



**HAL**  
open science

## Dioxins, furans and dioxin-like PCBs: occurrence in food and dietary intake in France

Alexandra Tard, Sophie Gallotti, Jean-Charles Leblanc, Jean-Luc J.L. Volatier

### ► To cite this version:

Alexandra Tard, Sophie Gallotti, Jean-Charles Leblanc, Jean-Luc J.L. Volatier. Dioxins, furans and dioxin-like PCBs: occurrence in food and dietary intake in France. *Food Additives and Contaminants*, 2007, 24 (09), pp.1007-1017. 10.1080/02652030701317293 . hal-00577291

**HAL Id: hal-00577291**

**<https://hal.science/hal-00577291>**

Submitted on 17 Mar 2011

**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.



**Dioxins, furans and dioxin-like PCBs: occurrence in food and dietary intake in France**

|                               |   |
|-------------------------------|---|
| Journal:                      | <i>Food Additives and Contaminants</i>  |
| Manuscript ID:                | TFAC-2006-335.R1  |
| Manuscript Type:              | Original Research Paper   |
| Date Submitted by the Author: | 26-Feb-2007   |
| Complete List of Authors:     | Tard, Alexandra; AFSSA, PASER<br>Gallotti, Sophie; AFSSA, DIVE<br>Leblanc, Jean-Charles; AFSSA, PASER<br>Volatier, Jean-Luc; AFSSA, PASER |
| Methods/Techniques:           | Exposure assessment   |
| Additives/Contaminants:       | Dioxins - TEQs, PCBs  |
| Food Types:                   | Dioxins - TEQs, PCBs  |
|                               |   |



## Dioxins, furans and dioxin-like PCBs: occurrence in food and dietary intake in France

### Abstract

PCDD/Fs and DL-PCBs contamination data in food products consumed in France collected from national monitoring programs (2001 to 2004) and representing analytical results for almost 800 individual food samples were combined with food consumption data from the French national dietary survey to estimate PCDD/Fs and DL-PCBs dietary intakes, expressed as toxic equivalents (WHO-TEQs). The mean PCDD/Fs and DL-PCBs intake was estimated at 1.8 and 2.8 pg WHO-TEQ/kg bw/d respectively for adults (15 years and over) and children (3-14 years). Main contributors to total intake were fish and milk products for both children and adults (respectively 48% and 31% for adults and 34 and 43% for children). DL-PCBs constituted the largest contributor to contamination in most of foodstuffs. Life-long intake estimate showed that a non-negligible part of the French population (between 20 to 28%) had an intake above the tolerable monthly intake for dioxins and dioxin-like PCBs of 70 pg WHO-TEQ/kg bw/month (JECFA, 2001).

### Introduction

Dioxins (polychlorinated dibenzo-p-dioxins, PCDDs) and furans (polychlorinated dibenzofuran, PCDFs) are chlorinated polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons. There are 75 and 135 congeners for PCDDs and PCDFs respectively depending on the number and position of chlorine atoms in the aromatic rings. Those congeners are very similar with common characteristics. They have a strong thermal stability, are insoluble in water but very soluble in lipids and are poorly biodegradable. As a result, they accumulate in adipose tissues, especially of animal origin, where they can remain for a long time. This leads to their classification as persistent organic pollutants. This category of molecules is generally called "dioxins".

Polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs) are also chlorinated aromatic compounds. 209 congeners form this group of closely related chemicals with different toxicity levels. As with dioxins,

1  
2  
3 PCBs are poorly biodegradable and have strong chemical and physical stability, which  
4 explains why they accumulate in tissues. But unlike dioxins, which are by-products (occurring  
5 during thermal process), PCBs were used in industry and agriculture until the 1970s. Some  
6 PCBs, called dioxin-like PCBs (DL-PCBs), have the same type of toxicity as dioxins. This  
7 enabled the overall intake of dioxins and DL-PCBs to be estimated using the Toxic Equivalent  
8 Factor (TEF) based on an additivity model (World Health Organization [WHO], 1998). 17 out  
9 of the (75+135) PCDD/F congeners and 12 DL-PCBs are recognised as biologically active  
10 and have a TEF value.  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20

21 The toxic equivalency concept uses the relative effect potency determined for each of the 17  
22 PCDD/F and 12 DL-PCB congeners in relation to the 2,3,7,8-TCDD, the most toxic element,  
23 identified as the reference compound. The toxicity of a mixture equals the sum of the  
24 products of the concentration of each congener multiplied by its TEF value. TEF values can  
25 often be re-estimated due to new toxicological insights (1988, NATO I-TEQ; 1998, WHO-  
26 TEQ; 2005, WHO Re-evaluation of TEFs, July 2006). For example, between 1988 and 1998,  
27 the same PCDD/PCDF congeners are included, but the main difference is for 1,2,3,7,8 –  
28 Pentachlorodibenzodioxin whose TEF has been multiplied by 2 (from 0.5 to 1); also 2 others  
29 TEF congeners (Octachlorodibenzodioxin and 1,2,3,4, 7,8,9 – Heptachlorodibenzofuran) fell  
30 from a factor 10 (0.001 to 0.0001). Considering DL-PCBs, they did not have TEF values  
31 before 1998. This study uses the 1998 WHO-TEQ since 2005 TEFs were not published when  
32 this assessment was performed.  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55

56 Dioxins and DL-PCBs are ubiquitous components in the environment and their characteristics  
57 result in bioaccumulation in adipose tissues. Dietary intake is therefore the major source of  
58 exposure (90%) (Liem et al., 2000), with lipid-rich food elements (food of animal origin)  
59 making up a considerable contribution.  
60

61 Dietary intake in France was first estimated in 2000 for dioxins only (CSHPF-AFSSA, 2000).  
62 This estimation was based on contamination data from the late 1990s (between 1996 and  
63 1998) and on 1994 consumption survey, ASPCC (Rigaud et al., 1997). With regard to DL-

1  
2  
3 PCBs in the estimation of total dioxin exposure, re-evaluation of TEF by WHO in 1998, better  
4 knowledge of the toxicological mechanisms of those molecules and changing dioxin  
5 emissions into the environment have led to an update of the estimated dietary intake of  
6 PCDD/Fs and DL-PCBs in France.  
7  
8  
9

10  
11  
12 This study presents PCDD/F and DL-PCB levels in most of the foods making up the French  
13 diet. For the survey of dietary intake in France (INCA, 1999), we estimated dietary intake  
14 among the general population, for children and adults, and the contribution of each food  
15 group. The results are compared with previous French data and international intake  
16 assessments.  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22

## 23 24 25 **Materials and methods**

### 26 27 *Food sampling*

28  
29 Contamination data used to estimate dioxin exposure in France comes mainly from food  
30 control and food monitoring programmes. The European food monitoring programme called  
31 “Market basket” gathers data on almost all food products (mostly of animal origin): meat  
32 (including poultry) and offal (liver), milk and butter, eggs, shellfish (mussels and oysters),  
33 farmed fish and also some fruit, vegetables and vegetable oils. About 350 analytical results  
34 from 2001 to 2004 come from this programme. From another national food monitoring  
35 programme, we added wild fish, crustaceans and cephalopods taken from a landing site  
36 including some freshwater fish. This represents 260 analyses from 2002 and 2003.  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44

