

**INTERACTION PROFILE FOR:
ARSENIC, CADMIUM, CHROMIUM, AND LEAD**

**U.S. Department of Health and Human Services
Public Health Service
Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry**

May 2004

PREFACE

The Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA) mandates that the Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry (ATSDR) shall assess whether adequate information on health effects is available for the priority hazardous substances. Where such information is not available or under development, ATSDR shall, in cooperation with the National Toxicology Program, initiate a program of research to determine these health effects. The Act further directs that where feasible, ATSDR shall develop methods to determine the health effects of substances in combination with other substances with which they are commonly found. The Food Quality Protection Act (FQPA) of 1996 requires that factors to be considered in establishing, modifying, or revoking tolerances for pesticide chemical residues shall include the available information concerning the cumulative effects of substances that have a common mechanism of toxicity, and combined exposure levels to the substance and other related substances. The FQPA requires that the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) consult with the Secretary of the Department of Health and Human Services (which includes ATSDR) in implementing some of the provisions of the act.

To carry out these legislative mandates, ATSDR's Division of Toxicology (DT) has developed and coordinated a mixtures program that includes trend analysis to identify the mixtures most often found in environmental media, *in vivo* and *in vitro* toxicological testing of mixtures, quantitative modeling of joint action, and methodological development for assessment of joint toxicity. These efforts are interrelated. For example, the trend analysis suggests mixtures of concern for which assessments need to be conducted. If data are not available, further research is recommended. The data thus generated often contribute to the design, calibration or validation of the methodology. This pragmatic approach allows identification of pertinent issues and their resolution as well as enhancement of our understanding of the mechanisms of joint toxic action. All the information obtained is thus used to enhance existing or developing methods to assess the joint toxic action of environmental chemicals. Over a number of years, ATSDR scientists in collaboration with mixtures risk assessors and laboratory scientists have developed approaches for the assessment of the joint toxic action of chemical mixtures. As part of the mixtures program a series of documents, Interaction Profiles, are being developed for certain priority mixtures that are of special concern to ATSDR.

The purpose of an Interaction Profile is to evaluate data on the toxicology of the "whole" priority mixture (if available) and on the joint toxic action of the chemicals in the mixture in order to recommend approaches for the exposure-based assessment of the potential hazard to public health. Joint toxic action includes additivity and interactions. A weight-of-evidence approach is commonly used in these documents to evaluate the influence of interactions in the overall toxicity of the mixture. The weight-of-evidence evaluations are qualitative in nature, although ATSDR recognizes that observations of toxicological interactions depend greatly on exposure doses and that some interactions appear to have thresholds. Thus, the interactions are evaluated in a qualitative manner to provide a sense of what influence the interactions may have when they do occur.

Literature searches for this Interaction Profile were conducted in January 2000. This final version of the document, released in 2004, includes changes based on additional literature searching and analysis of joint action for arsenic and chromium(VI) that were performed in 2002 for an ATSDR health consultation.

SUMMARY

Lead, arsenic, cadmium, and chromium constitute a very frequently occurring quaternary mixture at hazardous waste sites. This mixture was found in soil at 219 sites out of the 1,608 sites for which ATSDR has produced a Public Health Assessment, including waste storage, treatment or disposal, manufacturing and industrial, and government waste sites. The primary route of exposure for this mixture in soil is likely to be oral, and the duration of concern is intermediate and particularly chronic. The profile focuses on inorganic forms of these metals, consistent with the monitoring data, and on chromium(VI), the species of concern for chromium. Because no pertinent health effects data or physiologically based pharmacokinetic (PBPK) models were located for the quaternary mixture, exposure-based assessment of health hazards for this mixture depends on an evaluation of the health effects data for the individual metals and on the joint toxic action and mechanistic data for various combinations of these metals. This profile discusses and evaluates the evidence for joint toxic action among lead, arsenic, cadmium, and chromium(VI) and recommends how to incorporate concerns regarding possible interactions or additivity into public health assessments of sites where people may be exposed to mixtures of these chemicals.

