

# Conclusion

## In this guide

### [In this guide](#)

1. [Introduction - TOX/2025/16 Annex A](#)
2. [Toxicity - TOX/2025/16 Annex A](#)
3. [Health based guidance value - TOX/2025/16 Annex A](#)
4. [Publications since the EFSA 2012 opinion - TOX/2025/16 Annex A](#)
5. [Epidemiological studies - TOX/2025/16 Annex A](#)
6. [Exposure Assessment - TOX/2025/16 Annex A](#)
7. [Risk characterisation - TOX/2025/16 Annex A](#)
8. [Conclusion - TOX/2025/16 Annex A](#)
9. [List of Abbreviations and Technical Terms -TOX/2025/16 Annex A](#)
10. [References - TOX/2025/16 Annex A](#)

53. Based on the data available the COT concluded that a HBGV could not be set and agreed with the continued use of EFSA's previous approach, using a level of no concern for nephrotoxicity. The COT also considered this level to be adequately protective for maternal, reproductive and developmental effects. However, due to the limitations in the database a risk of genotoxicity and carcinogenicity cannot be excluded.

54. Estimated exposures are not of toxicological concern for nephrotoxicity and reproductive and developmental effects. In addition, CIT was not detected above the LOQ in any of the food groups further supporting that exposure to CIT is low and not of concern to UK consumers.

**COT Secretariat**

**October 2024**