45  
46  
47 To complete the set of data, dairy analysis from the joint-trade organization were added; data  
48 from an egg control plan including organic and free-range eggs sampled on the farms were  
49 included; cereals (bread, rice, pasta, etc.) were also sampled. In total, almost 800 (797)  
50 samples were analysed over 11 food groups. Table 1 presents the number of samples  
51 broken down into food groups. Food products not expected to contain dioxins or PCB-DLs  
52 due to their source and extremely low fat content (soft drinks, alcoholic beverages, sweets,  
53 etc.) were not considered for this exposure assessment.  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 [insert Table 1 about here]  
4  
5  
6

### 7 *Chemical analysis*

8  
9 The methods used to take samples and analyse dioxins and DL-PCBs in food were based on  
10 EU Directive 2002/69/EC. Extraction isolates the fat fraction containing dioxins and PCBs.  
11 Extracts are then purified and quantification is performed using a mass spectrometer  
12 equipped with gas chromatography. Analytical methods have already been described  
13 elsewhere and are not presented in detail here (AFSSA, 2005).  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18

19  
20  
21 The toxic equivalent factors (TEF) (WHO, 1998) of the 17 PCDD/F congeners and 12 DL-  
22 PCB congeners were multiplied by the analytical concentration in order to express the result  
23 in toxic equivalent (TEQ). The concentration of each sample was then calculated by adding  
24 up the concentrations of each of the 29 congeners (PCDD/F + PCB-DL).  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29

30  
31 Non-detects are considered as equal to zero (lower bound estimates) or to LOD (upper  
32 bound estimates). As there is no significant difference between lower bounds and upper  
33 bounds, the results reported in this paper are lower bound estimates. TEQs for animal  
34 products and oils were calculated on a lipid weight basis (pg TEQ/g fat), while vegetable and  
35 fish products were calculated on a fresh weight basis (pg TEQ/g FW).  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41

### 42 *Dietary intake*

43  
44 Food consumption data is based on the INCA survey (individual and national survey of  
45 dietary intake in France) (Volatier et al., 2000). This national survey was conducted across  
46 France from August 1998 to June 1999, so as to incorporate seasonal effects. Food  
47 consumption was reported in a diary record over 7 consecutive days. The identification of the  
48 type of food and portion size consumed were estimated with a validated photographic book.  
49 The food nomenclature was based on the nomenclature used in the food composition tables  
50 and contains about 1000 codes and 44 food groups.  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 The total sample (3003 people) was composed of 1985 adults aged 15 years and over and  
4  
5 1018 children and young teenagers (3-14 years). There is no data available for children  
6  
7 under the age of 3. The representativeness of the sample is assured by a geographical  
8  
9 stratification (based on region of residence, size of urban area) and by the quota sampling  
10  
11 method (with the factors age, gender, profession and size of household).  
12

13  
14  
15 In this survey, we recorded the body weight of almost all the participants so that intake per kg  
16  
17 of body weight could be calculated using the real weight of each person and not a fixed  
18  
19 weight.  
20

#### 21 *Recipes.*

22  
23 In order to take account of the ingredients in composite foods, recipes (Calamassi, 2004)  
24  
25 were used to assign their ingredients to the appropriate reported food. For example, in a  
26  
27 pastry, the cereal contamination value will be assigned to flour and the butter value to butter.  
28  
29 The use of recipes gave the total consumption by type of ingredients (vegetables, meat,  
30  
31 cereals, etc.) instead of food group.  
32

#### 33 34 *Comments on food groups*

35  
36 - Dairy products: As the analysed samples did not include all dairy products,  
37  
38 contamination of cheese and yoghurts for example was estimated by multiplying the milk  
39  
40 contamination (in pg TEQ/g fat) by their lipids percentage as recorded in the French  
41  
42 composition tables (Favier J.C. et al, 1995). We assume that contamination in milk (raw food)  
43  
44 ends up in the processed food as a proportion of the amount of fat in the product.  
45

46  
47 - Fish products: Many species of fish were analysed and contamination means were  
48  
49 allocated to each. When this was not possible, a mean fish contamination (taking account of  
50  
51 its consumption level) was assigned. Breaded fish was assigned the mean contamination of  
52  
53 cod and pollock, since these are the main types of fish used. With regard to contamination  
54  
55 differences between various types of wild fish according to their fishing area, a stratification  
56  
57 contingent based on the volume of fish landed has been applied on the basis of data from the  
58  
59 fishery joint trade organisation.  
60

1  
2  
3 - Vegetable products: as fruits and vegetables are generally far less contaminated,  
4 only a few analyses were conducted on these products. For example, as we did not have  
5 occurrence data on potatoes, despite their consumption level, we assume that they have the  
6 same contamination data as vegetables. Cereals were categorised into 4 contamination  
7 groups: bread, pasta, rice and other.  
8  
9

### 10 11 12 13 14 15 *Exposure assessment*

16  
17 Dietary intake was calculated using the standard deterministic method for chronic exposure  
18 (WHO/GEMS-Food, 1997). On the basis of food consumption specific to each individual and  
19 the contamination vector of various foods, the exposure of each person for each food is  
20 obtained. In order to calculate this exposure per kilogram body weight (kg bw), this value is  
21 divided by the weight of each consumer. All the descriptive statistics presented are produced  
22 from real individual data. No use is made of means or conventional data derived from other  
23 sources. The use of real individual data makes it possible to assess the reality of exposure  
24 variability, incorporating real correlations between the various components (body weight,  
25 consumption of different foods).  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36

37 Here, we make the assumption that there is an absence of correlation between body weight  
38 and dietary habits on the one hand and food contamination on the other. Irrespective of  
39 whether the consumer of a type of food – for example, UHT semi-skimmed milk – is small,  
40 medium-sized or large, it is assumed that the average contamination of the UHT semi-  
41 skimmed milk bought is, over a long period of time, equal to the average contamination for  
42 UHT semi-skimmed milks. This assumption is justified by the fact that this study does not  
43 take account of populations who, due to their proximity to a source of dioxin emissions, may  
44 systematically consume foods that are more contaminated than average. Another  
45 methodology must be used to assess the exposure of these populations (InVS, AFSSA,  
46 2003).  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55

56  
57  
58 This standard deterministic method to estimate exposure can be described by the following  
59 formula for the individual i:  
60



$$E_i = \frac{\sum_j C_{ij} T_j}{w_i}$$

where:

$w_i$  is the individual body weight of the individual  $i$

$C_{ij}$  is the consumption of food  $j$  by the individual  $i$

$T_j$  is the average PCDD/F or DL-PCB contamination of food  $j$

Exposure is calculated for both PCDD/Fs and DL-PCBs. Total exposure was calculated by adding the two together.

The results presented here concern the overall population. Since PCDD/Fs and DL-PCBs are found in a wide range of foods, all the individuals included in the dietary survey were revealed to have been exposed to PCDD/Fs and DL-PCBs.

## Results

### *Contamination data*

Table 2 shows the analysis results per food group. Results are expressed in pg WHO-TEQ/g fresh weight for fish products and vegetables and in pg WHO-TEQ/g fat for land-based animals (meat, including poultry and offal, dairy products, eggs).

