

1 **TITLE: A pilot biomonitoring study of cumulative phthalates exposure among Vietnamese**
2 **American nail salon workers**

3 Julia R. VARSHAVSKY, PhD^{1,2*,i}, Rachel MORELLO-FROSCH, PhD^{1,3}, Suhash HARWANI,
4 PhD⁴, Mr. Martin SNIDER, MS⁴, Syrago-Styliani E. PETROPOULOU, PhD⁴, June-Soo PARK,
5 PhD⁴, Myrto PETREAS, PhD⁴, Peggy REYNOLDS, PhD^{5,6}, Mr. Tuan NGUYEN, CIH, MBA⁷,
6 Thu QUACH, PhD^{5,6}

7
8 ¹ University of California, Berkeley, School of Public Health, Berkeley, CA, USA

9 ² University of California, San Francisco, Program on Reproductive Health and the
10 Environment, San Francisco, CA, USA

11 ³ University of California, Berkeley, Department of Environmental Science, Policy and
12 Management, Berkeley, CA, USA

13 ⁴ Environmental Chemistry Laboratory, California Department of Toxic Substances Control,
14 Berkeley, CA, USA

15 ⁵ Cancer Prevention Institute of California, Berkeley, CA, USA

16 ⁶ Department of Health Research and Policy, Stanford University School of Medicine, Palo Alto,
17 CA, USA

18 ⁷ State Compensation Insurance Fund, Safety and Health Services, Santa Ana, CA, USA
19

20 **Disclosure Statement:** The author(s) report no conflict of interest.
21

22 **Financial Support:** This work was supported by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
23 (FP-91750801-1 and RD-83543301), the National Science Foundation Systems Approach to
24 Green Energy (1144885), and the National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences (P01-
25 ES022841 and 1R56ES019598-01). These funding sources had no involvement in the conduct of
26 the research or preparation of this article.
27

28 *Corresponding Author:

29 Julia Varshavsky, PhD, MPH

30 Postdoctoral Scholar

31 University of California, Berkeley, School of Public Health

32 University of California, San Francisco, Program on Reproductive Health and the Environmentⁱ

33 130 Mulford Hall #3114

34 Berkeley, California 94720

35 Emails: juliav@berkeley.edu / julia.varshavsky@ucsf.edu

36 Phone: 510-384-0169 (cell) / Fax: 510-643-6358
37

38 ⁱ Present address: Program on Reproductive Health and the Environment, University of
39 California, San Francisco, Mailstop 0132, 550 16th Street, 7th Floor, San Francisco, CA 94143.

40 Email: julia.varshavsky@ucsf.edu. Phone: 510-384-0169 (cell).

41 **Abstract**

42 *Background:* Many California nail salon workers are low-income Vietnamese women of
43 reproductive age who use nail products daily that contain androgen-disrupting phthalates which
44 may increase risk of male reproductive tract abnormalities during pregnancy. Yet, few studies
45 have characterized phthalate exposures among this workforce. *Objective:* To characterize
46 individual metabolites and cumulative phthalates exposure among a potentially vulnerable
47 occupational group of nail salon workers. *Study Design:* We collected 17 post-shift urine
48 samples from Vietnamese workers at six San Francisco Bay Area nail salons in 2011, which
49 were analyzed for four primary phthalate metabolites: mono-*n*-butyl-, mono-isobutyl-, mono(2-
50 ethylhexyl)-, and monoethyl phthalates (MnBP, MiBP, MEHP, and MEP, respectively) ($\mu\text{g/L}$).
51 Phthalate metabolite concentrations and a potency-weighted sum of parent compound daily
52 intake (Σ androgen-disruptor, $\mu\text{g/kg/day}$) were compared to 203 Asian Americans from the 2011–
53 12 National Health and Nutritional Examination Survey (NHANES) using Student's t-test and
54 Wilcoxin signed rank test. *Results:* Creatinine-corrected MnBP, MiBP, MEHP ($\mu\text{g/g}$), and
55 cumulative phthalates exposure (Σ androgen-disruptor, $\mu\text{g/kg/day}$) levels were 2.9 ($p < 0.0001$),
56 1.6 ($p = 0.015$), 2.6 ($p < 0.0001$), and 2.0 ($p < 0.0001$) times higher, respectively, in our nail
57 salon worker population compared to NHANES Asian Americans. Levels exceeded the
58 NHANES 95th or 75th percentiles among some workers. *Conclusion:* This pilot study suggests
59 that nail salon workers are disproportionately exposed to multiple phthalates, a finding that
60 warrants further investigation to assess their potential health significance.

