

## **Reviewer's report**

**Title:** Consumer exposure to biocides - identification of relevant sources and evaluation of possible health effects

**Version:** 1 **Date:** 3 June 2009

**Reviewer:** Jacqueline van Engelen

### **Reviewer's report:**

Major Compulsory Revision:

1) in the conclusion it is stated that the study does not have added value, since in the near future more detailed assessments become available (reviewers interpretation).

In my opinion, the conclusion must be more focussed, e.g. on the use of refined models, or on the importance of aggregate exposure assessment, or on the irritating or sensitizing substances. Now, when only reading the conclusion, I wonder why this study is considered worthwhile for publication, whereas when the critical points are better identified, this publication might be useful for risk assessors of biocidal products.

2) The terms hazard and risk are not used consistently used throughout the document. For instance on page 5, first sentence last word should be risks instead of hazard (or it should be: classifying hazard, and assessing risk). Also on page 14: 'This is of minor importance, for the assessment of the health RISK (instead of hazard). On page 14, just below discussion: the health RISK (instead of relevance)

3) Page 10: there were some modifications to the algorithms of the TGD. It is not clear what these modifications were (fugacity and conc limited to max amount or also other?)

4) Page 13: It is not clear how the overall MOEs are calculated (they are not just summed up). Please explain

Minor essential revisions:

1) Suggestion to use aggregate instead of additive (page 2, last sentence)

2) Page 3: chloroacetamide may be present (instead of used)

3) Page 4: the sentence: For exposure estimates.. is not clear. What is meant here? Exposure models?

4) Page 4: please do not use the term consumption data (data on product use?)

5) Page 6, first sentence: maximum allowed concentrations

6) Page 6: what is the difference between wide range of applications .. and.. use in a variety of products

7) Page 6 last sentence: frame formulations (i.e. instead of e.g.)

8) Page 7: why was 100% absorption assumed, even in the case of more adequate data?

9) page 7: why was mouthing behaviour not taken into consideration

10) page 7: also NOAECs taken into account (for inhalation?)

11) Page 9: sentence: Here, mainly zinc pyrithone, triclosan.. (triclosan is mentioned twice)

12) Page 9: do not understand the sentence: no definite statement...

The relevance of objects for the overall exposure?

However, as seen in the conclusion, this statement can also not be made for other products.

13) Page 10: Please delete the sentence: for all active substances there is a high degree of dermal exposure if.... (this is too obvious, especially when 100% dermal abs. is assumed)

**Level of interest:** An article of limited interest

**Quality of written English:** Needs some language corrections before being published

**Statistical review:** No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.