- Meat (of which poultry and offal), dairy products and eggs: the total concentration (PCDD/F+DL-PCB) remains around 1 pg TEQ/g fat, except for offal (liver) whose concentration reaches 2.5 pg TEQ/g fat. Lamb has the highest level (1.5 pg/g fat) and pork the lowest (0.4 pg/g fat). For meat products, DL-PCBs represent 85% of total contamination. In dairy products and eggs, the proportion PCDD/Fs – DL-PCBs is better-balanced: 30%-70% and 45%-55% respectively.

- Fish and fish products: these are the most contaminated food products. Sea (wild and farmed) and freshwater fish have a total concentration of between 2.7 and 2.9 pg TEQ/g fresh weight. Farmed trout is far less contaminated (0.75), as are shellfish (range between 0.73 and 1.34). DL-PCBs account for 80 to 85% of total contamination for sea fish and freshwater fish and 55 to 75% for other fish products.

1  
2  
3 - Vegetable products (fruits, vegetables, cereals): PCDD/F+DL-PCB concentrations do  
4 not exceed 0.01 pg WHO-TEQ/g fresh weight. The dioxin part (in %) is higher on average  
5 than for other products.  
6  
7  
8  
9

10  
11 Of the 800 analyses, the highest PCDD/F and DL-PCB level is found in fish, irrespective of  
12 whether it is wild or farmed, from the sea or freshwater. Only farmed trout is less  
13 contaminated, perhaps because of its special feeding and breeding conditions. Even  
14 molluscs and crustaceans are more highly contaminated than meat (especially lamb, which is  
15 more fatty) or milk. We found that offal (liver) is also highly contaminated (2.52 pg TEQ/g  
16 LW), probably because of its high lipid content and also because of the role liver plays in the  
17 organism (metabolite accumulation). The other food groups (land-based animals) are far less  
18 contaminated: around 1 pg WHO-TEQ/g LW for animal products (only lamb is slightly more  
19 contaminated) and 0.01 pg WHO-TEQ/g FW for vegetable products. In spite of a slight  
20 decrease in fish contamination levels since 1999, we found the same order of magnitude for  
21 PCDD/Fs between 1999 and 2005. On the contrary, the decline is greater in meat and dairy  
22 products: from 2 to 3 times less in offal and pork; we found the same decline for eggs, milk  
23 and butter.  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35

36 [insert Table 2 about here]  
37  
38  
39  
40

#### 41 *Dietary intake of dioxins and DL-PCBs*

42 Intakes are calculated for PCDD/F on the one hand and for DL-PCBs on the other, and for  
43 the sum of the two. Results presented here represent the whole population. As dioxins and  
44 dioxin-like-PCBs are widely spread in the environment, all consumers in the survey are  
45 exposed to these contaminants.  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50

#### 51 *Dietary intake of dioxins.*

52 In order to compare our results with the previous assessment (2000), dietary intake of  
53 PCDD/Fs only was assessed first (no available data on DL-PCBs in 2000). For this  
54 estimation, we used the lower bound estimate (ND=0) and recipes were not used (non-  
55 existent in 2000). For the same reason, the whole population (aged 3 years and over) was  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 considered for dioxin intake estimation. The same methodology was used in the consumer  
4 survey used in 2000 and the INCA survey: a diary record over 7 consecutive days.  
5  
6

7 Table 3 and figure 1 present the comparison results between PCDD/F exposure in 2000 and  
8 in 2005. Food groups are broken down into 7 types of product.  
9

10  
11  
12  
13 [Insert Table 3 and figure 1 about here]  
14

15  
16  
17 In 2000, total exposure to dioxins and furans was estimated at 1.31 pg I-TEQ/kg bw/d (I-TEQ  
18 which correspond to NATO TEF (NATO/CCMS, 1988), were used for the 2000 French  
19 dioxins assessment). In 2005, it was 0.53 pg WHO-TEQ/kg bw/d. This indicates a 60%  
20 reduction in 5 years. Moreover, increases in the toxicity factors (I-TEF vs WHO-TEF) since  
21 1998 mean that the previous exposure has been underestimated, and a comparison (AFSSA,  
22 2002) between the 2 consumption surveys used in 2005 and 2000 (INCA and ASPCC  
23 respectively) with the same concentration data indicates that use of the INCA survey leads to  
24 a 15% decrease in the intake because of the decline in consumption of almost all food  
25 groups, but especially in dairy products (butter) and fish products (shellfish).  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35

36 Analysis of detailed exposure indicates that the contribution of each food group has fallen in 5  
37 years. The greatest decreasing trends concern dairy products, meat products and eggs.  
38

39 Figure 2 presents the contribution of food groups for dioxin intake between 1999 and 2005.  
40

41 In 2000, the highest contributing food groups were dairy products (40.5% of the total  
42 exposure) and seafood products (24.4%). In 2005, these groups reversed. Animal products  
43 (including fish) are still major contributors with 85% of total exposure, but fish products are  
44 now the leading contributor (almost 45% of total ingestion). We can see that, in general, land-  
45 based products such as milk, meat, eggs and vegetables have registered a greater  
46 downward trend than seafood products. The fall in dioxin emissions in the early 2000s  
47 (CITEPA, 2005) had a greater consequence for those products than for fish, for which  
48 exposure sources are not the same.  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

[Insert Figure 2 about here]

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
*Dietary intake of dioxins and dioxin-like PCBs.*

7 Table 4 shows the results of total exposure for children (3-14 years) and adults (15 years +).

8  
9 For adults, the mean daily intake was estimated at 1.8 pg WHO-TEQ/kg bw/d; the median is  
10  
11 1.5 pg WHO-TEQ/kg bw/d for a 95th percentile of 3.9 pg WHO-TEQ/kg bw/d. For children,  
12  
13 the mean daily intake is 2.8 pg WHO-TEQ/kg bw/d; the median equals 2.4 pg WHO-TEQ/kg  
14  
15 bw/d and the 95th percentile 6.0 pg WHO-TEQ/kg bw/d. Intake is therefore higher in children  
16  
17 than adults. This is partly due to the difference in food intake and partly to their relative body  
18  
19 weight.  
20

21  
22  
23 [Insert Table 4 about here]  
24  
25

26  
27  
*Life-long intakes.*

28  
29 Toxicological reference doses are established to ensure that people are not exceeding a  
30  
31 certain body burden. Accordingly, JECFA set up a tolerable daily intake in 2001 for PCDD/Fs  
32  
33 and DL-PCBs of 70 pg WHO-TEQ/kg bw/month (2.33 pg WHO-TEQ/kg bw/d). A life-long  
34  
35 daily intake (from 3 years and over) has been estimated with the same food consumption  
36  
37 survey, INCA, by building up individual cohorts at different life ages (AFSSA, 2002) In this  
38  
39 approach, the main conservative hypothesis is that each individual has the same position in  
40  
41 the statistical distribution of exposure during his whole life. The combination of children and  
42  
43 adult consumers enabled the construction of life-long individuals, resulting in an estimation of  
44  
45 2.0 pg WHO-TEQ/kg bw/d (median=1.9) over a person's lifetime. The most exposed  
46  
47 population (95th percentile) has an intake of 3.0 pg WHO-TEQ/kg bw/d. This would be the  
48  
49 case throughout a lifetime if we assume that food intake and dioxin and DL-PCB  
50  
51 concentrations remain the same throughout a person's lifetime.  
52

53  
54  
55 [Insert table 5 about here]  
56  
57

58  
59 If we convert this into the number of people exceeding the TDI, around 20 to 28% of people  
60  
exceed the TDI for their entire lifetime. It depends on whether consumption, but not

