 5.2.5. Chronic Duration

### 5.2.5.1. Choice of Principal Study and Critical Effect - with Rationale and Justification

Derivation of a chronic oral RfD for cylindrospermopsin is precluded by insufficient data. No information is available on the chronic toxicity of cylindrospermopsin by any route of exposure. The 11-week study (Humpage and Falconer, 2003) used to derive the subchronic RfD was considered for use in the derivation of a chronic RfD; however, this approach was rejected due to the lack of information on the potential progression of cylindrospermopsin-induced adverse effects with increased exposure duration. The use of the POD from the 11-week subchronic study for the derivation of a chronic RfD would require the application of a subchronic-to-chronic UF to account for the uncertainties involved in extrapolating across exposure durations. The application of a full subchronic-to-chronic UF of 10, along with UFs of 10 in three other areas of uncertainty (interspecies UF, intraspecies UF, database UF), would result in a total composite uncertainty factor of 10,000. A composite uncertainty factor of this

1 magnitude suggests that the database is insufficient to support the derivation of an RfD for  
2 chronic exposure; therefore, no chronic oral RfD is derived.

### 3 4 **5.2.6. Route-to-Route Extrapolation**

5  
6 Derivation of acute, short-term, and chronic RfD values for cylindrospermopsin by route-  
7 to-route extrapolation could not be considered due to a lack of inhalation data.

### 8 9 **5.3. INHALATION REFERENCE CONCENTRATION (RfC)**

10  
11 No information is available on the toxicity of inhaled cylindrospermopsin.

### 12 13 **5.4. CANCER ASSESSMENT**

14  
15 No dose-response or other information is available regarding the carcinogenicity of pure  
16 cylindrospermopsin.

1                                   **6. MAJOR CONCLUSIONS IN THE CHARACTERIZATION OF**  
2                                   **HAZARD AND DOSE RESPONSE**

3  
4  
5   **6.1. HUMAN HAZARD POTENTIAL**  
6

7           Cylindrospermopsin is a naturally occurring chemical produced by *Cylindrospermopsis*  
8 (particularly *C. raciborskii*) and at least four other genera of freshwater cyanobacteria.  
9 Toxicokinetic studies of cylindrospermopsin have not been performed using natural routes of  
10 exposure, but oral toxicity studies show that it is absorbed from the gastrointestinal tract, and i.p.  
11 toxicokinetic studies indicate that it is mainly distributed to the liver and excreted in the urine as  
12 unmetabolized compound. Main targets of cylindrospermopsin toxicity include the liver and  
13 kidneys, and possible modes of action include inhibition of protein synthesis, bioactivation to a  
14 reactive intermediate and covalent binding of parent compound or a metabolite to DNA and/or  
15 RNA.  
16

17           The main information on the toxicity of cylindrospermopsin in humans is from  
18 qualitative reports of a hepatoenteritis-like illness that is attributed to the acute or short-term  
19 consumption of drinking water containing *C. raciborskii*. The database on oral toxicity of  
20 purified cylindrospermopsin in animals is limited by a small number of studies and insufficient  
21 reporting. No studies have been performed assessing the acute oral toxicity of pure  
22 cylindrospermopsin. Information on short-term oral toxicity is available from inadequately  
23 reported 14- and 21-day studies in mice and rats. Data on the subchronic oral toxicity of pure  
24 cylindrospermopsin are available from a comprehensive 11-week study that identified NOAELs  
25 and LOAELs for kidney and liver effects in mice. No chronic toxicity, reproductive toxicity,  
26 developmental toxicity or carcinogenicity studies of cylindrospermopsin have been conducted.  
27 Testing following inhalation has not been performed.  
28

29   **6.2. DOSE RESPONSE**  
30

31           Kidney effects data in the 11-week toxicity study (Humpage and Falconer, 2003) provide  
32 a suitable basis for deriving a subchronic oral RfD. The most sensitive effect in this study was  
33 increased relative kidney weight; decreased urinary protein and minor histopathological damage  
34 to the liver occurred at the next highest dose. As discussed in Section 4.5.2, increased kidney  
35 weight and decreased urinary protein are consistent with suppressed protein synthesis, a known  
36 mode of action of cylindrospermopsin, and represent part of the progression of effects leading to  
37 toxicity. Based on a BMDL of 33.1 µg/kg-day for increased relative kidney weight in mice, a  
38 subchronic RfD of 3x10<sup>-5</sup> mg/kg-day was derived by dividing the BMDL by a UF of 1000. The  
39 UF comprises component factors of 10 for interspecies extrapolation, 10 for interindividual  
40 variability and 10 for database deficiencies. Acute, short-term and chronic oral RfDs could not  
41 be derived due to inadequate data. Inhalation RfC derivation is precluded by the lack of data for  
42 this route of exposure. There is inadequate information to evaluate the carcinogenicity of  
43 cylindrospermopsin.

## 7. REFERENCES

- 1  
2
- 3 Akimov, S.S. and A.M. Belkin. 2001. Cell surface tissue transglutaminase is involved in  
4 adhesion and migration of monocytic cells on fibronectin. *Blood*. 98(5):1567-1576.
- 5 Bachmann, S., A.B. Dawnay, N. Bouby and L. Bankir. 1991. Tamm-Horsfall protein excretion  
6 during chronic alterations in urinary concentration and protein intake in the rat. *Renal Physiol.*  
7 *Biochem.* 14(6):236-245.
- 8 Bachmann, S., K. Mutig, J. Bates et al. 2005. Renal effects of Tamm-Horsfall protein  
9 (uromodulin) deficiency in mice. *Am. J. Renal Physiol.* 288(3):F559-F567.
- 10 Banker, R., B. Teltsch, A. Sukenik and S. Carmeli. 2000. 7-Epicylindrospermopsin, a toxic  
11 minor metabolite of the cyanobacterium *Aphanizomenon ovalisporum* from Lake Kinneret,  
12 Israel. *J. Nat. Prod.* 63(3):387-389.
- 13 Banker, R., S. Carmeli, M. Werman et al. 2001. Uracil moiety is required for toxicity of the  
14 cyanobacterial hepatotoxin cylindrospermopsin. *J. Toxicol. Environ. Health A.* 62(4):281-288.
- 15 Bates, J.M., H.M. Raffi, K. Prasad et al. 2004. Tamm-Horsfall protein knockout mice are  
16 more prone to urinary tract infection: Rapid communication. *Kidney Int.* 65(3):791-797.
- 17 Blyth, S. 1980. Palm Island mystery disease. *Med. J. Aust.* 2(1):40-42.
- 18 Carmichael, W.W., S.M.F.O. Azevedo, J.S. An et al. 2001. Human fatalities from  
19 cyanobacteria: Chemical and biological evidence for cyanotoxins. *Environ. Health Perspect.*  
20 109(7):663-668.
- 21 Chiswell, R.K., G.R. Shaw, G. Eaglesham et al. 1999. Stability of cylindrospermopsin, the  
22 toxin from cyanobacterium, *Cylindrospermopsis raciborskii*: Effect of pH, temperature, and  
23 sunlight on decomposition. *Environ. Toxicol.* 14(1):155-161.
- 24 Falconer, I.R. and A.R. Humpage. 2001. Preliminary evidence for *in vivo* tumour initiation by  
25 oral administration of extracts of the blue-green alga *Cylindrospermopsis raciborski* containing  
26 the toxin cylindrospermopsin. *Environ. Toxicol.* 16(2):192-195.
- 27 Falconer, I.R., S.J. Hardy, A.R. Humpage et al. 1999. Hepatic and renal toxicity of the blue-  
28 green alga (cyanobacterium) *Cylindrospermopsis raciborski* in male Swiss albino mice.  
29 *Environ. Toxicol.* 14(1):143-150.
- 30 Fastner, J., R. Heinze, A.R. Humpage et al. 2003. Cylindrospermopsin occurrence in two  
31 German lakes and preliminary assessment of toxicity and toxin production of  
32 *Cylindrospermopsis raciborskii* (cyanobacteria) isolates. *Toxicon.* 42(3):313-321.
- 33 Fessard, V. and C. Bernard. 2003. Cell alterations but no DNA strand breaks induced *in vitro*  
34 by cylindrospermopsin in CHO K1 cells. *Environ. Toxicol.* 18(5):353-359.

- 1 Fesus, L., V. Thomazy and A. Falus. 1987. Induction and activation of tissue transglutaminase  
2 during programmed cell death. FEBS Lett. 224(1):104-108.
- 3 Froscio, S.M., A.R. Humpage, P.C. Burcham and I.R. Falconer. 2003. Cylindrospermopsin-  
4 induced protein synthesis inhibition and its dissociation from acute toxicity in mouse  
5 hepatocytes. Environ. Toxicol. 18(4):243-251.
- 6 Grenard, P., S. Bresson-Hadni, S. El Alaoui et al. 2001. Transglutaminase-mediated cross-  
7 linking is involved in the stabilization of extracellular matrix in human liver fibrosis. J. Hepatol.  
8 35(3):367-375.
- 9 Griffiths, D.J. and M.L. Saker. 2003. The Palm Island mystery disease 20 years on: A review of  
10 research on the cyanotoxin cylindrospermopsin. Environ. Toxicol. 18(2):78-93.
- 11 Hawkins, P.R., M.T.C. Runnegar, A.R.B. Jackson and I.R. Falconer. 1985. Severe  
12 hepatotoxicity caused by the tropical cyanobacterium (blue-green alga) *Cylindrospermopsis*  
13 *raciborskii* (Woloszynska) Seenaya and Subba Raju isolated from a domestic water supply  
14 reservoir. Appl. Environ. Microbiol. 50(5):1292-1295.
- 15 Hawkins, P.R., N.R. Chandrasena, G.J. Jones et al. 1997. Isolation and toxicity of  
16 *Cylindrospermopsis raciborskii* from an ornamental lake. Toxicon. 35(3):341-346.
- 17 Hayman, J. 1992. Beyond the Barcoo - probable human tropical cyanobacterial poisoning in  
18 outback Australia. Med. J. Aust. 157(11-12):794-796.
- 19 HSDB (Hazardous Substances Data Bank). 2006. Produced by the U.S. National Library of  
20 Medicine (NLM), Toxicology Data Network (TOXNET), Bethesda, Maryland. Accessed  
21 January 2, 2006 at <http://toxnet.nlm.nih.gov/cgi-bin/sis/htmlgen?HSDB>.
- 22 Humpage, A.R. and I.R. Falconer. 2003. Oral toxicity of the cyanobacterial toxin  
23 cylindrospermopsin in male Swiss albino mice: Determination of no observed adverse effect  
24 level for deriving a drinking water guideline value. Environ. Toxicol. 18(2):94-103.
- 25 Humpage, A.R., M. Fenech, P. Thomas and I.R. Falconer. 2000. Micronucleus induction and  
26 chromosome loss in transformed human white cells indicate clastogenic and aneugenic action of  
27 the cyanobacterial toxin, cylindrospermopsin. Mutat. Res. 472:155-161.
- 28 Humpage, A.R., F. Fontaine, S. Froscio, P. Burcham and I.R. Falconer. 2005.  
29 Cylindrospermopsin genotoxicity and cytotoxicity: Role of cytochrome P-450 and oxidative  
30 stress. J. Toxicol. Environ. Health, Part A. 68(9):739-753.
- 31 Lewis, R.J. 2000. Sax's Dangerous Properties of Industrial Materials, Vol. 1-3, 10<sup>th</sup> ed. John  
32 Wiley & Sons Inc., New York, NY. p. 1061.
- 33 Li, R., W.W. Carmichael, S. Brittain et al. 2001. First report of the cyanotoxins  
34 cylindrospermopsin and deoxycylindrospermopsin from *Raphidiopsis curvata* (cyanobacteria).  
35 J. Phycol. 37(6):1121-1126.

