Special Review Decision SRD2025-02

Special Review Decision of Pydiflumetofen and Its Associated End-use Products

Final Decision Document

(publié aussi en français)

11 December 2025

This document is published by the Health Canada Pest Management Regulatory Agency.
For further information, please contact:

Publications
Pest Management Regulatory Agency
Health Canada
2 Constellation Drive
8th floor, A.L. 2608 A
Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0K9

Internet: canada.ca/pesticides
pmra.publications-arla@hc-sc.gc.ca

Information Service:
1-800-267-6315
pmra.info-arla@hc-sc.gc.ca

Canada

ISSN: 2561-6269 (online)

Catalogue number: H113-17/2024-2E (print version)
H113-17/2024-2E-PDF (PDF version)

Table of Contents

Special Review Decision for Pydiflumetofen and associated end-use products

Under the authority of the *Pest Control Products Act*, pesticides are regulated by Health Canada's Pest Management Regulatory Agency (PMRA) on behalf of the Minister of Health. The *Pest Control Products Act* prescribes both the pre-market and post-market assessment (re-evaluations and special reviews) of pesticides to determine the acceptability or continued acceptability of human health and environmental risks, and acceptable value of a pesticide in Canada. Unlike a re-evaluation, a special review is triggered only under certain circumstances, as described in section 17 of the *Pest Control Products Act*, and the intent of a special review is to address specifically the identified aspect(s) of concern. The special review approach is described in the PMRA Guidance Document: *Approach to Special Reviews of Pesticides*. More details on the legislative framework are provided under the section of Legislative Framework of this document.

Health Canada evaluates the aspects of concern that prompted the special review in accordance with subsection 18(4) of the *Pest Control Products Act*. The internationally accepted science-based approach is used for the assessment of the aspect of concern, similar to all other scientific assessments (for example, new product registrations, re-evaluations). This step includes both risk assessment and risk management to address the concerns identified. Health Canada's approach to risk and value assessment as well as risk management is outlined in the PMRA Guidance Document: *Framework for Risk Assessment and Risk Management of Pest Control Products*.[1]

Pursuant to subsection 17(1) of the *Pest Control Products Act*, Health Canada conducted a special review of all registered pest control products containing pydiflumetofen, based on a 28-day inhalation study in rat that was submitted under the incident reporting program (IRP). The identified aspect of concern is:

- Occupational inhalation exposure

To assess the aspect of concern, Health Canada considered the information that prompted the special review and other relevant information currently available, including existing assessments (PRD2018-06[2] and RD2020-10[3]).

[1] PMRA Guidance Document, *A Framework for Risk Assessment and Risk Management of Pest Control Products* (https://www.canada.ca/en/health-canada/services/consumer-product-safety/reports-publications/pesticides-pest-management/policies-guidelines/risk-management-pest-control-products.html)

[2] PRD2018-06. *Pydiflumetofen, A19649 Fungicide, A19649TO Fungicide, A20259 Fungicide, A20560 Fungicide, and A21461 Fungicide. Proposed Registration Decision*.

[3] RD2020-10. *Pydiflumetofen and Saltro. Registration Decision*

Pydiflumetofen is a broad-spectrum fungicide currently registered as a foliar application, seed treatment or both, on various field food and feed crops, greenhouse food and non-food crops, outdoor ornamentals and turf for the control and suppression of certain diseases. All currently registered products containing pydiflumetofen have been considered in this special review. Currently registered pest control products containing pydiflumetofen are listed in Appendix I.

This document presents the final regulatory decision[4] for the special review of pydiflumetofen. All pest control products containing pydiflumetofen that are registered in Canada are subject to this special review decision. Prior to finalizing this decision, Health Canada published the Proposed Special Review Decision PSRD2024-03, *Proposed Special Review Decision for Pydiflumetofen and Its Associated End-use Products*,[5] which underwent a 45-day public consultation period ending on 13 January 2025.

Comments and information directly related to the proposed special review decision, such as comments directed to the assessment of the aspect of concern were received during the public consultation period conducted in accordance with section 28 of the *Pest Control Products Act*. Commenters are listed in Appendix II and comments are summarized in Appendix III with the responses from Health Canada. These comments and information were considered but did not result in revisions to the risk assessment. Therefore, this decision is consistent with the proposed special review decision as described in PSRD2024-03.

A reference list of information used as the basis for the proposed special review decision is included in PSRD2024-03, and further information used in the special review decision is listed in Appendix V of this SRD. Therefore, the complete reference list of all information used in this final special review decision includes both the information set out in PSRD2024-03 and the information set out in Appendix V herein.

