



HAL
open science

Dermal absorption of semivolatile organic compounds from the gas phase: Sensitivity of exposure assessment by steady state modeling to key parameters

Maud Pelletier, Nathalie Bonvallot, Olivier Ramalho, Olivier Blanchard, Corinne Mandin, Barbara Le Bot, Fabien Mercier, Philippe Glorennec

► **To cite this version:**

Maud Pelletier, Nathalie Bonvallot, Olivier Ramalho, Olivier Blanchard, Corinne Mandin, et al.. Dermal absorption of semivolatile organic compounds from the gas phase: Sensitivity of exposure assessment by steady state modeling to key parameters. *Environment International*, 2017, 102, pp.106-113. 10.1016/j.envint.2017.02.005 . hal-01635769

HAL Id: hal-01635769

<https://hal.science/hal-01635769>

Submitted on 15 Nov 2017

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.

1 **Dermal absorption of semivolatile organic compounds from the gas phase: sensitivity of**
2 **exposure assessment by steady state modeling to key parameters**

3

4 Maud Pelletier^{1,2}, Nathalie Bonvalot^{1,2}, Olivier Ramalho³, Olivier Blanchard^{1,2}, Fabien
5 Mercier^{1,2,4}, Corinne Mandin^{2,3,4}, Barbara Le Bot^{1,2,4}, Philippe Glorennec^{1,2*}

6

7 ¹EHESP-School of Public Health, Sorbonne Paris Cité, Rennes, France

8 ²INSERM-U1085, Irset-Research Institute for Environmental and Occupational Health,
9 Rennes, France

10 ³University of Paris-Est, Scientific and Technical Center for Building (CSTB), Health and
11 Comfort Department, French Indoor Air Quality Observatory (OQAI), 84 Avenue Jean
12 Jaurès, Champs sur Marne, 77447 Marne la Vallée Cedex 2, France

13 ⁴LERES-Environment and Health Research Laboratory (Irset and EHESP Technologic
14 Platform), Rennes, France

15 *Corresponding author:

16 INSERM-U1085, Irset-Research Institute for Environmental and Occupational Health,
17 Rennes, France. EHESP-School of Public Health, Sorbonne Paris Cité, Rennes, France.

18 Tel.: +33-2 99 02 26 80.

19 E-mail address: philippe.glorennec@ehesp.fr

20 **ABSTRACT**

21 Recent research has demonstrated the importance of dermal exposure for some semivolatile
22 organic compounds (SVOCs) present in the gas phase of indoor air. Though models for
23 estimating dermal intake from gaseous SVOCs exist, their predictions can be subject to
24 variations in input parameters, which can lead to large variation in exposure estimations. In
25 this sensitivity analysis for a steady state model, we aimed to assess these variations and their
26 determinants using probabilistic Monte Carlo sampling for 8 SVOCs from different chemical
27 families: phthalates, bisphenols, polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs),
28 organophosphorus (OPs), organochlorines (OCs), synthetic musks, polychlorinated biphenyls
29 (PCBs) and polybromodiphenylethers (PBDEs). Indoor SVOC concentrations were found to
30 be the most influential parameters. Both Henry's law constant (H) and octanol/water partition
31 coefficient (K_{ow}) uncertainty also had significant influence. While exposure media properties
32 such as volume fraction of organic matter in the particle phase ($f_{om-part}$), particle density (ρ_{part}),
33 concentration ($[TSP]$) and transport coefficient (γ_d) had a slight influence for some
34 compounds, human parameters such as body weight (W), body surface area (A) and daily
35 exposure (t) make a marginal or null contribution to the variance of dermal intake for a given
36 age group. Inclusion of a parameter sensitivity analysis appears essential to reporting
37 uncertainties in dermal exposure assessment.

38 **KEY WORDS**

39 Percutaneous, indoor air, chemical, contact, sensitivity analysis, Monte Carlo.

40 **HIGHLIGHTS**

- 41 • Sensitivity analysis was conducted for 8 SVOCs with MC simulations.
- 42 • SVOC air concentration is the most influential variable parameter.

43 • Octanol-water partition coefficient and Henry's law constant are influential uncertain
44 parameters.

45 • Influence of airborne particles characteristics and human parameters is minimal.

46 **ABBREVIATIONS**

47 *A* Body surface area (m^2)

48 *C_a* SVOC total concentration in indoor air (C_g+F) (ng/m^3)

49 *C_g* SVOC concentration in the gas phase (ng/m^3)

50 *DI_{dermal-gas}* Daily intake by dermal exposure through the gas phase (micrograms per kilogram
51 of body weight per day, $\mu g/kg\text{-}bw/d$)

52 *F* SVOC concentration in the particulate phase (ng/m^3 of air)

53 *f_{om-part}* Volume fraction of organic matter associated with airborne particles

54 *H* Henry's law constant ($Pa\cdot m^3/mol$)

55 *K_{oa}* Octanol/air partition coefficient

56 *K_{ow}* Octanol/water partition coefficient

57 *K_p* Gas/particle distribution coefficient ($m^3/\mu g$)

58 *k_{pg}* Indoor air transdermal permeability coefficient, describing the transport of a gas phase
59 SVOC from bulk indoor air to dermal capillaries, through the boundary layer adjacent
60 to skin, the stratum corneum and viable epidermis composite (m/h)

61 *MW* SVOC molecular weight (g/mol)

62 *P_s* SVOC vapor pressure (Pa)

- 63 R Ideal gas constant ($=8.314 \text{ Pa}\cdot\text{m}^3/\text{mol}\cdot\text{K}$)
- 64 ρ_{part} Density of airborne particles (g/m^3)
- 65 $SVOC$ Semivolatile organic compound
- 66 t Daily exposure duration (h/d)
- 67 T Temperature (K)
- 68 $[TSP]$ Total suspended particle concentration ($\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$)
- 69 W Body weight (kg)
- 70 y_d Coefficient describing the external transport of a gas phase SVOC from the bulk
71 indoor air to the boundary layer adjacent to the skin (m/h)

72 INTRODUCTION

73 People spend more than 80% of their time in enclosed spaces, largely in dwellings in which
74 they are exposed to an increasing number of chemicals from various sources and via different
75 exposure routes. In addition to other pollutants found in indoor environments (radon, carbon
76 monoxide, formaldehyde and other volatile organic compounds), semivolatile organic
77 compounds (SVOCs) have received a great deal of attention, due to a rise in their use in
78 consumer products as well as improved analytical techniques that have shown their ubiquity
79 in dwellings (Rudel et al., 2003; Weschler and Nazaroff, 2008).

