



# Re-evaluation Decision Document

RRD2001-01

## Di-*n*-propyl isocinchomeronate (MGK Repellent 326)

The purpose of this document is to notify registrants, pesticide regulatory officials, and the Canadian public of the status of the re-evaluation of di-*n*-propyl isocinchomeronate (MGK Repellent 326).

Registrants, pesticide regulatory officials, and other interested parties were notified in June 1990, by Announcement Document A90-01, Re-evaluation of Personal Insect Repellents, of the Pesticides Directorate, Agriculture Canada, that such repellents would be re-evaluated under Section 19 of the Pest Control Products (PCP) Regulations. The registrants of personal insect repellent products were asked to submit, within 6 months, indices to all known toxicology and efficacy studies on their products and copies for re-evaluation of any of the studies that had not already been submitted.

Eight active ingredients were named in Announcement Document A90-01, but only one is considered in this report, namely MGK Repellent 326 (di-*n*-propyl isocinchomeronate) as used in personal insect repellents (the other uses of MGK Repellent 326, in insecticide products, are not currently under re-evaluation). Of the seven other active ingredients named in the announcement, three (citronyl, dimethyl phthalate, and ethyl hexanediol) are no longer registered, two (oil of citronella and oil of lavender) are still used in registered personal repellents and are being re-evaluated separately, and the re-evaluation of *N,N*-diethyl-meta-toluamide (DEET) and MGK Synergist 264 (*n*-octyl bicycloheptene dicarboxamide) is completed and will be discussed in separate documents.

*(publié aussi en français)*

**December 12, 2001**

**This document is published by the Submission Coordination and Documentation Division, Pest Management Regulatory Agency. For further information, please contact:**

**Publications Coordinator  
Pest Management Regulatory Agency  
Health Canada  
2720 Riverside Drive  
A.L. 6605C  
Ottawa, Ontario  
K1A 0K9**

**Internet:** [pmra\\_publications@hc-sc.gc.ca](mailto:pmra_publications@hc-sc.gc.ca)  
[www.hc-sc.gc.ca/pmra-arla/](http://www.hc-sc.gc.ca/pmra-arla/)  
**Information Service:  
1-800-267-6315 or (613) 736-3799  
Facsimile: (613) 736-3798**



ISBN: 0-662-31454-9

Catalogue number: H113-12/2001-1E-IN

**© Her Majesty the Queen in Right of Canada, represented by the Minister of Public Works and Government Services  
Canada 2001**

All rights reserved. No part of this information (publication or product) may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical photocopying, recording or otherwise, or stored in a retrieval system, without prior written permission of the Minister of Public Works and Government Services Canada, Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0S5.

## **Risk Assessment**

There are no personal insect repellents registered for use in Canada that contain MGK Repellent 326 alone. All of the products also contain DEET insect repellent and MGK Synergist 264. The registrant for the technical-grade active ingredient is McLaughlin, Gormley, King Company.

During the course of the re-evaluation, additional toxicology data for MGK 326 were requested by the Pest Management Regulatory Agency (PMRA) and, although such data currently exist and have been provided to other regulatory agencies, McLaughlin, Gormley, King Company communicated to the PMRA that they would not be providing the additional data. In addition, McLaughlin, Gormley, King Company notified their customers of the decision not to invest further in this compound for Canadian registration, indicating that “the sales of this product do not warrant the expense of additional data submission.” This is interpreted as an indication that the registrant does not support continued registration of this product in Canada.

Since toxicity data were not provided for MGK 326, an updated risk assessment under the Re-evaluation Program was not completed for this active ingredient.

## **Efficacy Assessment of Mixtures of DEET, MGK Repellent 326, and MGK Synergist 264**

As stated in Announcement Document A90-01, Re-evaluation of Personal Insect Repellents, one of the six factors in the decision to re-evaluate personal insect repellents was that “There is some uncertainty that all registered products are efficacious for the pests, uses and protection times claimed.” This led to the call for efficacy data and to a literature survey carried out by the PMRA.