1  
2  
3 contamination, remains stable through a person's life (someone who eats a lot of a particular  
4 food category as a child continues to eat this amount as an adult), leading to 20% of people  
5 exceeding the TDI. If there is a correlation between contamination levels during a lifetime  
6 (someone who eats contaminated food as a child consumes as much contaminated food as  
7 an adult), then 28% of people exceed the TDI.  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12

#### 13 14 15 *Contribution of different food groups.*

16  
17 Figure 3 shows the detailed contributions to total intake of PCDD/Fs + DL-PCBs of the 7 food  
18 groups for children and adults. As seen earlier with dioxin intake, the major contributors are  
19 dairy products and fish products, consistent with other international studies (Fattore et al,  
20 2006). The greatest contribution comes from fish products for adults (48%), while for children  
21 it comes from dairy products (43%). This is due to their different consumption patterns. For  
22 others products, contributions are the same for both: meat products represent 8% of total  
23 intake, vegetables account for 5-6%, fats for 4-5% and eggs for 2-3%.  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32

33 [Insert Figure 3 about here]  
34  
35

36  
37 Considering dioxins and DL-PCBs separately, contributions to total intake are slightly  
38 different, as seen in Table 4. Table 6 shows in greater detail that DL-PCB levels are much  
39 higher than PCDD/F levels (3/4-1/4) in most products, particularly animal products i.e. fish,  
40 meat, dairy products and fats. For eggs, as for fruits and vegetables, dioxin and DL-PCB  
41 contributions are about the same. Cereal products demonstrate the opposite: PCDD/F levels  
42 are higher (almost 75%). The same distribution is observed for adults and children.  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47

48 [Insert Table 6 about here]  
49  
50  
51

#### 52 **Discussion**

53  
54 Overall, very few analyses, as reported in this paper, are not in accordance with the  
55 Commission Regulation (No 199/2006). This result is probably due to the decline in  
56 atmospheric emissions since the late 1990s (CITEPA, 2005), notably with the lockout of old  
57 domestic waste incinerators in 2003, and consistent with what is carried forward in different  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 publications (EU-SCOOP, 2000; Fernandez et al, 2002). The decline noted in the  
4 environment following the protective measures taken over recent years has paid off a few  
5 years later with the decreasing trend in land-based products, but is still not reflected in the  
6 aquatic milieu which remains much more contaminated. Dioxin sources are not the same and  
7 seem to evolve slowly here (sediments).  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12

13  
14  
15 An important difference is the ratio between PCDD/Ds and DL-PCBs in food products. In fish  
16 products, DL-PCB levels are high (between 85 and 77% of total TEQ for fish and up to 56%  
17 for crustaceans), whereas for milk, butter, meat and poultry, DL-PCBs account for 2/3 of the  
18 total and for liver, eggs and vegetable products, for half of the total. This converges with  
19 different sources of exposure between aquatic and land-based products.  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

25  
26  
27 Between countries, contamination data is wide-ranging. For Sweden and Finland (Darnerud,  
28 et al., 2006; Kiviranta et al., 2001), fish contamination data is only marginally less than that in  
29 France, whereas for land-based animals, French data is several times higher. On the  
30 contrary, Spanish and Dutch data is higher than French data for meat or dairy products, but  
31 about the same for fish products (Fernandez et al., 2004; Baars et al., 2004).  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36

37  
38  
39 This resulted in the whole population being exposed to two and a half times less PCDD/F  
40 between 2000 and 2005: from 1.31 pg TEQ/kg b.w./d to 0.53 pg TEQ/kg b.w./d. Moreover,  
41 the use in 2000 of I-TEQ makes the decrease marginally greater. Indeed, studies have  
42 shown that exposure calculated with I-TEQ is 10% less than when calculated with WHO-TEQ  
43 (WHO, 1998; InVS, 2000).  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49

50  
51 Even if the intake assessment methodology is identical (individual consumption survey with  
52 diary record, same methodology) for the 2 studies (AFSSA, 2000; this study), the  
53 consumption survey is not the same between the 2 exposure assessments, and a study  
54 (AFSSA, 2002) demonstrated that this led to a decrease of around 15% in general dioxin  
55 exposure with the INCA survey which was used for the intake calculations reported in this  
56 paper. This reflects the downward trend of fatty foods observed in several countries.  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4  
5 As seen in figure 1, there has been a decline in the contribution of all food groups, but the  
6 greatest decrease concerns dairy products, followed by meat, fruits and vegetables. There  
7 has also been a downward trend in fish and fish products, but the relative contribution of this  
8 food group is increasing, as seen on figure 2. We can note a contrast between land-based  
9 products whose contribution is decreasing and fish products whose relative contribution is on  
10 the rise.  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18

19 In terms of total PCDD/F and DL-PCB exposure, adults and children in France respectively  
20 reach an average of 1.8 pg WHO-TEQ/kg bw/d and 2.8 pg WHO-TEQ/kg bw/d (table 4). No  
21 such previous estimation has been done in France. It is difficult to conduct a comparison with  
22 international studies because methodologies used are not exactly the same, but intake  
23 among the French population seems to be within the same range as other European  
24 countries. In the UK (FSA, 2003), the mean adult 19-64 years intake is 0.9 pg WHO-TEQ/kg  
25 bw/d; the Netherlands (Baars et al., 2004) has estimated the median intake at 1.1 pg WHO-  
26 TEQ/kg bw/d for 40 year olds; in Finland (Kiviranta et al., 2001), the mean is 1.3 pg WHO-  
27 TEQ/kg bw/d for adults 25-64 years, while in Spain (Fernandez et al., 2004), it reaches 2.8 pg  
28 WHO-TEQ/kg bw/d for a person weighing 70 kg and in Italy (Fattore et al, 2006), the mean is  
29 2.3 pg WHO-TEQ/kg bw/d for 13 to 94 years old. All these studies include DL-PCBs. The  
30 Dutch study seems to resemble ours the most. In a comparison of occurrence data, fish  
31 contamination levels are about the same between these 2 studies, which is a logical outcome  
32 if we consider that the fish probably comes from the same fishing areas. However, a lot of  
33 other contamination data is higher in the Netherlands, particularly butter, eggs and poultry.  
34 This means that, in France, there is a higher proportion of fish and fish product in total intake  
35 (48% for adults versus 16% in the Netherlands). The UK intake level has been based on a  
36 methodology (Total Diet Study) assumed to give lower results because foods are sampled  
37 and analysed "as consumed". These differ considerably from produced or purchased foods.  
38 For example, the British study does not take account of the inedible part, and cooking foods  
39 reduces dioxin and DL-PCB contamination by 14 to 44% (Hori et al., 2005). The Spanish  
40 study used household food purchasing data instead of individual consumption data. The  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 consumption levels may be overestimated since non-consumed foods may be included in this  
4  
5 study.  
6  
7