80 SVOCs include organic molecules from many different chemical families (phthalates,
81 bisphenols, polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs), organophosphorus (OPs),
82 organochlorines (OCs), synthetic musks, polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs),
83 polybromodiphenylethers (PBDEs), etc.). They are emitted from multiple household sources:
84 flooring and wall materials, furniture, cosmetics, cleaning products, combustion products,

85 packaging, etc. Due to their physical-chemical properties, they are able to migrate to, and
86 partition between, different indoor compartments, including gas phase and airborne particles
87 and settled dust (Weschler and Nazaroff, 2008), as well as other available surfaces such as
88 walls, ceiling and flooring materials – or human skin and clothing. The scientific
89 community’s growing interest in studying exposure to these compounds is motivated by
90 suspicion of reprotoxic, (Rubin, 2011; Moreau-Guigon and Chevreuil, 2014), neurotoxic
91 (Baldi et al., 2001; Elbaz et al., 2009; Blanc-Lapierre et al., 2012; Zaganas et al., 2013) and
92 carcinogenic (Armstrong et al., 2004; IARC, 2010a, 2010b) health effects, as well as the
93 acknowledged presence of these compounds and their metabolites in human biological fluids
94 (blood and urine) (NHANES, 2015). This interest is even more pronounced with regard to
95 pregnant women and young children, considered more sensitive to these toxic effects
96 (Grandjean et al., 2008).

97 At home, in addition to food ingestion (the main exposure pathway for many SVOCs), people
98 are exposed through a variety of pathways: direct contact with the SVOC source, inhalation
99 and contact with indoor air (gaseous and particulate phases), ingestion and contact with
100 settled dust (on floor and furniture). Young children are more exposed than the rest of the
101 population due to their more frequent contact with the ground and deposited dust, carrying
102 objects in their mouths, etc. Though dust ingestion and inhalation of gaseous and particulate
103 phases are the two best-documented exposure pathways in the literature, dermal absorption is
104 rarely assessed in the course of environmental exposure assessments, because it is presumed
105 to be negligible. Nevertheless, recent research has hypothesized the significance of dermal
106 exposure (Weschler and Nazaroff, 2012; Gong et al. 2014) and more recently Weschler et al.
107 (2015) and Morrison et al. (2016) have corroborated these findings via experimental human
108 dermal exposure to two gaseous phthalates: diethyl phthalate (DEP) and di-n-butyl phthalate
109 (DnBP). The results confirm that transdermal uptake directly from air can be a meaningful

110 exposure pathway for DEP and DnBP, and that direct dermal absorption from air is also
111 expected to be significant for other SVOCs, where the molecular weight and K_{ow} are in a
112 similar range. Bekö et al. (2013) estimated daily intakes resulting from four different indoor
113 exposure pathways: dust ingestion, inhalation and dermal exposure through gas phase and
114 through dust adhering to skin, based on phthalates' metabolites levels in urine samples of
115 DEP, DnBP, di(isobutyl) phthalate (DiBP), butyl benzyl phthalate (BBzP) and di(2-
116 ethylhexyl) phthalate (DEHP) and their concentration in dust samples collected at the same
117 time. They found that gas phase dermal absorption was the major exposure pathway for the
118 more volatile compounds, in comparison with the other pathways involved. They also found
119 that intake through dermal contact with dust contributed only very slightly to total intake for
120 all studied phthalates. In order to assess SVOC gas phase dermal exposure, some authors have
121 adapted and used a model based on mass-transfer resistance to calculate an indoor air
122 transdermal permeability coefficient k_{p-g} (Weschler and Nazaroff, 2012; Bekö et al., 2013).
123 This mass-transfer model describes the transport of a gas phase SVOC from bulk indoor air to
124 dermal capillaries, through the boundary layer adjacent to skin, the stratum corneum and the
125 viable epidermis composite.

126 At equilibrium and due to their physical-chemical properties, especially K_{oa} , SVOCs partition
127 between the gas and particle phases of indoor air (Finizio et al., 1997; Pankow, 1998;
128 Weschler and Nazaroff, 2008). When assessing gaseous SVOC dermal exposure,
129 concentration in the gas phase (C_g) is required and could be either measured or modeled from
130 total concentration in indoor air (C_a) - which is the sum of gas and particulate (F) phases
131 ($C_g+F=C_a$). Salthammer and Schripp (2015) have highlighted the importance of taking
132 parameter uncertainty and variability into account when assessing SVOC partitioning and
133 exposure. Weschler and Nazaroff (2014) have already assessed the sensitivity of k_{p-g} and
134 other partitioning coefficient calculations, such as K_p , to the octanol/water partition

135 coefficient (K_{ow}), the octanol/air partition coefficient (K_{oa}) and Henry's law constant (H)
136 uncertainties. We would like to continue this work here by evaluating the sensitivity of dermal
137 intake, i.e. the mass of pollutant entering the body per kg of body weight and unit of time, to
138 these parameters using a steady-state model.

139 The objective of this sensitivity analysis is to evaluate dermal intake variation caused by the
140 uncertainty and variability of input parameters when using the model described by Weschler
141 and Nazaroff (2012) for dermal absorption of gas phase SVOCs. We chose the study by
142 Blanchard et al. (2014), in which 57 indoor SVOCs of health interest (Bonvallot et al., 2010)
143 were measured with separation of their gas phase and airborne particle concentrations, as a
144 starting study. We selected eight compounds from different chemical families having varied
145 K_{oa} and volatility to represent contrasting situations: dimethyl phthalate (DMP),
146 phenanthrene, galaxolide (HHCB), PCB 105, diazinon, permethrin, bisphenol A (BPA) and
147 BDE 154.

148 **METHODS**

149 1. Equation tested for dermal intake modeling

150 For a given human, chronic daily intake of gas phase SVOC via the dermal pathway, $DI_{dermal-}$
151 gas , can be estimated in steady-state conditions using the following equation adapted by Bekö
152 et al. (2013).

$$DI_{dermal-gas} = \frac{C_g \times k_{p-g} \times A \times t}{1000 \times W} \quad (1)$$

153
154 Where C_g is the SVOC gas phase concentration (ng/m^3), A is the body surface area (m^2), t is
155 the daily duration of exposure (h/d), W is the body weight (kg), k_{p-g} is the SVOC transdermal
156 permeability coefficient (m/h) and $DI_{dermal-gas}$ is expressed in $\mu g/kg-bw/d$.

157 The indoor air transdermal permeability coefficient (k_{p-g}) can be estimated using the steady-
 158 state model adapted by Weschler and Nazaroff (2012, 2014), (see supplementary material for
 159 the intermediate equations used to derive Equation 2):

$$k_{p-g} = 1/\left(\frac{1}{\gamma_d} + \left(\frac{H}{RT} / \frac{10^{(0.7 \times \log(K_{ow}) - 0.0722 \times MW^{2/3} - 5.252)} \times 3600 \times 10^{-2}}{1 + (10^{(0.7 \times \log(K_{ow}) - 0.0722 \times MW^{2/3} - 5.252)} \times MW^{0.5} \times 3600/2.6)}\right)\right) \quad (2)$$

160
 161 Where K_{ow} is the SVOC octanol-water partition coefficient, MW is the SVOC molecular
 162 weight (g/mol), H is the Henry's law constant (Pa.m³/mol), R is the ideal gas constant (8.314
 163 Pa.m³/mol.K), T is the air temperature (K) and γ_d is the coefficient that describes the external
 164 transport of an SVOC from the gas phase in the core of a room through the boundary layer
 165 adjacent to the skin (m/h).