61 **Keywords**

62 endocrine disrupting chemicals; exposure disparities; nail polish; occupational health;
63 reproductive health; personal care products

64 **Introduction**

65 Recent statements by the American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists (ACOG) and
66 other leading medical societies have called for timely action on reducing chemical exposures that
67 contribute to developmental harm and reproductive health inequities among underserved
68 populations.^{1,2} As suggested in a commentary on the environmental injustice of the beauty care
69 industry, eliminating harmful compounds in personal care products may provide opportunities
70 for achieving this goal.³ Indeed, many beauty industry workers are low wage immigrant women
71 of reproductive age, a population highlighted by ACOG as uniquely vulnerable due to their
72 disproportionate environmental exposures and social stressors at and outside of work.¹

73 The U.S. nail care industry has expanded rapidly over the last few decades, with active
74 nail technician licenses totaling over 400,000 in 2015⁴ and recent nationwide spending up to \$8.5
75 billion and \$768 million on nail care services and nail polish alone.⁵ Just over half of U.S. nail
76 salon workers are Vietnamese, most of whom are women of reproductive age.^{4,6,7} California has
77 the largest number of manicurists and salons in the country,^{4,7} in part due to a rise in Vietnamese
78 immigration between 1987 and 2002, which increased the proportion of Vietnamese nail salon
79 workers from 10% to 60%.^{8,9}

80 Because many nail salon workers are low income women of color with limited English
81 proficiency and access to chemical health and safety information, the California Healthy Nail
82 Salon Collaborative and National Healthy Nail Salon Alliance formed in recent years to
83 safeguard occupational health while maintaining economic integrity among this workforce.¹⁰⁻¹³
84 Diverse coalition members include workers, owners, researchers, advocates, and government
85 agency officials who contribute to local and national initiatives on chemical exposure research,
86 worker health and safety trainings, green salon certification programs, and efforts to increase

87 cosmetic product labeling requirements.^{13,14} As part of this effort, California’s Department of
88 Toxic Substances and Control (DTSC) revealed the presence of dibutyl phthalate (DBP), toluene,
89 and formaldehyde in nail care products claiming to be free of “toxic trio” ingredients, and has
90 since proposed nail salon products as a target category for alternatives assessment in the coming
91 years.^{15–17} Characterizing occupational exposures among this workforce can thus inform
92 practical workplace intervention strategies and upstream efforts to promote safer products.

93 Phthalates are priority chemicals of concern because they are reproductive toxicants
94 commonly used in nail care products and other cosmetics, for example, to increase flexibility and
95 prevent nail polish from chipping or to sustain fragrances in scented lotions.^{17,18} They are anti-
96 androgenic compounds associated with multiple hormone mediated health impacts across the life
97 course, including pregnancy complications, neurodevelopmental effects, cancer, and metabolic
98 disease.^{19–22} Moreover, in a groundbreaking 2008 report entitled, *Phthalates and Cumulative*
99 *Risk Assessment: The Tasks Ahead*, the National Academy of Sciences (NAS) recommended
100 evaluating phthalates in combination because their joint effects may increase risk of impaired
101 male reproductive tract development during pregnancy.²³

102 Although two prior studies measured phthalate levels among U.S. nail salon workers,
103 they were not designed to characterize exposures among Vietnamese or Asian workers
104 specifically.^{24,25} Study populations were either predominantly white (40% Asian)²⁵ or did not
105 distinguish racial/ethnic differences (*i.e.*, country of origin) among Asian study participants.²⁴
106 Additionally, worker levels were compared to the entire general population rather than a
107 nationally representative sample of Asian Americans. Accordingly, the goals of this pilot
108 biomonitoring study are to build on prior research and for the first time characterize phthalate
109 exposures in an exclusive sample of Vietnamese nail salon workers compared to Asian

110 Americans in the general population during an overlapping time period. Our study is also the
111 first to characterize potency-weighted cumulative phthalates exposure (as recommended in the
112 2008 NAS report) among a uniquely exposed and potentially vulnerable workforce to
113 reproductive toxicants.²³