- 1 Mirza, A., S-L. Liu, E. Frizell et al. 1997. A role for tissue transglutaminase in hepatic injury  
2 and fibrogenesis, and its regulation by NF-κB. *Am. J. Physiol.* 272:G281-G288.
- 3 Norris, R.L., G.K. Eaglesham, G. Pierens et al. 1999. Deoxycylindrospermopsin, an analog of  
4 cylindrospermopsin from *Cylindrospermopsis raciborskii*. *Environ. Toxicol.* 14(1):163-165.
- 5 Norris, R.L.G., A.A. Seawright, G.R. Shaw et al. 2001. Distribution of <sup>14</sup>C cylindrospermopsin  
6 *in vivo* in the mouse. *Environ. Toxicol.* 16(6):498-505.
- 7 Norris, R.L.G., A.A. Seawright, G.R. Shaw et al. 2002. Hepatic xenobiotic metabolism of  
8 cylindrospermopsin *in vivo* in the mouse. *Toxicol.* 40(4):471-476.
- 9 NRC (National Research Council). 1983. Risk Assessment in the Federal Government:  
10 Managing the Process. National Academy Press, Washington, DC.
- 11 Ohtani, I., R.E. Moore and M.T.C. Runnegar. 1992. Cylindrospermopsin: A potent hepatotoxin  
12 from the blue-green alga *Cylindrospermopsis raciborskii*. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.*  
13 114(20):7941-7942.
- 14 O'Neil, M.J., Ed. 2001. The Merck Index - An Encyclopedia of Chemicals, Drugs, and  
15 Biologicals, 13<sup>th</sup> ed. Merck and Co., Inc., Whitehouse Station, NJ.
- 16 Pesce, A.J. and M.R. First. 1979. Proteinuria. An integrated review. Marcell Dekker.  
17 pp. 54-79
- 18 Piacentini, M., M.G. Farrace, L. Piredda et al. 2002. Transglutaminase overexpression  
19 sensitizes neuronal cell lines to apoptosis by increasing mitochondrial membrane potential and  
20 cellular oxidative stress. *J. Neurochem.* 81(5):1061-1072.
- 21 Pilotto, L., P. Hobson, M.D. Burch, G. Ranmuthugala, R. Attewell and W. Weightman. 2004.  
22 Acute skin irritant effects of cyanobacteria (blue-green algae) in healthy volunteers. *Aust. N. Z.*  
23 *J. Public Health.* 28(3):220-224.
- 24 Runnegar, M.T., S.M. Kong, Y-Z. Zhong et al. 1994. The role of glutathione in the toxicity of a  
25 novel cyanobacterial alkaloid cylindrospermopsin in cultured rat hepatocytes. *Biochem.*  
26 *Biophys. Res. Commun.* 201(1):235-241.
- 27 Runnegar, M.T., S.M. Kong, Y-Z. Zhong and S.C. Lu. 1995. Inhibition of reduced glutathione  
28 synthesis by cyanobacterial alkaloid cylindrospermopsin in cultured rat hepatocytes. *Biochem.*  
29 *Pharmacol.* 49(2):219-225.
- 30 Runnegar, M.T., C. Xie, B.B. Snider et al. 2002. *In vitro* hepatotoxicity of the cyanobacterial  
31 alkaloid cylindrospermopsin and related synthetic analogues. *Toxicol. Sci.* 67(1):81-87.
- 32 Schoel, B. and G. Pfeleiderer. 1987. The amount of Tamm-Horsfall protein in the human kidney,  
33 related to its daily excretion. *J. Clin. Chem. Clin. Biochem.* 25(10):681-682.



- 1 Seawright, A.A., C.C. Nolan, G.R. Shaw et al. 1999. The oral toxicity for mice of the tropical  
2 cyanobacterium *Cylindrospermopsis raciborskii* (Woloszynska). *Environ. Toxicol.*  
3 14(1):135-142.
- 4 Shaw, G.R., A. Sukenik, A. Livne et al. 1999. Blooms of the cylindrospermopsin containing  
5 cyanobacterium, *Aphanizomenon ovalisporum* (Forti), in newly constructed lakes, Queensland,  
6 Australia. *Environ. Toxicol.* 14(1):167-177.
- 7 Shaw, G.R., A.A. Seawright, M.R. Moore and P.K. Lam. 2000. Cylindrospermopsin, a  
8 cyanobacterial alkaloid: Evaluation of its toxicologic activity. *Ther. Drug Monit.* 22(1):89-92.
- 9 Shaw, G.R., A.A. Seawright and M.R. Moore. 2001. Toxicology and human health implications  
10 of the cyanobacterial toxin cylindrospermopsin. In: *Mycotoxins and Phycotoxins in Perspective*  
11 *at the Turn of the Millennium*, W.J. Dekoe, R.A. Samson, H.P. van Egmond et al., Ed. IUPAC  
12 & AOAC International, Brazil. p. 435-443.
- 13 Shen, X., P.K.S. Lam, G.R. Shaw and W. Wickramasinghe. 2002. Genotoxicity investigation of  
14 a cyanobacterial toxin, cylindrospermopsin. *Toxicon.* 40(10):1499-1501.
- 15 Shen, X., G.R. Shaw, G.A. Codd et al. 2003. DNA microarray analysis of gene expression in  
16 mice treated with the cyanobacterial toxin, cylindrospermopsin. In: *Proceedings of the Eighth*  
17 *Canadian Workshop on Harmful Marine Algae*, S.S. Bates, Ed. Fisheries and Oceans Canada,  
18 Monkton, New Brunswick. p. 49-51. Available at  
19 [http://www.glf.dfo-mpo.gc.ca/sci-sci/cwhma-atcamn/8th\\_cwhma\\_proceedings.pdf](http://www.glf.dfo-mpo.gc.ca/sci-sci/cwhma-atcamn/8th_cwhma_proceedings.pdf).
- 20 Sigma. 2006. Cylindrospermopsin from *Cylindrospermopsis raciborskii*. C9866. Sigma-  
21 Aldrich, Inc., Saint Louis, MO. Accessed January 23, 2006 at  
22 <http://www.sigmaaldrich.com/catalog/search/ProductDetail?ProdNo=C9866&Brand=SIGMA>.
- 23 Terao, K., S. Ohmori, K. Igarashi et al. 1994. Electron microscopic studies on experimental  
24 poisoning in mice induced by cylindrospermopsin isolated from blue-green alga *Umezakia*  
25 *natans*. *Toxicon.* 32(7):833-843.
- 26 U.S. EPA. 1986a. Guidelines for the Health Risk Assessment of Chemical Mixtures. *Fed. Reg.*  
27 51(185):34014-34025.
- 28 U.S. EPA. 1986b. Guidelines for Mutagenicity Risk Assessment. *Fed. Reg.*  
29 51(185):34006-34012.
- 30 U.S. EPA. 1988. Recommendations for and Documentation of Biological Values for Use in  
31 Risk Assessment. Prepared by the Office of Health and Environmental Assessment,  
32 Environmental Criteria and Assessment Office, Cincinnati, OH for the Office of Solid Waste and  
33 Emergency Response, Washington, DC. EPA 600/6-87/008. NTIS PB88-179874/AS.
- 34 U.S. EPA. 1991. Guidelines for Developmental Toxicity Risk Assessment. *Fed. Reg.*  
35 56(234):63798-63826.

1 U.S. EPA. 1994a. Interim Policy for Particle Size and Limit Concentration Issues in Inhalation  
2 Toxicity Studies: Notice of Availability. Fed. Reg. 59(206):53799.

3 U.S. EPA. 1994b. Methods for Derivation of Inhalation Reference Concentrations and  
4 Application of Inhalation Dosimetry. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Office of  
5 Research and Development, Washington, DC. EPA/600/8-90/066F. NTIS PB2000-500023.  
6 Available at <http://www.epa.gov/iris/backgr-d.htm>.

7 U.S. EPA. 1995. Use of the Benchmark Dose Approach in Health Risk Assessment. U.S.  
8 Environmental Protection Agency, Risk Assessment Forum, Washington, DC.  
9 EPA/630/R-94/007. NTIS PB95-213765. Available at <http://www.epa.gov/iris/backgr-d.htm>.

10 U.S. EPA. 1996. Guidelines for Reproductive Toxicity Risk Assessment. Fed. Reg.  
11 61(212):56274-56322.

12 U.S. EPA. 1998a. Guidelines for Neurotoxicity Risk Assessment. Fed. Reg.  
13 63(93):26926-26954.

14 U.S. EPA. 1998b. Science Policy Council Handbook: Peer Review. U.S. Environmental  
15 Protection Agency, Office of Research and Development, Washington, DC. EPA/100/B-98/001.  
16 NTIS PB98-140726.

17 U.S. EPA. 2000a. Science Policy Council Handbook: Peer Review, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. U.S. Environmental  
18 Protection Agency, Office of Research and Development, Washington, DC. EPA/100/B-00/001.  
19 Available at <http://www.epa.gov/iris/backgr-d.htm>.

20 U.S. EPA. 2000b. Science Policy Council Handbook: Risk Characterization. U.S.  
21 Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Research and Development, Washington, DC.  
22 EPA/100/B-00/002. Available at <http://www.epa.gov/iris/backgr-d.htm>.

23 U.S. EPA. 2000c. Benchmark Dose Technical Guidance Document [External Review Draft].  
24 U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Risk Assessment Forum, Washington, DC.  
25 EPA/630/R-00/001. Available at <http://www.epa.gov/iris/backgr-d.htm>.

26 U.S. EPA. 2000d. Supplementary Guidance for Conducting Health Risk Assessment of  
27 Chemical Mixtures. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Research and  
28 Development, Washington, DC. EPA/630/R-00/002. Available at  
29 <http://www.epa.gov/iris/backgr-d.htm>.

30 U.S. EPA. 2002. A Review of the Reference Dose and Reference Concentration Processes.  
31 U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Risk Assessment Forum, Washington, DC.  
32 EPA/630/P-02/002F. Available at <http://www.epa.gov/iris/backgr-d.htm>.

33 U.S. EPA. 2005a. Guidelines for Carcinogen Risk Assessment. U.S. Environmental Protection  
34 Agency, Risk Assessment Forum, Washington, DC. EPA/630/P-03/001B. Available at  
35 <http://www.epa.gov/iris/backgr-d.htm>.

1 U.S. EPA. 2005b. Supplemental Guidance for Assessing Susceptibility from Early-Life  
2 Exposure to Carcinogens. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Risk Assessment Forum,  
3 Washington, DC. EPA/630/R-03/003F. Available at <http://www.epa.gov/iris/backgr-d.htm>.

4 WHO (World Health Organization). 1999. Toxic Cyanobacteria in Water: A Guide to Their  
5 Public Health Consequences, Monitoring, and Management, I. Chorus and J. Bartram, Ed. ISBN  
6 0-419-23930-8. World Health Organization, Geneva, Switzerland. Available at  
7 [http://www.who.int/water\\_sanitation\\_health/resourcesquality/toxcyanobacteria.pdf](http://www.who.int/water_sanitation_health/resourcesquality/toxcyanobacteria.pdf).

8 Zhang, L-X., K.J. Mills, M.L. Dawson et al. 1995. Evidence for the involvement of retinoic  
9 acid receptor RAR $\alpha$ -dependent signaling pathway in the induction of tissue transglutaminase and  
10 apoptosis by retinoids. *J. Biol. Chem.* 270(11):6022-6029.

## APPENDIX A

### BENCHMARK DOSE MODELING RESULTS FOR CYLINDROSPERMOPSIN

**Part I.**

Humpage and Falconer 2003

male mice treated with purified cylindrospermopsin

rel kidney wt

```

=====
Polynomial Model. Revision: 2.2 Date: 9/12/2002
Input Data File: C:\BMDS\DATA\CYLINDRO.(d)
Gnuplot Plotting File: C:\BMDS\DATA\CYLINDRO.plt
Thu May 12 22:04:04 2005
=====

```

BMDS MODEL RUN

The form of the response function is:

$$Y[\text{dose}] = \text{beta}_0 + \text{beta}_1 \cdot \text{dose} + \text{beta}_2 \cdot \text{dose}^2 + \dots$$

Dependent variable = MEAN  
 Independent variable = dose  
 rho is set to 0  
 Signs of the polynomial coefficients are not restricted  
 A constant variance model is fit

Total number of dose groups = 5  
 Total number of records with missing values = 0  
 Maximum number of iterations = 250  
 Relative Function Convergence has been set to: 1e-008  
 Parameter Convergence has been set to: 1e-008

Default Initial Parameter Values

```

alpha = 0.018741
rho = 0 Specified
beta_0 = 1.551
beta_1 = 0.00123333

```

Parameter Estimates

Variable	Estimate	Std. Err.	95.0% Wald Confidence Interval	
			Lower Conf. Limit	Upper Conf. Limit
alpha	0.0215477	0.00459399	0.0125437	0.0305518
beta_0	1.54205	0.0311925	1.48091	1.60318
beta_1	0.00138389	0.000287871	0.000819671	0.00194811

Asymptotic Correlation Matrix of Parameter Estimates

	alpha	beta_0	beta_1
alpha	1	2.1e-009	1.2e-010
beta_0	2.1e-009	1	-0.7
beta_1	1.2e-010	-0.7	1

Table of Data and Estimated Values of Interest

Dose Res.	N	Obs Mean	Obs Std Dev	Est Mean	Est Std Dev	Chi^2
0	10	1.48	0.1	1.54	0.147	-1.34
30	10	1.57	0.14	1.58	0.147	-0.292
60	9	1.66	0.16	1.63	0.147	0.714
120	9	1.82	0.12	1.71	0.147	2.29
240	6	1.78	0.17	1.87	0.147	-1.57

Model Descriptions for likelihoods calculated

Model A1:  $Y_{ij} = \mu(i) + e(ij)$   
 $\text{Var}\{e(ij)\} = \sigma^2$

Model A2:  $Y_{ij} = \mu(i) + e(ij)$   
 $\text{Var}\{e(ij)\} = \sigma(i)^2$

Model R:  $Y_i = \mu + e(i)$   
 $\text{Var}\{e(i)\} = \sigma^2$

Likelihoods of Interest

Model	Log(likelihood)	DF	AIC
A1	68.148702	6	-124.297404
A2	69.554943	10	-119.109885
fitted	62.424690	2	-120.849381
R	52.631671	2	-101.263343

Test 1: Does response and/or variances differ among dose levels

(A2 vs. R)

Test 2: Are Variances Homogeneous (A1 vs A2)

Test 3: Does the Model for the Mean Fit (A1 vs. fitted)

Tests of Interest

Test	-2*log(Likelihood Ratio)	Test df	p-value
Test 1	33.8465	8	<.0001
Test 2	2.81248	4	0.5897
Test 3	11.448	3	0.009534

The p-value for Test 1 is less than .05. There appears to be a difference between response and/or variances among the dose levels.