166 When estimating dermal intake from the gas phase (see Equations 1 and 2), exposure
 167 assessors may face two situations which can be distinguished in terms of availability of the C_g
 168 value: A) C_g is measured experimentally or B) C_g is calculated from total indoor air
 169 concentration (C_a). Assuming that SVOCs are in equilibrium between gas and particulate
 170 phases, C_g can be estimated from C_a using the partitioning model proposed by Weschler and
 171 Nazaroff (2010) and can be expressed as follows (see supplementary material for the detailed
 172 calculation):

$$C_g = \frac{C_a}{1 + ([TSP] \times \frac{f_{om-part} \times K_{ow} \times R \times T}{\rho_{part} \times 10^6 \times H})} \quad (3)$$

173
 174 Where [TSP] is the total suspended particle concentration (μg/m³), $f_{om-part}$ is the volume
 175 fraction of organic matter associated with airborne particles and ρ_{part} is the density of airborne
 176 particles.

177 2. Parameter estimation

178 The impact of uncertainty or variability of equation parameters on $DI_{\text{dermal-gas}}$ variability was
179 assessed. Parameter distributions were constructed or retrieved from the literature as detailed
180 below. For a given group of occupants in a given indoor setting, some of these parameters
181 will be the same for all SVOCs (γ_d , [TSP], $f_{\text{om-part}}$, ρ_{part} , W, A and t) while others will vary
182 from one compound to another (K_{ow} , H, C_g and C_a).

183 *Physical-chemical parameters*

184 For each SVOC, measured or estimated values of $\log(K_{\text{ow}})$ and Henry's law constant (H) at
185 25°C were retrieved from: online databases - Hazardous Substances Data Bank (HSBD) and
186 ChemIDplus (<http://toxnet.nlm.nih.gov/>), Chemspider (<http://www.chemspider.com/>), and
187 Chemicalize (<http://www.chemicalize.org/>); toxicological and environmental data sheets from
188 the French National Competence Centre for Industrial Safety and Environmental Protection
189 (INERIS) (<http://www.ineris.fr/substances/fr/page/21>); online calculators - Chemexper
190 (<https://www.chemexper.com/>) and ACD/Labs (<http://www.acdlabs.com/>); EPI Suite software
191 (US EPA, v4.1) and the Handbook of Physical-Chemical Properties and Environment Fate for
192 Organic Chemicals (Mackay et al., 2010a, 2010b, 2010c, 2010d). Only values at 25°C
193 (reference temperature) were selected, in order to be consistent and to estimate $DI_{\text{dermal-gas}}$ at a
194 constant temperature. For each SVOC, where at least 15 values for their $\log(K_{\text{ow}})$ and H were
195 retrieved from the sources mentioned above, distributions were fitted – and otherwise we used
196 triangular distributions (between minimum, average and maximum values). Corresponding
197 distributions are displayed in Table 1.

198 *Contamination data*

199 In situation A (C_g measured): SVOC gas phase concentration values (C_g) were retrieved from
200 Blanchard et al. (2014). When 100% (i.e. in 30 out of 30 dwellings) of the data were > the
201 limit of quantification (LOQ), log-normal distributions were fitted. When 100% of the values

202 were < LOQ, uniform distributions between 0 and LOQ were used. Lastly when single values
203 were > LOQ, custom distributions were constructed, related to their probabilities of
204 occurrence, with continuous range between 0 and LOQ and discrete ranges for the values >
205 LOQ. In situation B (C_g measured from C_a): SVOC indoor air concentration values (C_a) were
206 retrieved from the literature (Fromme et al., 2004; Fromme et al., 2009 and Rudel et al.,
207 2010). Log-normal distributions were fitted where possible; otherwise custom distributions
208 were constructed, related to their probabilities of occurrence, with continuous ranges from 0
209 to LOQ and from LOQ to maximum value, or triangular distributions between minimum,
210 average and maximum values. Corresponding distributions are displayed in Table 1.

211 *Human parameters*

212 We considered a 4-year-old male child to be representative of the sensitive population in
213 terms of the identified toxicological effects and exposure behavior. As an example we
214 searched literature for body weight (W), surface area (A), and time spent in dwellings (t) for a
215 child living in France. Log-normal distributions were used for weight and body surface area.
216 Normal distribution was used for the space-time-budget. Corresponding distributions are
217 displayed in Table 1.

218 *Exposure media properties*

219 The assessment of gas phase SVOC dermal transfer requires the use of exposure media
220 properties such as γ_d , [TSP], $f_{om-part}$ and ρ_{part} . Triangular distribution was used for γ_d , using the
221 minimum and maximum values found in the literature and the generally-assumed 6 m/h as the
222 most likely value to occur. Log-normal distribution was used for [TSP] and $f_{om-part}$. Normal
223 distribution was used for ρ_{part} . Corresponding distributions are displayed in Table 1.

224 3. Simulation

225 Dermal intake sensitivity analysis (Eq. 1) was performed using Crystal Ball® software
226 (Oracle®, version 11.1.1.3.00). For each SVOC and for each of the two situations regarding
227 C_g (A: C_g measured, B: C_g modeled), Latin Hypercube one-dimensional simulations were
228 carried out with 10^5 runs.

229 **Table 1:** Parameter distributions used in the dermal intake sensitivity analysis from gas phase for 8 SVOCs.