8  
9 Other international studies outside Europe, assessed total dioxin and dioxin-like compound  
10 intake. In the USA (Schechter, 2001), total intake is comparable to adult intake in France,  
11 estimated at 2.2 and 2.4 pg/kg bw/day respectively for men and women aged between 20  
12 and 79 years old. The small difference may be due to different dietary habits and the time  
13 period of the analysis: for the US population, less consumption of fish products which have  
14 approximately the same contamination values, but higher levels of dioxins and dioxin-like  
15 PCBs in meat which are major contributors to total intake, especially for men. Total intake  
16 among children is also markedly higher than for adults (from 6.3 pg WHO-TEQ/kg bw/d for  
17 boys aged between 1 and 11 years old to 2.7 for 12 to 19 year-old girls). Their relatively high  
18 consumption level in proportion to their body weight explains this difference. More recent  
19 study (FDA, 2004) based on TDS data, shows dietary PCDD/F exposure estimate between  
20 9.6 pg WHO-TEQ/kg bw/month (0.32 pg WHO-TEQ/kg bw/d) and 26.8 pg WHO-TEQ/kg  
21 bw/month (0.89 pg WHO-TEQ/kg bw/d) for the whole population. This is quite a large range  
22 depending on whether non-detects equals zero, half the LOD or LOD, however, those results  
23 are in accordance with ours for dioxins only,  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39

40  
41 Considering the methodology used for this study, these results provide reference data for the  
42 background dioxin and DL-PCB exposure in France from 2002 to 2004. The consumption  
43 survey dates from 1999 but the individual and national survey of food intake in France  
44 (INCA) is representative for early 2000s food consumption. Diary recording, a validated  
45 method, was used; foods as ingredients were included; with regard to the sub-samples of  
46 adults and children, their characteristics were compared with national data from the  
47 population census (organised by INSEE: National Institute of Statistics and Economic  
48 Studies) and the differences were very small. Contamination data covers almost 90% of total  
49 diet (excluding beverages), several samples for one item. The fact that it dates from 2001 to  
50 2004 makes it representative of a slightly earlier exposure. Note that the results presented  
51 here are calculated using data from the early 2000s (2001 to 2004), the 2000 estimation was  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3 also made with previous data. As the decline is probably continuous, today's exposure is  
4  
5 presumably lower.  
6  
7

8  
9 French dietary exposure has to be compared with the Provisional Tolerable Monthly Intake of  
10  
11 70 pg WHO-TEQ/kg bw/m i.e. 2.33 pg WHO-TEQ/kg bw/d (JECFA, 2002). On average, adult  
12  
13 exposure is lower than this reference dose; children exceed the tolerable limit but the PTMI  
14  
15 has to be understood as a life-long intake. This means that an excessive intake during  
16  
17 childhood does not raise an additional health risk. An estimation of the life-long intake (from  
18  
19 age 3 and over) provides an excess for 20 to 28% of the population (average life-long intake  
20  
21 estimate of 2.0 pg WHO-TEQ/kg bw/d). As in the Italian study (Fattore et al, 2006), a non  
22  
23 negligible part of the population is above the PTMI.  
24

25  
26  
27 For dioxins only, intake for adults and children does not exceed the limit. For DL-PCBs,  
28  
29 intake is above the limits. At present, no maximum value is established for DL-PCBs only, but  
30  
31 if we consider that the new bound of 2.33 pg WHO-TEQ/kg bw/d is for both PCDD/Fs and  
32  
33 DL-PCBs, it remains 1.33 pg WHO-TEQ/kg bw/d for DL-PCBs. This mean that on average,  
34  
35 adults are below the threshold (1.2 pg WHO-TEQ/kg bw/d) while high consumers are above  
36  
37 (p90=2.2 pg WHO-TEQ/kg bw/d). For children, the problem is evidently greater and related to  
38  
39 their higher consumption level in proportion to their body weight: the mean is already over the  
40  
41 limit (1.9 pg WHO-TEQ/kg bw/d for DL-PCBs only). Comparison of average intakes with  
42  
43 PTMI seems inappropriate and results have to be interpret carefully: indeed, when intakes  
44  
45 are above limits, it does not mean that there is a risk for the population because they are  
46  
47 point estimates whereas limits are constructed for a life-long intake. Average intake allow  
48  
49 comprehension about general exposure and trend analysis.  
50

51  
52  
53 As for dioxin and dioxin-like PCB contamination levels in food products, for both populations  
54  
55 (adults and children), the proportion of DL-PCBs is predominant in total exposure: 70% of the  
56  
57 total.  
58  
59  
60

## Conclusion

This study must be viewed as a current reference point for the French population. Indeed, the methodology is recognised and validated, and data is representative: firstly the food consumption survey, INCA 1999, gives the most complete and up-to-date information about food consumption in France; secondly, occurrence data covers 90% of total diet; comparison is made with new regulations for occurrence data and total exposure. However, this study only reflects the primary exposure of the French population through their diet, since people who might be exposed to other key sources are not considered here.

It shows that, since 1999, exposure has decreased sharply (around 60% for dioxins only). As the data used for this estimation dates from 2001-2004, we can assume that the actual estimation for 2006 is probably lower in view of the rapidly decreasing trend. Moreover, the dioxin exposure level of 1 pg WHO-TEQ/kg bw/d has now been reached. Future efforts will have to focus on secondary emission sources like road traffic or wood burning fires.

However progress still has to be made in terms of total exposure, particularly for DL-PCBs. Indeed, the recent inclusion of DL-PCBs in the PTMI requires data on dioxin-like compounds to be collected in order to estimate overall exposure. The result is that they are major contributors (around 70%). The first step to reduce these compounds was the establishment of maximum levels in foods at a European level [amended Regulation (EC) N°466/2001]. There is still a need to monitor regularly exposure to dioxins and DL-PCBs in France.

## References

AFSSA Report, 2005. Dioxins, furans and dioxin-like PCBs: Assessment of exposure of the French population. November 2005. AFSSA report, available from: [www.afssa.fr](http://www.afssa.fr).

AFSSA, 2002. Sensibilité des études d'exposition chronique aux contaminants de la population française, Application au cas des dioxines et des furanes. AFSSA Note, Working paper OCA/AD/RP/JLV/2002-521.

1  
2  
3 Baars, A. J., Bakker, M. I., Baumann, R. A., Boon, P. E., Freijer, J. I., Hoogenboom, L. A.,  
4  
5 Hoogerbrugge, R., van Klaveren, J. D., Liem, A. K., Traag, W. A., de Vries, J., 2004. Dioxins,  
6  
7 dioxin-like PCBs and non-dioxin-like PCBs in foodstuffs: occurrence and dietary intake in The  
8  
9 Netherlands. *Toxicology Letters* 151(1): 51-61.

10  
11  
12 Calamassi G., 2004. Présentation de RECIPE base de recettes de la nomenclature INCA.  
13  
14 AFSSA Note, Working paper OCA/GCT/2004-38.

15  
16  
17  
18  
19 CITEPA, 2005. Inventaire des émissions de polluants atmosphériques en France – format  
20  
21 SECTEN, February 2005, Available from: [www.citepa.org](http://www.citepa.org).

22  
23  
24  
25 CSHPF/AFSSA, 2000. Dioxines: données de contamination et d'exposition de la population  
26  
27 française. Rapport rédigé dans le cadre du groupe de travail "Contaminants et  
28  
29 phytosanitaires" du Conseil Supérieur d'Hygiène Publique de France Section Alimentation et  
30  
31 Nutrition. AFSSA report, available from: [www.afssa.fr](http://www.afssa.fr).