It seems appropriate to model the data

The p-value for Test 2 is greater than .05. A homogeneous variance model appears to be appropriate here

The p-value for Test 3 is less than .05. You may want to try a different model

Benchmark Dose Computation


Specified effect = 1

Risk Type = Estimated standard deviations from the control mean

Confidence level = 0.95

BMD = 106.072

BMDL = 76.5569



22:04 05/12 2005



```

=====
Polynomial Model. Revision: 2.2 Date: 9/12/2002
Input Data File: C:\BMDS\DATA\CYLINDRO.(d)
Gnuplot Plotting File: C:\BMDS\DATA\CYLINDRO.plt
Thu May 12 22:27:06 2005
=====

```

BMDS MODEL RUN

The form of the response function is:

$$Y[\text{dose}] = \text{beta}_0 + \text{beta}_1 \cdot \text{dose} + \text{beta}_2 \cdot \text{dose}^2 + \dots$$

Dependent variable = MEAN  
 Independent variable = dose  
 rho is set to 0  
 The polynomial coefficients are restricted to be positive  
 A constant variance model is fit

Total number of dose groups = 5  
 Total number of records with missing values = 0  
 Maximum number of iterations = 250  
 Relative Function Convergence has been set to: 1e-008  
 Parameter Convergence has been set to: 1e-008

Default Initial Parameter Values

```

alpha = 0.018741
rho = 0 Specified
beta_0 = 1.46523
beta_1 = 0
beta_2 = 0

```

Parameter Estimates

Variable	Estimate	Std. Err.	95.0% Wald Confidence Interval	
			Lower Conf. Limit	Upper Conf. Limit
alpha	0.0215477	0.00459399	0.0125437	0.0305518
beta_0	1.54205	0.0311925	1.48091	1.60318
beta_1	0.00138389	0.000287871	0.000819671	0.00194811
beta_2	0	NA		

NA - Indicates that this parameter has hit a bound implied by some inequality constraint and thus has no standard error.

Asymptotic Correlation Matrix of Parameter Estimates

	alpha	beta_0	beta_1
alpha	1	1.4e-010	7.2e-011
beta_0	1.4e-010	1	-0.7
beta_1	7.2e-011	-0.7	1

The following parameter(s) have been estimated at a boundary point or have been specified. Correlations are not computed:

beta\_2

Table of Data and Estimated Values of Interest

Dose Res.	N	Obs Mean	Obs Std Dev	Est Mean	Est Std Dev	Chi^2
0	10	1.48	0.1	1.54	0.147	-1.34
30	10	1.57	0.14	1.58	0.147	-0.292
60	9	1.66	0.16	1.63	0.147	0.714
120	9	1.82	0.12	1.71	0.147	2.29
240	6	1.78	0.17	1.87	0.147	-1.57

Model Descriptions for likelihoods calculated

Model A1:  $Y_{ij} = \mu(i) + e(ij)$   
 $\text{Var}\{e(ij)\} = \sigma^2$

Model A2:  $Y_{ij} = \mu(i) + e(ij)$   
 $\text{Var}\{e(ij)\} = \sigma(i)^2$

Model R:  $Y_i = \mu + e(i)$   
 $\text{Var}\{e(i)\} = \sigma^2$

Likelihoods of Interest

Model	Log(likelihood)	DF	AIC
A1	68.148702	6	-124.297404
A2	69.554943	10	-119.109885
fitted	62.424690	2	-120.849381
R	52.631671	2	-101.263343

Test 1: Does response and/or variances differ among dose levels  
(A2 vs. R)

Test 2: Are Variances Homogeneous (A1 vs A2)

Test 3: Does the Model for the Mean Fit (A1 vs. fitted)

Tests of Interest

Test	-2*log(Likelihood Ratio)	Test df	p-value
Test 1	33.8465	8	<.0001
Test 2	2.81248	4	0.5897
Test 3	11.448	2	0.003267

The p-value for Test 1 is less than .05. There appears to be a difference between response and/or variances among the dose levels.

It seems appropriate to model the data

The p-value for Test 2 is greater than .05. A homogeneous variance model appears to be appropriate here

The p-value for Test 3 is less than .05. You may want to try a different model

#### Benchmark Dose Computation

Specified effect = 1


Risk Type = Estimated standard deviations from the control mean

Confidence level = 0.95

BMD = 106.072

BMDL = 76.5569

Polynomial Model with 0.95 Confidence Level



22:27 05/12 2005

```

=====
Power Model. $Revision: 2.1 $ $Date: 2000/10/11 20:57:36 $
Input Data File: C:\BMDS\DATA\CYLINDRO.(d)
Gnuplot Plotting File: C:\BMDS\DATA\CYLINDRO.plt
                        Thu May 12 22:28:38 2005
=====

```

BMDS MODEL RUN

The form of the response function is:

$$Y[\text{dose}] = \text{control} + \text{slope} * \text{dose}^{\text{power}}$$

Dependent variable = MEAN  
 Independent variable = dose  
 rho is set to 0  
 The power is restricted to be greater than or equal to 1  
 A constant variance model is fit

Total number of dose groups = 5  
 Total number of records with missing values = 0  
 Maximum number of iterations = 250  
 Relative Function Convergence has been set to: 1e-008  
 Parameter Convergence has been set to: 1e-008

Default Initial Parameter Values  
 alpha = 0.018741  
 rho = 0 Specified  
 control = 1.48  
 slope = 0.0132605  
 power = 0.612843

Asymptotic Correlation Matrix of Parameter Estimates

	alpha	rho	control	slope	power
alpha	1	-1	NA	NA	NA
rho	-1	1	NA	NA	NA
control	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
slope	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
power	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

NA - This parameter's variance has been estimated at zero.

Parameter Estimates

Variable	Estimate	Std. Err.
alpha	0.0215477	0.0399798
rho	0	3.81654
control	1.54205	0.0380886
slope	0.00138389	0.00299534
power	1	0.337065

Table of Data and Estimated Values of Interest

Dose	N	Obs Mean	Obs Std Dev	Est Mean	Est Std Dev	Chi^2
0	10	1.48	0.1	1.54	0.147	-0.423
30	10	1.57	0.14	1.58	0.147	-0.0924
60	9	1.66	0.16	1.63	0.147	0.238
120	9	1.82	0.12	1.71	0.147	0.762
240	6	1.78	0.17	1.87	0.147	-0.642

Model Descriptions for likelihoods calculated

Model A1:  $Y_{ij} = \mu(i) + e(ij)$   
 $\text{Var}\{e(ij)\} = \sigma^2$

Model A2:  $Y_{ij} = \mu(i) + e(ij)$   
 $\text{Var}\{e(ij)\} = \sigma(i)^2$

Model R:  $Y_i = \mu + e(i)$   
 $\text{Var}\{e(i)\} = \sigma^2$

#### Likelihoods of Interest

Model	Log(likelihood)	DF	AIC
A1	68.148702	6	-124.297404
A2	69.554943	10	-119.109885
fitted	62.424690	4	-116.849381
R	52.631671	2	-101.263343

Test 1: Does response and/or variances differ among dose levels (A2 vs. R)

Test 2: Are Variances Homogeneous (A1 vs A2)

Test 3: Does the Model for the Mean Fit (A1 vs. fitted)

#### Tests of Interest

Test	$-2 \cdot \log(\text{Likelihood Ratio})$	df	p-value
Test 1	33.8465	8	<.00001
Test 2	2.81248	4	0.5897
Test 3	11.448	2	0.003267

The p-value for Test 1 is less than .05. There appears to be a difference between response and/or variances among the dose levels. It seems appropriate to model the data

The p-value for Test 2 is greater than .05. A homogeneous variance model appears to be appropriate here

The p-value for Test 3 is less than .05. You may want to try a different model

#### Benchmark Dose Computation

Specified effect = 1


Risk Type = Estimated standard deviations from the control mean

Confidence level = 0.95

BMD = 106.072

BMDL = 76.5569

Power Model with 0.95 Confidence Level



22:28 05/12 2005

```
=====
Hill Model. $Revision: 2.1 $ $Date: 2000/10/11 21:21:23 $
Input Data File: C:\BMDS\DATA\CYLINDRO.(d)
Gnuplot Plotting File: C:\BMDS\DATA\CYLINDRO.plt
Thu May 12 22:29:31 2005
=====
```

BMDS MODEL RUN

The form of the response function is:

$$Y[\text{dose}] = \text{intercept} + v \cdot \text{dose}^n / (k^n + \text{dose}^n)$$

Dependent variable = MEAN  
 Independent variable = dose  
 rho is set to 0  
 Power parameter restricted to be greater than 1  
 A constant variance model is fit

Total number of dose groups = 5  
 Total number of records with missing values = 0  
 Maximum number of iterations = 250  
 Relative Function Convergence has been set to: 1e-008  
 Parameter Convergence has been set to: 1e-008

Default Initial Parameter Values  
 alpha = 0.0183633  
 rho = 0 Specified  
 intercept = 1.48  
 v = 0.34  
 n = 0.959904  
 k = 63.3333

Asymptotic Correlation Matrix of Parameter Estimates

	alpha	rho	intercept	v	n	k
alpha	1	0	0	0	0	0
rho	0	1	0	0	0	0
intercept	0	0	1	0	0	0
v	0	0	0	1	0	0
n	0	0	0	0	1	0
k	0	0	0	0	0	1

Parameter Estimates

Variable	Estimate	Std. Err.
alpha	0.0172084	1
rho	0	1
intercept	1.4859	1
v	0.33478	1
n	2.46401	1
k	51.624	1

Table of Data and Estimated Values of Interest

Dose	N	Obs Mean	Obs Std Dev	Est Mean	Est Std Dev	Chi^2
0	10	1.48	0.1	1.49	0.131	-0.0449
30	10	1.57	0.14	1.56	0.131	0.11
60	9	1.66	0.16	1.68	0.131	-0.183
120	9	1.82	0.12	1.78	0.131	0.279
240	6	1.78	0.17	1.81	0.131	-0.253

Model Descriptions for likelihoods calculated

Model A1:  $Y_{ij} = \mu(i) + e(ij)$   
 $\text{Var}\{e(ij)\} = \sigma^2$



Model A2:  $Y_{ij} = \mu(i) + e(ij)$   
 $\text{Var}\{e(ij)\} = \sigma(i)^2$

Model R:  $Y_i = \mu + e(i)$   
 $\text{Var}\{e(i)\} = \sigma^2$

Likelihoods of Interest

Model	Log(likelihood)	DF	AIC
A1	68.148702	6	-124.297404
A2	69.554943	10	-119.109885
fitted	67.371885	5	-124.743770
R	52.631671	2	-101.263343

- Test 1: Does response and/or variances differ among dose levels (A2 vs. R)  
 Test 2: Are Variances Homogeneous (A1 vs A2)  
 Test 3: Does the Model for the Mean Fit (A1 vs. fitted)

Tests of Interest

Test	-2*log(Likelihood Ratio)	Test df	p-value
Test 1	33.8465	8	<.0001
Test 2	2.81248	4	0.5897
Test 3	1.55363	1	0.2126

The p-value for Test 1 is less than .05. There appears to be a difference between response and/or variances among the dose levels. It seems appropriate to model the data

The p-value for Test 2 is greater than .05. A homogeneous variance model appears to be appropriate here

The p-value for Test 3 is greater than .05. The model chosen appears to adequately describe the data

Benchmark Dose Computation

Specified effect = 1

Risk Type = Estimated standard deviations from the control mean


Confidence level = 0.95

BMD = 43.1891

Warning: optimum may not have been found. Bad completion code in Optimization routine.

BMDL computation failed.

# Hill Model



22:29 05/12 2005

**Part II.**

Humpage and Falconer 2003

male mice treated with purified cylindrospermopsin

rel kidney wt

drop high dose group

```

=====
Polynomial Model. Revision: 2.2 Date: 9/12/2002
Input Data File: C:\BMDS\DATA\CYLINDRO.(d)
Gnuplot Plotting File: C:\BMDS\DATA\CYLINDRO.plt
Thu May 12 22:31:50 2005
=====

```

BMDS MODEL RUN

The form of the response function is:

$$Y[\text{dose}] = \text{beta}_0 + \text{beta}_1 \cdot \text{dose} + \text{beta}_2 \cdot \text{dose}^2 + \dots$$

Dependent variable = MEAN  
Independent variable = dose  
rho is set to 0  
The polynomial coefficients are restricted to be positive  
A constant variance model is fit

Total number of dose groups = 4  
Total number of records with missing values = 0  
Maximum number of iterations = 250  
Relative Function Convergence has been set to: 1e-008  
Parameter Convergence has been set to: 1e-008

Default Initial Parameter Values

```

alpha = 0.0172471
rho = 0 Specified
beta_0 = 1.484
beta_1 = 0.00282857

```

Parameter Estimates

Variable	Estimate	Std. Err.	95.0% Wald Confidence Interval	
			Lower Conf. Limit	Upper Conf. Limit
alpha	0.0154483	0.00354407	0.008502	0.0223945
beta_0	1.4838	0.0306522	1.42373	1.54388
beta_1	0.00283099	0.000456935	0.00193541	0.00372656

Asymptotic Correlation Matrix of Parameter Estimates

	alpha	beta_0	beta_1
alpha	1	-1.7e-010	1.4e-010
beta_0	-1.7e-010	1	-0.75
beta_1	1.4e-010	-0.75	1

Table of Data and Estimated Values of Interest

Dose	N	Obs Mean	Obs Std Dev	Est Mean	Est Std Dev	Chi^2
0	10	1.48	0.1	1.48	0.124	-0.0968
30	10	1.57	0.14	1.57	0.124	0.0323
60	9	1.66	0.16	1.65	0.124	0.153
120	9	1.82	0.12	1.82	0.124	-0.085

Model Descriptions for likelihoods calculated

Model A1:  $Y_{ij} = \mu(i) + e(ij)$   
 $\text{Var}\{e(ij)\} = \sigma^2$

Model A2:  $Y_{ij} = \mu(i) + e(ij)$   
 $\text{Var}\{e(ij)\} = \sigma(i)^2$

Model R:  $Y_i = \mu + e(i)$   
 $\text{Var}\{e(i)\} = \sigma^2$

Likelihoods of Interest

Model	Log(likelihood)	DF	AIC
A1	60.255446	5	-110.510893
A2	61.376237	8	-106.752474
fitted	60.234922	2	-116.469843
R	46.462327	2	-88.924654

Test 1: Does response and/or variances differ among dose levels

(A2 vs. R)

Test 2: Are Variances Homogeneous (A1 vs A2)

Test 3: Does the Model for the Mean Fit (A1 vs. fitted)

Tests of Interest

Test	-2*log(Likelihood Ratio)	Test df	p-value
Test 1	29.8278	6	<.0001
Test 2	2.24158	3	0.5238
Test 3	0.0410496	2	0.9797

The p-value for Test 1 is less than .05. There appears to be a difference between response and/or variances among the dose levels.