Special review decision for pydiflumetofen

Health Canada has completed the special review for pydiflumetofen. Under the authority of the *Pest Control Products Act*, Health Canada has determined that the registration of products containing pydiflumetofen is required to be amended, in accordance with paragraph 21(2)(a) of the *Pest Control Products Act*. The assessments of the aspects of concern from this special review indicated that the risks to human health are acceptable for all uses of pydiflumetofen when used according to the amended conditions of registration, which includes new mitigation measures, as summarized below and listed in Appendix IV.

[4] "Decision statement" as required by subsection 28(5) of the *Pest Control Products Act.*

[5] "Consultation statement" as required by subsection 28(2) of the *Pest Control Products Act*.

Risk mitigation measures

Registered pesticide product labels include specific directions for use. Directions include risk mitigation measures to protect human health and the environment and must be followed by law. The required amendments, including any revised/updated label statements and/or mitigation measures, as a result of the special review of pydiflumetofen, are summarized below. Refer to Appendix IV for details.

Human health

The following risk mitigation measures are required to address potential inhalation risks to workers in commercial facilities treating corn seed and workers using handheld equipment on agricultural crops:

- Commercial seed treatment of corn:
  - A filtering facepiece respirator (dust mask) is required during bagging, sewing, and stacking of treated seed.
  - A respirator is required during cleaning and repairing.

- Handheld application on agricultural crops:
  - Eye, head and respiratory protection are required when applying above waist-height, including overhead.

Other updates

The following label updates are required to correct errors relating to pre-harvest interval and application rate:

- For A20259 Fungicide (Registration Number 33020), correction to the pre-harvest interval from 3 days to 5 days.
- For Miravis Neo 300SE (Registration Number 33391), correction to the maximum product application rate from 1.5 L/ha to 0.75 L/ha.

Implementation of the special review decision

Regulatory Directive DIR2018-01, *Policy on Cancellations and Amendments Following Re-evaluation and Special Review* provides information and general timelines regarding the implementation of post-market decisions, (for example, up to 24-month timeline for label amendments and up to 36-month phase-out timeline for cancelled registrations), and Information Note: *Update on implementation of post-market decisions* provides additional information on phase-out measures for post-market decisions that include cancellations. The post-market decision considers potential health and environmental risks regarding the use of the pest control product, and its value, when establishing the implementation timelines.

The health considerations for the implementation timeline for this final decision are outlined below.

Health considerations

When conducting human health risk assessments, risks from exposure to a pesticide are estimated by comparing potential exposures with the most relevant endpoint from toxicology studies, with standard protection factors incorporated to further protect human health, including the most sensitive population. These factors provide an inherent level of protection from exposures that could result in adverse effects to human health. Furthermore, Health Canada applies additional protection factors if warranted by the hazard profile of the pesticide or by the quality and completeness of the underlying data. When risks of concern are identified in the human health exposure scenarios, it does not necessarily mean that exposure will result in adverse effects, but mitigation measures to reduce potential risks would be required in order to support continued registration of the product/use.

Potential and relative health risks are thus considered acceptable during the general 2-year implementation period unless there is evidence from incident reports or other sources of real-world post-market surveillance data suggesting that there are adverse health effects occurring as a result of the use of the products according to the currently approved label/use conditions. Other considerations may include how widely the product is used, the populations potentially exposed to the product and/or other factors.

Taking into consideration these factors, the general 2-year implementation timeline for label amendments for pydiflumetofen is considered appropriate from a human health perspective.

Amendment timeframe

Based on the above considerations, the required amendments (mitigation measures and label updates) for pest control products containing pydiflumetofen must be implemented within 24-months from the date of this decision document.

Next steps

To comply with this decision, the required amendments (mitigation measures and label updates) must be implemented on all product labels no later than 24 months after the publication date of this decision document. Accordingly, both registrants and retailers will have up to 24 months from the date of this decision document to transition to selling the product with the newly amended labels. Similarly, users will also have the same 24-month period from the date of this decision document to transition to using the newly amended labels, which will be available on the Public Registry.

Refer to Appendix I for details on specific products impacted by this decision.

Other information

Any person may file a notice of objection[6] regarding this decision on pydiflumetofen and its associated end-use products within 60 days from the date of publication of this Special Review Decision. For more information regarding the basis for objecting (which must be based on scientific grounds), please refer to the Pesticides and pest management Section of the Canada.ca website (Public Engagement Portal - Public Engagement Forms - Notice of Objection) or contact PMRA's Pest Management Information Service.

