



HAL
open science

Health risk assessment with multiple reference indices

Pascal Petit, Dominique J. Bicout

► **To cite this version:**

Pascal Petit, Dominique J. Bicout. Health risk assessment with multiple reference indices. Science of the Total Environment, 2022, 804, pp.149971. 10.1016/j.scitotenv.2021.149971 . hal-03364381

HAL Id: hal-03364381

<https://hal.univ-grenoble-alpes.fr/hal-03364381>

Submitted on 16 Oct 2023

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



Distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution - NonCommercial 4.0 International License

1 **Health risk assessment with multiple reference indices**

2

3 Pascal Petit^{a,*}, Dominique J. Bicot^a

4 ^a Univ. Grenoble Alpes, CNRS, Grenoble INP, VetAgro Sup, TIMC, 38000 Grenoble, France

5

6 * Corresponding authors at: Laboratoire TIMC-IMAG, Equipe EPSP, Faculté de Médecine de Grenoble,

7 Domaine de La Merci, 38706 La Tronche Cedex, France.

8 Tel: +33(0) 4 76 63 75 06

9 E-mail address: pascal.petit@univ-grenoble-alpes.fr

10 **ABSTRACT**

11 *Background:* Conducting a risk assessment can be challenging, especially when dealing with several
12 reference indices, which could lead to conflicting conclusions between studies. The common approach
13 is to use a reference index from a single source based on the risk assessor's preference.

14 *Objectives:* To propose an approach for constructing a multi-reference index-based aggregated risk
15 estimate using mathematical objectivity to reflect all of the available information.

16 *Methods:* The aggregated risk estimate based on multiple reference indices (AREMRI) results from
17 the weighted linear combination of risk distributions that were obtained with each reference index
18 available. The weights were calculated using the degree of agreement among the reference index-
19 based risk distributions. The approach is illustrated through three practical cases of benzene inhalation
20 cancer risk assessment using inhalation unit risks (IURs) from six different regulatory agencies.

21 *Results:* The degrees of agreement between the reference index-based risk distribution, obtained with
22 the six IURs, ranged from 0.7 to 92%. The highest weights were attributed to reference index-based
23 risk distributions that had the highest degree of agreement with the maximum number of other
24 reference index-based risk distributions. Regardless of the practical case considered, the AREMRI risk
25 distribution resulted in the third highest risk compared to the six single risk distributions.

26 *Conclusion:* Our approach can be useful in the presence of several reference indices by providing
27 useful insights, consistency and direct comparisons between studies to support better-informed risk
28 assessment and management decisions. This approach can shed some light on some of the
29 uncertainties associated with the toxicological reference values in a risk assessment associated with the
30 toxicological reference values. If the uncertainty is large, more detailed evaluation of the toxicological
31 reference values would be needed.

32

33 **KEYWORDS**

34 Health risk assessment; probabilistic risk assessment; risk aggregation; cancer risk

35 **1. Introduction**

36 Risk assessments are paramount in ensuring the protection of human health against environmental
37 pollutants (Rotter et al. 2018). Performing a risk assessment requires the use of toxicity reference
38 indices. Reference indices are derived using rigorous methodological weights of evidence approaches
39 by regulatory agencies based on available data generated in experimental toxicology and exposure
40 assessment. For a given absorption pathway (oral, respiratory, cutaneous), dates when the index values
41 were derived, the method of derivation, and knowledge or assumptions about substances' mechanisms
42 of action are often different from one organization/agency/study to another (Petit et al. 2020). These
43 differences arise mainly from the use of different data sources/key studies (e.g., the results from
44 animal studies or epidemiological studies), extrapolation methods, correction factors, and commonly
45 accepted assumptions and uncertainties (ANSES 2015; Beck et al. 2016; Melnick et al. 2008; US EPA
46 2014). Even when similar studies are considered for the same critical health effects and absorption
47 pathway, organizations/agencies/studies can reach different conclusions due to different policies
48 and/or expert judgments (Beck et al. 2016). Depending on the reference index chosen, the results of
49 the risk assessment can thus differ and lead to different conclusions and decisions, which may have
50 broad and profound implications regarding the prevention of adverse effects and the protection of
51 human health and the environment.

52 The double question that arises when carrying out a risk assessment is knowing which reference index
53 to use and how to take into account the information provided by the other indices. Indeed, there are no
54 criteria or benchmark/gold standard approaches guiding the choice of an index, especially since, by
55 definition, all reference indices available from health/regulatory agencies are legitimate. In practice,
56 we tend to use either an index from our own home country agency (when available) or an index from
57 an agency to which we subjectively attach a certain importance. Thus, in this paper, we explored and
58 suggest an alternative approach, which would be to construct and use an aggregated risk estimate
59 based on multiple reference indices (AREMRI) created from mathematical objectivity. Such an
60 AREMRI would allow for direct comparisons among studies, promote transparency and ensure a
61 consistency of analysis during risk assessment. The aim here is not to judge how researchers and/or

62 regulatory agencies derive reference indices or to criticize existing reference indices but rather to use
 63 them as is, starting from the fact that each of the indices carries a part of the truth.

64 The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. The general approach for constructing an
 65 AREMRI risk distribution (uncertain risks) is presented in Section 2. Section 3 is devoted to an
 66 illustrative application of the developed approach to inhalation cancer risks. Finally, the last section,
 67 Section 4, discusses the proposed approach and considers the practical implications and
 68 implementation of the developed analysis in an interactive web application.