114

115 **Materials and Methods**

116 *Study population and sample collection*

117 Our study population comprised a subset of participants sampled in a 2011 pilot intervention
118 study designed to educate nail salon workers and owners about how to reduce occupational
119 exposures to various hazardous chemicals.²⁶ That study included 26 Vietnamese American
120 workers at eight San Francisco Bay Area nail salons and measured each worker's personal
121 breathing zone air for volatile organic compounds such as toluene and methyl methacrylate.
122 During air monitoring sessions, each participant completed questionnaires on characteristics such
123 as age, the number of other workers and customers on the day of sampling, types of nail care
124 services performed, and individual protective behaviors. Prior to educating workers about how to
125 reduce their exposures, post-shift urine samples were collected from 17 of these workers at six
126 nail salons during busier days of the week (Thursday, Friday, and Saturday) and warmer months
127 of the year (June and July). Written consent was obtained in Vietnamese, and human subjects
128 institutional review and approval from the Cancer Prevention Institute of California was received
129 on May 11, 2011 (Protocol # 2010-013). Urine samples were collected in four-ounce glass
130 containers, shipped on ice, and stored at -20 °C prior to analysis. To reduce potential effects of
131 freeze-thaw cycles, samples were thawed and aliquoted (2–4 mL) in pre-cleaned amber vials.
132 Water laboratory blanks were also prepared in the same type vials and frozen.

133 *Laboratory analysis*

134 All urinary phthalate analyses were conducted at the Department of Toxic Substances Control
135 (DTSC) in Berkeley, California. We measured four phthalate metabolites in this pilot study
136 because our modest pilot study budget warranted a targeted approach to analyte selection, and
137 our collaborators at DTSC sought to develop methods to measure urinary analytes for priority
138 chemicals that would inform DTSC's Safer Consumer Products program. We selected analytes
139 based on earlier studies which suggested that mono-*n*-butyl-, mono-isobutyl-, mono(2-
140 ethylhexyl)-, and monoethyl phthalates (MnBP, MiBP, MEHP, and MEP, respectively) may be
141 associated with working in a nail salon.^{24,25} To analyze urine samples in the lab, we adapted and
142 validated the Silva *et al.* (2004) method used by the Centers for Disease Control (CDC) to
143 measure urinary MnBP, MiBP, MEHP, and MEP concentrations using liquid chromatography-
144 tandem mass spectrometry (LC-MS/MS).²⁷ Isotopically-labeled internal standards (IS) were used
145 for quantitation (MnBP IS was used for MiBP) and Agilent Nexus ABS Bond Elut cartridges for
146 solid-phase extraction (SPE) clean-up. Samples were analyzed using a Varian 320MS LC-
147 MS/MS with a Phenomenex Gemini C6-Phenyl column (100mm x 2.00mm, 3 μ m). Baseline
148 peak resolution was achieved for all metabolites, and no significant laboratory background was
149 detected. Relative recoveries of quality control standards spiked into the urine before SPE ranged
150 between 80–95%. Inter- and intra-day reproducibility and precision (coefficient of variation <
151 15%) were demonstrated in addition to accuracy (< 15% difference between expected and
152 observed concentrations). The limit of detection (LOD) was defined as the lowest calibration
153 standard providing a signal-to-noise ratio > 6. Once the method was validated, all 17 nail salon
154 worker urine samples were analyzed and aliquots were submitted to the clinical laboratory at San
155 Francisco General Hospital for creatinine measurements.

156 *Statistical analysis*

157 Nail salon worker data were compared to 2011–12 CDC-administered National Health and
158 Nutritional Examination Survey (NHANES), a nationally representative questionnaire and
159 physical survey of the U.S. civilian, non-institutionalized population. As part of the NHANES
160 medical examination, spot urine samples are collected and shipped on dry ice to CDC’s National
161 Center for Environmental Health for analysis.²⁸ Demographic and laboratory files were
162 downloaded from the NHANES website in May 2015 (<http://www.cdc.gov/nchs/nhanes.htm>).
163 Out of 9756 NHANES participants, 2489 were sampled for >10 urinary phthalate metabolites,
164 quantified using high performance liquid chromatography coupled with tandem mass
165 spectrometry (HPLC-MS/MS).²⁹ Primary comparison populations were restricted to pooled (men
166 and women) and female-only NHANES Asian Americans 20–59 years old ($n = 203$ and $n = 97$,
167 respectively). A secondary comparison population included all NHANES participants aged 20–
168 59 years ($N = 1175$).