The relevant confidential test data on which the decision is based (as referenced in PSRD2024-03 and in Appendix V of this document) are available for public inspection, upon application, in PMRA's Reading Room. For more information, please contact PMRA's Pest Management Information Service.

[6] As per subsection 35(1) of the *Pest Control Products Act*

Evaluation approach

Legislative framework

The Minister of Health's primary objective under the *Pest Control Products Act* (or the Act) subsection 4(1) is to prevent unacceptable risks to individuals and the environment from the use of pest control products.

As noted in the preamble of the Act, it is in the national interest that the attainment of the objectives of the federal regulatory system continue to be pursued through a scientifically-based national registration system that addresses risks to human health, the environment and value both before and after registration and applies to the regulation of pest control products throughout Canada; and that pest control products with acceptable risk and value be registered for use only if it is shown that their use would be efficacious and if conditions of registration can be established to prevent unacceptable risks to human health and the environment.

For the purposes of the Act, the health or environmental risks of a pest control product are acceptable if there is reasonable certainty that no harm to human health, future generations or the environment will result from exposure to or use of the product, taking into account its conditions of registration as per subsection 2(2) of the *Pest Control Products Act*.

Risk for the human health and environment, and value are defined under the Act subsection 2(1) as follows:

> **Health risk**, in respect of a pest control product, means the possibility of harm to human health resulting from exposure to or use of the product, taking into account its conditions or proposed conditions of registration.
>
> **Environmental risk**, in respect of a pest control product, means the possibility of harm to the environment, including its biological diversity, resulting from exposure to or use of the product, taking into account its conditions or proposed conditions of registration
>
> **Value**, in respect of a pest control product, means the product's actual or potential contribution to pest management, taking into account its conditions or proposed conditions of registration, and includes the product's (a) efficacy; (b) effect on host organisms in connection with which it is intended to be used; and (c) health, safety and environmental benefits and social and economic impact.

When evaluating the health and environmental risks of a pesticide and determining whether those risks are acceptable, subsection 19(2) of the *Pest Control Products Act* requires Health Canada to apply a scientifically-based approach. The science-based approach to assessing pesticides considers both the toxicity and the level of exposure of a pesticide in order to fully characterize risk. Health Canada's approach to risk and value assessment is outlined in the PMRA Guidance Document: *A Framework for Risk Assessment and Risk Management of Pest Control Products*.

List of abbreviations

µm	micrometre
DAF	dosimetric adjustment factors
DACO	data code
g	gram(s)
ha	hectare
HEC	human equivalent concentration
L	litre(s)
LOAEC	lowest observed adverse effect concentration
mg	milligram(s)
MOE	margin of exposure
MPPD	Multiple-Path Particle Dosimetry Model
NIOSH	National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health
NOAEC	no observed adverse effect concentration
PAF	particle adjustment factor
PPE	personal protective equipment
PMRA	Pest Management Regulatory Agency
PSRD	Proposed Special Review Decision
RDDRr	regional deposited dose ratio for respiratory tract region
SRD	Special Review Decision
TRV	toxicological reference values

Appendix I Registered products containing pydiflumetofen in Canada[1]

Table 1 Registered pydiflumetofen products in Canada requiring label amendments

Registration number	Marketing class	Registrant	Product name	Formulation type	Active Ingredient (g/L, %)
33017	Technical	Syngenta Canada Inc.	Pydiflumetofen Technical	Solid	98.7
33018	Commercial	Syngenta Canada Inc.	A19649 Fungicide	Suspension	200
33019	Commercial	Syngenta Canada Inc.	Posterity Fungicide	Suspension	200
33020	Commercial	Syngenta Canada Inc.	A20259 Fungicide	Suspension	75
33021	Commercial	Syngenta Canada Inc.	A20560 Fungicide	Suspension	150
33022	Commercial	Syngenta Canada Inc.	A21461 Fungicide	Suspension	75
33206	Commercial	Syngenta Canada Inc.	Miravis Duo Fungicide	Suspension	75
33207	Commercial	Syngenta Canada Inc.	Miravis Prime Fungicide	Suspension	150
33213	Commercial	Syngenta Canada Inc.	Miravis Bold Fungicide	Suspension	200
33391	Commercial	Syngenta Canada Inc.	Miravis Neo 300SE	Suspension	75
33572	Commercial	Syngenta Canada Inc.	A21573 Fungicide	Suspension	150
33573	Commercial	Syngenta Canada Inc.	Miravis Ace Fungicide	Suspension	150
33643	Commercial	Syngenta Canada Inc.	Saltro	Suspension	500
33798	Commercial	Syngenta Canada Inc.	A22070 Fungicide	Suspension	10.2
34323	Commercial	Syngenta Canada Inc.	Miravis Era A	Suspension	200
34613	Commercial	Syngenta Canada Inc.	Trebuset	Suspension	500
34616	Commercial	Syngenta Canada Inc.	A23089 Fungicide	Suspension	75
34775	Commercial	Syngenta Canada Inc.	A20808 Fungicide	Suspension	100
34841	Commercial	Syngenta Canada Inc.	Miravis Star Fungicide	Suspension	100

