

6/1/2010

Review: NIOSH Skin Notations Review - Group A
Profile Number: 05
Profile Title: Acrylamide

Summary

Both reviewers agreed that the document clearly outlined the systemic health hazards, direct health hazards, and immune-mediated responses associated with exposures of the skin to acrylamide. The rationale behind the assignment of the skin notations was judged to be acceptable and appropriate.

Recommendation

- The carrier in the Fennell (2006) study should be stated. (Q11, Reviewer 2)

Verbatim Reviewer Comments

1. Does this document clearly outline the systemic health hazards associated with exposures of the skin to the chemical? If not, what specific information is missing from the document?

Reviewer 1:

This document clearly outlined the systemic health hazards associated with exposures of the skin to acrylamide. No specific information is missing from the document.

Reviewer 2:

There is a clear outline of systemic health hazards

2. If the SYS or SYS (FATAL) notations are assigned, is the rationale and logic behind the assignment clear? If not assigned, is the logic clear why it was not (e.g., insufficient data, no identified health hazard)?

Reviewer 1:

This document assigns SYS notation to acrylamide. The rationale and logic behind this notation assignment is clear.

Reviewer 2:

The rationales are clear.

3. Does this document clearly outline the direct (localized) health hazards associated with exposures of the skin to the chemical? If not, what specific information is missing from the document?

Reviewer 1:

This document clearly outlines the direct health hazards associated with exposures of the skin to acrylamide.

Reviewer 2:

Document includes direct hazards

4. If the DIR, DIR (IRR), or DIR (COR) notations are assigned, is the rationale and logic behind the assignment clear? If not assigned, is the logic clear why it was not (e.g., insufficient data, no identified health hazard)?

Reviewer 1:

The document assigned DIR (IRR) notation to acrylamide. The logic and rationale behind this assignment is clear.

Reviewer 2:

DIR (IRR) basis was clear.

5. Does this document clearly outline the immune-mediated responses (allergic response) health hazards associated with exposures of the skin to the chemical? If not, what specific information is missing from the document?

Reviewer 1:

This document clearly outlined the immune-mediated responses health hazards associated with exposures of the skin to acrylamide.

Reviewer 2:

Basis is present.

6. If the SEN notation is assigned, is the rationale and logic behind the assignment clear? If not assigned, is the logic clear why it was not (e.g., insufficient data, no identified health hazard)?

Reviewer 1:

The rationale and logic behind SEN notation to acrylamide is clear.

Reviewer 2:

Limited human but sufficient animal data

7. If the ID^(SK) or SK were assigned, is the rationale and logic outlined within the document?

Reviewer 1:

This notation is not assigned.

Reviewer 2:

SK basis was fine

8. Are the conclusions supported by the data?

Reviewer 1:

The conclusions are supported by the data provided in the document.

Reviewer 2:

Yes

9. Are the tables clear and appropriate?

Reviewer 1:

Tables are clear and appropriate.

Reviewer 2:

Yes

10. Is the document organized appropriately? If not, what improvements are needed?

Reviewer 1:

This document is organized appropriately and no improvement are needed.

Reviewer 2:

Some paragraphs are too long.

11. Is the language of the manuscript acceptable as written? If not, what improvements are needed?

Reviewer 1:

The language of the manuscript as written is acceptable.

Reviewer 2:

1. The carrier in the Fennell et al (2006) study should be stated. I think it was an aqueous solution.

12. Are you aware of any scientific data reported in governmental publications, databases, peer reviewed journals, or other sources that should be included within this document?

Reviewer 1:

I am not aware of any scientific data that should be included in the document.

Reviewer 2:

No

13. What is your final recommendation for this manuscript? (Do you agree with the scientific rationale that serves as a basis for the skin notation assignments?)

Reviewer 1:

I recommend that this document be accepted as presented.

Reviewer 2:

Acceptable