169 The nail salon urine sample and NHANES data were analyzed using SAS software,
170 Version 9.4 (SAS Institute Inc., Cary, NC, USA). Phthalate metabolite concentrations below the
171 LOD were imputed with LOD divided by $\sqrt{2}$. To correct for urine dilution, metabolite
172 concentration ($\mu\text{g/L}$) was divided by urinary creatinine concentration (g/L), which is often used
173 as a surrogate for urine dilution.^{30,31} A potency weighted cumulative sum of phthalates daily
174 intake (Σ androgen-disruptor, $\mu\text{g/kg/day}$) was constructed as described elsewhere.^{32,33} Briefly,
175 daily intakes of DnBP, DiBP, DEHP, and DEP were weighted by relative potency factors and
176 summed using the following equation: Σ androgen-disruptor = (DnBP x 1.0) + (DiBP x 0.24) +
177 (DEHP x 0.61) + (DEP x 0.024). Daily intake for each phthalate was back-calculated from
178 creatinine-corrected urinary metabolite concentrations ($\mu\text{g/g}$) using creatinine excretion rates and

179 fractional excretion values of metabolites relative to parent compounds. Because MEHP was the
180 only DEHP metabolite included in this analysis, an F_{UE} value of 0.062 was used for DEHP
181 estimation.³⁴ Average creatinine excretion rates of 23 mg/kg/day and 18 mg/kg/day were applied
182 to men and women, respectively.³⁵ Concentrations of Σ androgen-disruptor and urinary
183 metabolites were log-transformed prior to statistical testing to account for non-normal
184 distributions, and statistical and marginal significance were defined at $p < 0.05$ and $p < 0.10$ for
185 two-sided tests, respectively.

186 Descriptive statistics were calculated for worker and salon characteristics, such as
187 average hours worked per week, number of services performed on the day of sampling, and salon
188 volume in cubic meters of air (m^3). We calculated detection frequencies (% > LOD) of measured
189 urinary metabolites and performed univariate statistics on creatinine-corrected concentrations,
190 non-creatinine-corrected concentrations, and our cumulative exposure metric (Σ androgen-
191 disruptor). Univariate statistics included the arithmetic mean, geometric mean (GM), geometric
192 standard deviation (GSD) or geometric standard error (GSE), range, and 25th, 50th, 75th, and 95th
193 percentiles, and were calculated for all 17 nail salon workers and female-only workers ($n = 15$).
194 These were also calculated for NHANES comparison populations, accounting for sample
195 population weights and the complex NHANES survey design according to analytical
196 guidelines.²⁸

197 Phthalate concentrations were compared between nail salon workers and NHANES
198 2011–12 participants using a parametric t-test for MnBP, MEHP, MEP, and the cumulative
199 exposure metric (Σ androgen-disruptor). For statistical hypothesis testing, NHANES values were
200 assumed to be the true population values. The Wilcoxon signed rank non-parametric t-test was
201 used for the MiBP comparison, since several MiBP outliers were observed among nail salon

202 workers. This analysis was performed separately for pooled (men and women) and female-only
203 Asian Americans aged 20–59 years old, in addition to all race/ethnicities of the same age range.

204 Because urine dilution correction and daily intake estimation may both introduce
205 uncertainty and variability into back-calculated biological exposure metrics,^{30,31,36,37} we
206 conducted a supplementary analysis to evaluate whether alternate approaches impacted results.
207 Two additional cumulative exposure metrics were calculated by first applying RPF weights
208 directly to non-creatinine-corrected concentrations measured in urine ($\mu\text{g/L}$), and then by
209 applying RPF weights to creatinine-corrected urinary metabolite concentrations ($\mu\text{g/g}$).³²
210 Compared to the original metric (Σ androgen-disruptor), which both corrected for urine dilution
211 and estimated daily intake, the first supplementary metric provided a comparison to an absence
212 of both potential sources of uncertainty/variability, while the second provided a comparison to
213 the absence of daily intake estimation only.