[1] as of 16 September 2025, excluding discontinued products or products with a submission for discontinuation

Appendix II List of commenters to PSRD2024-03

List of commenters' affiliations for comments submitted in response to PSRD2024-03

Category	Commenter
Registrant	Syngenta Canada Inc.

Appendix III Comments and responses

Health Canada received comments from a registrant directly related to the assessment of the aspect(s) of concern in the consultation document Proposed Special Review Decision, PSRD2024-03 *Special Review of Pydiflumetofen and Its Associated End-use Products*. The consolidated comments related to the assessment of the aspects of concern of this special review and Health Canada's responses to those comments are provided below.

1.0 Comments related to the health risk assessment

1.1 Toxicology

1.1.1 Short-term repeated dose 28-day inhalation toxicity study of pydiflumetofen – Position paper: Changes in hematological parameters are considered non-adverse

The commenter objected to the no observed adverse effect concentrations and lowest observed adverse effect concentrations (NOAEC/LOAECs) set by both the study authors and Health Canada in the 28-day inhalation toxicity study in rats. The basis of the NOAEC/LOAECs was increased neutrophil counts and increased severity and incidence of pulmonary lesions in males and females at the mid-dose. However, according to the commenter, also identified as the sponsor of the 28-day inhalation toxicity study in rats, changes in the hematology parameters (white blood cells, lymphocytes, neutrophils) in mid- and high-dose groups were all within the historical control range and not treatment-related or adverse. In support of their argument, the commenter supplied historical control data from 19 studies performed in the same laboratory in the three years (2019 to 2022) following the completion of the 28-day inhalation toxicity study in 2019.

Health Canada response

While the values for the hematology parameters in the mid- and high-dose animals were within the newly submitted historical control values for the laboratory, Health Canada is of the opinion that, although historical control data can provide important contextual information regarding the concurrent controls, they should not be used in isolation to determine a treatment-related effect.

In the case of the 28-day inhalation toxicity study, the affected values demonstrated a clear dose-response relationship and statistical significance at and above the mid-dose as well as a biologically significant magnitude of change when compared to the concurrent control group. Finally, the treatment-related increases in neutrophils were in keeping with the inflammatory changes seen in the airways, which is, in turn, consistent with the manifestation of chronic inflammatory lung diseases in humans (PMRA No. 3748196, PMRA No. 3748200). In conclusion, the hematological changes were considered to be treatment-related, adverse and relevant to human health.

1.1.2 Short-term repeated dose 28-day inhalation toxicity study of pydiflumetofen – Position paper: Lung histopathological changes are due to particulate effects, not direct chemical injury of pydiflumetofen

The commenter objected to the NOAEC/LOAECs set by the study authors and Health Canada in the 28-day inhalation toxicity study in rats on the basis that the histopathological changes in the lungs were the result of the irritating potential of low-solubility particulates depositing within the alveoli and not a result of the chemical or toxicologic properties of the test substance. The commenter noted that the rest of the toxicological database for pydiflumetofen confirms that the substance is of low systemic toxicity with primary effects on the liver and not the lungs.

Health Canada response

Health Canada agrees that the compound is of low systemic toxicity with limited effects on the liver at the high dose; however, the inhalation of the test substance caused adverse effects in the lungs at the mid- and high-dose. This toxicological effect is relevant to the human health risk assessment. As such, the inhalation study is considered relevant to establishing inhalation reference values for pydiflumetofen, which are required as the effects are relevant to occupational exposure scenarios, such as seed treatment.