32  
33  
34  
35 Darnerud, P. O., Atuma, S., Aune, M., Bjerselius, R., Glynn, A., Grawe, K. P., Becker, W.,  
36  
37 2006, Dietary intake estimations of organohalogen contaminants (dioxins, PCB, PBDE and  
38  
39 chlorinated pesticides, e.g. DDT) based on Swedish market basket data. *Food and Chemical*  
40  
41 *Toxicology* 44(9): 1597-606.

42  
43  
44 EU-SCOOP, 2000. European commission, Scientific Co-Operation on Questions Relating to  
45  
46 Food. Assessment of Dietary Intake of Dioxins and Related PCBs by the Population of EU  
47  
48 Member States. Task 3.2.5, June 2000 (Brussels:EC).

49  
50  
51  
52 Favier, J.C., Ireland, J., Toque, C., Feinberg, M., 1995. Répertoire général des aliments.  
53  
54 ISBN: 2-85206-921-0. Editions Tec&Doc Lavoisier, 897 p.

1  
2  
3 Fattore, E., Fanelli, R., Turrini, A., di Domenico, A., 2006. Current dietary exposure to  
4 polychlorodibenzo-p-dioxins, polychlorodibenzofurans, and dioxin-like polychlorobiphenyls in  
5 Italy. *Molecular Nutrition and Food Research* 50(10): 915-21.  
6  
7

8  
9  
10  
11 Fernandes, A. R., Rose, M., White, S., Mortimer, D. N., Gem, M., 2006. Dioxins and  
12 polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs) in fish oil dietary supplements: occurrence and human  
13 exposure in the UK. *Food Additives and Contaminants* 23(9): 939-47.  
14  
15

16  
17  
18  
19 Fernandez, M.A., Gomara, B., Herrero, L., Bordajandi, L. R., Ramos, L. , Abad, E., Rivera, J.,  
20 and Gonzalez, M. J., 2002. Temporal trends in PCDD, PCDF and non-ortho PCB  
21 concentrations in Spanish commercial dairy products from 1993 to 2001. *Organohalogen*  
22 *Compounds*, 56, 485-488.  
23  
24  
25

26  
27  
28  
29 Food Standards Agency (FSA), 2003. Dioxins and dioxin-like PCBs in the UK diet: 2001 total  
30 diet study samples. <http://www.food.gov.uk/science/surveillance/fsis2003/fsis382003>. Report  
31 38/03.  
32  
33

34  
35  
36  
37 Food and Drug Administration (FDA), 2004. PCDD/PCDF Exposure estimates from TDS  
38 samples collected in 2001-2004. <http://www.cfsan.fda.gov/~lrd/dioxee.html>.  
39  
40

41  
42  
43 Hori, T., R. Nakagawa, Tobiishi, K., Iida, T., Tsutsumi, T., Sasaki, K., Toyoda, M., 2005.  
44 Effects of cooking on concentrations of polychlorinated dibenzo-p-dioxins and related  
45 compounds in fish and meat. *Journal of Agricultural and Food Chemistry* 53(22): 8820-8.  
46  
47  
48

49  
50  
51 InVS, CAREPS, ADEME, 2000. Etude sur les dioxines et les furanes dans le lait maternel en  
52 France. ISBN 2-11-091490-4. Available from: <http://www.invs.sante.fr>.  
53  
54

55  
56  
57 InVS, AFSSA, 2003. Exposition aux dioxines de la population vivant à proximité des UIOM;  
58 État des connaissances et protocole d'une étude d'exposition. November 2003. Available  
59 from: <http://www.invs.sante.fr>  
60

1  
2  
3  
4  
5 JECFA, 2002. Polychlorinated dibenzodioxins, polychlorinated dibenzofurans, and coplanar  
6 polychlorinated biphenyls. Safety evaluation of certain food additives and contaminants,  
7 WHO Food Additives Series 48, pp 451-664.  
8  
9

10  
11  
12 Kiviranta, H., Hallikainen, A., Ovaskainen, M. L., Kumpulainen, J., Vartiainen, T., 2001.  
13 Dietary intakes of polychlorinated dibenzo-p-dioxins, dibenzofurans and polychlorinated  
14 biphenyls in Finland. Food Additives and Contaminants 18(11): 945-53.  
15  
16  
17  
18

19  
20  
21 Kiviranta, H., Ovaskainen, M. L., Vartiainen, T., 2004. Market basket study on dietary intake  
22 of PCDD/Fs, PCBs, and PBDEs in Finland. Environment International 30(7): 923-32.  
23  
24  
25

26  
27 Liem, A. K., Furst, P., Rappe, C., 2000. Exposure of populations to dioxins and related  
28 compounds. Food Additives and Contaminants 17(4): 241-59.  
29  
30  
31

32  
33 NATO/CCMS, 1988. Scientific basis for the development of the International Toxicity  
34 Equivalency Factor (I-TEF) method for risk assessment for complex mixtures of dioxins and  
35 related compounds. Reports No 178, Dec. 1988.  
36  
37  
38  
39

40  
41 Rigaud, D., Giachetti, I., Deheeger, M., Borys, J.-M., Volatier, J.-L., Lemoine, A., Cassuto, D.-  
42 A., 1997. Enquête française de Consommation Alimentaire – Energie et macronutriments.  
43 Cahiers de Nutrition et de Diététique 32 (6): 379-388.  
44  
45  
46  
47

48  
49 Schecter, A., Cramer, P., Boggess, K., Stanley, J., Papke, O., Olson, J., Silver, A., Schmitz,  
50 M., 2001. Intake of dioxins and related compounds from food in the U.S. population. Journal  
51 of Toxicology and Environmental Health. Part A 63(1): 1-18.  
52  
53  
54  
55

56  
57 Van den Berg, M., Birnbaum, L., Bosveld, A. T., Brunstrom, B., Cook, P., Feeley, M., Giesy,  
58 J., Hanberg, A., Hasegawa, R., Kennedy, S. W., Kubiak, T., Larsen, J. C., van Leeuwen, F.  
59 X., Liem, A. K., Nolt, C., Peterson, R. E., Poellinger, L., Safe, S., Schrenk, D., Tillitt, D.,  
60

1  
2  
3 Tysklind, M., Younes, M., Waern, F., Zacharewski, T., 1998. Toxic equivalency factors  
4 (TEFs) for PCBs, PCDDs, PCDFs for humans and wildlife. Environmental Health  
5 Perspectives 106(12): 775-92.  
6  
7  
8  
9


10  
11 Van den Berg, M., Birnbaum, L. S., Denison, M., De Vito, M., Farland, W., Feeley, M.,  
12 Fiedler., Hakansson, H., Hanberg, A., Haws, L., Rose, M., Safe, S., Schrenk, D., Tohyama,  
13 C., Tritscher, A., Tuomisto, J., Tysklind, M., Walker, N., Peterson, R. E. (2006). The 2005  
14 World Health Organization reevaluation of human and Mammalian toxic equivalency factors  
15 for dioxins and dioxin-like compounds. Toxicological Sciences 93(2): 223-41.  
16  
17  
18  
19

20  
21  
22  
23 Volatier J.L. (coordinator), 2000. Enquête Individuelle et Nationale sur les Consommations  
24 Alimentaires. ISBN: 2-7430-0426-6. Editions Tec&Doc Lavoisier, 158 p.  
25  
26  
27



28  
29 WHO GEMS-Food, 1997. Joint FAO/WHO consultation on food consumption and exposure  
30 assessment to chemicals in food. Geneva, Switzerland, 10-14 February 1997.  
31  
32

33  
34 WHO, 1998. Executive summary: Assessment of the health risk of dioxins: re-evaluation of  
35 the tolerable daily intake (TDI). WHO Consultation, May 25-29, 1998, Geneva.  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60


**Figure 1.** Comparison of levels of exposure to PCDD/Fs. estimated in 1999 and 2005 for the general population for the 7 food categories



**Figure 2.** Contribution of the different food groups to PCDD/F exposure:



**Figure 3.** Relative contribution of 7 food categories to total exposure (PCDD/F + DL-PCB) for adults (15 years and older) and children (3-14 years).