An intermediate-duration dietary study of the trinary mixture lead, arsenic, and cadmium in rats indicates that results for the binary submixtures predicted the toxicity of the trinary mixture reasonably well, and that subthreshold doses of two metals can, when administered in combination, result in effects (Fowler and Mahaffey 1978; Mahaffey and Fowler 1977; Mahaffey et al. 1981). An intermediate-duration drinking water study of lead, cadmium, and chromium(VI+III) in diethylnitrosamine-initiated rats gave no evidence that the mixture had promoting activity (Benjamin et al. 1999).

Most of the information regarding joint toxic action for the metals in this mixture is for binary combinations of the metals. Data are voluminous for the lead-cadmium mixture, and fairly extensive for the lead-arsenic mixture. Many of the studies for these two binary mixtures are highly relevant because they employed simultaneous, intermediate or chronic oral exposure, and relevant endpoints of toxicity. Limitations in study design and reporting, and inconsistencies in results across studies for the same target organ make it difficult to draw conclusions from these studies. The data for the other binary mixtures are less extensive, and tend to be less relevant in terms of sequence, duration, and route of exposure, as well as endpoints of toxicity. For these reasons, the weight-of-evidence (WOE) approach for the assessment of interactions was used to prepare binary weight-of-evidence determinations (BINWOE) for the binary mixtures (ATSDR 2001a, 2001b). The BINWOE determinations provide conclusions regarding the

expected direction of interaction, and the degree of confidence in these conclusions. BINWOE determinations need to take into account the potential endpoint-specificity of joint toxic action (ATSDR 2001b), particularly as the data for the lead-cadmium and lead-arsenic mixtures indicated that the direction of interaction may not be consistent across endpoints.

Each of the four metals affects a wide range of target organs and endpoints, and there are a number of target organs in common across two or more of the metals. These four metals do not, however, share the same critical effects (i.e., the most sensitive effect that is the basis for the MRL or other health criterion) for long-term oral exposure. For a mixture of this type, the recommended approach is to estimate endpoint-specific hazard indexes, using the target-organ toxicity dose (TTD) modification of the hazard index method (ATSDR 2001a). Uncertainties regarding the impact of interactions are taken into account through application of the qualitative WOE approach (ATSDR 2001a), including the BINWOEs developed for the binary mixtures.

Endpoints of concern for oral exposure to this mixture include the critical effects on which the oral minimal risk levels (MRLs) are based, other sensitive effects, and also endpoints in common that may become significant due to additivity or interactions. The critical effect for lead is neurological, particularly in infants and children. Although no MRLs have been derived for lead, the Centers for Disease Control (CDC 1991) has defined a level of concern for lead exposure in children in terms of a blood lead concentration (PbB), and ATSDR (1999b) suggests the use of media-specific slope factors and site-specific environmental monitoring data to predict media-specific contributions to PbB. The critical effect for arsenic is dermal (ATSDR 2000a) and for cadmium is renal (ATSDR 1999a); these effects are the bases for the chronic oral MRLs. The critical effect for chromium(VI) is uncertain; no oral MRLs have been derived, and other health effects guidelines are based on essentiality (because chromium(III) is essential) (ATSDR 2000b) and a free-standing no-observed-adverse-effect level (NOAEL) for chromium(VI) (IRIS 2001). Sensitive effects in common across two or more of these metals include neurological, renal, cardiovascular, and hematological effects. Although less sensitive, testicular effects also are an endpoint of concern because a synergistic interaction has been noted for lead and cadmium, and because chromium(VI) also affects the testes. TTDs and BINWOEs were developed for the endpoints of concern for the four metals using the methods recommended by ATSDR (2001a, 2001b).

The binary mixtures with the most extensive interaction databases are the lead-arsenic mixture and the lead-cadmium mixture. The predicted direction of interaction for the effects of these mixtures is not

consistent across endpoints. This observation is most striking for the effects of cadmium on the toxicity of lead. The predicted direction is greater than additive for the neurological effects (the critical effect) and testicular effects (a less sensitive effect), less than additive for renal and hematological effects, and additive for cardiovascular effects. Confidence in the BINWOE determinations ranges from relatively high for renal and testicular to low for neurological.