1.1.3 Short-term repeated dose 28-day inhalation toxicity study of pydiflumetofen – Position paper: Evidence of threshold effect and relevance to human toxicity

The commenter attested that, due to differences in human and rat pulmonary physiology, the rat is not an acceptable model for the assessment of low soluble substances with low inherent toxicity, including pydiflumetofen. The commenter cited a reference that reviewed the lung effects in humans for a number of poorly soluble chemicals (PMRA No. 3748201), which described the mode of toxicity in the rat where low solubility particulate matter is deposited into the alveoli and, when overload is reached, removal of the particulate matter in the rat lung leads to inflammation, hyperplasia and, finally, tumourigenesis. Conversely, as particulate matter is instead deposited into the interstitial areas of the lungs in humans, it remains there longer and does not trigger the tumourigenesis pathway. The commenter attested that, since the toxicity pathways in the rat and humans are different and because adverse effects in the rat are due to the physical properties of pydiflumetofen as a poorly soluble chemical as opposed to the chemical properties which do not target the lungs in non-inhalation studies, the changes in the rat are not appropriate for setting the inhalation endpoint. The commenter further stated that the 3- and 10-fold uncertainty factors for the potential increase in toxicity observed with increased duration of exposure, applied by Health Canada for intermediate- and long-term exposures, respectively, may not be appropriate.

Health Canada response

Health Canada agrees that there are physiological differences between rats and humans that may result in a lack of tumourigenesis in the human lung following exposure to poorly soluble particulate matter; however, particulate matter in the interstitial space in humans has been linked to chronic conditions such as chronic obstructive pulmonary disease, idiopathic pulmonary fibrosis, asthma and inflammation of the airways leading to greater risk of complications with pneumonia (PMRA No. 3748202). Overall, risk of cancer is not the sole cause for concern and the 28-day study in rats is a relevant model for human health risk.

The 3- and 10-fold uncertainty factors for intermediate- and long-term inhalation exposures are considered to be appropriate due to the lack of long-term studies for this endpoint. The target MOE of 300 for intermediate-term and 1000 for long-term reflects the potential increase in toxicity observed with increased duration of exposure by including uncertainty factors of 3- and 10-fold, respectively. The selection of the 28-day inhalation toxicity study is protective of all populations, including nursing infants and the unborn children of exposed female workers.

1.1.4 Short-term repeated dose 28-day inhalation toxicity study of pydiflumetofen – Position paper: Additional comments on liver weight and histopathology assessment

The commenter stated that the liver findings in the 28-day inhalation toxicity study should not be considered adverse, nor used for establishing health-based guidance values, in the absence of histopathological and clinical chemistry changes.

Health Canada response

The liver changes were considered to be treatment-related at the high-dose with liver weight increases in males and an increased incidence of vacuolation in females. While liver weight changes would not be considered adverse on their own, the fact that histopathological changes of the liver were present in females and the liver is a target organ in many studies in the toxicology database, the changes were considered to be treatment-related and adverse at that dose level, although they were not the basis for determining the NOAEC and LOAEC. As such, Health Canada will not be altering the toxicological reference values (TRVs) for pydiflumetofen.

1.1.5 Conducting pydiflumetofen inhalation risk assessment by incorporating the Particle Adjustment Factor (PAF) into inhalation dosimetry modeling – Position paper

The commenter presented an alternative means for estimating whether inhaled particles get deposited into the respiratory tract in the same manner and at the same concentrations in the human and the rat. The Multiple-Path Particle Dosimetry Model (MPPD) is a computational model for elucidating interspecies extrapolations by predicting species-specific deposition or particle retention in different lung regions. The commenter stated that the MPPD model can be used to determine the human equivalent concentration (HEC) using a regional deposited dose ratio for respiratory tract region, (RDDRr) and the PAF.

The commenter concluded by stating that “When inhalation toxicity data exist, it is prudent to derive the HEC that not only considers the dosimetry difference between rodents and humans but also the human-relevant aerosol [particle size distribution].”

Health Canada response

Health Canada's Pest Management Regulatory Agency does not currently use dosimetric adjustment factors (DAF) or derive HECs in human health risk assessments. While the MPPD model is a potential tool for improving inhalation risk assessments, it has not been validated nor evaluated for regulatory use by Health Canada. Furthermore, the HEC approach as a part of the risk assessment for inhalation exposures does not appear to be widely used on a regular basis at the moment by other regulatory authorities, outside the United States Environmental Protection Agency.

In the updated occupational review of pydiflumetofen from PSRD2024-03, the only scenarios that required updated personal protective equipment (PPE) on the basis of the use of the inhalation endpoint were bagger, sewer and stacker activities and cleaner activities for seed treatment on corn in commercial facilities. All other scenarios, including groundboom, mechanically pressurized handgun and manually pressurized handwand applications on a wide variety of crops, had acceptable inhalation margins of exposure and did not require additional PPE.