Parameter	DMP	Phenanthrene	HHCB	Permethrin	Diazinon	PCB105	BPA	BDE154	Sources
log (K _{ow})*	Log-normal min=1.35 μ=1.65 σ=0.14	Logistic μ=4.50 scale=0.09	Triangular min=3.42 μ=5.23 max=6.26	Minimum extreme likeliest=6.51 scale=0.73	Minimum extreme likeliest=3.74 scale=0.37	Minimum extreme likeliest=6.72 scale=0.35	Triangular min=3.32 μ=3.48 max=4.04	Triangular min=6.86 μ=7.89 max=8.83	Internet databases***, Chemexper, ACD/Labs calculators, EPI Suite software (US EPA, v4.1), Mackay et al., 2010a, 2010b, 2010c, 2010d.
H* (Pa.m ³ /mol)	Triangular min=6.20E-3 μ=3.60E-2 max=1.11E-1	Triangular min=2.38 μ=3.74 max=5.55	Uniform min=7.66E-2 max=1.34E+1	Triangular min=2.33E-6 μ=5.34E-2 max=1.89E-1	Triangular min=7.00E-3 μ=4.25E-2 max=1.44E-1	Triangular min=2.43 μ=2.24E+1 max=8.36E+1	Triangular min=9.28E-7 μ=2.49E-6 max=4.05E-6	Triangular min=4.77E-2 μ=1.46E-1 max=2.40E-1	
C _g (ng/m ³)	Log-normal min=0 μ _g =8.57 σ _g =2.23	Log-normal min=4.16 μ _g =3.88 σ _g =2.98	Log-normal min=0 μ _g =6.67E+1 σ _g =2.57	Uniform [0 - 0.6(LOQ)]	Discrete (p=0.03) 2.45 Uniform (p=0.97) [0 - 0.6(LOQ)]	Discrete (p=0.03) 0.4 Uniform (p=0.97) [0 - 0.25(LOQ)]	Uniform [0 - 0.6(LOQ)]	Uniform [0 - 0.6(LOQ)]	Blanchard et al., 2014.
C _a (ng/m ³)	Log-normal μ=1.18E+3 p50=4.36E+2 p95=4.65E+3	Log-normal μ=6.1 p50=1.10E+1 p95=2.90E+1	Log-normal μ=1.19E+2 p50=1.01E+2 p95=2.45E+2	Uniform (p=0.92) [0 - 0.3(LOQ)] Uniform (p=0.08) [0.3(LOQ) - 2]	Uniform (p=0.98) [0 - 0.3 (LOQ)] Uniform (p=0.02) [0.3(LOQ) - 3.1E+1]	Uniform (p=0.88) [0 - 0.3 (LOQ)] Uniform (p=0.12) [0.3(LOQ) - 1.2]	Uniform (p=0.84) [0 - 0.8(LOQ)] Uniform (p=0.16) [0.8(LOQ) - 2.2E+1]	Triangular min=0 μ=6.20E-4 max=1.09E-2	Rudel et al., 2010 (phen, per, diaz, PCB105, BPA), Fromme et al., 2004 (DMP, HHCB), Fromme et al., 2009 (BDE154).
Y _d (m/h)	Triangular min=5, likeliest=6, max=10								Tamas et al., 2006; Pandrangi and Morrison, 2008; Weschler and Nazaroff, 2008.
[TSP] (μg/m ³)	Log-normal, μ _g =37.34, σ _g =2.17, p95=182								Ramalho et al., 2012.
f _{om-part}	Normal, μ=0.35, σ=0.2								Salthammer and Schripp, 2015.
ρ _{part} (g/m ³)	Normal, μ=1.6E+6, σ=0.5E+6								Pitz et al., 2003.
W ^{**} (kg)	Log-normal, μ _{lnx} =2.68, σ _{lnx} =0.17, p95=22.0								Tanguy et al., 2007.
A ^{**} (m ²)	Log-normal, μ=-0.28, σ=0.12, p95=0.94								Sabaterie et al., 2013.
T (h/d)	Normal, μ=17.17, σ=0.63								Zeghnoun and Dor, 2010.

230 A: body surface area; BPA: bisphenol A; C_a : SVOC total concentration in indoor air; C_g : SVOC concentration in the gas phase; diaz: diazinon; DMP:
231 dimethyl phthalate; $f_{om-part}$: volume fraction of organic matter associated with airborne particles; γ_d : coefficient describing the external transport of a gas phase
232 SVOC from the bulk indoor air to the boundary layer adjacent to the skin; H: Henry's law constant; HHCB: galaxolide; K_{ow} : octanol/water partition
233 coefficient; μ : arithmetic mean; μ_g : geometric mean; per: permethrin; phe: phenanthrene; ρ_{part} : density of airborne particles; σ : standard deviation; σ_g :
234 geometric standard deviation; t: daily exposure duration; [TSP]: total suspended particle concentration; W: body weight. Distribution parameters may be
235 different for a same distribution law because of diversity of reporting data in the literature.

236 *: Measured or estimated at 25°C.

237 **: Spearman's rank correlation between mass and body surface area is 0.99 for a 4-year-old male child (Sabaterie et al., 2013).

238 ***: Hazardous Substances Data Bank (HSBD), ChemIDplus, Chemspider, Chemicalize and the French toxicological and environmental data sheets from
239 INERIS.

240 **RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

241 1. Daily dermal intake variation

242 Daily dermal intake variations are presented in Table 2.


243 **Table 2:** Variations in daily dermal intake ($DI_{\text{dermal-gas}}$), expressed as the relative interdecile
 244 range, for each SVOC and for each of the two situations regarding gas phase concentration
 245 (A: C_g measured, B: C_g modeled).

Situation	SVOC	Relative interdecile range $= \frac{d90 - d10}{d50}$
A	Dimethyl phthalate (DMP)	3.1
	Phenanthrene	1.9
	Galaxolide (HHCB)	6.3
	Permethrin	2.2
	Diazinon	3.1
	PCB 105	2.8
	Bisphenol A (BPA)	1.2
	BDE 154	1.6
B	Dimethyl phthalate (DMP)	6.2
	Phenanthrene	1.4
	Galaxolide (HHCB)	2.8
	Permethrin	3.6
	Diazinon	3.1
	PCB 105	3.7
	Bisphenol A (BPA)	17.8
	BDE 154	7.3

246


247 The relative interdecile range of $DI_{\text{dermal-gas}}$, when C_g value is measured (situation A), ranged
 248 from 1.2 for BPA to 6.3 for galaxolide (HHCB). When C_g is estimated from C_a (situation B),
 249 $DI_{\text{dermal-gas}}$ variation was highest for BPA having a relative interdecile range of 17.8 and
 250 lowest for phenanthrene, at 1.4. The following sensitivity analysis results allow us to interpret
 251 $DI_{\text{dermal-gas}}$ variation, particularly for compounds having high relative interdecile ranges.

252 2. Sensitivity to model parameters



253 A)

254



255 B)

256

257 **Figure 1:** Relative contribution (%) to total variation of gaseous SVOC daily dermal intakes
 258 ($\mu\text{g}/\text{kg-bw}/\text{d}$) according to key parameters: C_g , C_a , $\log(K_{ow})$, H, γ_d , $f_{\text{om-part}}$, ρ_{part} , and [TSP] for
 259 both situations: A) C_g is measured and B) C_g is estimated from C_a .

260

261 Results of the sensitivity analysis are presented in Figure 1 as tornado charts, showing relative
262 contributions to total variation of gas phase SVOC daily dermal intakes ($\mu\text{g}/\text{kg}\text{-bw}/\text{d}$)
263 according to key parameters. Parameters having a relative contribution that is always lower
264 than 5% are not shown in Figure 1, that is, each of the human parameters: W, A and t
265 (situation A and B) and γ_d (only for situation B).

266 The sensitivity analysis of $\text{DI}_{\text{dermal-gas}}$ calculation, when C_g is measured (situation A), reveals
267 that for the studied compounds the most influential parameters are: C_g , H and $\log(K_{ow})$.
268 $\text{DI}_{\text{dermal-gas}}$ estimation is mainly driven by variability in C_g .