69

70 **2. Methods**

71 *2.1 Aggregated risk distribution construction based on multiple reference indices (AREMRI)*

72 Consider a discrete ensemble of n indicators of uncertain risk r , each based on a reference index from
 73 a different source (e.g., organization/agency/study), and each being described by a distribution
 74 function normalized to one, $R_i(r)$, with $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$. It is assumed that all reference indices from n
 75 sources are legitimate and relevant (developed for the same purpose) and that there is no objective
 76 and/or impartial reason to choose one over another for the risk assessment. As a first step, the
 77 ensemble of n indicators can be characterized by the matrix of degrees of agreement, \mathbf{A} , given by (Eq.
 78 1):

$$79 \quad \mathbf{A} = \begin{pmatrix} a_{11} & a_{12} & \cdots & a_{1n} \\ a_{21} & a_{22} & \cdots & a_{2n} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ a_{n1} & a_{n2} & \cdots & a_{nn} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & a_{12} & \cdots & a_{1n} \\ a_{21} & 1 & \cdots & a_{2n} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ a_{n1} & a_{n2} & \cdots & 1 \end{pmatrix} \quad (1)$$

80 where $a_{ij} = a_{ji}$ is the degree of agreement between two reference index-based distributions
 81 (indicators) i and j such that $0 \leq a_{ij} = a_{ji} \leq 1$ and $a_{ii} = 1$. $a_{ij} = 0$ refers to no agreement, while
 82 $a_{ij} = 1$ indicates total agreement between the two reference index-based risk distributions. A
 83 reference index-based distribution is defined as a risk distribution resulting from the use of a
 84 given/source-specific reference index (e.g., oral slope factor from US EPA). Mathematically, $a_{ij} =$
 85 $\text{overlap}[R_i, R_j]$ is obtained by calculating the overlap between two (normalized to one) distribution

86 functions $R_i(r)$ and $R_j(r)$; a general method for calculating the overlap (or overlapping area) between
 87 two functions is described elsewhere (Petit et al. 2020).

88 The content of \mathbf{A} is very informative to compare reference index-based risk distribution with each
 89 other and also to guide the development of a pragmatic choice of one reference index over the others,
 90 in possible combination with other techniques such as stochastic dominance or expected utility
 91 (Verteramo Chiu et al. 2020). Whichever approach is used, the result would be to choose the indicator
 92 (i.e., reference index) from a single source (e.g., regulatory agency/study). Consequently, we are rather
 93 in favor of constructing a composite indicator resulting from the aggregation of all indicators to reflect
 94 all of the available information. Our aim is to develop such an aggregation based on the content of \mathbf{A}
 95 and, in this case, there will be no aggregation when $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{1}$ (identity matrix), i.e., when none of the
 96 reference index-based distributions would agree with the others.

97 To this end, we propose to construct an aggregated risk distribution based on multiple reference
 98 indices (AREMRI), $R_a(r)$, as a weighted linear combination of reference index-based risk
 99 distributions $R_i(r)$, as follows (Eq. 2):

$$100 \quad R_a(r) = \sum_{i=1}^n \omega_i R_i(r) \quad (2)$$

101 where ω_i ($0 \leq \omega_i \leq 1$ such that $\sum_{i=1}^n \omega_i = 1$) is a contributing weight of the risk distribution
 102 generated with the reference index “ i ” and $R_i(r)$ is a risk distribution based on a single given
 103 reference index. Next, to determine the ω_i coefficients and obtain an objective aggregated distribution,
 104 we require that $R_a(r)$ has a maximum agreement with all risk distributions generated with all
 105 reference indices available $R_i(r)$, i.e., to maximize total agreement θ between $R_a(r)$ and all $R_i(r)$.

106 The total agreement θ is related to the agreement matrix \mathbf{A} as (Eq. 3):


$$107 \quad \theta = \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \\ \vdots \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}^T \underbrace{\begin{pmatrix} 1 & a_{12} & \cdots & a_{1n} \\ a_{21} & 1 & \cdots & a_{2n} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ a_{n1} & a_{n2} & \cdots & 1 \end{pmatrix}}_{\mathbf{A}} \begin{pmatrix} \omega_1 \\ \omega_2 \\ \vdots \\ \omega_n \end{pmatrix} \quad (3)$$

108 The agreement matrix \mathbf{A} is symmetric with the trace, $\text{Tr}(\mathbf{A}) = \sum_{k=1}^n \lambda_k = n$, where λ_k are the
 109 eigenvalues associated with (normalized to one) eigenvectors \mathbf{v}_k of matrix \mathbf{A} such that $0 \leq \lambda_1 < \lambda_2 <$

110 $\dots < \lambda_n \leq n$. When there is no agreement among all reference index-based risk distributions $R_i(r)$, \mathbf{A}
 111 reduces to the identity matrix with $a_{ij} = 0$ for $i \neq j$, and the total agreement is always $\theta = 1$
 112 regardless of the weights ω_i . In this case, no aggregation based on the agreement matrix \mathbf{A} is possible
 113 as there is no objective way of choosing one reference index over another. In the opposite situation
 114 when all $a_{ij} = 1$, i.e., perfect agreement among all reference index-based risk distributions, the total
 115 agreement is maximum, $\theta = n$. We will show below that, in this case, $\omega_i = 1/n$ (arithmetic mean).
 116 Finally, when $0 < a_{ij} < 1$, the maximum of the total agreement, θ , is obtained by setting the ω_i
 117 coefficients equal to eigenvector \mathbf{v}_n corresponding to the largest eigenvalue λ_n as shown in (Eq. 4):

$$118 \quad \begin{pmatrix} \omega_1 \\ \omega_2 \\ \vdots \\ \omega_n \end{pmatrix} = \frac{1}{[\sum_{i=1}^n v_{n,i}]} \begin{pmatrix} v_{n,1} \\ v_{n,2} \\ \vdots \\ v_{n,n} \end{pmatrix} \Rightarrow \theta = \lambda_n \frac{1}{[\sum_{i=1}^n v_{n,i}]} \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \\ \vdots \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}^T \begin{pmatrix} v_{n,1} \\ v_{n,2} \\ \vdots \\ v_{n,n} \end{pmatrix} = \lambda_n \quad (4)$$

119 This determines the weights of $R_a(r)$ in Eq. 2. It is paramount to ensure that all $v_{n,i}$ have the same
 120 sign. Fig. 1 presents a schematic summary of the different steps of the construction of the aggregated
 121 risk distribution based on multiple reference indices.