The observation of inconsistency in predicted direction of interaction underscores the uncertainty in extrapolating interactions from one endpoint to another. It also suggests the possibility that a less sensitive target organ may have the potential to impact a mixture's health assessment if it is affected synergistically. Concern would be heightened if several chemicals in the mixture affect that target organ, and if confidence in the interaction (as reflected by the BINWOE scores) is high.

The recommendations for assessing the potential hazard to public health of the joint toxic action of lead, arsenic, cadmium, and chromium(VI) is to use the hazard index and TTDs to estimate endpoint-specific hazard indexes for neurological, renal, cardiovascular, hematological, and testicular toxicity of the mixture. This approach is appropriate when hazard quotients of at least two of the components equal or exceed 0.1 (ATSDR 2001a). The hazard quotient for arsenic's dermal toxicity (critical effect for chronic oral MRL) and the cancer risk estimate for arsenic are estimated separately from the other mixture components, because dermal effects are a unique critical effect (oral exposure to the other components does not affect the skin) and because the other components are not carcinogenic by the oral route (ATSDR 2001a). The impact of interactions on the endpoint-specific hazard indexes, unique hazard quotient, and cancer risk, were predicted using the WOE approach (ATSDR 2001a, 2001b), and are summarized below.

Neurological: The predicted direction of joint toxic action for neurological effects, an endpoint common to all four components, is greater than additive for the effect of lead on arsenic (low-moderate confidence), arsenic on lead (moderate confidence), cadmium on lead (low confidence), and chromium(VI) on arsenic (low confidence), and less than additive for the effect of arsenic on chromium(VI). The remaining seven BINWOEs were indeterminate due to a lack of toxicological and mechanistic data. Thus, the potential health hazard may be somewhat greater than estimated by the endpoint-specific hazard index for neurological effects, particularly for waste sites with relatively high hazard quotients for lead and arsenic, and lower hazard quotients for the other components. Given the indeterminate ratings for the majority of the BINWOEs, confidence in this conclusion would be lower for

mixtures where cadmium and chromium(VI) account for a greater portion of the apparent neurological hazard.

Renal: The potential health hazard regarding renal effects is likely to be lower than the additive, endpoint-specific hazard index, because five of the BINWOEs were less than additive, two were additive, and five were indeterminate. Confidence in the less-than-additive and additive BINWOEs ranges from low-moderate to high-moderate. Uncertainty regarding the impact of interactions on this endpoint is less than for neurological toxicity, because more information was available and a greater number of BINWOEs could be determined.

Cardiovascular: The WOE will have little impact on the additive, endpoint-specific hazard index, because the two moderate-confidence BINWOEs for this endpoint (for the effects of cadmium and lead and vice versa) were additive, one low confidence BINWOE (for chromium(VI) on arsenic) was less than additive, six BINWOEs were indeterminate, and three were not applicable (for the effect of the other components on chromium(VI)). For mixtures other than those predominated by lead and cadmium, uncertainty is high.

Hematological: The potential health hazard for hematological effects is likely to be lower than indicated by the endpoint-specific hazard index, because six of the BINWOEs were less than additive, one was greater than additive, one was additive, and four were indeterminate. Confidence in the less-than-additive and additive BINWOEs is primarily low-moderate, and confidence in the greater-than-additive BINWOE is low.

Testicular: The potential health hazard may be higher than the endpoint-specific hazard index for testicular effects for mixtures with relatively high hazard quotients for cadmium and lead, because BINWOEs for this pair were greater than additive, with relatively high confidence. The BINWOE scores for arsenic effects on cadmium and chromium(VI) testicular toxicity were less than additive, but the confidence was low and the impact on the hazard index will be low. For the other pairs, BINWOEs were indeterminate (five BINWOEs) or not applicable (three BINWOEs for the effect of the other components on arsenic).

Dermal: Interactions of the other mixture components on the dermal toxicity of arsenic are indeterminate for lead and cadmium, and greater than additive with low confidence for chromium(VI). Thus the

available data do not indicate a significant impact of interactions on the hazard quotient for the unique critical effect of arsenic, but uncertainty is high due to the lack of pertinent information.

Carcinogenic: Data regarding effects of the other mixture components on arsenic carcinogenicity were not available. Mechanistic considerations suggest that the effect of chromium(VI) on arsenic carcinogenicity may be greater than additive, but confidence in this assessment was low. The remaining BINWOEs are indeterminate and will have no impact on the cancer risk estimate for arsenic. Uncertainty regarding interactions is high due to the lack of pertinent information.