269 When C_g is estimated from C_a (situation B), $\text{DI}_{\text{dermal-gas}}$ variation is dominated by variability in
270 C_a , with the exception of HHCB and BDE 154 for which it is mainly driven by uncertainty in
271 $\log(K_{ow})$. For permethrin and BDE 154, uncertainties in $f_{\text{om-part}}$, ρ_{part} and [TSP] are also
272 significant, though less influential in $\text{DI}_{\text{dermal-gas}}$ calculation.

273 For a given age group in both situations, the following parameters make a marginal or null
274 contribution to $\text{DI}_{\text{dermal-gas}}$ variation for all of the studied SVOCs: t, W, A, and γ_d - with the
275 exception of BPA in situation A, for which γ_d makes a significant contribution.

276 3. Variability and uncertainty in C_g and C_a measurements

277 Indoor air SVOCs concentrations can be variable and/or uncertain. Variabilities in indoor air
278 concentrations (C_g and C_a) are high due to several conditions, such as differences in occupant
279 habits, variety of sources, and dwelling characteristics. For example, Clausen et al. (2012)
280 found that indoor temperature has a significant influence on DEHP air concentrations: this
281 increases by a factor of about 10 with an increase of 12°C in indoor temperature.
282 Furthermore, these concentrations may vary considerably from one country to another

283 depending, for example, on national regulations regarding the use of specific SVOCs
284 (Weschler and Nazaroff, 2008). In this sensitivity analysis, C_g and C_a were retrieved from
285 studies (Fromme et al., 2004; Fromme et al., 2009; Rudel et al., 2010 and Blanchard et al.,
286 2014) having measured these concentrations at various indoor temperatures and in different
287 countries. But C_g and C_a are also uncertain, especially when all or most values are below the
288 LOQ. When C_g and C_a values were below the LOQ (permethrin, diazinon, PCB 105, BPA and
289 BDE 154), the applied distribution shape (custom, triangular and uniform) also brings
290 uncertainty to these unknown values. In order to assess the impact of the distribution on C_g
291 and C_a uncertainty, triangular distributions (between 0, LOQ/2 and LOQ) were also tested in
292 place of uniform distributions (data not shown). The same results were found, providing
293 evidence that distribution shape does not influence the relative contribution of C_g and C_a
294 uncertainty in $DI_{\text{dermal-gas}}$ result variation.

295 Moreover, some LOQs used as maxima in uniform distribution regarding C_g (permethrin,
296 BPA and BDE 154) are open to discussion because they are high in comparison with other
297 studies in which fewer compounds were measured at the same time. This uncertainty can lead
298 to discrepancy between the two situations regarding the distribution we used, especially for
299 BDE 154 concentrations in indoor air (see Table 1) where C_g maximum value ($0.6=LOQ$) is
300 larger than C_a maximum (0.01). This unrealistic situation is the only one in our study - but it is
301 important to bear in mind that the objective here is a sensitivity analysis linked to information
302 availability, rather than an exposure assessment.

303 4. Uncertainty in physical-chemical parameter values

304 Physical-chemical parameters can either be measured experimentally or calculated using other
305 chemical properties. Depending on which of these methods is used, it follows that values vary
306 by one order of magnitude or more (Finizio et al., 1997) - and these uncertainties will be

307 propagated in the calculation of k_{p-g} , C_g and $DI_{\text{dermal-gas}}$. On this topic, Weschler and Nazaroff
308 (2008) warned that H , K_{ow} and K_{oa} values, calculated using the SPARC Online Calculator
309 v4.0 (Hilal et al., 2003, 2004), sometimes vary substantially from experimentally derived
310 values. For the same parameters, Schossler et al. (2011) demonstrated that values vary by one
311 order of magnitude or more between the results obtained using software tools such as EPI
312 Suite (US EPA, 2013) or the SPARC Online Calculator v4.6. In this study, $\log(K_{ow})$ and H
313 values were collected from several databases, online calculators and literature sources at
314 25°C, and for each SVOC (see Table 1). The wide intervals obtained for certain compounds -
315 such as H for HHCB - corroborate the relatively high level of uncertainty for these
316 parameters.

317 When assessing gas/particle SVOC distribution (see Equation 8 in the supplementary material
318 for the detailed calculation), Salthammer and Schripp (2015) assumed normal distributions for
319 H and $\log(K_{ow})$. Due to the lack of data (as discussed above) the authors calculated mean and
320 standard deviation, in order to build normal distribution using just two values for certain
321 compounds. In our study, where at least 15 values for these parameters were retrieved from
322 literature, log-normal distributions were fitted - otherwise we used triangular, minimum
323 extreme or logistic distributions (see Table 1). However, in order to assess the impact of
324 distribution, other distributions, such as uniform, were also tested and the same parameters
325 were found to be most sensitive regarding $DI_{\text{dermal-gas}}$ variability, providing evidence that
326 choice of distribution shape does not influence the relative contribution made by H and \log
327 (K_{ow}) in $DI_{\text{dermal-gas}}$ result variation.

328 In each situation (A and B), H and $\log(K_{ow})$ have a significant influence on $DI_{\text{dermal-gas}}$
329 variability, depending on the range of H and $\log(K_{ow})$ values. For example, H values for
330 HHCB range from [7.66E-2 to 13.4], which logically leads to this parameter having a greater
331 influence on $DI_{\text{dermal-gas}}$ variability (see Figure 1). These results are consistent with previous

332 studies: Weschler and Nazaroff (2014) assessed k_{p-g} sensitivity (see Equation 2) to the same
333 key parameters and also found that the permeability coefficient was more sensitive to H. In
334 the same way, Salthammer and Schripp (2015) assessed the sensitivity of K_p (see Equations 8
335 and 9 in the supplementary material for the detailed calculation) and found that the error
336 margin in K_p calculation was dominated by H uncertainty. Because $\log(K_{ow})$ and H are two
337 of the most influential parameters on $DI_{\text{dermal-gas}}$ variation for every SVOC and in both
338 situations, reducing their uncertainties could significantly reduce variation on $DI_{\text{dermal-gas}}$ and
339 uncertainty in exposure analysis.

