

I. Literature Search / Study Selection – Charge Question 1

EPA:

1. **Literature search/study selection.** Is the literature search strategy well documented? Please identify additional peer-reviewed studies that might have been missed.

PCTC:

1. **Literature search/study selection.** Is the literature search strategy well documented? Please identify additional peer-reviewed studies that might have been missed. Is the quality, relevance and transparency of the selected studies appropriately documented? Are the selected studies the appropriate studies to use for the purposes indicated in the assessment?

ACC:

1. **Literature Search/study selection and evaluation.** ~~DELETE: Is the literature search strategy well documented? Please identify additional peer reviewed studies that could have been missed[END DELETION].~~

Please comment on whether the literature search approach, screening, evaluation, and selection of studies for inclusion in the assessment are clearly described and supported. Please comment on whether EPA has clearly identified the criteria (e.g., study quality, risk of bias) used for the selection of studies to review and for the selection of key studies include in the assessment. Please identify any additional peer-reviewed studies from the primary literature that should be considered in the assessment of noncancer and cancer health effects of BaP.

AMMONIA PANEL:

Literature Search Strategy/Study Selection and Evaluation – Final Version

The process for identifying and selecting pertinent studies for consideration in developing the assessment is detailed in the Literature Search Strategy/Study Selection and Evaluation section. Please comment on whether the literature search approach, screening, evaluation, and selection of studies for inclusion in the assessment are clearly described and supported. Please comment on whether EPA has clearly identified the criteria (e.g., study quality, risk of bias) used for the selection of studies to review and for the selection of key studies to include in the assessment. Please identify any additional peer-reviewed studies from the primary literature that should be considered in the assessment of noncancer and cancer health effects of ammonia.

SBA Proposed AMMONIA Charge:

Literature Search Strategy/Study Selection and Evaluation

The process for identifying and selecting pertinent studies for consideration in developing the assessment is detailed in the *Literature Search Strategy/Study Selection and Evaluation* section. Please comment on whether the literature search approach, screening, evaluation, and selection of studies for inclusion in the assessment are clearly described and supported. **Please comment on whether EPA has clearly identified the criteria (e.g., study quality, risk of bias) used for selection of studies to review, the influential studies to select for inclusion in the assessment, and the key studies used in the development of reference values. Can you recommend improved approaches or criteria to be employed by the agency?** Please identify any additional peer-reviewed studies from the primary literature that should be considered in the assessment of noncancer and cancer health effects of ammonia. **(modified language in bold from the ORIGINAL EPA CHARGE)**

SBA PROPOSED REVISION: ACC Version tracks Ammonia – and is recommended but with the addition of:

“Can you recommend improved approaches or criteria to be employed by the agency?” was missing from the Ammonia charge.

The ammonia version appears not to explicitly ask the panel to opine on the validity and utility of the chosen approaches and criteria.

II. Public Comments - Charge Question 5

EPA:

In August 2013, EPA asked for public comments on an earlier draft of this assessment. Appendix G summarizes the public comments and this assessment's responses to them. Please comment on EPA's response to the scientific issues raised in the public comments. Please comment on EPA's response to the scientific issues raised in the public comments.

ACC :

In August 2013, EPA asked for public comments on an earlier draft of this assessment. Appendix G summarizes the public comments and this assessment's responses to them. Please comment on EPA's response to the scientific issues raised in the public comments. Please consider in your review whether there are scientific issues that were raised by the public as described in Appendix G that may not have been adequately addressed by EPA.

AMMONIA PANEL:

EPA solicited public comments on the draft IRIS assessment of ammonia and has revised the assessment to respond to the scientific issues raised in the comments. A summary of the public comments and EPA's responses are provided in Appendix G of the Supplemental Information to the Toxicological Review of Ammonia. Please consider in your review whether there are scientific issues that were raised by the public as described in Appendix G that may not have been adequately addressed by EPA.

PROPOSED REVISION: ACC Version tracks Ammonia – and is recommended