

# Conclusions

## In this guide

### [In this guide](#)

1. [Introduction and Background - Annex A to TOX/2025/32](#)
2. [Toxicology - Annex A to TOX/2025/32](#)
3. [Health based guidance values - Annex A to TOX/2025/32](#)
4. [Exposure Assessment - Annex A to TOX/2025/32](#)
5. [Risk characterisation - Annex A to TOX/2025/32](#)
6. [Uncertainties - Annex A to TOX/2025/32](#)
7. [Conclusions - Annex A to TOX/2025/32](#)
8. [List of Abbreviations and Technical Terms - Annex A to TOX/2025/32](#)
9. [References - Annex A to TOX/2025/32](#)

**This is a paper for discussion. This does not represent the views of the Committee and should not be cited.**

59. Based on the data available the COT concluded that a HBGV could not be established and agreed with EFSA's approach, using a level of no concern of 0.2 µg/kg bw per day for nephrotoxicity. The COT further considered this level to be adequately protective for maternal, reproductive and developmental effects. The RIVM set a BMDL of 48 µg/kg bw per day as a POD for reproductive effects, which is higher than the level of no concern for nephrotoxicity, adding further confidence.

60. Estimated exposures for CIT were 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 confirming that dietary exposure to CIT was low and hence supporting the conclusion that levels of CIT in the diet were not of concern to UK consumers.

61. However, due to the limitations in the database a genotoxic and/or carcinogenic risk cannot be excluded. There is a need for further research to explore the potential genotoxic and carcinogenic effects of CIT.

**COT Secretariat**

**September 2025**