It seems appropriate to model the data

The p-value for Test 2 is greater than .05. A homogeneous variance model appears to be appropriate here

The p-value for Test 3 is greater than .05. The model chosen appears to adequately describe the data

Benchmark Dose Computation

Specified effect = 1


Risk Type = Estimated standard deviations from the control mean

Confidence level = 0.95

BMD = 43.9038

BMDL = 33.0684

Linear Model with 0.95 Confidence Level



22:31 05/12 2005

```

=====
Polynomial Model. Revision: 2.2 Date: 9/12/2002
Input Data File: C:\BMDS\DATA\CYLINDRO.(d)
Gnuplot Plotting File: C:\BMDS\DATA\CYLINDRO.plt
Thu May 12 22:33:17 2005
=====

```

BMDS MODEL RUN

The form of the response function is:

$$Y[\text{dose}] = \text{beta}_0 + \text{beta}_1 \cdot \text{dose} + \text{beta}_2 \cdot \text{dose}^2 + \dots$$

Dependent variable = MEAN  
 Independent variable = dose  
 rho is set to 0  
 The polynomial coefficients are restricted to be positive  
 A constant variance model is fit

Total number of dose groups = 4  
 Total number of records with missing values = 0  
 Maximum number of iterations = 250  
 Relative Function Convergence has been set to: 1e-008  
 Parameter Convergence has been set to: 1e-008

Default Initial Parameter Values

```

alpha = 0.0172471
rho = 0 Specified
beta_0 = 1.47945
beta_1 = 0.00314242
beta_2 = 0

```

Parameter Estimates

Variable	Estimate	Std. Err.	95.0% Wald Confidence Interval	
			Lower Conf. Limit	Upper Conf. Limit
alpha	0.0154483	0.00354407	0.008502	0.0223945
beta_0	1.4838	0.0306522	1.42373	1.54388
beta_1	0.00283099	0.000456935	0.00193541	0.00372656
beta_2	0	NA		

NA - Indicates that this parameter has hit a bound implied by some inequality constraint and thus has no standard error.

Asymptotic Correlation Matrix of Parameter Estimates

	alpha	beta_0	beta_1
alpha	1	4.9e-011	9.5e-011
beta_0	4.9e-011	1	-0.75
beta_1	9.5e-011	-0.75	1

The following parameter(s) have been estimated at a boundary point or have been specified. Correlations are not computed:

beta\_2

Table of Data and Estimated Values of Interest

Dose Res.	N	Obs Mean	Obs Std Dev	Est Mean	Est Std Dev	Chi^2
0	10	1.48	0.1	1.48	0.124	-0.0968
30	10	1.57	0.14	1.57	0.124	0.0323
60	9	1.66	0.16	1.65	0.124	0.153
120	9	1.82	0.12	1.82	0.124	-0.085

Model Descriptions for likelihoods calculated

Model A1:  $Y_{ij} = \mu(i) + e(ij)$   
 $\text{Var}\{e(ij)\} = \sigma^2$

Model A2:  $Y_{ij} = \mu(i) + e(ij)$   
 $\text{Var}\{e(ij)\} = \sigma(i)^2$

Model R:  $Y_i = \mu + e(i)$   
 $\text{Var}\{e(i)\} = \sigma^2$

Likelihoods of Interest

Model	Log(likelihood)	DF	AIC
A1	60.255446	5	-110.510893
A2	61.376237	8	-106.752474
fitted	60.234922	2	-116.469843
R	46.462327	2	-88.924654

Test 1: Does response and/or variances differ among dose levels

(A2 vs. R)

Test 2: Are Variances Homogeneous (A1 vs A2)

Test 3: Does the Model for the Mean Fit (A1 vs. fitted)



Tests of Interest

Test	-2*log(Likelihood Ratio)	Test df	p-value
Test 1	29.8278	6	<.0001
Test 2	2.24158	3	0.5238
Test 3	0.0410496	1	0.8394

The p-value for Test 1 is less than .05. There appears to be a difference between response and/or variances among the dose levels.

It seems appropriate to model the data

The p-value for Test 2 is greater than .05. A homogeneous variance model appears to be appropriate here

The p-value for Test 3 is greater than .05. The model chosen appears to adequately describe the data

Benchmark Dose Computation

Specified effect = 1


Risk Type = Estimated standard deviations from the control mean

Confidence level = 0.95

BMD = 43.9038

BMDL = 33.0684

Polynomial Model with 0.95 Confidence Level



22:33 05/12 2005

```

=====
Power Model. $Revision: 2.1 $ $Date: 2000/10/11 20:57:36 $
Input Data File: C:\BMDS\DATA\CYLINDRO.(d)
Gnuplot Plotting File: C:\BMDS\DATA\CYLINDRO.plt
Thu May 12 22:34:08 2005
=====

```

BMDS MODEL RUN

The form of the response function is:

$$Y[\text{dose}] = \text{control} + \text{slope} * \text{dose}^{\text{power}}$$

Dependent variable = MEAN  
 Independent variable = dose  
 rho is set to 0  
 The power is restricted to be greater than or equal to 1  
 A constant variance model is fit

Total number of dose groups = 4  
 Total number of records with missing values = 0  
 Maximum number of iterations = 250  
 Relative Function Convergence has been set to: 1e-008  
 Parameter Convergence has been set to: 1e-008

Default Initial Parameter Values  
 alpha = 0.0172471  
 rho = 0 Specified  
 control = 1.48  
 slope = 0.00345163  
 power = 0.958769

Asymptotic Correlation Matrix of Parameter Estimates

	alpha	rho	control	slope	power
alpha	1	-0.99	0.25	-0.29	0.29
rho	-0.99	1	-0.25	0.29	-0.28
control	0.25	-0.25	1	-0.71	0.66
slope	-0.29	0.29	-0.71	1	-1
power	0.29	-0.28	0.66	-1	1

Parameter Estimates

Variable	Estimate	Std. Err.
alpha	0.0154483	0.0279175
rho	0	3.65432
control	1.4838	0.0410106
slope	0.00283099	0.00517499
power	1	0.372848

Table of Data and Estimated Values of Interest

Dose	N	Obs Mean	Obs Std Dev	Est Mean	Est Std Dev	Chi^2
0	10	1.48	0.1	1.48	0.124	-0.0306
30	10	1.57	0.14	1.57	0.124	0.0102
60	9	1.66	0.16	1.65	0.124	0.051
120	9	1.82	0.12	1.82	0.124	-0.0283

Model Descriptions for likelihoods calculated

Model A1:  $Y_{ij} = \mu(i) + e(ij)$   
 $\text{Var}\{e(ij)\} = \sigma^2$

Model A2:  $Y_{ij} = \mu(i) + e(ij)$   
 $\text{Var}\{e(ij)\} = \sigma(i)^2$

Model R:  $Y_i = \mu + e(i)$   
 $\text{Var}\{e(i)\} = \sigma^2$

Likelihoods of Interest

Model	Log(likelihood)	DF	AIC
A1	60.255446	5	-110.510893
A2	61.376237	8	-106.752474
fitted	60.234922	4	-112.469843
R	46.462327	2	-88.924654

Test 1: Does response and/or variances differ among dose levels (A2 vs. R)

Test 2: Are Variances Homogeneous (A1 vs A2)

Test 3: Does the Model for the Mean Fit (A1 vs. fitted)

Tests of Interest

Test	$-2 \cdot \log(\text{Likelihood Ratio})$	df	p-value
Test 1	29.8278	6	<.00001
Test 2	2.24158	3	0.5238
Test 3	0.0410496	1	0.8394

The p-value for Test 1 is less than .05. There appears to be a difference between response and/or variances among the dose levels. It seems appropriate to model the data

The p-value for Test 2 is greater than .05. A homogeneous variance model appears to be appropriate here

The p-value for Test 3 is greater than .05. The model chosen appears to adequately describe the data

Benchmark Dose Computation

Specified effect = 1


Risk Type = Estimated standard deviations from the control mean

Confidence level = 0.95

BMD = 43.9038

BMDL = 33.0684

Power Model with 0.95 Confidence Level



22:34 05/12 2005

```
=====
Hill Model. $Revision: 2.1 $ $Date: 2000/10/11 21:21:23 $
Input Data File: C:\BMDS\DATA\CYLINDRO.(d)
Gnuplot Plotting File: C:\BMDS\DATA\CYLINDRO.plt
Thu May 12 22:34:43 2005
=====
```

BMDS MODEL RUN

The form of the response function is:

$$Y[\text{dose}] = \text{intercept} + v \cdot \text{dose}^n / (k^n + \text{dose}^n)$$

Dependent variable = MEAN  
 Independent variable = dose  
 rho is set to 0  
 Power parameter restricted to be greater than 1  
 A constant variance model is fit

Total number of dose groups = 4  
 Total number of records with missing values = 0  
 Maximum number of iterations = 250  
 Relative Function Convergence has been set to: 1e-008  
 Parameter Convergence has been set to: 1e-008

Default Initial Parameter Values  
 alpha = 0.0163951  
 rho = 0 Specified  
 intercept = 1.48  
 v = 0.34  
 n = 0.68364  
 k = 63.3333

Asymptotic Correlation Matrix of Parameter Estimates

	alpha	rho	intercept	v	n	k
alpha	1	0	0	0	0	0
rho	0	1	0	0	0	0
intercept	0	0	1	0	0	0
v	0	0	0	1	0	0
n	0	0	0	0	1	0
k	0	0	0	0	0	1

Parameter Estimates

Variable	Estimate	Std. Err.
alpha	0.0154316	1
rho	0	1
intercept	1.48	1
v	1.62004	1
n	1.08746	1
k	406.089	1

Table of Data and Estimated Values of Interest

Dose	N	Obs Mean	Obs Std Dev	Est Mean	Est Std Dev	Chi^2
0	10	1.48	0.1	1.48	0.124	-2.33e-007
30	10	1.57	0.14	1.57	0.124	-4.42e-007
60	9	1.66	0.16	1.66	0.124	8.2e-007
120	9	1.82	0.12	1.82	0.124	-1.25e-008

Model Descriptions for likelihoods calculated

Model A1:  $Y_{ij} = \mu(i) + e(ij)$   
 $\text{Var}\{e(ij)\} = \sigma^2$

Model A2:  $Y_{ij} = \mu(i) + e(ij)$   
 $\text{Var}\{e(ij)\} = \sigma(i)^2$

Model R:  $Y_i = \mu + e(i)$   
 $\text{Var}\{e(i)\} = \sigma^2$

Warning: Likelihood for fitted model larger than the Likelihood for model A1.