340 5. Uncertainty in exposure media properties

341 In earlier studies, default values were used for $f_{\text{om-part}}$, ρ_{part} , [TSP] and γ_d . Regarding the
342 volume fraction of organic matter associated with airborne particles, $f_{\text{om-part}}$, we assumed the
343 same normal distribution parameters as Salthammer and Schripp (2015). Regarding particle
344 density, ρ_{part} , several values are found in the literature and 1.10^6 g/m^3 is often assumed, as a
345 default value (Turpin and Lim, 2001). In order to assess $DI_{\text{dermal-gas}}$ sensitivity to this
346 parameter, normal distribution was used rather than a single value (Pitz et al., 2003).
347 Regarding total suspended particle concentration, [TSP], a default value of $20\mu\text{g/m}^3$ was
348 assumed by Weschler and Nazaroff (2008). More recently, Salthammer and Schripp (2015)
349 found that [TSP] strongly influenced gas/particle partitioning, and we decided to build a log-
350 normal distribution for this parameter using data on indoor PM_{10} concentrations (Ramalho et
351 al., 2012). These data are weekly-averaged, and cover different climate zones and seasons.
352 Regarding γ_d , a value of 6m/h is assumed for the coefficient describing the external transport
353 of a gas phase SVOC from bulk indoor air to the boundary layer adjacent to the skin
354 (Weschler and Nazaroff, 2012). The authors have previously estimated this parameter to
355 range between 5 and 10 m/h (Weschler and Nazaroff, 2008). In this study, triangular
356 distribution was built between these three values. This parameter variation's influence on

357 $DI_{\text{dermal-gas}}$ variation was insignificant, with the exception of BPA in situation A (see Figure 1,
358 A). Nevertheless, Weschler and Nazaroff (2008) also proposed an estimate of 3 m/h for the
359 mass-transfer coefficient. In order to provide a comprehensive sensitivity analysis we
360 assessed different distribution shapes: triangular with a minimum of 3, a likeliest value of 6
361 and a maximum of 10 and uniform between 3 and 10. The results (not shown) were identical
362 and γ_d did not become an influential parameter.

363 While exposure media properties such as $f_{\text{om-part}}$, ρ_{part} , [TSP] and γ_d have a slight influence
364 (less than 10%, see Figure 1) for some compounds (permethrin, BPA and BDE 154), they
365 make a marginal or null contribution (less than 5%) to the variance of dermal intake for a
366 given age group, for the other SVOCs and in both situations.

367 6. Variability in human parameters

368 Human parameters such as body weight (W), body surface area (A) and daily exposure (t)
369 make a marginal or null contribution (less than 5%) to the variance of dermal intake for a
370 given age group, for each SVOC and in each situation. However, one has to bear in mind that
371 we ran the model for a given age group and that these parameters would have a larger impact
372 when applied on a more diverse population. Regarding the role of clothing in dermal
373 exposure, Piotrovski (1971) assessed the exposed body surface area (A) and found little
374 difference in dermal absorption between clothed and naked people exposed to phenol vapor.
375 More recently Morrison et al. (2016) assessed the influence of clothing on the dermal uptake
376 of two phthalates (DEP and DnBP). The authors found that clean clothes were protective
377 against air pollutants; whereas worn clothes, because they have adsorbed air pollutants,
378 increased dermal intake. Because only clean clothes could be considered protective, we
379 decided to not take into account the role of clothing in this sensitivity analysis, and to assume
380 total body surface area exposed to indoor air when calculating $DI_{\text{dermal-gas}}$. However, the fact

381 that we found A to make a marginal or null contribution (less than 5%) to the variance of
382 dermal intake, does not mean that clothing should not, when possible, be taken into account in
383 assessing dermal exposure. In this case the proportion of exposed body surface area has to be
384 taken into account.

385 In addition to the important role of clothing, other parameters not included in this model are
386 suspected of influencing or playing a role in dermal exposure were not taken into account in
387 this sensitivity analysis: skin temperature, metabolic processes on (e.g. ionization) or in the
388 skin, the effects of bathing on SVOC levels in skin-surface lipids, etc.

389 Furthermore, it is important to bear in mind that we did not assess model uncertainty - only
390 parametric uncertainty when using this model. A first source of uncertainty is model
391 boundaries. Indeed our model relies partly on equation of Mitragotri (2002) that may lead to
392 greater uncertainty when MW is higher than 400, which is the case for BDE 154. In addition,
393 more sophisticated, and recent, models exist taking into account the dynamics of aerosols
394 and/or the clothing effect. Regarding the dynamics of aerosols, Shi and Zao (2015) showed
395 that, in their model, air exchange rate and surfaces cleaning frequency were influential
396 parameters, while density of settled dust and its organic fraction were important media
397 properties. Also, the transient model proposed by Gong et al. (2014), addresses the rapidly
398 changing conditions and concentrations and considers a convective mass transfer resistance in
399 the boundary air layer adjacent to the skin, and leads to lower estimates of dermal uptake.
400 Morrison et al. (2016) improved this model taking clothing effect modeling, and showed that
401 bathing frequency and change of clothes frequency were influential. Also, the introduction of
402 a skin surface lipid film in the models and its interactions with clothing may affect the results,
403 so do the corresponding additional parameters, such as for instance the thickness of this
404 lipidic film.

405 CONCLUSION

406 When assessing dermal absorption of gas phase SVOCs, variation of dermal intake estimation
407 is driven firstly by variability and uncertainty in indoor air concentration (C_g or C_a), and
408 secondly by uncertainty in SVOC physical-chemical parameters: $\log(K_{ow})$ and H . While
409 exposure media properties such as volume fraction of organic matter in the particle phase (f_{om-}
410 $_{part}$), particle density (ρ_{part}), concentration ([TSP]) and transport coefficient (γ_d) do have a
411 slight influence (less than 10%) for some compounds, human parameters such as body weight
412 (W), body surface area (A) and daily exposure (t) make a marginal or null contribution (less
413 than 5%) to the variance of dermal intake for a given age group.

414 Considering that $DI_{dermal-gas}$ variation can be high for some compounds, exposure assessors
415 aiming to assess SVOC $DI_{dermal-gas}$ using the k_{p-g} , or to estimate C_g from C_a , must pay
416 particular attention to the determination, estimation, and selection of the following SVOC-
417 specific parameters: concentration in gas phase (C_g) or indoor air (C_a), K_{ow} and H .

418 It is however important to remain aware, when analyzing these results, that exposure to an
419 SVOC is strongly dependent on its partition between gas phase and particulate phase. When
420 an SVOC is more abundant in the gas phase, dermal absorption will be greater than dust
421 ingestion, and conversely, when a SVOC is more present in the particulate phase, dust
422 ingestion is likely to be greater than dermal absorption (Weschler and Nazaroff, 2012).
423 Therefore, less volatile SVOCs ($P_s < 10^{-6}$ Pa), which are more present in the particulate phase
424 and have a low predicted dermal absorption, do not require the same caution in estimation of
425 dermal intake in order to assess their total exposure to indoor SVOC.

426 In general, inclusion of an uncertainty analysis in exposure assessment appears to be essential.
427 In view of these sensitivity analysis results, reducing $\log(K_{ow})$ and H uncertainties could
428 significantly reduce uncertainties in $DI_{dermal-gas}$ assessment.

429 **ACKNOWLEDGMENTS**

430 This research did not receive any specific grant from funding agencies in the public,
431 commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

432 **REFERENCES**

433 Armstrong, B. Hutchinson, E. Unwin, J. and Fletcher, T. (2004) Lung cancer risk after
434 exposure to polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons: A review and meta-analysis, *Environ. Health*
435 *Persp.*, 112, 970–978.