Most of the efficacy data reviewed as a part of the re-evaluation of all of the personal insect repellents were gathered by treating the forearms or lower legs of test subjects with standard dosages of the repellent and exposing the treated areas continuously or intermittently to unfed insects in a cage or to biting populations in the field. The usual index of efficacy has been the complete protection time (CPT), which is defined as the time from application of the repellent to the first *confirmed* bite (a bite followed by another within 30 min). This is an appropriate index for end-use products because most users want *complete* protection rather than partial protection for a longer period.

Most laboratory tests used the yellow fever mosquito, *Aedes aegypti* (L.), or the stable fly, *Stomoxys calcitrans* (L.), reared under standard conditions and uniform in age and nutritional state. The repellents were applied at standardized dosages to human forearms, which were exposed to mosquitoes or stable flies in test cage for a few minutes at 30-min intervals until bites were received at two consecutive exposures. The CPT was the time between treatment and the first confirmed bite.

In field tests against mosquitoes and other biting flies, the test surfaces were the bare forearms of each subject, from wrist to elbow, or the legs from ankle to knee, depending on the attack behaviour of the insects concerned.

In Table 1, the mean CPT values for mixtures of DEET, MGK Repellent 326, and MGK Synergist 264 against mosquitoes in one laboratory study and one field study at Ste.-Anne-de-Bellevue, Quebec, are compared with expected CPT values for solutions of DEET alone, at concentrations equivalent to DEET plus all the other actives combined in the mixtures and to the DEET only in the mixtures.

CPT values for 20% DEET + 4% MGK 264 against mosquitoes were shorter than those calculated for 24% and 20% DEET alone. Mixtures of DEET + MGK 326 + MGK 264 generally remained effective against mosquitoes for about as long as would be expected for equivalent concentrations of DEET alone. The products tested do not cover the full range of concentrations of actives in currently registered products, and there are not enough data to perform regression analyses or derive expected CPT values for the mixtures against mosquitoes.

No data were found to support the label claims of efficacy of these mixtures against other pests (black flies, biting midges, deer flies, stable flies, fleas, chiggers, and ticks).

**Table 1 Complete protection times (CPTs) for mixtures of DEET with other active ingredients compared with those for equivalent dosages of DEET alone**

Mixture	CPT (min)		
	Measured	Expected*	
		DEET plus all other actives	DEET only
<b>Laboratory study, mosquitoes, <i>Aedes aegypti</i> (L.)</b>			
11% DEET + 1% MGK 326 + 2% MGK 264	250	265	228
<b>Field study, mosquitoes, <i>Aedes</i> spp.</b>			
20% DEET + 4% MGK 264	247	346	319
7% DEET + 2% MGK 326 + 1% MGK 264	214	214	160
11% DEET + 1% MGK 326 + 2% MGK 264	277	265	228
25% DEET + 5% MGK 326 + 2% MGK 264	371	390	352

## **Conclusions**

The PMRA has concluded that there is insufficient justification to maintain registration of mixtures of MGK 326 with DEET and MGK 264. The PMRA was unable to complete an updated risk assessment for this active ingredient. In addition, the data available do not show any consistent or significant gain in CPT against mosquitoes for the products with DEET + MGK 326 + MGK 264 compared with DEET alone at equivalent concentrations. Since the only reason to add MGK Repellent 326 and MGK Synergist 264 would be to increase efficacy, there is no justification for continued registration of these products based on the efficacy evaluation.

## **Regulatory Decision**

In light of the conclusions outlined above, the registrant (McLaughlin, Gormley, King Company) of technical-grade MGK Repellent 326, and the manufacturing concentrates containing them, has discontinued sale and distribution of the technical active ingredient and the manufacturing concentrates for use in personal insect repellents, pursuant to Section 16 of the PCP Regulations.

The PMRA has notified registrants of end-use products of this decision and anticipates that registrants will request a voluntary discontinuation of the sales of their products containing MGK 326 for use in personal insect repellents, pursuant to Section 16 of the PCP Regulations. The effect of voluntary discontinuation would be that product could no longer be sold by registrants effective August 31, 2002. Under authority of Section 16 of the PCP Regulations, distribution and sale of product by other than the registrant would be permitted until December 31, 2002. Voluntary discontinuation of sales by a registrant is an alternative to the taking of action against the registration as a means of terminating the marketing of a product.

The decisions outlined in this Decision Document conclude the re-evaluation by the PMRA of the use of MGK Repellent 326 in personal insect repellent products.