Likelihoods of Interest

Model	Log(likelihood)	DF	AIC
A1	60.255446	5	-110.510893
A2	61.376237	8	-106.752474
fitted	60.255447	5	-110.510893
R	46.462327	2	-88.924654

Test 1: Does response and/or variances differ among dose levels (A2 vs. R)

Test 2: Are Variances Homogeneous (A1 vs A2)

Test 3: Does the Model for the Mean Fit (A1 vs. fitted)

Tests of Interest

Test	-2*log(Likelihood Ratio)	Test df	p-value
Test 1	29.8278	6	<.0001
Test 2	2.24158	3	0.5238
Test 3	-4.58279e-007	0	NA

The p-value for Test 1 is less than .05. There appears to be a difference between response and/or variances among the dose levels. It seems appropriate to model the data

The p-value for Test 2 is greater than .05. A homogeneous variance model appears to be appropriate here

NA - Degrees of freedom for Test 3 are less than or equal to 0. The Chi-Square

test for fit is not valid

Benchmark Dose Computation

Specified effect = 1


Risk Type = Estimated standard deviations from the control mean

Confidence level = 0.95

BMD = 41.1966

BMDL = 21.722

Hill Model with 0.95 Confidence Level



22:34 05/12 2005



**Part III.**

Humpage and Falconer 2003

male mice treated with purified cylindrospermopsin  
urinary protein levels

```

=====
Polynomial Model. Revision: 2.2 Date: 9/12/2002
Input Data File: C:\BMDS\DATA\CYLINDRO.(d)
Gnuplot Plotting File: C:\BMDS\DATA\CYLINDRO.plt
Thu May 12 23:15:09 2005
=====

```

BMDS MODEL RUN

The form of the response function is:

$$Y[\text{dose}] = \text{beta}_0 + \text{beta}_1 \cdot \text{dose} + \text{beta}_2 \cdot \text{dose}^2 + \dots$$

Dependent variable = MEAN  
 Independent variable = dose  
 rho is set to 0  
 Signs of the polynomial coefficients are not restricted  
 A constant variance model is fit

Total number of dose groups = 5  
 Total number of records with missing values = 0  
 Maximum number of iterations = 250  
 Relative Function Convergence has been set to: 1e-008  
 Parameter Convergence has been set to: 1e-008

Default Initial Parameter Values  
 alpha = 0.0467949  
 rho = 0 Specified  
 beta\_0 = 4.00125  
 beta\_1 = -0.0114583

Parameter Estimates

Variable	Estimate	Std. Err.	95.0% Wald Confidence Interval	
			Lower Conf. Limit	Upper Conf. Limit
alpha	0.109717	0.0233918	0.0638701	0.155564
beta_0	4.03293	0.070386	3.89498	4.17088
beta_1	-0.0120086	0.000649584	-0.0132818	-0.0107354

Asymptotic Correlation Matrix of Parameter Estimates

	alpha	beta_0	beta_1
alpha	1	2.5e-009	9.1e-010
beta_0	2.5e-009	1	-0.7
beta_1	9.1e-010	-0.7	1

Table of Data and Estimated Values of Interest

Dose	N	Obs Mean	Obs Std Dev	Est Mean	Est Std Dev	Chi^2
0	10	4.25	0.3	4.03	0.331	2.07
30	10	3.7	0.25	3.67	0.331	0.261
60	9	3.25	0.05	3.31	0.331	-0.565
120	9	2.15	0.2	2.59	0.331	-4
240	6	1.5	0.15	1.15	0.331	2.58

Model Descriptions for likelihoods calculated

Model A1:  $Y_{ij} = \mu(i) + e(ij)$   
 $\text{Var}\{e(ij)\} = \sigma^2$

Model A2:  $Y_{ij} = \mu(i) + e(ij)$   
 $\text{Var}\{e(ij)\} = \sigma(i)^2$

Model R:  $Y_i = \mu + e(i)$   
 $\text{Var}\{e(i)\} = \sigma^2$

Likelihoods of Interest

Model	Log(likelihood)	DF	AIC
A1	48.017412	6	-84.034824
A2	59.392540	10	-98.785081
fitted	26.616696	2	-49.233392
R	-21.651321	2	47.302642

Test 1: Does response and/or variances differ among dose levels

(A2 vs. R)

Test 2: Are Variances Homogeneous (A1 vs A2)

Test 3: Does the Model for the Mean Fit (A1 vs. fitted)

Tests of Interest

Test	-2*log(Likelihood Ratio)	Test df	p-value
Test 1	162.088	8	<.0001
Test 2	22.7503	4	0.000142
Test 3	42.8014	3	<.0001

The p-value for Test 1 is less than .05. There appears to be a difference between response and/or variances among the dose levels.

It seems appropriate to model the data

The p-value for Test 2 is less than .05. Consider running a non-homogeneous variance model

The p-value for Test 3 is less than .05. You may want to try a different model

Benchmark Dose Computation

Specified effect = 1


Risk Type = Estimated standard deviations from the control mean

Confidence level = 0.95

BMD = 27.5832

BMDL = 22.9758

Linear Model with 0.95 Confidence Level



23:15 05/12 2005

```

=====
Polynomial Model. Revision: 2.2 Date: 9/12/2002
Input Data File: C:\BMDS\DATA\CYLINDRO.(d)
Gnuplot Plotting File: C:\BMDS\DATA\CYLINDRO.plt
Thu May 12 23:16:16 2005
=====

```

BMDS MODEL RUN

The form of the response function is:

$$Y[\text{dose}] = \text{beta}_0 + \text{beta}_1 \cdot \text{dose} + \text{beta}_2 \cdot \text{dose}^2 + \dots$$

Dependent variable = MEAN  
Independent variable = dose  
Signs of the polynomial coefficients are not restricted  
The variance is to be modeled as  $\text{Var}(i) = \text{alpha} \cdot \text{mean}(i)^{\text{rho}}$

Total number of dose groups = 5  
Total number of records with missing values = 0  
Maximum number of iterations = 250  
Relative Function Convergence has been set to: 1e-008  
Parameter Convergence has been set to: 1e-008

Default Initial Parameter Values

```

alpha = 0.0467949
rho = 0
beta_0 = 4.00125
beta_1 = -0.0114583

```

Parameter Estimates

Variable	Estimate	Std. Err.	95.0% Wald Confidence Interval	
			Lower Conf. Limit	Upper Conf. Limit
alpha	0.0612302	0.0136561	0.0344646	0.0879957
rho	-0.214753	0.0359694	-0.285252	-0.144255
beta_0	4.26301	0.0535233	4.15811	4.36791
beta_1	-0.0177625	0.00084855	-0.0194257	-0.0160994

Asymptotic Correlation Matrix of Parameter Estimates

	alpha	rho	beta_0	beta_1
alpha	1	0.12	0.11	-0.18
rho	0.12	1	-0.18	0.29
beta_0	0.11	-0.18	1	-0.75
beta_1	-0.18	0.29	-0.75	1

Table of Data and Estimated Values of Interest

Dose	N	Obs Mean	Obs Std Dev	Est Mean	Est Std Dev	Chi^2
0	10	4.25	0.3	4.26	0.212	-0.194
30	10	3.7	0.25	3.73	0.215	-0.444
60	9	3.25	0.05	3.2	0.218	0.724
120	9	2.15	0.2	2.13	0.228	0.243
240	6	1.5	0.15	4.95e-008	1.51	2.44

Model Descriptions for likelihoods calculated

- Model A1:  $Y_{ij} = \mu(i) + e(ij)$   
 $\text{Var}\{e(ij)\} = \sigma^2$
- Model A2:  $Y_{ij} = \mu(i) + e(ij)$   
 $\text{Var}\{e(ij)\} = \sigma(i)^2$
- Model A3:  $Y_{ij} = \mu(i) + e(ij)$   
 $\text{Var}\{e(ij)\} = \alpha * (\mu(i))^\rho$
- Model R:  $Y_i = \mu + e(i)$   
 $\text{Var}\{e(i)\} = \sigma^2$

Likelihoods of Interest

Model	Log(likelihood)	DF	AIC
A1	48.017412	6	-84.034824
A2	59.392540	10	-98.785081
A3	49.799962	7	-85.599924
fitted	33.618701	4	-59.237401
R	-21.651321	2	47.302642

Explanation of Tests

- Test 1: Does response and/or variances differ among Dose levels?  
 (A2 vs. R)
- Test 2: Are Variances Homogeneous? (A1 vs A2)
- Test 3: Are variances adequately modeled? (A2 vs. A3)
- Test 4: Does the Model for the Mean Fit? (A3 vs. fitted)

Tests of Interest

Test	-2*log(Likelihood Ratio)	Test df	p-value
Test 1	162.088	8	<.0001
Test 2	22.7503	4	0.000142
Test 3	19.1852	3	0.0002503
Test 4	32.3625	3	<.0001

The p-value for Test 1 is less than .05. There appears to be a difference between response and/or variances among the dose levels  
It seems appropriate to model the data

The p-value for Test 2 is less than .05. A non-homogeneous variance model appears to be appropriate

The p-value for Test 3 is less than .05. You may want to consider a different variance model

The p-value for Test 4 is less than .05. You may want to try a different model

Benchmark Dose Computation

Specified effect = 1


Risk Type = Estimated standard deviations from the control mean

Confidence level = 0.95

BMD = 11.9223

BMDL computation failed.

Linear Model with 0.95 Confidence Level



23:16 05/12 2005

```
=====  
Polynomial Model. Revision: 2.2 Date: 9/12/2002  
Input Data File: C:\BMDS\DATA\CYLINDRO.(d)  
Gnuplot Plotting File: C:\BMDS\DATA\CYLINDRO.plt  
Thu May 12 23:17:30 2005  
=====
```

BMDS MODEL RUN

The form of the response function is:

$$Y[\text{dose}] = \text{beta}_0 + \text{beta}_1 \cdot \text{dose} + \text{beta}_2 \cdot \text{dose}^2 + \dots$$

Dependent variable = MEAN  
Independent variable = dose  
rho is set to 0  
Signs of the polynomial coefficients are not restricted  
A constant variance model is fit

Total number of dose groups = 5  
Total number of records with missing values = 0  
Maximum number of iterations = 250  
Relative Function Convergence has been set to: 1e-008  
Parameter Convergence has been set to: 1e-008



Default Initial Parameter Values  
 alpha = 0.0467949  
 rho = 0 Specified  
 beta\_0 = 4.23439  
 beta\_1 = -0.0148331  
 beta\_2 = -5.51541e-005  
 beta\_3 = 2.89474e-007

Parameter Estimates

Variable	Estimate	Std. Err.	95.0% Wald Confidence Interval	
			Lower Conf. Limit	Upper Conf. Limit
alpha	0.0424211	0.0090442	0.0246948	0.0601474
beta_0	4.23509	0.0633648	4.1109	4.35929
beta_1	-0.0149779	0.00335279	-0.0215492	-0.00840654
beta_2	-5.33342e-005	4.06738e-005	-0.000133053	2.63851e-005
beta_3	2.84322e-007	1.17673e-007	5.36875e-008	5.14956e-007

Asymptotic Correlation Matrix of Parameter Estimates

	alpha	beta_0	beta_1	beta_2	beta_3
alpha	1	-1.8e-008	-4.3e-009	1.3e-009	1.5e-009
beta_0	-1.8e-008	1	-0.71	0.55	-0.48
beta_1	-4.3e-009	-0.71	1	-0.96	0.91
beta_2	1.3e-009	0.55	-0.96	1	-0.99
beta_3	1.5e-009	-0.48	0.91	-0.99	1

Table of Data and Estimated Values of Interest

Dose	N	Obs Mean	Obs Std Dev	Est Mean	Est Std Dev	Chi^2
0	10	4.25	0.3	4.24	0.206	0.229
30	10	3.7	0.25	3.75	0.206	-0.698
60	9	3.25	0.05	3.21	0.206	0.643
120	9	2.15	0.2	2.16	0.206	-0.161
240	6	1.5	0.15	1.5	0.206	0.0141

Model Descriptions for likelihoods calculated

Model A1:  $Y_{ij} = \mu(i) + e(ij)$   
 $\text{Var}\{e(ij)\} = \sigma^2$   
 Model A2:  $Y_{ij} = \mu(i) + e(ij)$   
 $\text{Var}\{e(ij)\} = \sigma(i)^2$   
 Model R:  $Y_i = \mu + e(i)$   
 $\text{Var}\{e(i)\} = \sigma^2$

Likelihoods of Interest

Model	Log(likelihood)	DF	AIC
A1	48.017412	6	-84.034824
A2	59.392540	10	-98.785081
fitted	47.522415	4	-87.044831
R	-21.651321	2	47.302642

Test 1: Does response and/or variances differ among dose levels

(A2 vs. R)

Test 2: Are Variances Homogeneous (A1 vs A2)

Test 3: Does the Model for the Mean Fit (A1 vs. fitted)

Tests of Interest

Test	-2*log(Likelihood Ratio)	Test df	p-value
Test 1	162.088	8	<.0001
Test 2	22.7503	4	0.000142
Test 3	0.989994	1	0.3197

The p-value for Test 1 is less than .05. There appears to be a difference between response and/or variances among the dose levels.

It seems appropriate to model the data

The p-value for Test 2 is less than .05. Consider running a non-homogeneous variance model

The p-value for Test 3 is greater than .05. The model chosen appears to adequately describe the data

Benchmark Dose Computation

Specified effect = 1


Risk Type = Estimated standard deviations from the control mean

Confidence level = 0.95

BMD = 13.1764

BMDL = 9.7619

Polynomial Model with 0.95 Confidence Level



23:17 05/12 2005

```
=====  
Polynomial Model. Revision: 2.2 Date: 9/12/2002  
Input Data File: C:\BMDS\DATA\CYLINDRO.(d)  
Gnuplot Plotting File: C:\BMDS\DATA\CYLINDRO.plt  
Thu May 12 23:18:39 2005  
=====
```

BMDS MODEL RUN

The form of the response function is:

$$Y[\text{dose}] = \text{beta}_0 + \text{beta}_1 \cdot \text{dose} + \text{beta}_2 \cdot \text{dose}^2 + \dots$$

Dependent variable = MEAN  
Independent variable = dose  
rho is set to 0  
The polynomial coefficients are restricted to be negative  
A constant variance model is fit

Total number of dose groups = 5  
Total number of records with missing values = 0  
Maximum number of iterations = 250  
Relative Function Convergence has been set to: 1e-008  
Parameter Convergence has been set to: 1e-008

Default Initial Parameter Values  
 alpha = 0.0467949  
 rho = 0 Specified  
 beta\_0 = 4.23439  
 beta\_1 = -0.0148331  
 beta\_2 = -5.51541e-005  
 beta\_3 = 0

Parameter Estimates

Variable	Estimate	Std. Err.	95.0% Wald Confidence Interval	
			Lower Conf. Limit	Upper Conf. Limit
alpha	0.109717	0.0233918	0.0638701	0.155564
beta_0	4.03293	0.070386	3.89498	4.17088
beta_1	-0.0120086	0.000649584	-0.0132818	-0.0107354
beta_2	0	NA		
beta_3	0	NA		

NA - Indicates that this parameter has hit a bound implied by some inequality constraint and thus has no standard error.