122
 123 **Fig. 1:** Scheme of the general approach to construct an aggregated risk distribution based on multiple
 124 reference indices

125 ω_i : contributing weight of agency “ i ” with $0 \leq \omega_i \leq 1$ such that $\sum_{i=1}^n \omega_i = 1$; $R_a(r)$: aggregated risk
 126 distribution function based on multiple reference indices; $R_i(r)$: risk distribution function generated
 127 with reference index “ i ”.

128

129 In case of perfect agreement among all reference index-based risk distributions (indicators), i.e., all
 130 $a_{ij} = 1$, the highest eigenvalue of the agreement matrix \mathbf{A} is $\lambda_n = n$, associated with the eigenvector
 131 $\mathbf{v}_n^T = (1, 1, \dots, 1)^T$; this leads to $\omega_1 = \omega_2 = \dots = \omega_n = 1/n$.

132 When dealing with only two reference indices (indicators), i.e., $n = 2$ and $a_{12} = a_{21} \neq 0$, the highest
 133 eigenvalue of \mathbf{A} is $\lambda_2 = 1 + a_{12}$, associated with the eigenvector $\mathbf{v}_2^T = (1, 1)^T$. In this case, the
 134 weights are $\omega_1 = \omega_2 = 1/2$, independent of a_{12} , provided that $a_{12} \neq 0$.

135 To gain more understanding of these weights, consider an example of $n = 3$ for which weights can be
 136 calculated explicitly as:

$$137 \quad \mathbf{A} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & a_{12} & 0 \\ a_{21} & 1 & a_{23} \\ 0 & a_{32} & 1 \end{pmatrix} \Rightarrow \begin{pmatrix} \omega_1 \\ \omega_2 \\ \omega_3 \end{pmatrix} = \frac{1}{[a_{12} + \sqrt{a_{12}^2 + a_{23}^2 + a_{23}}]} \begin{pmatrix} a_{12} \\ \sqrt{a_{12}^2 + a_{23}^2} \\ a_{23} \end{pmatrix} \quad (5)$$

138 where $a_{12} = a_{21} < 1$ and $a_{23} = a_{32} < 1$ such that $a_{13} = a_{31} = 0$, and the highest eigenvalue of \mathbf{A} is
 139 $\lambda_3 = 1 + \sqrt{a_{12}^2 + a_{23}^2}$. Clearly, Eq. 5 shows how the weights are “proportional or a function” of the
 140 respective agreements. For instance, setting $a_{23} = 0$ leads to $\omega_3 = 0$, i.e., the contribution of a
 141 reference index-based risk distribution (indicator) is zero when the reference index-based risk
 142 distribution does not agree with any other. In addition, the weight of a reference index-based risk
 143 distribution (indicator) increases with its total agreement with the other reference index-based risk
 144 distributions (indicators). Indeed, we have $\omega_3 < \omega_1 < \omega_2$ when $a_{23} < a_{12}$, and $\omega_1 < \omega_3 < \omega_2$ for
 145 $a_{23} > a_{12}$. These observations remain valid for $n > 3$.

146

147 *2.2 Application to inhalation cancer risks*

148

149 To illustrate the usefulness of using an aggregated risk distribution based on multiple reference
 150 indices, we consider three practical cases/scenarios of risk assessment of benzene exposure where each
 151 exposure scenario is characterized by a distribution of benzene concentrations assumed constant over
 152 time and following a lognormal distribution with the geometric mean (GM) and geometric standard
 153 deviation (GSD) parameters given in Table 1 and an exposure duration of 4 hours a day, 120 days a

154 year for 50 years. Regardless of the reference index considered, the concentration distributions used
155 for a given scenario were exactly the same (same geometric mean and geometric standard deviation).
156 The concentration distribution parameters differed from one practical case to another with a GM set to
157 253, 253 and 58.4 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ and a GSD set to 2.80, 1.03 and 2.80 for cases 1, 2 and 3, respectively. For
158 all scenarios, both the GM and GSD were set at pragmatic random values generated with R software
159 4.0.5® (R Core Team, Vienna, Austria) for Windows 10©.

160 We used the *InCaRisk* app (Petit et al. 2020) with 1,000 simulations runs to generate all of the
161 reference index-based risk distributions $R_i(r)$. Briefly, the *InCaRisk* app is a free user-friendly and
162 interactive web application that allows for cancer risk estimation following inhalation exposure
163 (<https://exporisk-timc.imag.fr/InCaRisk/>). A total of 305 substances/chemicals with reference values
164 from up to eight agencies are available. *InCaRisk* requires no programming knowledge to use. This
165 app also incorporates a variety of features and options to make it easy to use, with the possibility of
166 configuring the exposure settings (exposure scenario), the concentration distribution settings (choice
167 of the type of distribution, distribution parameters, uploading an exposure concentration file) and to
168 export the results as a report. This app offers the chance to have an immediate glimpse into the results
169 and to see how the results change according to different setting configurations with interactive easy-to-
170 read graphs, which are downloadable.

171 The reference index-based risk distributions $R_i(r)$ were generated for six sanitary agencies for which
172 the tumor site (leukemia) and tumor type (hematologic/immune) used in the inhalation unit risk (IUR)
173 establishment were the same: ANSES (French Agency for Food, Environmental and Occupational
174 Health & Safety), Health Canada, OEHHA (California Office of Environmental Health Hazard
175 Assessment), RIVM (National Dutch Institute for Public Health and the Environment), US EPA (US
176 Environmental Protection Agency) and WHO (World Health Organization). The IURs for benzene set
177 by these agencies regarding the risk of leukemia for lifetime exposure were 2.6×10^{-5} (ANSES 2019),
178 3.3×10^{-6} (Health Canada 2010), 2.9×10^{-5} (OEHHA 2019), 5×10^{-6} (RIVM 2001), 7.8×10^{-6} (US EPA
179 2018) and $6 \times 10^{-6} \text{ m}^3/\mu\text{g}$ (WHO 2000).