Peer Review Only



**Table 1.** Number of analysed samples per food group:

| <b>Products</b>   | <b>Number of samples</b> |
|---|--------------------------|
| Wild sea fish and wild freshwater fish                          | 219                      |
| Farmed sea fish and farmed freshwater fish                      | 148                      |
| Other sea food products (crustaceans, molluscs and cephalopods) | 98                       |
| Fish oil  | 2                        |
| Meat (except poultry)   | 17                       |
| Poultry   | 38                       |
| Offal (liver)   | 39                       |
| Eggs  | 91                       |
| Milk and dairy products   | 102                      |
| Vegetables products (including fruits)                          | 22                       |
| Cereal products   | 21                       |
| <b>Total</b>  | <b>797</b>               |

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

For Peer Review Only

**Table 2.** Mean and standard deviation of PCDD/F, DL-PCB or both PCDD/F+PCB-DL, expressed in pg TEQ/g fresh weight (FW) or lipid weight (LW) (indicated with \* and in italic)

|                             | PCDD/F<br>(in pg TEQ/g LW<br>or FW)<br>(SD) | PCDD/F<br>(in pg TEQ/g LW<br>or FW)<br>(SD) | DL-PCB<br>(in pg TEQ/g LW<br>or FW)<br>(SD) | DL-PCB<br>(in pg TEQ/g LW<br>or FW)<br>(SD) | total<br>PCDD/F+PCB-DL (in<br>pg TEQ/g LW or FW) | total<br>PCDD/F+PCB-DL (in<br>pg TEQ/g LW or FW) |
|-----------------------------|---|---|---|---|--|--|
| Food groups                 | Lowerbound<br>(ND=0)                        | Upperbound<br>(ND=LOD)                      | Lowerbound<br>(ND=0)                        | Upperbound<br>(ND=LOD)                      | Lowerbound<br>(ND=0)                             | Upperbound<br>(ND=LOD)                           |
| Wild sea fish               | 0.42 (0.79)                                 | 0.42 (0.79)                                 | 2.29 (6.51)                                 | 2.29 (6.51)                                 | 2.72   | 2.72   |
| Farmed sea fish             | 0.56 (0.33)                                 | 0.56 (0.33)                                 | 2.33 (2.40)                                 | 2.33 (2.40)                                 | 2.89   | 2.89   |
| Farmed trout                | 0.17 (0.12)                                 | 0.17 (0.12)                                 | 0.58 (0.33)                                 | 0.58 (0.33)                                 | 0.75   | 0.75   |
| Freshwater fish             | 0.38 (0.51)                                 | 0.38 (0.51)                                 | 2.35 (3.05)                                 | 2.35 (3.05)                                 | 2.73   | 2.73   |
| Molluscs (mussels, oysters) | 0.39 (0.41)                                 | 0.40 (6.97)                                 | 0.94 (1.49)                                 | 0.94 (1.49)                                 | 1.34   | 1.34   |
| Cephalopods                 | 0.18 (0.19)                                 | 0.18 (0.19)                                 | 0.55 (1.00)                                 | 0.55 (1.00)                                 | 0.73   | 0.73   |
| Crustaceans                 | 0.57 (0.85)                                 | 0.57 (0.85)                                 | 0.70 (1.11)                                 | 0.70 (1.11)                                 | 1.28   | 1.28   |
| <i>Meat*</i>                | <i>0.24 (0.19)</i>                          | <i>0.36 (0.25)</i>                          | <i>0.74 (0.61)</i>                          | <i>0.74 (0.61)</i>                          | <i>0.99</i>                                      | <i>1.11</i>                                      |
| - <i>beef*</i>              | <i>0.41 (0.14)</i>                          | <i>0.42 (0.21)</i>                          | <i>0.77 (0.23)</i>                          | <i>0.77 (0.23)</i>                          | <i>1.18</i>                                      | <i>1.18</i>                                      |
| - <i>lamb*</i>              | <i>0.25 (0.08)</i>                          | <i>0.50 (0.33)</i>                          | <i>1.25 (0.66)</i>                          | <i>1.25 (0.66)</i>                          | <i>1.5</i>                                       | <i>1.75</i>                                      |
| - <i>pork*</i>              | <i>0.05 (0.02)</i>                          | <i>0.21 (0.18)</i>                          | <i>0.37 (0.71)</i>                          | <i>0.37 (0.70)</i>                          | <i>0.42</i>                                      | <i>0.59</i>                                      |
| <i>Offal*</i>               | <i>1.23 (1.21)</i>                          | <i>1.26 (1.21)</i>                          | <i>1.29 (2.35)</i>                          | <i>1.29 (2.35)</i>                          | <i>2.52</i>                                      | <i>2.55</i>                                      |
| <i>Poultry*</i>             | <i>0.31 (0.25)</i>                          | <i>0.39 (0.28)</i>                          | <i>0.56 (0.73)</i>                          | <i>0.56 (0.73)</i>                          | <i>0.87</i>                                      | <i>0.95</i>                                      |
| <i>Eggs*</i>                | <i>0.48 (0.61)</i>                          | <i>0.51 (0.62)</i>                          | <i>0.58 (1.98)</i>                          | <i>0.58 (1.98)</i>                          | <i>1.05</i>                                      | <i>1.08</i>                                      |
| <i>Butter*</i>              | <i>0.29 (0.03)</i>                          | <i>0.29 (0.03)</i>                          | <i>0.52 (0.13)</i>                          | <i>0.52 (0.13)</i>                          | <i>0.82</i>                                      | <i>0.82</i>                                      |
| <i>Milk*</i>                | <i>0.36 (0.13)</i>                          | <i>0.38 (0.13)</i>                          | <i>0.74 (0.28)</i>                          | <i>0.74 (0.28)</i>                          | <i>1.1</i>                                       | <i>1.12</i>                                      |
| Fruit                       | 0.01 (0.00)                                 | 0.01 (0.01)                                 | 0.01 (0.01)                                 | 0.01 (0.01)                                 | 0.01   | 0.02   |
| Vegetables                  | 0.01 (0.00)                                 | 0.01 (0.01)                                 | 0.01 (0.00)                                 | 0.01 (0.00)                                 | 0.01   | 0.02   |
| Bread                       | 0.01 (0.01)                                 | 0.01 (0.01)                                 | 0.00 (0.00)                                 | 0.00 (0.00)                                 | 0.01   | 0.01   |
| Rice                        | 0.00 (0.00)                                 | 0.00 (0.00)                                 | 0.01 (0.01)                                 | 0.01 (0.01)                                 | 0.01   | 0.01   |
| Pasta                       | 0.00 (0.00)                                 | 0.00 (0.00)                                 | 0.00 (0.00)                                 | 0.00 (0.00)                                 | 0  | 0  |
| Cereals                     | 0.01 (0.00)                                 | 0.01 (0.00)                                 | 0.00 (0.00)                                 | 0.00 (0.00)                                 | 0.01   | 0.01   |
| <i>Vegetable oil*</i>       | <i>0.07 (0.01)</i>                          | <i>0.17 (0.03)</i>                          | <i>0.18 (0.04)</i>                          | <i>0.18 (0.04)</i>                          | <i>0.25</i>                                      | <i>0.36</i>                                      |
| <i>Fish oil*</i>            | <i>0.57 (0.16)</i>                          | <i>0.74 (0.11)</i>                          | <i>0.35 (0.46)</i>                          | <i>0.35 (0.46)</i>                          | <i>0.92</i>                                      | <i>1.09</i>                                      |