436 Baldi, I. Filleul, L. Mohammed-Brahim, B. Fabrigoule, C. Dartigues, J.F. Schwall, S. Drevet,
437 J.P. Salamon, R. and Brochard, P. (2001) Neuropsychologic effects of long-term exposure to
438 pesticides: Results from the French Phytoneer study, *Environ. Health Persp.*, 109, 839–844.

439 Beko, G. Weschler, C.J. Langer, S. Callesen, M. Toftum, J. and Clausen, G. (2013)
440 Children’s Phthalate Intakes and Resultant Cumulative Exposures Estimated from Urine
441 Compared with Estimates from Dust Ingestion, Inhalation and Dermal Absorption in Their
442 Homes and Daycare Centers, *PLoS One* 8(4), e62442.

443 Blanchard, O. Glorennec, P. Mercier, F. Bonvallot, N. Chevrier, C. Ramalho, O. Mandin, C.
444 and Le Bot, B. (2014) Semivolatile Organic Compounds in Indoor Air and Settled Dust in 30
445 French Dwellings, *Environ. Sci. Technol.*, 48, 3959–3969.

446 Blanc-Lapierre, A. Bouvier, G. Garrigou, A. Canal-Raffin, M. Raheison, C. Brochard, P. and
447 Baldi, I. (2012) Chronic central nervous system effects of pesticides : state-of-the-art, *Rev.*
448 *Epidemiol. Sante.*, 60(5), 389–400.

449 Bonvallot, N. Mandin, C. Mercier, F. Le Bot, B. and Glorennec, P. (2010) Health ranking of
450 ingested semivolatile organic compounds in house dust: an application to France, *Indoor Air*,

451 20, 458–472.

452 Clausen, P. A. Liu, Z. Kofoed-Sørensen, V. Little, J. and Wolkoff, P. (2012) Influence of
453 temperature on the emission of di-(2-ethylhexyl) phthalate (DEHP) from PVC flooring in the
454 emission cell FLEC, *Environ. Sci. Technol.*, 46, 2, 909–915.

455 Elbaz, A. Clavel, J. Rathouz, P.J. Moisan, F. Galanaud, J.P. Delemotte, B. Alperovitch, A.
456 and Tzourio, C. (2009) Professional Exposure to Pesticides and Parkinson Disease, *Ann.*
457 *Neurol.*, 66, 494–504.

458 Finizio, A. Mackay, D. Bidleman, T. and Harner, T. (1997) Octanol-air partition coefficient
459 as a predictor of partitioning of semivolatile organic chemicals to aerosols, *Atmos. Environ.*,
460 31, 2289–2296.

461 Fromme, H. Koerner, W. Shahin, N. Wanner, A. Albrecht, M. Boehmer, S. Parlar, H. Mayer,
462 R. Liebl, B. and Bolte, G. (2009) Human exposure to polybrominated diphenyl ethers
463 (PBDE), as evidenced by data from a duplicate diet study, indoor air, house dust, and
464 biomonitoring in Germany, *Environ. Int.*, 35, 1125–1135.

465 Fromme, H. Lahrz, T. Hainsch, A. Oddoy, A. Piloty, M. and Ruden, H. (2005) Elemental
466 carbon and respirable particulate matter in the indoor air of apartments and nursery schools
467 and ambient air in Berlin (Germany), *Indoor Air*, 15, 335–341.

468 Fromme, H. Lahrz, T. Piloty, M. Gebhart, H. Oddoy, A. and Ruden, H. (2004) Occurrence of
469 phthalates and musk fragrances in indoor air and dust from apartments and kindergartens in
470 Berlin (Germany), *Indoor Air*, 14, 188–195.

471 Glorennec, P. Mercier, F. Blanchard, O. Bonvallot, N. Ramalho, O. Mandin, C. and Le Bot,
472 B. (2011) Cumulative indoor exposures to Semivolatile Organic Compounds (SVOCs) in
473 France: the ECOS project, Indoor Air Conference, Austin, Texas, USA. <https://hal.archives->

474 ouvertes.fr/hal-00688091/document

475 Gong, M. Zhang, Y. and Weschler, C.J. (2014) Predicting dermal absorption of gas phase
476 chemicals: transient model development, evaluation, and application, *Indoor Air*, 24, 292–
477 306.

478 Grandjean, P. Bellinger, D. Bergman, A. Cordier, S. Davey-Smith, G. Eskenazi, B. Gee, D.
479 Gray, K. Hanson, M. Van den Hazel, P. Heindel, J.J. Heinzow, B. Hertz-Picciotto, I. Hu, H.
480 Huang, T.T.K. Jensen, T.K. Landrigan, P.J. McMillen, I.C. Murata, K. Ritz, B. Schoeters, G.
481 Skakkebaek, N.E. Skerfving, S. and Weihe, P. (2008) The faroes statement: Human health
482 effects of developmental exposure to chemicals in our environment, *Basic Clin. Pharmacol.*
483 *Toxicol.*, 102, 73–75.

484 IARC (2015a) Polychlorinated biphenyls and polybrominated biphenyls, *IARC Monogr. Eval.*
485 *Carcinog. Risk Chem. Hum.*, Vol. 107, (available online:
486 <http://monographs.iarc.fr/ENG/Monographs/vol107/index.php>).

487 IARC (2015b) Some organophosphate insecticides and herbicides: diazinon, glyphosate,
488 malathion, parathion, and tetrachlorvinphos, *IARC Monogr. Eval. Carcinog. Risk Chem.*
489 *Hum.*, Vol. 112, (available online: [http://](http://monographs.iarc.fr/ENG/Monographs/vol112/index.php)
490 monographs.iarc.fr/ENG/Monographs/vol112/index.php).

491 Mackay, D. Shiu, W.Y. Ma, K.C. and Lee, S.C. (2010a) *Handbook of physical-chemical*
492 *properties and environmental fate for organic chemicals*, Vol. 1, Introduction and
493 hydrocarbons. CRC Press.

494 Mackay, D. Shiu, W.Y. Ma, K.C. and Lee, S.C. (2010b) *Handbook of physical-chemical*
495 *properties and environmental fate for organic chemicals*, Vol. 2, Halogenated hydrocarbons.
496 CRC Press.

497 Mackay, D. Shiu, W.Y. Ma, K.C. and Lee, S.C. (2010c) *Handbook of physical-chemical*
498 *properties and environmental fate for organic chemicals*, Vol. 3, Oxygen containing
499 compounds. CRC Press.

500 Mackay, D. Shiu, W.Y. Ma, K.C. and Lee, S.C. (2010d) *Handbook of physical-chemical*
501 *properties and environmental fate for organic chemicals*, Vol. 4, Nitrogen and sulfur
502 containing compounds and pesticides. CRC Press.

503 Mitragotri, S. (2002) A theoretical analysis of permeation of small hydrophobic solutes across
504 the stratum corneum based on scaled particle theory, *J. Pharm. Sci.*, 91, 744-752.