Asymptotic Correlation Matrix of Parameter Estimates

	alpha	beta_0	beta_1
alpha	1	-1.2e-007	8.2e-008
beta_0	-1.2e-007	1	-0.7
beta_1	8.2e-008	-0.7	1

The following parameter(s) have been estimated at a boundary point or have been specified. Correlations are not computed:

beta\_2 beta\_3

Table of Data and Estimated Values of Interest

Dose	N	Obs Mean	Obs Std Dev	Est Mean	Est Std Dev	Chi^2
0	10	4.25	0.3	4.03	0.331	2.07
30	10	3.7	0.25	3.67	0.331	0.261
60	9	3.25	0.05	3.31	0.331	-0.565
120	9	2.15	0.2	2.59	0.331	-4
240	6	1.5	0.15	1.15	0.331	2.58

Model Descriptions for likelihoods calculated

Model A1:  $Y_{ij} = \mu(i) + e(ij)$   
 $\text{Var}\{e(ij)\} = \sigma^2$

Model A2:  $Y_{ij} = \mu(i) + e(ij)$   
 $\text{Var}\{e(ij)\} = \sigma(i)^2$

Model R:  $Y_i = \mu + e(i)$   
 $\text{Var}\{e(i)\} = \sigma^2$

Likelihoods of Interest

Model	Log(likelihood)	DF	AIC
A1	48.017412	6	-84.034824
A2	59.392540	10	-98.785081
fitted	26.616696	2	-49.233392
R	-21.651321	2	47.302642

Test 1: Does response and/or variances differ among dose levels

(A2 vs. R)

Test 2: Are Variances Homogeneous (A1 vs A2)

Test 3: Does the Model for the Mean Fit (A1 vs. fitted)

Tests of Interest

Test	-2*log(Likelihood Ratio)	Test df	p-value
Test 1	162.088	8	<.0001
Test 2	22.7503	4	0.000142
Test 3	42.8014	1	<.0001

The p-value for Test 1 is less than .05. There appears to be a difference between response and/or variances among the dose levels.

It seems appropriate to model the data

The p-value for Test 2 is less than .05. Consider running a non-homogeneous variance model

The p-value for Test 3 is less than .05. You may want to try a different model

Benchmark Dose Computation

Specified effect = 1


Risk Type = Estimated standard deviations from the control mean

Confidence level = 0.95

BMD = 27.5832

BMDL = 22.9758

Polynomial Model with 0.95 Confidence Level



23:18 05/12 2005

```

=====
Polynomial Model. Revision: 2.2 Date: 9/12/2002
Input Data File: C:\BMDS\DATA\CYLINDRO.(d)
Gnuplot Plotting File: C:\BMDS\DATA\CYLINDRO.plt
Thu May 12 23:19:29 2005
=====

```

BMDS MODEL RUN

The form of the response function is:

$$Y[\text{dose}] = \text{beta}_0 + \text{beta}_1 \cdot \text{dose} + \text{beta}_2 \cdot \text{dose}^2 + \dots$$

Dependent variable = MEAN  
 Independent variable = dose  
 rho is set to 0  
 Signs of the polynomial coefficients are not restricted  
 A constant variance model is fit

Total number of dose groups = 5  
 Total number of records with missing values = 0  
 Maximum number of iterations = 250  
 Relative Function Convergence has been set to: 1e-008  
 Parameter Convergence has been set to: 1e-008

Default Initial Parameter Values

alpha = 0.0467949  
 rho = 0 Specified  
 beta\_0 = 4.31231  
 beta\_1 = -0.0224959  
 beta\_2 = 4.45961e-005

Parameter Estimates

Variable	Estimate	Std. Err.	95.0% Wald Confidence Interval	
			Lower Conf. Limit	Upper Conf. Limit
alpha	0.0480497	0.0102442	0.0279713	0.068128
beta_0	4.30818	0.0592565	4.19204	4.42432
beta_1	-0.0223839	0.00144605	-0.0252181	-0.0195497
beta_2	4.40376e-005	5.86023e-006	3.25518e-005	5.55235e-005

Asymptotic Correlation Matrix of Parameter Estimates

	alpha	beta_0	beta_1	beta_2
alpha	1	3.3e-009	-6.2e-010	-7.7e-009
beta_0	3.3e-009	1	-0.75	0.62
beta_1	-6.2e-010	-0.75	1	-0.95
beta_2	-7.7e-009	0.62	-0.95	1

Table of Data and Estimated Values of Interest

Dose	N	Obs Mean	Obs Std Dev	Est Mean	Est Std Dev	Chi^2
0	10	4.25	0.3	4.31	0.219	-0.839
30	10	3.7	0.25	3.68	0.219	0.342
60	9	3.25	0.05	3.12	0.219	1.73
120	9	2.15	0.2	2.26	0.219	-1.45
240	6	1.5	0.15	1.47	0.219	0.306

Model Descriptions for likelihoods calculated

Model A1:  $Y_{ij} = \mu(i) + e(ij)$   
 $\text{Var}\{e(ij)\} = \sigma^2$

Model A2:  $Y_{ij} = \mu(i) + e(ij)$   
 $\text{Var}\{e(ij)\} = \sigma(i)^2$

Model R:  $Y_i = \mu + e(i)$   
 $\text{Var}\{e(i)\} = \sigma^2$

Likelihoods of Interest

Model	Log(likelihood)	DF	AIC
A1	48.017412	6	-84.034824
A2	59.392540	10	-98.785081
fitted	44.781449	3	-83.562899
R	-21.651321	2	47.302642

Test 1: Does response and/or variances differ among dose levels

(A2 vs. R)

Test 2: Are Variances Homogeneous (A1 vs A2)

Test 3: Does the Model for the Mean Fit (A1 vs. fitted)

Tests of Interest

Test	-2*log(Likelihood Ratio)	Test df	p-value
Test 1	162.088	8	<.0001
Test 2	22.7503	4	0.000142
Test 3	6.47193	2	0.03932

The p-value for Test 1 is less than .05. There appears to be a difference between response and/or variances among the dose levels.

It seems appropriate to model the data

The p-value for Test 2 is less than .05. Consider running a non-homogeneous variance model

The p-value for Test 3 is less than .05. You may want to try a different model

Benchmark Dose Computation

Specified effect = 1

Risk Type = Estimated standard deviations from the control mean


Confidence level = 0.95

BMD = 9.98916

BMDL = 8.24167



Polynomial Model with 0.95 Confidence Level



23:19 05/12 2005

```
=====  
Polynomial Model. Revision: 2.2 Date: 9/12/2002  
Input Data File: C:\BMDS\DATA\CYLINDRO.(d)  
Gnuplot Plotting File: C:\BMDS\DATA\CYLINDRO.plt  
Thu May 12 23:20:33 2005  
=====
```

BMDS MODEL RUN

The form of the response function is:

$$Y[\text{dose}] = \text{beta}_0 + \text{beta}_1 \cdot \text{dose} + \text{beta}_2 \cdot \text{dose}^2 + \dots$$

Dependent variable = MEAN  
Independent variable = dose  
rho is set to 0  
The polynomial coefficients are restricted to be negative  
A constant variance model is fit

Total number of dose groups = 5  
Total number of records with missing values = 0  
Maximum number of iterations = 250  
Relative Function Convergence has been set to: 1e-008  
Parameter Convergence has been set to: 1e-008

Default Initial Parameter Values  
 alpha = 0.0467949  
 rho = 0 Specified  
 beta\_0 = 4.31231  
 beta\_1 = -0.0224959  
 beta\_2 = 0

Parameter Estimates

Variable	Estimate	Std. Err.	95.0% Wald Confidence Interval	
			Lower Conf. Limit	Upper Conf. Limit
alpha	0.109717	0.0233918	0.0638701	0.155564
beta_0	4.03293	0.070386	3.89498	4.17088
beta_1	-0.0120086	0.000649584	-0.0132818	-0.0107354
beta_2	0	NA		

NA - Indicates that this parameter has hit a bound implied by some inequality constraint and thus has no standard error.

Asymptotic Correlation Matrix of Parameter Estimates

	alpha	beta_0	beta_1
alpha	1	1.4e-008	2.1e-009
beta_0	1.4e-008	1	-0.7
beta_1	2.1e-009	-0.7	1

The following parameter(s) have been estimated at a boundary point or have been specified. Correlations are not computed:

beta\_2

Table of Data and Estimated Values of Interest

Dose	N	Obs Mean	Obs Std Dev	Est Mean	Est Std Dev	Chi^2
0	10	4.25	0.3	4.03	0.331	2.07
30	10	3.7	0.25	3.67	0.331	0.261
60	9	3.25	0.05	3.31	0.331	-0.565
120	9	2.15	0.2	2.59	0.331	-4
240	6	1.5	0.15	1.15	0.331	2.58

Model Descriptions for likelihoods calculated

Model A1:  $Y_{ij} = \mu(i) + e(ij)$   
 $\text{Var}\{e(ij)\} = \sigma^2$

Model A2:  $Y_{ij} = \mu(i) + e(ij)$   
 $\text{Var}\{e(ij)\} = \sigma(i)^2$

Model R:  $Y_i = \mu + e(i)$   
 $\text{Var}\{e(i)\} = \sigma^2$

Likelihoods of Interest

Model	Log(likelihood)	DF	AIC
A1	48.017412	6	-84.034824
A2	59.392540	10	-98.785081
fitted	26.616696	2	-49.233392
R	-21.651321	2	47.302642

Test 1: Does response and/or variances differ among dose levels

(A2 vs. R)

Test 2: Are Variances Homogeneous (A1 vs A2)

Test 3: Does the Model for the Mean Fit (A1 vs. fitted)

Tests of Interest

Test	-2*log(Likelihood Ratio)	Test df	p-value
Test 1	162.088	8	<.0001
Test 2	22.7503	4	0.000142
Test 3	42.8014	2	<.0001

The p-value for Test 1 is less than .05. There appears to be a difference between response and/or variances among the dose levels.

It seems appropriate to model the data

The p-value for Test 2 is less than .05. Consider running a non-homogeneous variance model

The p-value for Test 3 is less than .05. You may want to try a different model

Benchmark Dose Computation

Specified effect = 1


Risk Type = Estimated standard deviations from the control mean

Confidence level = 0.95

BMD = 27.5832

BMDL = 22.9758

Polynomial Model with 0.95 Confidence Level



23:20 05/12 2005

```

=====
Power Model. $Revision: 2.1 $ $Date: 2000/10/11 20:57:36 $
Input Data File: C:\BMDS\DATA\CYLINDRO.(d)
Gnuplot Plotting File: C:\BMDS\DATA\CYLINDRO.plt
Thu May 12 23:21:09 2005
=====

```

BMDS MODEL RUN

The form of the response function is:

$$Y[\text{dose}] = \text{control} + \text{slope} * \text{dose}^{\text{power}}$$

Dependent variable = MEAN  
 Independent variable = dose  
 rho is set to 0  
 The power is restricted to be greater than or equal to 1  
 A constant variance model is fit

Total number of dose groups = 5  
 Total number of records with missing values = 0  
 Maximum number of iterations = 250  
 Relative Function Convergence has been set to: 1e-008  
 Parameter Convergence has been set to: 1e-008

Default Initial Parameter Values  
 alpha = 0.0467949  
 rho = 0 Specified  
 control = 4.25  
 slope = -340.972  
 power = -0.879496

Asymptotic Correlation Matrix of Parameter Estimates

	alpha	rho	control	slope	power
alpha	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
rho	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
control	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
slope	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
power	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

NA - This parameter's variance has been estimated at zero.