CONTRIBUTORS

CHEMICAL MANAGER(S)/AUTHORS:

Nickolette Roney, M.P.H.
ATSDR, Division of Toxicology, Atlanta, GA

Joan Colman, Ph.D.
Lisa Ingerman, Ph.D.
Gary Diamond, Ph.D., technical advisor
Syracuse Research Corporation, North Syracuse, NY

PEER REVIEW

A peer review panel was assembled for this profile. The panel consisted of the following members:

Dr. Max Costa
Department of Environmental Medicine
New York University Medical Center
Nelson Institute of Environmental Medicine
Tuxedo, New York

Dr. Ingeborg Harding-Barlow
Private Consultant in Toxicology, Risk Management, and Risk Assessment
Palo Alto, California

Dr. Derek Hodgson
Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs
University of Nebraska at Omaha
Omaha, Nebraska

All reviewers were selected in conformity with the conditions for peer review specified in Section 104(i)(13) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act, as amended.

Scientists from the Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry (ATSDR) have reviewed the peer reviewers' comments and determined which comments will be included in the profile. A listing of the peer reviewers' comments not incorporated in the profile, with a brief explanation of the rationale for their exclusion, exists as part of the administrative record for this compound.

The citation of the peer review panel should not be understood to imply its approval of the profile's final content. The responsibility for the content of this profile lies with the ATSDR.

CONTENTS

PREFACE	iii
SUMMARY	v
CONTRIBUTORS	xi
PEER REVIEW	xiii
CONTENTS	xv
LIST OF FIGURES	xvii
LIST OF TABLES	xvii
LIST OF ACRONYMS, ABBREVIATIONS, AND SYMBOLS	xix
1. Introduction	1
2. Joint Toxic Actions Data for the Mixture of Concern and Component Mixtures	5
2.1 Mixture of Concern	5
2.2 Component Mixtures	6
2.2.1 Lead, Arsenic, and Cadmium	7
2.2.2 Lead, Arsenic, and Chromium(VI)	8
2.2.3 Lead and Arsenic	9
2.2.4 Lead and Cadmium	21
2.2.5 Lead and Chromium(VI)	48
2.2.6 Arsenic and Cadmium	48
2.2.7 Arsenic and Chromium(VI)	59
2.2.8 Cadmium and Chromium(VI)	64
2.3 Relevance of the Joint Toxic Action Data and Approaches to Public Health	68
3. Recommendation for Exposure-Based Assessment of Joint Toxic Action of the Mixture	103
4. Conclusions	117
5. List of References	119
Appendix A: Background Information for Lead	133
A.1 Toxicokinetics	133
A.2 Health Effects	133
A.3 Mechanisms of Action	134
A.4 Health Guidelines	135
A.5 Derivation of Target-Organ Toxicity Dose (TTD) Values	136
Appendix B: Background Information for Arsenic	139
B.1 Toxicokinetics	139
B.2 Health Effects	139

B.3	Mechanisms of Action	141
B.4	Health Guidelines	141
B.5	Derivation of Target Organ Toxicity Dose (TTD) Values	142
Appendix C:	Background Information for Cadmium	147
C.1	Toxicokinetics	147
C.2	Health Effects	147
C.3	Mechanisms of Action	148
C.4	Health Guidelines	150
C.5	Derivation of Target Organ Toxicity Dose (TTD) Values	151
Appendix D:	Background Information for Chromium(VI)	155
D.1	Toxicokinetics	155
D.2	Health Effects	155
D.3	Mechanisms of Action	156
D.4	Health Guidelines	156
D.5	Derivation of Target Organ Toxicity Dose (TTD) Values	158

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1	Binary Weight-of-Evidence Scheme for the Assessment of Chemical Interactions	73
----------	--	----