For the scenarios that did not have acceptable margins without additional PPE, the DAF as calculated would not be considered appropriate, as the calculation of the PAF in the submitted comments is based on near field and far field exposures where the test substance is in solution and the mean maximum aerodynamic dose (MMAD) was set to 35 µm as opposed to the 3.0 µm of the nose-only inhalation studies. This is not a relevant PAF for a risk assessment for dust coming off treated seeds.

PSRD2024-03 did recommend additional PPE for scenarios where handheld applications were performed above waist height with "Eye, head and respiratory protection" added. This was not in response to the revised inhalation TRVs used in the occupational risk assessment, but was instead a best practices amendment to the label.

Appendix IV Label amendments for products containing pydiflumetofen

The label amendments presented below do not include all label requirements for individual end-use products, such as first aid statements, disposal statements, precautionary statements and supplementary protective equipment. Information on labels of currently registered products should not be removed unless it contradicts the following label statements.

1.0 Label amendments relating to the health risk assessment

For commercial class products:

For products that are registered for commercial treatment of corn seed:

Under the **PRECAUTIONS** section, add the following statements unless the current mitigation is more restrictive. If the existing PPE statements are more restrictive (for example, a respirator is required), then these existing PPE must be incorporated into the applicable statement(s) below.

- "For commercial treatment of corn seed, a NIOSH-approved N95 (minimum) filtering facepiece respirator (dust mask) that is properly fit tested is required during bagging, sewing, and stacking of treated seed."
- "For commercial treatment of corn seed, a respirator with a NIOSH-approved organic vapour-removing cartridge (with a prefilter) approved for pesticides, or a NIOSH approved canister approved for pesticides is required during cleaning and repairing."

For products that are registered for use as a spray application:

Under the **PRECAUTIONS** section, add the following statement in order to minimize overhead exposure using handheld equipment. If a similar statement is already present, it must be replaced with the following statement:

- "For handheld application, wear eye, head and respiratory protection when applying above waist-height, including overhead."

2.0 Other label amendments

For A20259 Fungicide, Registration Number 33020

Pre-harvest interval for Brassica head and stem vegetables (Crop Group 5-13):

Under the Directions for Use, in the table "Application Limitations and Pre-harvest Intervals", correct the pre-harvest interval from 3 days to 5 days.

For Miravis Neo 300SE, Registration Number 33391

Application rate for lowbush blueberries:

In the table, "Application Limitations and Pre-harvest Intervals", correct the maximum product application rate from 1.5 L/ha to 0.75 L/ha.

Appendix V References considered following publication of PSRD2024-03

Information considered in the updated toxicological assessment

List of studies/Information submitted by registrant

PMRA Document Number	Reference
3676160	2025, Sub. No. 2023-1713 - Pydiflumetofen Special Review. Syngenta Comments on Proposed Special Review Decision of Pydiflumetofen and Its Associated End-use Products (PSRD2024-03), DACO: 0.8
3676162	2025, Short-term Repeated Dose 28-day Inhalation Toxicity Study of Pydiflumetofen, DACO: 4.1,4.3.7
3676163	2025, Conducting Pydiflumetofen Inhalation Risk Assessment by Incorporating the Particle-Adjustment Factor (PAF) into Inhalation Dosimetry Modeling, DACO: 4.8

Additional information considered

Published information

PMRA Document Number	Reference
3748196	Jasper AE, McIver WJ, Sapey E, Walton GM, 2019, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC6489989/;, Understanding the role of neutrophils in chronic inflammatory airway disease, DACO: 4.8
3748200	Yoon EC, Koo SM, Park HY, Kim HC, Kim WJ, Kim KU, Jung KS, Yoo KH, Yoon HK, Yoon HY., 2024, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC10773455/, Predictive Role of White Blood Cell Differential Count for the Development of Acute Exacerbation in Korean Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disease., DACO: 4.8
3748201	European Centre for Ecotoxicology and Toxicology of Chemicals, https://www.ecetoc.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/ECETOC-TR-122-Poorly-Soluble-Particles-Lung-Overload.pdf a, Poorly Soluble Particles/Lung Overload: Technical Report No. 122, DACO: 4.8
3748202	Kyung SY, Jeong SH., 2020, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC7105434/, Particulate-Matter Related Respiratory Diseases. Tuberc Respir Dis (Seoul)., DACO: 4.8