Parameter Estimates

Variable	Estimate	Std. Err.
alpha	0.109717	0.114352
rho	0	0.935809
control	4.03293	0.129954
slope	-0.0120086	0.0133934
power	1	0.202697

Table of Data and Estimated Values of Interest

Dose	N	Obs Mean	Obs Std Dev	Est Mean	Est Std Dev	Chi^2
0	10	4.25	0.3	4.03	0.331	0.655
30	10	3.7	0.25	3.67	0.331	0.0825
60	9	3.25	0.05	3.31	0.331	-0.188
120	9	2.15	0.2	2.59	0.331	-1.33
240	6	1.5	0.15	1.15	0.331	1.05

Model Descriptions for likelihoods calculated

Model A1:  $Y_{ij} = \mu(i) + e(ij)$   
 $\text{Var}\{e(ij)\} = \sigma^2$

Model A2:  $Y_{ij} = \mu(i) + e(ij)$   
 $\text{Var}\{e(ij)\} = \sigma(i)^2$

Model R:  $Y_i = \mu + e(i)$   
 $\text{Var}\{e(i)\} = \sigma^2$

Likelihoods of Interest

Model	Log(likelihood)	DF	AIC
A1	48.017412	6	-84.034824
A2	59.392540	10	-98.785081
fitted	26.616696	4	-45.233392
R	-21.651321	2	47.302642

- Test 1: Does response and/or variances differ among dose levels (A2 vs. R)
- Test 2: Are Variances Homogeneous (A1 vs A2)
- Test 3: Does the Model for the Mean Fit (A1 vs. fitted)

Tests of Interest

Test	-2*log(Likelihood Ratio)	df	p-value
Test 1	162.088	8	<.00001
Test 2	22.7503	4	0.000142
Test 3	42.8014	2	<.00001

The p-value for Test 1 is less than .05. There appears to be a difference between response and/or variances among the dose levels. It seems appropriate to model the data


The p-value for Test 2 is less than .05. Consider running a non-homogeneous variance model

The p-value for Test 3 is less than .05. You may want to try a different model

Benchmark Dose Computation

Specified effect = 1  
 Risk Type = Estimated standard deviations from the control mean  
 Confidence level = 0.95  
 BMD = 27.5832  
 BMDL = 22.9758

Power Model with 0.95 Confidence Level



23:21 05/12 2005

```

=====
Power Model. $Revision: 2.1 $ $Date: 2000/10/11 20:57:36 $
Input Data File: C:\BMDS\DATA\CYLINDRO.(d)
Gnuplot Plotting File: C:\BMDS\DATA\CYLINDRO.plt
Thu May 12 23:21:44 2005
=====

```

BMDS MODEL RUN

The form of the response function is:

$$Y[\text{dose}] = \text{control} + \text{slope} * \text{dose}^{\text{power}}$$

Dependent variable = MEAN  
 Independent variable = dose  
 rho is set to 0

The power is not restricted  
 A constant variance model is fit

Total number of dose groups = 5  
 Total number of records with missing values = 0  
 Maximum number of iterations = 250  
 Relative Function Convergence has been set to: 1e-008  
 Parameter Convergence has been set to: 1e-008

Default Initial Parameter Values  
 alpha = 0.0467949  
 rho = 0 Specified  
 control = 4.25  
 slope = -0.0336166  
 power = 0.803617

Asymptotic Correlation Matrix of Parameter Estimates

	alpha	rho	control	slope	power
alpha	1	-0.97	-0.22	0.57	0.6
rho	-0.97	1	0.22	-0.58	-0.62
control	-0.22	0.22	1	-0.67	-0.6
slope	0.57	-0.58	-0.67	1	0.99
power	0.6	-0.62	-0.6	0.99	1

Parameter Estimates

Variable	Estimate	Std. Err.
alpha	0.0696661	0.0661961
rho	0	0.846718
control	4.30267	0.0817494
slope	-0.0726613	0.0255026
power	0.676841	0.0658079

Table of Data and Estimated Values of Interest

Dose	N	Obs Mean	Obs Std Dev	Est Mean	Est Std Dev	Chi^2
0	10	4.25	0.3	4.3	0.264	-0.2
30	10	3.7	0.25	3.58	0.264	0.468
60	9	3.25	0.05	3.14	0.264	0.41
120	9	2.15	0.2	2.45	0.264	-1.12
240	6	1.5	0.15	1.34	0.264	0.623

Model Descriptions for likelihoods calculated

Model A1:  $Y_{ij} = \mu(i) + e(ij)$   
 $\text{Var}\{e(ij)\} = \sigma^2$

Model A2:  $Y_{ij} = \mu(i) + e(ij)$   
 $\text{Var}\{e(ij)\} = \sigma(i)^2$



Model R:  $Y_i = \mu + e(i)$   
 $\text{Var}\{e(i)\} = \sigma^2$

Likelihoods of Interest

Model	Log(likelihood)	DF	AIC
A1	48.017412	6	-84.034824
A2	59.392540	10	-98.785081
fitted	36.608912	4	-65.217824
R	-21.651321	2	47.302642

Test 1: Does response and/or variances differ among dose levels (A2 vs. R)

Test 2: Are Variances Homogeneous (A1 vs A2)

Test 3: Does the Model for the Mean Fit (A1 vs. fitted)

Tests of Interest

Test	-2*log(Likelihood Ratio)	df	p-value
Test 1	162.088	8	<.00001
Test 2	22.7503	4	0.000142
Test 3	22.817	2	1.11e-005

The p-value for Test 1 is less than .05. There appears to be a difference between response and/or variances among the dose levels. It seems appropriate to model the data

The p-value for Test 2 is less than .05. Consider running a non-homogeneous variance model

The p-value for Test 3 is less than .05. You may want to try a different model

Benchmark Dose Computation

Specified effect = 1


Risk Type = Estimated standard deviations from the control mean

Confidence level = 0.95

BMD = 6.72481

BMDL = 3.97902

Power Model with 0.95 Confidence Level



23:21 05/12 2005

```

=====
Hill Model. $Revision: 2.1 $ $Date: 2000/10/11 21:21:23 $
Input Data File: C:\BMDS\DATA\CYLINDRO.(d)
Gnuplot Plotting File: C:\BMDS\DATA\CYLINDRO.plt
Thu May 12 23:22:53 2005
=====

```

BMDS MODEL RUN

The form of the response function is:

$$Y[\text{dose}] = \text{intercept} + v \cdot \text{dose}^n / (k^n + \text{dose}^n)$$

Dependent variable = MEAN  
 Independent variable = dose  
 rho is set to 0  
 Power parameter restricted to be greater than 1  
 A constant variance model is fit

Total number of dose groups = 5  
 Total number of records with missing values = 0  
 Maximum number of iterations = 250  
 Relative Function Convergence has been set to: 1e-008  
 Parameter Convergence has been set to: 1e-008

Default Initial Parameter Values

alpha = 0.0263306  
 rho = 0 Specified  
 intercept = 4.25  
 v = -2.75  
 n = 2.08208  
 k = 80.4545

Asymptotic Correlation Matrix of Parameter Estimates

	alpha	rho	intercept	v	n	k
alpha	1	0	0	0	0	0
rho	0	1	0	0	0	0
intercept	0	0	1	0	0	0
v	0	0	0	1	0	0
n	0	0	0	0	1	0
k	0	0	0	0	0	1

Parameter Estimates

Variable	Estimate	Std. Err.
alpha	0.0466116	1
rho	0	1
intercept	4.22518	1
v	-3.35427	1
n	1.63976	1
k	94.2147	1

Table of Data and Estimated Values of Interest

Dose	N	Obs Mean	Obs Std Dev	Est Mean	Est Std Dev	Chi^2
0	10	4.25	0.3	4.23	0.216	0.115
30	10	3.7	0.25	3.78	0.216	-0.369
60	9	3.25	0.05	3.14	0.216	0.502
120	9	2.15	0.2	2.22	0.216	-0.323
240	6	1.5	0.15	1.47	0.216	0.156

Model Descriptions for likelihoods calculated

Model A1:  $Y_{ij} = \mu(i) + e(ij)$   
 $\text{Var}\{e(ij)\} = \sigma^2$

Model A2:  $Y_{ij} = \mu(i) + e(ij)$   
 $\text{Var}\{e(ij)\} = \sigma(i)^2$

Model R:  $Y_i = \mu + e(i)$   
 $\text{Var}\{e(i)\} = \sigma^2$

Likelihoods of Interest

Model	Log(likelihood)	DF	AIC
A1	48.017412	6	-84.034824
A2	59.392540	10	-98.785081
fitted	45.449933	5	-80.899866
R	-21.651321	2	47.302642

Test 1: Does response and/or variances differ among dose levels (A2 vs. R)

Test 2: Are Variances Homogeneous (A1 vs A2)

Test 3: Does the Model for the Mean Fit (A1 vs. fitted)

Tests of Interest

Test	$-2 \cdot \log(\text{Likelihood Ratio})$	Test df	p-value
Test 1	162.088	8	<.0001
Test 2	22.7503	4	0.000142
Test 3	5.13496	1	0.02345

The p-value for Test 1 is less than .05. There appears to be a difference between response and/or variances among the dose levels. It seems appropriate to model the data

The p-value for Test 2 is less than .05. Consider running a non-homogeneous variance model

The p-value for Test 3 is less than .05. You may want to try a different model

Benchmark Dose Computation

Specified effect = 1


Risk Type = Estimated standard deviations from the control mean

Confidence level = 0.95

BMD = 18.4161

BMDL = 12.8257

Hill Model with 0.95 Confidence Level



23:22 05/12 2005

**Part IV.**

Humpage and Falconer 2003

male mice treated with purified cylindrospermopsin

urinary protein levels

drop high dose

```

=====
Polynomial Model. Revision: 2.2 Date: 9/12/2002
Input Data File: C:\BMDS\DATA\CYLINDRO.(d)
Gnuplot Plotting File: C:\BMDS\DATA\CYLINDRO.plt
Thu May 12 23:24:32 2005
=====

```

BMDS MODEL RUN

The form of the response function is:

$$Y[\text{dose}] = \text{beta}_0 + \text{beta}_1 \cdot \text{dose} + \text{beta}_2 \cdot \text{dose}^2 + \dots$$

Dependent variable = MEAN  
Independent variable = dose  
rho is set to 0  
Signs of the polynomial coefficients are not restricted  
A constant variance model is fit

Total number of dose groups = 4  
Total number of records with missing values = 0  
Maximum number of iterations = 250  
Relative Function Convergence has been set to: 1e-008  
Parameter Convergence has been set to: 1e-008

Default Initial Parameter Values

```

alpha = 0.0503676
rho = 0 Specified
beta_0 = 4.25
beta_1 = -0.017381

```

Parameter Estimates

Variable	Estimate	Std. Err.	95.0% Wald Confidence Interval	
			Lower Conf. Limit	Upper Conf. Limit
alpha	0.0457633	0.0104988	0.025186	0.0663406
beta_0	4.24885	0.052757	4.14545	4.35225
beta_1	-0.017373	0.000786454	-0.0189144	-0.0158316

Asymptotic Correlation Matrix of Parameter Estimates

	alpha	beta_0	beta_1
alpha	1	2.2e-009	1e-009
beta_0	2.2e-009	1	-0.75
beta_1	1e-009	-0.75	1

Table of Data and Estimated Values of Interest

Dose	N	Obs Mean	Obs Std Dev	Est Mean	Est Std Dev	Chi^2
0	10	4.25	0.3	4.25	0.214	0.017
30	10	3.7	0.25	3.73	0.214	-0.409
60	9	3.25	0.05	3.21	0.214	0.611
120	9	2.15	0.2	2.16	0.214	-0.198

Model Descriptions for likelihoods calculated

Model A1:  $Y_{ij} = \mu(i) + e(ij)$   
 $\text{Var}\{e(ij)\} = \sigma^2$

Model A2:  $Y_{ij} = \mu(i) + e(ij)$   
 $\text{Var}\{e(ij)\} = \sigma(i)^2$

Model R:  $Y_i = \mu + e(i)$   
 $\text{Var}\{e(i)\} = \sigma^2$

Likelihoods of Interest

Model	Log(likelihood)	DF	AIC
A1	39.893006	5	-69.786011
A2	50.462856	8	-84.925712
fitted	39.601194	2	-75.202387
R	-10.831438	2	25.662876

Test 1: Does response and/or variances differ among dose levels

(A2 vs. R)

Test 2: Are Variances Homogeneous (A1 vs A2)

Test 3: Does the Model for the Mean Fit (A1 vs. fitted)

Tests of Interest

Test	-2*log(Likelihood Ratio)	Test df	p-value
Test 1	122.589	6	<.0001
Test 2	21.1397	3	<.0001
Test 3	0.583624	2	0.7469

The p-value for Test 1 is less than .05. There appears to be a difference between response and/or variances among the dose levels.

It seems appropriate to model the data



The p-value for Test 2 is less than .05. Consider running a non-homogeneous variance model

The p-value for Test 3 is greater than .05. The model chosen appears to adequately describe the data

Benchmark Dose Computation

Specified effect = 1


Risk Type = Estimated standard deviations from the control mean

Confidence level = 0.95

BMD = 12.3135

BMDL = 10.1957

Linear Model with 0.95 Confidence Level



23:24 05/12 2005

```

=====
Polynomial Model. Revision: 2.2 Date: 9/12/2002
Input Data File: C:\BMDS\DATA\CYLINDRO.(d)
Gnuplot Plotting File: C:\BMDS\DATA\CYLINDRO.plt
Thu May 12 23:26:08 2005
=====

```

BMDS MODEL RUN

The form of the response function is:

$$Y[\text{dose}] = \text{beta}_0 + \text{beta}_1 \cdot \text{dose} + \text{beta}_2 \cdot \text{dose}^2 + \dots$$

Dependent variable = MEAN  
Independent variable = dose  
rho is set to 0  
Signs of the polynomial coefficients are not restricted  
A constant variance model is fit

Total number of dose groups = 4  
Total number of records with missing values = 0  
Maximum number of iterations = 250  
Relative Function Convergence has been set to: 1e-008  
Parameter Convergence has been set to: 1e-008

Default Initial Parameter Values

```

alpha = 0.0503676
rho = 0 Specified
beta_0 = 4.23636
beta_1 = -0.0164394
beta_2 = -7.57576e-006

```

Parameter Estimates

Variable	Estimate	Std. Err.	95.0% Wald Confidence Interval	
			Lower Conf. Limit	Upper Conf. Limit
alpha	0.0456423	0.0104711	0.0251194	0.0661652
beta_0	4.23685	0.0648402	4.10977	4.36394
beta_1	-0.016519	0.00280362	-0.022014	-0.011024
beta_2	-6.92416e-006	2.18203e-005	-4.96911e-005	3.58428e-005

Asymptotic Correlation Matrix of Parameter Estimates

	alpha	beta_0	beta_1	beta_2
alpha	1	1.2e-010	-1.4e-013	1.1e-010
beta_0	1.2e-010	1	-0.73	0.58
beta_1	-1.4e-013	-0.73	1	-0.96
beta_2	1.1e-010	0.58	-0.96	1