180

181 Table 1 here (see Table 1 after the Reference section).

182 **3. Results**

183 For a given practical case, each IUR-based risk distribution resulted in different cancer estimates even
184 though the exposure concentration distributions were the same. These differences came solely from
185 the IUR values that differed from one agency to another (Table 1). Indeed, each IUR-based risk
186 distribution had the same shape (height and width) because of similar concentration parameters (Table
187 1) but was shifted from one another (different mean) by a factor that depended on the ratio
188 $IUR_{agency_i}/IUR_{agency_j}$ (Fig. 2C, 3C and 4C).

189 As seen in the matrix of agreement between sources (agencies) (Fig. 2A, 3A and 4A), the degrees of
190 agreement were heterogeneous between IUR-based risk distributions, regardless of the practical case
191 considered. The results were similar for cases 1 and 3. Degrees of agreement were lower for the
192 second scenario than for the first and third scenarios because the GSDs were the lowest (narrower
193 distributions) for case 2. For all scenarios, the highest degrees of agreement, 92% for cases 1 and 3
194 and 81% for case 2, were found between IUR-based risk distributions from RIVM and WHO, while
195 the lowest degrees of agreement were found between IUR-based risk distributions from Health Canada
196 and OEHHA (30% for cases 1 and 3, 0.7% for case 2). Regardless of the practical case considered,
197 IUR-based risk distributions from OEHHA and ANSES had a high degree of agreement with each
198 other (84% for cases 1 & 3, 80% for case 2), a medium degree of agreement with all other IUR-based
199 risk distributions for cases 1 & 3 (30 to 56%), and a low degree of agreement with all other IUR-based
200 risk distributions for case 2 (0.7 to 15%). IUR-based risk distributions from the WHO, US EPA,
201 Health Canada and RIVM had a medium to high degree of agreement with each other (66 to 92% for
202 cases 1 & 3 and 30 to 81% for case 2).

203
204 The weights were similar for cases 1 and 3, ranging from 0.136 to 0.189, and they ranged from 0.053
205 to 0.247 for case 2 (Fig. 2B, 3B and 4B). The highest weights were attributed to IUR-based risk
206 distributions that had the highest degree of agreement with the maximum number of other IUR-based
207 risk distributions. Conversely, IUR-based risk distributions that shared a high degree of agreement
208 with the smallest number of other IUR-based risk distributions had the smallest weights.


209

210 For the first and third scenarios, the aggregated multi IUR-based risk distribution (AREMRI) followed
211 a lognormal distribution of parameters $GM = 1.65 \times 10^{-4}$ and $GSD = 2.8$ for case 1 and $GM = 3.82 \times 10^{-5}$
212 and $GSD = 2.84$ for case 3. The AREMRI resulted in the third highest risk, with a leukemia risk of
213 6.56×10^{-4} [IC 95%: $2.31 \times 10^{-5} - 1.32 \times 10^{-3}$] for case 1 and 1.53×10^{-4} [IC 95%: $5.30 \times 10^{-6} - 3.07 \times 10^{-4}$] for
214 case 3. For both scenarios, these leukemia risks were 2.5 and 2.2 times lower than the cancer risk
215 estimated with the reference indices (IURs) of OEHHA and ANSES, respectively (Fig. 2C and 4C).
216 Conversely, the aggregated multi-IUR-based risks were 1.5, 1.9, 2.3 and 3.5 times higher than the
217 leukemia risk estimated with the reference indices from the US EPA, WHO, RIVM and Health
218 Canada, respectively. The concentration GSDs used for cases 1 & 3 were the same ($GSD = 2.80$),
219 which explains why the weights and degrees of agreement were similar for both scenarios. The only
220 difference between case 1 and case 3 came from the estimated leukemia risk, which was 4.3 times
221 lower for case 3 than for case 1. This difference corresponded to the ratio of their concentration GM
222 ($253 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ for case 1 vs. $58.4 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ for case 3). In other words, for a given concentration GSD,
223 changing the concentration GM will shift the risk estimate toward higher values when the GM is
224 increased and toward lower values when the GM is decreased, with little to no change at all of the
225 degrees of agreement or the weighted values.



226

227 For the second scenario, the aggregated multi-IUR-based risk distribution (AREMRI) followed a
228 lognormal distribution of parameters $GM = 1.08 \times 10^{-4}$ and $GSD = 1.52$. The AREMRI resulted in the
229 third highest risk, with a leukemia risk of 1.83×10^{-4} [IC 95%: $4.77 \times 10^{-5} - 2.55 \times 10^{-4}$], which was 3.5
230 and 3.1 times lower than the cancer risk estimated with the reference indices (IURs) of OEHHA and
231 ANSES, respectively (Fig. 3C). Conversely, the aggregated multi-IUR-based risk was 1.1, 1.4, 1.6 and
232 2.5 times higher than the leukemia risk estimated with the reference indices from the US EPA, WHO,
233 RIVM and Health Canada, respectively. For this scenario, the GM concentration was the same as that
234 in the first scenario ($GM = 253 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$), but the GSD concentration was lower (1.03 for case 2 vs. 2.80
235 for case 1). A lower GSD concentration for case 2 resulted in lower degrees of agreement (Fig. 3A)
236 and better risk estimation (narrower 95% confidence interval) than for case 1. Indeed, there was a 5.3



237 factor between the lower and upper bounds of the 95% confidence interval of the risk distribution for
238 case 2 compared to a factor of 57 for case 1.



240 **Fig. 2:** Side-by-side comparison of single IUR-based risk distributions for the construction of the aggregated multi-IUR-based risk distribution – case 1
241 A: Matrix of degrees of agreement between a single IUR-based risk distribution, B: Weights attributed to the IUR-based risk distribution for the aggregated
242 multi-IUR-based risk distribution construction, C: IUR-based risk distributions.
243 ANSES: French Agency for Food, Environmental and Occupational Health & Safety, H. Canada: Health Canada, OEHHA: California Office of
244 Environmental Health Hazard Assessment, RIVM: National Dutch Institute for Public Health and the Environment, US EPA: US Environmental Protection
245 Agency, WHO: World Health Organization. Each agency name refers to the risk distribution generated using its benzene IUR and the exposure scenario
246 considered. The term “Inter-agency” refers here to the aggregated risk estimate based on multiple reference indices (AREMRI).