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1.	Potential Health Effects of Concern for Intermediate and Chronic Oral Exposure to the Mixture Lead, Arsenic, Cadmium, and Chromium(VI)	3
Table 2.	Availability of Pertinent Interactions Data for Pairs of Components	3
Table 3.	Summary of Available Data on the Influence of Lead on Toxicity/Carcinogenicity of Arsenic by Simultaneous Exposure	15
Table 5.	Summary of Available Data on the Influence of Arsenic on Toxicity/Carcinogenicity of Lead by Simultaneous Exposure	18
Table 6.	Summary of Available Data on the Influence of Arsenic on Tissue Concentrations of Lead by Simultaneous Exposure	20
Table 7.	Summary of Available Data on the Influence of Lead on Toxicity/Carcinogenicity of Cadmium by Simultaneous Exposure	36
Table 8.	Summary of Available Data on the Influence of Lead on Tissue Concentrations of Cadmium by Simultaneous Exposure	39
Table 9.	Summary of Available Data on the Influence of Cadmium on Toxicity/Carcinogenicity of Lead by Simultaneous Exposure	41
Table 10.	Summary of Available Data on the Influence of Cadmium on Tissue Concentrations of Lead by Simultaneous Exposure	46
Table 11.	Summary of Available Data on the Influence of Arsenic on Toxicity/Carcinogenicity of Cadmium by Simultaneous Exposure	55
Table 12.	Summary of Available Data on the Influence of Cadmium on Toxicity/Carcinogenicity of Arsenic by Simultaneous Exposure	57
Table 13.	Summary of Available Data on the Influence of Arsenic on Toxicity/Carcinogenicity of Chromium(VI) by Simultaneous Exposure	62
Table 14.	Summary of Available Data on the Influence of Chromium(VI) on Toxicity/Carcinogenicity of Arsenic by Simultaneous Exposure	63
Table 15.	Summary of Available Data on the Influence of Cadmium on Toxicity/Carcinogenicity of Chromium(VI) by Sequential Exposure	66
Table 16.	Summary of Available Data on the Influence of Chromium(VI) on Toxicity/Carcinogenicity of Cadmium by Sequential Exposure	67
Table 17.	Health Effects Forming the Basis of ATSDR Oral MRLs for Chemicals of Concern.	69
Table 18.	Effect of Lead on Arsenic : Neurological Toxicity for Oral Exposure	74
Table 19.	Effect of Arsenic on Lead : Neurological Toxicity for Oral Exposure	75
Table 20.	Effect of Lead on Arsenic : Dermal Toxicity for Oral Exposure	76
Table 21.	Effect of Lead on Arsenic : Renal Toxicity for Oral Exposure	77
Table 22.	Effect of Arsenic on Lead : Renal Toxicity for Oral Exposure	78
Table 23.	Effect of Lead on Arsenic : Cardiovascular Toxicity for Oral Exposure	79
Table 24.	Effect of Arsenic on Lead : Cardiovascular Toxicity for Oral Exposure	80
Table 25.	Effect of Lead on Arsenic : Hematological Toxicity for Oral Exposure	81
Table 26.	Effect of Arsenic on Lead : Hematological Toxicity for Oral Exposure	82
Table 27.	Effect of Lead on Cadmium : Neurological Toxicity for Oral Exposure	83
Table 28.	Effect of Cadmium on Lead : Neurological Toxicity for Oral Exposure	84
Table 29.	Effect of Lead on Cadmium : Renal Toxicity for Oral Exposure	85
Table 30.	Effect of Cadmium on Lead : Renal Toxicity for Oral Exposure	86