Table of Data and Estimated Values of Interest

Dose	N	Obs Mean	Obs Std Dev	Est Mean	Est Std Dev	Chi^2
0	10	4.25	0.3	4.24	0.214	0.195
30	10	3.7	0.25	3.74	0.214	-0.519
60	9	3.25	0.05	3.22	0.214	0.41
120	9	2.15	0.2	2.15	0.214	-0.0684

Model Descriptions for likelihoods calculated

Model A1:  $Y_{ij} = \mu(i) + e(ij)$   
 $\text{Var}\{e(ij)\} = \sigma^2$

Model A2:  $Y_{ij} = \mu(i) + e(ij)$   
 $\text{Var}\{e(ij)\} = \sigma(i)^2$

Model R:  $Y_i = \mu + e(i)$   
 $\text{Var}\{e(i)\} = \sigma^2$

Likelihoods of Interest

Model	Log(likelihood)	DF	AIC
A1	39.893006	5	-69.786011
A2	50.462856	8	-84.925712
fitted	39.651475	3	-73.302950
R	-10.831438	2	25.662876

- Test 1: Does response and/or variances differ among dose levels  
 (A2 vs. R)
- Test 2: Are Variances Homogeneous (A1 vs A2)
- Test 3: Does the Model for the Mean Fit (A1 vs. fitted)

Tests of Interest

Test	-2*log(Likelihood Ratio)	Test df	p-value
Test 1	122.589	6	<.0001
Test 2	21.1397	3	<.0001
Test 3	0.483061	1	0.487

The p-value for Test 1 is less than .05. There appears to be a difference between response and/or variances among the dose levels. It seems appropriate to model the data

The p-value for Test 2 is less than .05. Consider running a non-homogeneous variance model  
 The p-value for Test 3 is greater than .05. The model chosen appears to adequately describe the data


Benchmark Dose Computation  
Specified effect = 1

Risk Type = Estimated standard deviations from the control mean

Confidence level = 0.95

BMD = 12.8637

BMDL = 9.74645



23:26 05/12 2005

```

=====
Polynomial Model. Revision: 2.2 Date: 9/12/2002
Input Data File: C:\BMDS\DATA\CYLINDRO.(d)
Gnuplot Plotting File: C:\BMDS\DATA\CYLINDRO.plt
Thu May 12 23:27:07 2005
=====

```

BMDS MODEL RUN

The form of the response function is:

$$Y[\text{dose}] = \text{beta}_0 + \text{beta}_1 \cdot \text{dose} + \text{beta}_2 \cdot \text{dose}^2 + \dots$$

Dependent variable = MEAN  
 Independent variable = dose  
 rho is set to 0  
 The polynomial coefficients are restricted to be negative  
 A constant variance model is fit

Total number of dose groups = 4  
 Total number of records with missing values = 0  
 Maximum number of iterations = 250  
 Relative Function Convergence has been set to: 1e-008  
 Parameter Convergence has been set to: 1e-008

Default Initial Parameter Values

```

alpha = 0.0503676
rho = 0 Specified
beta_0 = 4.23636
beta_1 = -0.0164394
beta_2 = -7.57576e-006

```

Parameter Estimates

Variable	Estimate	Std. Err.	95.0% Wald Confidence Interval	
			Lower Conf. Limit	Upper Conf. Limit
alpha	0.0456423	0.0104711	0.0251194	0.0661652
beta_0	4.23685	0.0648402	4.10977	4.36394
beta_1	-0.016519	0.00280362	-0.022014	-0.011024
beta_2	-6.92416e-006	2.18203e-005	-4.96911e-005	3.58428e-005

Asymptotic Correlation Matrix of Parameter Estimates

	alpha	beta_0	beta_1	beta_2
alpha	1	1.2e-010	-1.4e-013	1.1e-010
beta_0	1.2e-010	1	-0.73	0.58
beta_1	-1.4e-013	-0.73	1	-0.96
beta_2	1.1e-010	0.58	-0.96	1

Table of Data and Estimated Values of Interest

Dose	N	Obs Mean	Obs Std Dev	Est Mean	Est Std Dev	Chi^2
0	10	4.25	0.3	4.24	0.214	0.195
30	10	3.7	0.25	3.74	0.214	-0.519
60	9	3.25	0.05	3.22	0.214	0.41
120	9	2.15	0.2	2.15	0.214	-0.0684

Model Descriptions for likelihoods calculated

Model A1:  $Y_{ij} = \mu(i) + e(ij)$   
 $\text{Var}\{e(ij)\} = \sigma^2$

Model A2:  $Y_{ij} = \mu(i) + e(ij)$   
 $\text{Var}\{e(ij)\} = \sigma(i)^2$

Model R:  $Y_i = \mu + e(i)$   
 $\text{Var}\{e(i)\} = \sigma^2$

Likelihoods of Interest

Model	Log(likelihood)	DF	AIC
A1	39.893006	5	-69.786011
A2	50.462856	8	-84.925712
fitted	39.651475	3	-73.302950
R	-10.831438	2	25.662876

Test 1: Does response and/or variances differ among dose levels

(A2 vs. R)

Test 2: Are Variances Homogeneous (A1 vs A2)

Test 3: Does the Model for the Mean Fit (A1 vs. fitted)

Tests of Interest

Test	-2*log(Likelihood Ratio)	Test df	p-value
Test 1	122.589	6	<.0001
Test 2	21.1397	3	<.0001
Test 3	0.483061	1	0.487

The p-value for Test 1 is less than .05. There appears to be a difference between response and/or variances among the dose levels. It seems appropriate to model the data

The p-value for Test 2 is less than .05. Consider running a non-homogeneous variance model

The p-value for Test 3 is greater than .05. The model chosen appears to adequately describe the data

Benchmark Dose Computation  
Specified effect = 1


Risk Type = Estimated standard deviations from the control mean

Confidence level = 0.95

BMD = 12.8637

BMDL = 10.2295

Polynomial Model with 0.95 Confidence Level



23:27 05/12 2005

```

=====
Power Model. $Revision: 2.1 $ $Date: 2000/10/11 20:57:36 $
Input Data File: C:\BMDS\DATA\CYLINDRO.(d)
Gnuplot Plotting File: C:\BMDS\DATA\CYLINDRO.plt
Thu May 12 23:27:43 2005
=====

```

BMDS MODEL RUN

The form of the response function is:

$$Y[\text{dose}] = \text{control} + \text{slope} * \text{dose}^{\text{power}}$$

Dependent variable = MEAN  
 Independent variable = dose  
 rho is set to 0  
 The power is restricted to be greater than or equal to 1  
 A constant variance model is fit

Total number of dose groups = 4  
 Total number of records with missing values = 0  
 Maximum number of iterations = 250  
 Relative Function Convergence has been set to: 1e-008  
 Parameter Convergence has been set to: 1e-008

Default Initial Parameter Values

```

alpha = 0.0503676
rho = 0 Specified
control = 4.25
slope = -22.4349
power = -0.494765

```

Asymptotic Correlation Matrix of Parameter Estimates

	alpha	rho	control	slope	power
alpha	1	-0.98	-0.041	-0.0042	-0.014
rho	-0.98	1	0.042	0.0043	0.014
control	-0.041	0.042	1	-0.67	-0.62
slope	-0.0042	0.0043	-0.67	1	1
power	-0.014	0.014	-0.62	1	1



Parameter Estimates

Variable	Estimate	Std. Err.
alpha	0.0457244	0.0552045
rho	0	0.931145
control	4.24139	0.0671298
slope	-0.0159238	0.00783392
power	1.01795	0.100882

Table of Data and Estimated Values of Interest

Dose Res.	N	Obs Mean	Obs Std Dev	Est Mean	Est Std Dev	Chi^2
0	10	4.25	0.3	4.24	0.214	0.0403
30	10	3.7	0.25	3.73	0.214	-0.157
60	9	3.25	0.05	3.21	0.214	0.172
120	9	2.15	0.2	2.16	0.214	-0.0426

Model Descriptions for likelihoods calculated

Model A1:  $Y_{ij} = \mu(i) + e(ij)$   
 $\text{Var}\{e(ij)\} = \sigma^2$

Model A2:  $Y_{ij} = \mu(i) + e(ij)$   
 $\text{Var}\{e(ij)\} = \sigma(i)^2$

Model R:  $Y_i = \mu + e(i)$   
 $\text{Var}\{e(i)\} = \sigma^2$

Likelihoods of Interest

Model	Log(likelihood)	DF	AIC
A1	39.893006	5	-69.786011
A2	50.462856	8	-84.925712
fitted	39.617353	4	-71.234706
R	-10.831438	2	25.662876

Test 1: Does response and/or variances differ among dose levels (A2 vs. R)

Test 2: Are Variances Homogeneous (A1 vs A2)

Test 3: Does the Model for the Mean Fit (A1 vs. fitted)

Tests of Interest

Test	-2*log(Likelihood Ratio)	df	p-value
Test 1	122.589	6	<.00001
Test 2	21.1397	3	9.847e-005
Test 3	0.551305	1	0.4578

The p-value for Test 1 is less than .05. There appears to be a difference between response and/or variances among the dose levels. It seems appropriate to model the data

The p-value for Test 2 is less than .05. Consider running a non-homogeneous variance model

The p-value for Test 3 is greater than .05. The model chosen appears to adequately describe the data

Benchmark Dose Computation

Specified effect = 1


Risk Type = Estimated standard deviations from the control mean

Confidence level = 0.95

BMD = 12.8275

BMDL = 10.2065

Power Model with 0.95 Confidence Level



23:27 05/12 2005

```

=====
Hill Model. $Revision: 2.1 $ $Date: 2000/10/11 21:21:23 $
Input Data File: C:\BMDS\DATA\CYLINDRO.(d)
Gnuplot Plotting File: C:\BMDS\DATA\CYLINDRO.plt
Thu May 12 23:28:26 2005
=====

```

BMDS MODEL RUN

The form of the response function is:

$$Y[\text{dose}] = \text{intercept} + v \cdot \text{dose}^n / (k^n + \text{dose}^n)$$

Dependent variable = MEAN  
 Independent variable = dose  
 rho is set to 0  
 Power parameter restricted to be greater than 1  
 A constant variance model is fit

Total number of dose groups = 4  
 Total number of records with missing values = 0  
 Maximum number of iterations = 250  
 Relative Function Convergence has been set to: 1e-008  
 Parameter Convergence has been set to: 1e-008

Default Initial Parameter Values

```

alpha = 0.0273861
rho = 0 Specified
intercept = 4.25
v = -2.1
n = 1.7744
k = 62.7273

```

Asymptotic Correlation Matrix of Parameter Estimates

	alpha	rho	intercept	v	n	k
alpha	1	0	0	0	0	0
rho	0	1	0	0	0	0
intercept	0	0	1	0	0	0
v	0	0	0	1	0	0
n	0	0	0	0	1	0
k	0	0	0	0	0	1

Parameter Estimates

Variable	Estimate	Std. Err.
alpha	0.0457348	1
rho	0	1
intercept	4.24125	1
v	-461.591	1
n	1.02098	1
k	23703.4	1

Table of Data and Estimated Values of Interest

Dose Res.	N	Obs Mean	Obs Std Dev	Est Mean	Est Std Dev	Chi^2
0	10	4.25	0.3	4.24	0.214	0.0409
30	10	3.7	0.25	3.73	0.214	-0.159
60	9	3.25	0.05	3.21	0.214	0.174
120	9	2.15	0.2	2.16	0.214	-0.0428

Model Descriptions for likelihoods calculated

Model A1:  $Y_{ij} = \mu(i) + e(ij)$   
 $\text{Var}\{e(ij)\} = \sigma^2$

Model A2:  $Y_{ij} = \mu(i) + e(ij)$   
 $\text{Var}\{e(ij)\} = \sigma(i)^2$

Model R:  $Y_i = \mu + e(i)$   
 $\text{Var}\{e(i)\} = \sigma^2$

Degrees of freedom for Test A1 vs fitted  $\leq 0$

Likelihoods of Interest

Model	Log(likelihood)	DF	AIC
A1	39.893006	5	-69.786011
A2	50.462856	8	-84.925712
fitted	39.613009	5	-69.226018
R	-10.831438	2	25.662876

Test 1: Does response and/or variances differ among dose levels (A2 vs. R)

Test 2: Are Variances Homogeneous (A1 vs A2)

Test 3: Does the Model for the Mean Fit (A1 vs. fitted)

Tests of Interest

Test	$-2 \cdot \log(\text{Likelihood Ratio})$	Test df	p-value
------	--	---------	---------

Test 1	122.589	6	<.0001
Test 2	21.1397	3	<.0001
Test 3	0.559993	0	NA

The p-value for Test 1 is less than .05. There appears to be a difference between response and/or variances among the dose levels. It seems appropriate to model the data

The p-value for Test 2 is less than .05. Consider running a non-homogeneous variance model

NA - Degrees of freedom for Test 3 are less than or equal to 0. The Chi-Square test for fit is not valid

Benchmark Dose Computation  
Specified effect = 1

Risk Type = Estimated standard deviations from the control mean


Confidence level = 0.95

BMD = 12.8644

Warning: optimum may not have been found. Bad completion code in Optimization routine.

BMDL computation failed.

# Hill Model



23:28 05/12 2005