248 **Fig. 3:** Side-by-side comparison of single IUR-based risk distributions for the construction of the aggregated multi-IUR-based risk distribution – case 2
249 A: Matrix of degrees of agreement between a single IUR-based risk distribution, B: Weights attributed to the IUR-based risk distribution for the aggregated
250 multi-IUR-based risk distribution construction, C: IUR-based risk distributions.
251 ANSES: French Agency for Food, Environmental and Occupational Health & Safety, H. Canada: Health Canada, OEHHA: California Office of
252 Environmental Health Hazard Assessment, RIVM: National Dutch Institute for Public Health and the Environment, US EPA: US Environmental Protection
253 Agency, WHO: World Health Organization. Each agency name refers to the risk distribution generated using its benzene IUR and the exposure scenario
254 considered. The term “Inter-agency” refers here to the aggregated risk estimate based on multiple reference indices (AREMRI).



256 **Fig. 4:** Side-by-side comparison of single IUR-based risk distributions for the construction of the aggregated multi-IUR-based risk distribution – case 3
257 A: Matrix of degrees of agreement between a single IUR-based risk distribution, B: Weights attributed to the IUR-based risk distribution for the aggregated
258 multi-IUR-based risk distribution construction, C: IUR-based risk distributions.
259 ANSES: French Agency for Food, Environmental and Occupational Health & Safety, H. Canada: Health Canada, OEHHA: California Office of
260 Environmental Health Hazard Assessment, RIVM: National Dutch Institute for Public Health and the Environment, US EPA: US Environmental Protection
261 Agency, WHO: World Health Organization. Each agency name refers to the risk distribution generated using its benzene IUR and the exposure scenario
262 considered. The term “Inter-agency” refers here to the aggregated risk estimate based on multiple reference indices (AREMRI).

263 **4. Discussion**

264 Performing a risk assessment requires the use of toxicity reference indices. When dealing with several
265 reference indices, risk assessment can be challenging, as there is no objective way to choose one
266 reference index over the others. By definition, all indices available from sanitary/regulatory agencies
267 are legitimate, but in practice, we tend to use an index from a source or agency to which we
268 subjectively attach a certain importance. In this paper, we propose a novel approach consisting of
269 constructing and using an aggregated multi-reference index-based risk estimate constructed only on
270 mathematical objectivity, assuming that the reference indices considered are all relevant and suitable
271 for the risk assessment to be conducted. An R code allowing for the estimation of risks (AREMRI) by
272 inputting multiple reference indices is provided in the Supplemental Material.

273 The construction of the aggregated risk distribution was based on the weighted linear aggregation
274 (arithmetic mean) of the probability risk distribution generated using a given reference index and using
275 the degree of agreement among the reference index-based risk distributions for the assignment of
276 weight. Other approaches could be used, such as stochastic dominance, which is a form of stochastic
277 ordering that would favor one reference index-based risk distribution over the others based on a
278 specific criterion. For example, using stochastic dominance, it would be possible to favor only the risk
279 distribution resulting from the source or agency with the highest reference index, that is to say the
280 most protective, or with the lowest reference index (weight of 1 while a weight of 0 for all the other
281 reference index-based risk distribution) (Verteramo Chiu et al. 2020). That kind of approach is,
282 however, different from our goal, which was not to judge or provide arguments for choosing a
283 reference index over the others but rather to objectively construct an aggregated risk indicator that
284 takes into account several reference indices from different sources (e.g., sanitary agencies), as all
285 reference indices are legitimate and carry part of the truth.

286 The proposed approach was illustrated using three practical cases where the exposure concentration
287 distributions were assumed to follow lognormal distributions. Our approach is not limited to
288 lognormal distributions and can work with any type of distribution. Two additional examples are
289 available in the Supplemental Material (Fig. S1 and S2), with exposure concentrations following
290 normal and Poisson distributions, respectively.

291 The approach consisting of constructing and using an aggregated multi-reference index-based risk
292 estimate was illustrated for one kind of stochastic reference value (inhalation cancer unit risk). The
293 presented approach could be used with other types of toxicological reference values, such as oral slope
294 factors, drinking water unit risks or threshold/deterministic values. For some toxicological reference
295 values, the distribution of the underlying toxicity data is available, and the reference value itself can
296 sometimes correspond to a certain point on that distribution (e.g., for BMDL values). In that particular
297 case, these reference values could potentially be set as distributions instead of single values using the
298 distribution of the underlying toxicity data when available. While the presented approach can still be
299 used with reference value distributions, it should be noted that the choice of the reference value
300 distribution (e.g., gamma, lognormal, Poisson, Weibull) and the associated uncertainties (confidence
301 intervals) will both have an important impact on the resulting risk estimate. In particular, in the
302 presence of large confidence intervals (high data dispersion), the degrees of agreement (overlaps
303 between distributions of risks) are so high that all of the reference indices contribute almost equally to
304 the aggregate distribution and the notion of multi-reference indices becomes less relevant. This issue is
305 particularly true with deterministic values (threshold values), for which the choice of the derivation
306 method and, in particular, the choice and use of large safety factors may dominate the differences
307 between the toxicological reference values. One possible solution to address this issue would be to
308 replace traditional noncancer reference doses (threshold values) with probabilistic estimates (Chiu et
309 al. 2018).