Table 31. Effect of Lead on Cadmium : Cardiovascular Toxicity for Oral Exposure	87
Table 32. Effect of Cadmium on Lead : Cardiovascular Toxicity for Oral Exposure	88
Table 33. Effect of Lead on Cadmium : Hematological Toxicity for Oral Exposure	89
Table 34. Effect of Cadmium on Lead : Hematological Toxicity for Oral Exposure	90
Table 35. Effect of Lead on Cadmium : Testicular Toxicity for Oral Exposure	91
Table 36. Effect of Cadmium on Lead : Testicular Toxicity for Oral Exposure	92
Table 37. Effect of Arsenic on Cadmium : Renal Toxicity for Oral Exposure	93
Table 38. Effect of Cadmium on Arsenic : Renal Toxicity for Oral Exposure	94
Table 39. Effect of Cadmium on Arsenic : Dermal Toxicity for Oral Exposure	95
Table 40. Effect of Arsenic on Cadmium : Hematological Toxicity for Oral Exposure	96
Table 41. Effect of Cadmium on Arsenic : Hematological Toxicity for Oral Exposure	97
Table 42. Effect of Arsenic on Cadmium : Testicular Toxicity for Oral Exposure	98
Table 43. Effect of Chromium(VI) on Arsenic : Dermal and Other Non-Renal Toxicities for Oral Exposure	99
Table 44. Effect of Arsenic on Chromium(VI) : Renal and Non-Renal Toxicities for Oral Exposure	100
Table 45. Effect of Chromium(VI) on Arsenic : Renal Toxicity for Oral Exposure	101
Table 46. MRLs and TTDs for Chronic Oral Exposure to Chemicals of Concern.	105
Table 47. Summary of Endpoint-Specific BINWOEs for Lead and Arsenic	106
Table 48. Summary of Endpoint-Specific BINWOEs for Lead and Cadmium	106
Table 49. Matrix of BINWOE Determinations for Neurological Toxicity of Intermediate or Chronic Simultaneous Oral Exposure to Chemicals of Concern	108
Table 50. Matrix of BINWOE Determinations for Dermal Toxicity of Intermediate or Chronic Simultaneous Oral Exposure to Chemicals of Concern	109
Table 51. Matrix of BINWOE Determinations for Renal Toxicity of Intermediate or Chronic Simultaneous Oral Exposure to Chemicals of Concern	110
Table 52. Matrix of BINWOE Determinations for Cardiovascular Toxicity of Intermediate or Chronic Simultaneous Oral Exposure to Chemicals of Concern	112
Table 53. Matrix of BINWOE Determinations for Hematological Toxicity of Intermediate or Chronic Simultaneous Oral Exposure to Chemicals of Concern	113
Table 54. Matrix of BINWOE Determinations for Testicular Toxicity of Intermediate or Chronic Simultaneous Oral Exposure to Chemicals of Concern	114

LIST OF ACRONYMS, ABBREVIATIONS, AND SYMBOLS

ACGIH	American Conference of Governmental Industrial Hygienists	NOAEL	no-observed-adverse-effect level
ALA	delta-aminolevulinic acid	NPL	National Priorities List
ALAD	delta-aminolevulinic acid dehydratase	NRC	National Research Council
ALAS	delta-aminolevulinic acid synthetase	NTP	National Toxicology Program
As	arsenic	Pb	lead
ATSDR	Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry	PbB	blood lead
BINWOE	binary weight-of-evidence	PBPK	physiologically based pharmacokinetic
BMC	benchmark concentration	PBPK/PD	physiologically-based pharmacokinetic
Cd	cadmium		pharmacodynamic
CdB	blood cadmium	ppb	parts per billion
CDC	Centers for Disease Control	ppm	parts per million
CdMT	cadmium metallothionein	RfC	Reference Concentration
CdU	urinary cadmium	RfD	Reference Dose
CERCLA	Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Recovery Act	RNA	ribonucleic acid
Cr	chromium	SCE	sister chromatid exchange
dL	deciliter	SGOT	serum glutamic-oxaloacetic transaminase
DMA	dimethylarsenite	TTD	target-organ toxicity dose
DNA	deoxyribonucleic acid	U.S.	United States
DT	Division of Toxicology	WOE	weight-of-evidence
EPA	Environmental Protection Agency	ZPP	zinc protoporphyrin
FQPA	Food Quality Protection Act	>	greater than
HOME	Home Observation for Measurement of the Environment	≥	greater than or equal to
IARC	International Agency for Research on Cancer	=	equal to
IRIS	Integrated Risk Information System	<	less than
kg	kilogram	≤	less than or equal to
L	liter	μg	microgram
LD ₅₀	lethal dose, 50% kill	μmole	micromole
LOAEL	lowest-observed-adverse-effect level		
MCH	mean corpuscular hemoglobin		
MCHC	mean corpuscular hemoglobin concentrations		
MCV	mean corpuscular volume		
mg	milligram		
mL	milliliter		
MMA	monomethylarsenite		
MRL	Minimal Risk Level		
MT	metallothionein		