# Values are based on 1998 WHO-TEFs.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

For Peer Review Only

**Table 3.** Dietary intake of PCDD/F: Comparison of exposure between CSHPF/Afssa study in 2000 and Afssa study in 2005 in the general population.

| Food groups                      | ASPPC food survey                      |                     |                | INCA food survey       |             |                |
|----------------------------------|--|---------------------|----------------|------------------------|-------------|----------------|
|                                  | CSHPF/Afssa 2000                       |                     |                | Afssa 2005             |             |                |
|                                  | Mean dioxin exposure                   |                     | % contribution | Mean dioxin exposure   |             | % contribution |
| (pg TEQ <sub>NATO</sub> /pers/d) | (pg TEQ <sub>NATO</sub> /kg b.w./jour) | (pg WHO-TEQ/pers/d) |                | (pg WHO-TEQ/kg b.w./d) |             |                |
| Meat products                    | 9.83                                   | 0.20                | 15.3           | 3.24                   | 0.06        | 10.5           |
| Fish and fish products           | 17.22                                  | 0.32                | 24.4           | 13.97                  | 0.24        | 44.7           |
| Fats                             | 0.52                                   | 0.01                | 0.8            | 0.36                   | 0.01        | 1.1            |
| Dairy Products                   | 25.81                                  | 0.53                | 40.5           | 8.87                   | 0.15        | 29.1           |
| Eggs                             | 4.04                                   | 0.08                | 6.1            | 0.77                   | 0.01        | 2.5            |
| Cereals products                 | 2.21                                   | 0.05                | 3.8            | 1.94                   | 0.03        | 6.4            |
| Fruit and vegetables             | 6.12                                   | 0.12                | 9.2            | 1.78                   | 0.03        | 5.7            |
| <b>Total</b>                     | <b>65.73</b>                           | <b>1.31</b>         | <b>100.0</b>   | <b>30.93</b>           | <b>0.53</b> | <b>100.0</b>   |

**Table 4.** Estimation of daily exposure to PCDD/Fs+DL-PCBs. PCDD/Fs and DL-PCBs for adults (15 years +) and children (3-14 years)

| Population      | Total exposure in pg TEQ <sub>WHO</sub> /kg bw/d |            |                    |            |            | % Contribution |
|-----------------|--|------------|--------------------|------------|------------|----------------|
|                 | Mean   | Median     | Standard deviation | p90        | p95        |                |
| <b>Adults</b>   | <b>1.8</b>                                       | <b>1.5</b> | <b>1.1</b>         | <b>3.1</b> | <b>3.9</b> |                |
| <i>PCDD/F</i>   | 0.5  | 0.5        | 0.3                | 0.9        | 1.1        | 30.6           |
| <i>DL-PCB</i>   | 1.2  | 1.0        | 0.8                | 2.2        | 2.8        | 69.4           |
| <b>Children</b> | <b>2.8</b>                                       | <b>2.4</b> | <b>1.6</b>         | <b>4.8</b> | <b>6.0</b> |                |
| <i>PCDD/F</i>   | 0.9  | 0.8        | 0.4                | 1.5        | 1.8        | 31.8           |
| <i>DL-PCB</i>   | 1.9  | 1.6        | 1.1                | 3.3        | 4.2        | 68.2           |

**Table 5.** Estimation of life-long intakes to PCDD/Fs+DL-PCBs. PCDD/Fs and DL-PCBs

| Total exposure in pg TEQ <sub>WHO</sub> /kg bw/d |            |                    |            |            |
|--|------------|--------------------|------------|------------|
| Mean   | Median     | Standard deviation | p90        | p95        |
| <b>2,0</b>                                       | <b>1,9</b> | <b>0,5</b>         | <b>2,6</b> | <b>3,0</b> |

For Peer Review Only

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

For Peer Review Only



**Table 6.** Contribution of 7 food categories to total exposure. expressed in pg TEQ/kg bw/d and relative share of PCDD/Fs and DL-PCBs. expressed as a percentage. in adults (15 years and +): N=1474

| Food category         | Exposure in pg/kg bw/d |            |                    |            |            | Percentage of consumers<br>(in %) | DL-PCBs<br>(in %) | PCDD/Fs<br>(in %) |
|-----------------------|------------------------|------------|--------------------|------------|------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|
|                       | Mean                   | Median     | Standard deviation | p90        | p95        |                                   |                   |                   |
| <b>Seafood</b>        | <b>0.8</b>             | <b>0.5</b> | <b>1.0</b>         | <b>2.0</b> | <b>2.8</b> | <b>92.4</b>                       | <b>75.5</b>       | <b>24.5</b>       |
| <b>Dairy products</b> | <b>0.6</b>             | <b>0.5</b> | <b>0.2</b>         | <b>0.8</b> | <b>1.0</b> | <b>100.0</b>                      | <b>65.6</b>       | <b>34.4</b>       |
| Meat products         | 0.1                    | 0.1        | 0.1                | 0.2        | 0.3        | 99.9                              | 70.3              | 29.7              |
| Fruit & vegetables    | 0.1                    | 0.1        | 0.1                | 0.2        | 0.2        | 100.0                             | 54.1              | 45.9              |
| Fats                  | 0.1                    | 0.1        | 0.0                | 0.1        | 0.1        | 100.0                             | 72.9              | 27.1              |
| Eggs                  | 0.0                    | 0.0        | 0.0                | 0.1        | 0.1        | 98.8                              | 54.5              | 45.5              |
| Cereal products       | 0.0                    | 0.0        | 0.0                | 0.0        | 0.0        | 100.0                             | 26.8              | 73.2              |
| <b>Total exposure</b> | <b>1.8</b>             | <b>1.5</b> | <b>1.1</b>         | <b>3.1</b> | <b>3.9</b> | <b>100.0</b>                      | <b>69.4</b>       | <b>30.6</b>       |

**Table 7:** Summary of reference values:

|             | <b>PCDD/F</b>                                       | <b>DL-PCB</b> |
|-------------|---|---------------|
| WHO, 1990   | 10 pg I-TEQ/ kg bw/d                                | -             |
| WHO, 1998   | 1-4 pg WHO-TEQ/kg bw/d                              |               |
| SCF, 2001   | 14 pg WHO-TEQ/kg bw/week (2 pg WHO-TEQ/kg bw/d)     |               |
| JECFA, 2002 | 70 pg WHO-TEQ/kg bw/month (2.33 pg WHO-TEQ/kg bw/d) |               |

For Peer Review Only