310 Regardless of the practical case considered, IUR-based risk distributions from OEHHA and ANSES
311 had a high degree of agreement with each other but a medium to low degree of agreement with other
312 IUR-based risk distributions. The six benzene reference values used in this illustration were derived
313 for the same purpose (lifetime benzene exposure), all based on cohort studies of benzene-exposed
314 workers, but using different key studies and extrapolation/derivation methods among agencies, which
315 may explain the observed differences (ANSES 2019; Health Canada 2010; OEHHA 2019; RIVM
316 2001; US EPA 2018; WHO 2000). OEHHA and ANSES used the same extrapolation method, a
317 relatively risk procedure, but chose two different key studies, Rinsky et al. (1981) for OEHHA and
318 Richardson (2008) for ANSES. RIVM chose the same key study as OEHHA but used a nonthreshold

319 extrapolation method. The WHO used an average relative risk model with Crump (1994) as a key
320 study. The US EPA applied a low-dose linearity utilizing the maximum likelihood estimates method
321 based on six key studies (Crump and Allen 1984; Crump 1994; Paustenbach et al. 1993; Rinsky et al.
322 1981, 1987; US EPA 1998). Health Canada applied a linear quadratic model of the exposure response
323 relationship based on four key studies (Bond et al. 1986; Rinsky et al. 1987; Wong 1987a,b).
324 Differences in policies and/or expert judgments could also have played a role in the observed
325 differences (Beck et al. 2016).

326 The aggregated multi-reference index-based distribution (the degrees of agreement and weights)
327 depends on the number of reference indices included in the aggregation as well as the concentration
328 distribution parameters. The narrower the concentration distributions (lower GSD), the lower the
329 degrees of agreement and the better the risk distribution estimation (narrower confidence interval). If
330 the GSD concentration tends to 1, as in the second scenario, the AREMRI tends to the mean risk value
331 and also tends to approach and equal a single reference index-based risk distribution (e.g., the risk
332 distribution using the reference value from the US EPA for case 2).

333 Regarding the reference indices, we found, for our practical cases, six agencies that set/proposed an
334 IUR for benzene and the risk of leukemia. There are most likely other agencies and studies around the
335 world which we are not aware of that may also have proposed an IUR for benzene and the risk of
336 leukemia for lifetime exposure. Integrating these potential other IURs into the aggregated multi-
337 reference index-based risk distribution construction would change the leukemia risk obtained with the
338 aggregated risk indicator. However, the approach presented in this paper does not remove the
339 requirement of a prior screening of reference values to be included in the integrated approach. This
340 screening should always be made to determine how reference indices were derived, which data they
341 are based on, and their intended use (e.g., assessment of occupational exposure, exposure via
342 foodstuffs and unintentional exposure). Indeed, it is paramount that the risk assessor has some
343 knowledge regarding the reference values used in an assessment and understands the way the values
344 were derived, their associated uncertainties and their relevance and validity for the risk assessment
345 being carried out. If the approach presented in this paper is used to interpret the results of a risk

346 assessment, then only reference values derived for the same purpose(s) should be included in the
347 analysis.

348

349 **5. Conclusions**

350 The three practical cases highlighted the usefulness of comparing risk estimates generated using
351 multiple reference indices from several sources (e.g., regulatory agencies) when assessing the human
352 health risk associated with exposure to environmental pollutants.

353 Therefore, the proposed approach hinges on its ability to provide useful information when conducting
354 risk assessment in the presence of several reference indices from various sources. These results are
355 essential for risk managers, practitioners, and decision-makers by providing guidance and by
356 supporting direct comparisons between studies. Indeed, our approach can provide a more complete,
357 consistent and transparent risk assessment of pollutants that pose a threat to human health and support
358 better-informed risk management decisions by giving some insight into the uncertainties associated
359 with the choice of the reference index in the risk assessment. Our approach could also serve to
360 integrate risk assessments, such as by obtaining an integrated view of risk assessments when trying to
361 prioritize among different cases for remedial action.

362 To facilitate the use of our approach, the matrix of degrees of agreement, side-by-side comparison of
363 reference index-based risk distributions, the choice of the reference values to consider and the
364 construction of the aggregated multi-reference index-based risk distribution will be implemented in the
365 *InCaRisk* app for inhalation cancer risk assessment. In addition to making information more readily
366 understood and retained in a quicker time, the visual aids and representations provided by *InCaRisk*
367 could be useful for improving risk communication and promoting transparency among studies when
368 conducting risk assessments (Beck et al. 2016).

369 Regardless of the type of exposure (e.g., acute, subchronic, or chronic), absorption pathways, exposure
370 setting (environmental or occupational), stages of the life cycle of a chemical (e.g., manufacture, use,
371 disposal, consumer products or waste) and stages of the life of an individual (e.g., adulthood), the
372 approach presented in this paper can be used. However, this approach can only be used with reference
373 indices intended for the same purpose (e.g., the same absorption pathway, same type of exposure and

374 same exposure setting), and some prior screening of reference indices has to be done to ensure that the
375 aggregated approach does not look at a mixture of reference values that should not be integrated.
376 Finally, the proposed approach has applicability in other fields and studies with similar problematics,
377 as long as there is some constraint on the choice of reference values to be included.

378

379 *Author contributions*

380 **Pascal Petit:** Conceptualization, Methodology, Software, Formal analysis, Investigation, Data
381 Curation, Writing - Original Draft, Visualization. **Dominique J. Bicot:** Conceptualization,
382 Methodology, Validation, Writing - Review & Editing.

383

384 *Declaration of interests:* The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or
385 personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper.

386

387 *Funding*

388 This research did not receive a specific grant from agencies in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit
389 sectors.

390

391 *Acknowledgements:* None.