505 Morawska, L. Afshari, A. Bae, G.N. Buonanno, G. Chao, C.Y.H. Hanninen, O. Hofmann, W.
506 Isaxon, C. Jayaratne, E.R. Pasanen, P. Salthammer, T. Waring, M. and Wierzbicka, A. (2013)
507 Indoor aerosols: from personal exposure to risk assessment, *Indoor Air*, 23, 462–487.

508 Moreau-Guigon, E. and Chevreuil, M. (2014) Human exposure to endocrine disruptors via
509 ambient air: An unknown health risk, *Arch. Mal. Prof. Environ.*, 75, 74–81.

510 Morrison, G. C. Weschler, C. J. and Bekö, G. (2016) Dermal uptake directly from air under
511 transient conditions: advances in modeling and comparisons with experimental results for
512 human subjects, *Indoor air*, 26, 913-924.

513 Morrison, G.C. Weschler, C.J. Bekö, G. Koch, H.M. Salthammer, T. Schripp, T. Toftum, J.
514 and Clausen, G. (2016) Role of clothing in both accelerating and impeding dermal absorption
515 of airborne SVOCs, *J. Expos. Sci. Environ. Epidemiol.*, 26, 113–118.

516 NHANES (2015) Fourth National Report on Human Exposure to Environmental Chemicals.
517 US Department of Health and Human and Service. Updated tables, February 2015. Center for
518 Disease Control and Prevention.

519 Pandrangi, L.S. and Morrison, G.C. (2008) Ozone interactions with human hair: Ozone
520 uptake rates and product formation, *Atmos. Environ.*, 42, 5079–5089.

521 Pankow, J.F. (1998) Further discussion of the octanol/air partition coefficient K_{oa} as a
522 correlating parameter for gas/particle partitioning coefficients, *Atmos. Environ.*, 32, 1493–
523 1497.

524 Piotrowski, J.K. (1971) Evaluation of exposure to phenol: absorption of phenol vapour in the
525 lungs and through the skin and excretion of phenol in urine, *Brit. J. Ind. Med.*, 28, 172–178.

526 Pitz, M. Cyrus, J. Karg, E. Wiedensohler, A. Wichmann, H.E. and Heinrich, J. (2003)
527 Variability of apparent particle density of an urban aerosol, *Environ. Sci. Technol.*, 37(19),
528 4336–4342.

529 Rubin, B.S. (2011) Bisphenol A: An endocrine disruptor with widespread exposure and
530 multiple effects, *J. Steroid Biochem.*, 127, 27–34.

531 Rudel, R. Dodson, R. Perovich, L. Morello-Frosch, R. Camann, D. Zuniga, M. Yau, A. Just,
532 A. and Brody, J. (2010) Semivolatile endocrine-disrupting compounds in paired indoor and
533 outdoor air in two northern California communities, *Environ. Sci. Technol.*, 44, 6583–6590.

534 Rudel, R. Camann, D. Spengler, J. Korn, L. and Brody, J. (2003) Phthalates, alkylphenols,
535 pesticides, polybrominated diphenyl ethers, and other endocrine-disrupting compounds in
536 indoor air and dust, *Environ. Sci. Technol.*, 37(20), 4543-4553.

537 Sabaterie, N. Kairo, C. and Zeghnoun, A. (2013) Body surface area in the French population:
538 A proposed distribution for health risk assessments, *Environ. Risque Sante*, 12, 397–407.

539 Salthammer, T. and Schripp, T. (2015) Application of the Junge- and Pankow-equation for
540 estimating indoor gas/particle distribution and exposure to SVOCs, *Atmos. Environ.*, 106,

541 467–476.

542 Schossler, P. Schripp, T. Salthammer, T. and Bahadir, M. (2011) Beyond phthalates: Gas
543 phase concentrations and modeled gas/particle distribution of modern plasticizers, *Sci. Total*
544 *Environ.*, 409, 4031–4038.

545 Shi, S. and Zhao, B. (2015) Estimating indoor semi-volatile organic compounds (SVOCs)
546 associated with settled dust by an integrated kinetic model accounting for aerosol dynamics,
547 *Atmos. Environ.*, 107, 52-61.

548 Tamas, G. Weschler, C.J. Bako-Biro, Z. Wyon, D.P. and Strom-Tejsen, P. (2006) Factors
549 affecting ozone removal rates in a simulated aircraft cabin environment, *Atmos. Environ.*, 40,
550 6122–6133.

551 Tanguy, J. Zeghnoun, A. and Dor, F. (2007) Description of body weight according to sex and
552 age in the French population, *Environ. Risque Sante*, 6, 179–187.

553 Turpin, B.J. and Lim, H.J. (2001) Species contributions to PM_{2.5} mass concentrations:
554 Revisiting common assumptions for estimating organic mass, *Aerosol Sci. Tech.*, 35, 602–
555 610.

556 US EPA (2013) Estimation Program Interface (EPI) Suite (last updated on 15.3.2013, Version
557 EPI 4.11).

558 Weschler, C.J. Bekö, G. Koch, H.M. Salthammer, T. Schripp, T. Toftum, J. and Clausen, G.
559 (2015) Transdermal Uptake of Diethyl Phthalate and Di (n-butyl) Phthalate Directly from Air:
560 Experimental Verification, *Environ. Health Persp.*, 1–6.

561 Weschler, C.J. and Nazaroff, W.W. (2014) Dermal Uptake of Organic Vapors Commonly
562 Found in Indoor Air, *Environ. Sci. Technol.*, 48, 1230–1237.

563 Weschler, C.J. and Nazaroff, W.W. (2012) SVOC exposure indoors: fresh look at dermal
564 pathways, *Indoor Air*, 22, 356–377.

565 Weschler, C.J. and Nazaroff, W.W. (2010) SVOC partitioning between the gas phase and
566 settled dust indoors, *Atmos. Environ.*, 44, 3609–3620.

567 Weschler, C.J. and Nazaroff, W.W. (2008) Semivolatile organic compounds in indoor
568 environments, *Atmos. Environ.*, 42, 9018–9040.

569 Wilson, N.K. Chuang, J.C. Lyu, C. Menton, R. and Morgan, M.K. (2003) Aggregate
570 exposures of nine preschool children to persistent organic pollutants at day care and at home,
571 *J. Expo. Anal. Environ. Epidemiol.*, 13, 187–202.

572 Zaganas, I. Kapetanaki, S. Mastorodemos, V. Kanavouras, K. Colosio, C. Wilks, M.F. and
573 Tsatsakis, A.M. (2013) Linking pesticide exposure and dementia: What is the evidence?
574 *Toxicology*, 307, 3–11.

575 Zeghnoun, A. and Dor, F. (2010) Description of space-time-budget and exposure assessment
576 of the French population in the home, Report (in French), *Institut de veille sanitaire–*
577 *Observatoire de la qualité de l'air intérieur*, 37 pp. (available online:
578 http://www.oqai.fr/userdata/documents/298_InVS_OQAI_BET_Logements_2010_Internet.pdf).

579