392 **REFERENCES**

- 393 ANSES, 2015. Valeurs toxicologiques de référence (VTR). Guide d'élaboration de VTR. Rapport
394 d'expertise collective. Février 2010 - Edition scientifique. Seconde édition - mise à jour septembre
395 2015 [in French]. ANSES, Maisons-Alfort (France).
- 396 ANSES, 2019. List of toxicity reference values (TRVs) established by ANSES.
397 <https://www.anses.fr/en/content/list-toxicity-reference-values-trvs-established-anses> (accessed 06
398 February 2019).
- 399 Beck, N.B., Becker, R.A., Erraguntla, N., Farland, W.H., Grant, R.L., Gray, G. et al., 2016.
400 Approaches for describing and communicating overall uncertainty in toxicity characterizations: U.S.
401 Environmental Protection Agency's Integrated Risk Information System (IRIS) as a case study.
402 **Environ. Int.** 89-90, 110-128. PMID: 26827183. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.envint.2015.12.031>.
- 403 Bond, G.G., McLaren, E.A., Baldwin, C.L., Cook, R.R., 1986. An update of mortality among
404 chemical workers exposed to benzene. **Br. J. Ind. Med.** 43, 685-691. PMID: 3465366. DOI:
405 <https://dx.doi.org/10.1136%2Foem.43.10.685>.
- 406 Chiu WA, Axelrad DA, Dalajamts C, Dockins C, Shao K, Shapiro AJ et al., 2018. Beyond the RfD:
407 Broad Application of a Probabilistic Approach to Improve Chemical Dose-Response Assessments for
408 Noncancer Effects. **Environ. Health. Perspect.** 126(6), 067009. PMID: 29968566. DOI:
409 <https://doi.org/10.1289/ehp3368>.
- 410 Crump, K.S., 1994. Risk of benzene-induced leukemia: a sensitivity analysis of the pliofilm cohort
411 with additional follow-up and new exposure estimates. **J. Toxicol. Environ. Health.** 42, 219–242.
412 PMID: 8207757. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/15287399409531875>.
- 413 Crump, K.S., Allen, B.C., 1984. Quantitative estimates of risk of leukemia from occupational
414 exposure to benzene. Prepared for the Occupational Safety and Health Administration by
415 Science Research Systems, Inc., Ruston, LA. Unpublished. In: US EPA, 1998.
- 416 Health Canada, 2010. Federal Contaminated Site Risk Assessment in Canada. Part II: Health Canada
417 Toxicological Reference Values (TRVs). Version 2.0. Health Canada, Ottawa.

418 Melnick, R.L., Thayer, K.A., Bucher, J.R., 2008. Conflicting views on chemical carcinogenesis arising
419 from the design and evaluation of rodent carcinogenicity studies. **Environ. Health. Perspect.** 116(1),
420 130-135. PMID: 18197312. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1289/ehp.9989>.

421 OEHHA, 2019. Consolidated table of OEHHA/ARB approved risk assessment health values.
422 <https://ww3.arb.ca.gov/toxics/healthval/contable.pdf> (accessed 06 February 2019).

423 Paustenbach, D., Bass, R., Price, P., 1993. Benzene toxicity and risk assessment, 1972-1992:
424 implications for future regulation. **Environ. Health. Perspect.** 101 (Suppl 6), 177-200. PMID:
425 8020442. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1289/ehp.93101s6177>.

426 Petit, P., Maître, A., Bicout, D. J., 2021. A consensus approach for estimating health risk: application
427 to inhalation cancer risks. **Environ. Res.** 196, 110436. PMID: 33166535. DOI:
428 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envres.2020.110436>.

429 Richardson, D.B., 2008. Temporal variation in the association between benzene and leukemia
430 mortality. **Environ. Health. Perspect.** 116(3), 370-374. PMID: 18335105. DOI:
431 <https://doi.org/10.1289/ehp.10841>.

432 Rinsky, R.A., Young, R.J., Smith, A.B., 1981. Leukemia in benzene workers. **Am. J. Ind. Med.** 2,
433 217-245. PMID: 7345926. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1002/ajim.4700020305>.

434 Rinsky, R.A., Smith, A.B., Hornung, R., Filloon, T.G., Young, R.J., Okun, A.H., et al., 1987. Benzene
435 and leukemia - An epidemiologic risk assessment. **N. Engl. J. Med.** 316, 1044-1050. PMID: 3561457.
436 DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1056/nejm198704233161702>.

437 RIVM, 2001. RIVM report 711701 025. Re-evaluation of human-toxicological maximum permissible
438 risk levels. <https://www.rivm.nl/bibliotheek/rapporten/711701025.pdf> (accessed 10 September 2020).

439 Rotter, S., Beronius, A., Boobis, A.R., Hanberg, A., van Klaveren, J., Luijten, M. et al., 2018.
440 Overview on legislation and scientific approaches for risk assessment of combined exposure to
441 multiple chemicals: the potential EuroMix contribution. **Crit. Rev. Toxicol.** 48(9), 796-814. PMID:
442 30632445. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/10408444.2018.1541964>.

443 U.S. EPA, 1998. Carcinogenic effects of benzene: an update. Prepared by the
444 National Center for Environmental Health, Office of Research and Development. US EPA,
445 Washington DC. EPA/600/P-97/001F.

446 U.S. EPA, 2014. Guidance for applying quantitative data to develop data-derived extrapolation factors
447 for interspecies and intraspecies extrapolation. EPA/R-14/002. Risk Assessment Forum, Office of the
448 Science Advisor, Washington, DC.

449 U.S. EPA, 2018. Table 1. Prioritized Chronic Dose-Response Values for Screening Risk Assessments.
450 U.S. EPA, Washington (DC). [https://www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2014-](https://www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2014-05/documents/table1.pdf)
451 [05/documents/table1.pdf](https://www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2014-05/documents/table1.pdf) (accessed 06 February 2019).

452 Verteramo Chiu, L.J., Tauer, L.W., Gröhn, Y.T., Smith, R.L., 2020. Ranking disease control strategies
453 with stochastic outcomes. **Prev. Vet. Med.** PMID: 32014682. DOI:
454 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.prevetmed.2020.104906>.

455 WHO, 2000. Air Quality Guidelines for Europe. Second Edition. WHO Regional Publications,
456 European Series, No. 91. https://www.euro.who.int/data/assets/pdf_file/0005/74732/E71922.pdf
457 (accessed 10 September 2020).

458 Wong, O., 1987a. An industry wide mortality study of chemical workers occupational exposed to
459 benzene. I - General results. **Br. J. Ind. Med.** 44, 365-381. PMID: 3606966. DOI:
460 <https://doi.org/10.1136/oem.44.6.365>.

461 Wong, O., 1987b. An industry wide mortality study of chemical workers occupational exposed to
462 benzene. II - Dose response analyses. **Br. J. Ind. Med.** 44, 382-395. PMID: 3606967. DOI:
463 <https://doi.org/10.1136/oem.44.6.382>.

464 **Tables**

465

466 **Table 1:** Summary of the lognormal exposure concentration distribution parameters used for three
 467 practical cases

Reference index source	Reference index	Case 1	Case 2	Case 3
	IUR (m ³ /μg)	GM; GSD	GM; GSD	GM; GSD
Using the reference index from ANSES	2.6x10 ⁻⁵	253 μg/m ³ ; 2.80	253 μg/m ³ ; 1.03	58.4 μg/m ³ ; 2.80
Using the reference index from Health Canada	3.3x10 ⁻⁶	253 μg/m ³ ; 2.80	253 μg/m ³ ; 1.03	58.4 μg/m ³ ; 2.80
Using the reference index from OEHHA	2.9x10 ⁻⁵	253 μg/m ³ ; 2.80	253 μg/m ³ ; 1.03	58.4 μg/m ³ ; 2.80
Using the reference index from RIVM	5.0x10 ⁻⁶	253 μg/m ³ ; 2.80	253 μg/m ³ ; 1.03	58.4 μg/m ³ ; 2.80
Using the reference index from US EPA	7.8x10 ⁻⁶	253 μg/m ³ ; 2.80	253 μg/m ³ ; 1.03	58.4 μg/m ³ ; 2.80
Using the reference index from WHO	6.0x10 ⁻⁶	253 μg/m ³ ; 2.80	253 μg/m ³ ; 1.03	58.4 μg/m ³ ; 2.80

468 *Note:* GM: geometric mean; GSD: geometric standard deviation, IUR: inhalation unit risk, ANSES:
 469 French Agency for Food, Environmental and Occupational Health & Safety, H. Canada: Health
 470 Canada, OEHHA: California Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment, RIVM: National
 471 Dutch Institute for Public Health and the Environment, US EPA: US Environmental Protection
 472 Agency, WHO: World Health Organization.

473 **Figure captions**

474

475 **Fig. 1:** Scheme of the general approach to construct an aggregated risk distribution based on multiple
476 reference indices

477 ω_i : contributing weight of agency “*i*” with $0 \leq \omega_i \leq 1$ such that $\sum_{i=1}^n \omega_i = 1$; $R_a(r)$: aggregated risk
478 distribution function based on multiple reference indices; $R_i(r)$: risk distribution function of agency
479 “*i*”.

480

481 **Fig. 2:** Side-by-side comparison of single IUR-based risk distributions for the construction of the
482 aggregated multi-IUR-based risk distribution – case 1

483 A: Matrix of degrees of agreement between a single IUR-based risk distribution, B: Weights attributed
484 to the IUR-based risk distribution for the aggregated multi-IUR-based risk distribution construction,
485 C: IUR-based risk distributions.

486 ANSES: French Agency for Food, Environmental and Occupational Health & Safety, H. Canada:
487 Health Canada, OEHHA: California Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment, RIVM:
488 National Dutch Institute for Public Health and the Environment, US EPA: US Environmental
489 Protection Agency, WHO: World Health Organization. Each agency name refers to the risk
490 distribution generated using its benzene IUR and the exposure scenario considered. The term “Inter-
491 agency” refers here to the aggregated risk estimate based on multiple reference indices (AREMRI).

492

493 **Fig. 3:** Side-by-side comparison of single IUR-based risk distributions for the construction of the
494 aggregated multi-IUR-based risk distribution – case 2

495 A: Matrix of degrees of agreement between a single IUR-based risk distribution, B: Weights attributed
496 to the IUR-based risk distribution for the aggregated multi-IUR-based risk distribution construction,
497 C: IUR-based risk distributions.

498 ANSES: French Agency for Food, Environmental and Occupational Health & Safety, H. Canada:
499 Health Canada, OEHHA: California Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment, RIVM:
500 National Dutch Institute for Public Health and the Environment, US EPA: US Environmental

501 Protection Agency, WHO: World Health Organization. Each agency name refers to the risk
502 distribution generated using its benzene IUR and the exposure scenario considered. The term “Inter-
503 agency” refers here to the aggregated risk estimate based on multiple reference indices (AREMRI).

504

505 **Fig. 4:** Side-by-side comparison of single IUR-based risk distributions for the construction of the
506 aggregated multi-IUR-based risk distribution – case 3

507 A: Matrix of degrees of agreement between a single IUR-based risk distribution, B: Weights attributed
508 to the IUR-based risk distribution for the aggregated multi-IUR-based risk distribution construction,
509 C: IUR-based risk distributions.

510 ANSES: French Agency for Food, Environmental and Occupational Health & Safety, H. Canada:
511 Health Canada, OEHHA: California Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment, RIVM:
512 National Dutch Institute for Public Health and the Environment, US EPA: US Environmental
513 Protection Agency, WHO: World Health Organization. Each agency name refers to the risk
514 distribution generated using its benzene IUR and the exposure scenario considered. The term “Inter-
515 agency” refers here to the aggregated risk estimate based on multiple reference indices (AREMRI).



Where:

$$\left. \begin{matrix} \omega_1 \\ \omega_2 \\ \omega_3 \end{matrix} \right\} = \text{function}[\text{agreement}]$$

Agreement $[R_1(r), R_2(r)]$
Risk with reference index₁ – Risk with reference index₂

Agreement $[R_1(r), R_3(r)]$
Risk with reference index₁ – Risk with reference index₃

Agreement $[R_2(r), R_3(r)]$
Risk with reference index₂ – Risk with reference index₃



$R_1(r)$	100%		
$R_2(r)$	30%	100%	
$R_3(r)$	45%	76%	100%
	$R_1(r)$	$R_2(r)$	$R_3(r)$

Matrix of agreement