214 To facilitate interpretation of results, we additionally compiled a summary of urinary
215 phthalate metabolite concentrations measured in relevant biomonitoring and health impact
216 studies. These included two previous biomonitoring studies that reported creatinine-corrected
217 values, one that collected 25 post-shift urine samples from predominantly Asian nail salon
218 workers in Maryland, USA,²⁴ and another that collected 30 urine samples exclusively from the
219 general population in Vietnam.³⁸ One other known study measured urinary MnBP and MiBP in
220 U.S. nail salon workers, but the study population was predominantly white and specific gravity-
221 corrected concentrations were the only values reported, which limited comparability with our
222 results.²⁵ Lastly, we included five epidemiology studies that reported significant associations
223 between non-corrected concentrations of urinary metabolites measured in this study and adverse

224 male developmental outcomes,^{39–43} excluding studies that reported specific-gravity corrected
225 values only, as they were not directly comparable.

226
227 **Results**

228 All 17 nail salon workers were born in Vietnam and most preferred to speak Vietnamese at home
229 (**Table 1**). The average age of the study population was 40 years. There was a wide range of
230 hours worked per week at the salon (10 to 60 hours), with a mean of 34.5 hours per week, and
231 number of services performed on the day of sampling (1 to 17 services), with an average of 8
232 services. The average number of other workers in the salon on the day of sampling was 4 and
233 ranged from 2 to 8. The estimated number of total salon customers on the day of sampling was
234 around 22, with a range between 7 and 40. Most workers reported using gloves and a metal trash
235 bin. The most popular ventilation practice was leaving the doors of the salon open.

236 Detection frequencies for urinary phthalate metabolites were similar or higher in nail
237 salon workers (93–100%) compared to NHANES Asian Americans (80–100%) (**Tables 2 and 3**).
238 In all workers ($n = 17$), MEP had the highest creatinine-corrected GM of 38 $\mu\text{g/g}$ (GSD = 3.3,
239 range = 8.1–497 $\mu\text{g/g}$), followed by 23 $\mu\text{g/g}$ for MnBP (1.7, 9.9–61 $\mu\text{g/g}$), 13 for MiBP (2.3, 3.6–
240 121 $\mu\text{g/g}$), and 5.9 for MEHP (1.8, 2.2–16 $\mu\text{g/g}$) (**Table 2**). The same rank order was observed
241 among female-only workers and NHANES Asian Americans (pooled and female participants)
242 (**Tables 2 and 3**), as well as for non-creatinine-corrected values (**Table 4**).

243 Creatinine-corrected phthalate metabolite concentrations were higher among nail salon
244 workers compared to NHANES Asian Americans, and some of the differences were statistically
245 significant (**Table 2**). MnBP, MiBP, MEHP, and MEP were 186% ($p < 0.0001$), 66% ($p =$
246 0.015), 158% ($p < 0.0001$), and 25% ($p = 0.445$) higher, respectively. For some nail salon
247 workers, creatinine-corrected metabolite concentrations exceeded the NHANES 95th percentile

248 in adult Asian Americans. The highest worker concentrations were 44%, 293%, 20%, and 40%
249 above the NHANES 95th percentile for MnBP, MiBP, MEHP, and MEP, respectively.
250 Additionally, two nail salon workers had more than one urinary metabolite concentration greater
251 than the NHANES 95th percentile (**Table 2**). Female nail salon workers had similar but
252 attenuated results, with 132% ($p < 0.0001$), 46% ($p = 0.041$), 120% ($p = 0.0002$), and 27% ($p =$
253 0.455) higher MnBP, MiBP, MEHP, and MEP concentrations, respectively, compared to
254 NHANES Asian American females (**Table 3**).

255 Non-creatinine-corrected results for pooled (men and women) and female participants
256 were also similar and/or slightly attenuated, though MiBP was not significantly higher in pooled
257 nail care workers compared to NHANES Asian Americans, and only marginally significant
258 when the analysis was restricted to female participants (**Table 4**). Because urinary concentrations
259 among all NHANES race/ethnicities ($N = 1175$) were lower than those measured in NHANES
260 Asian Americans for each phthalate metabolite except MEP, this study population was not
261 included in further analyses.

262 Among pooled study populations (men and women), the GM of cumulative phthalates
263 daily intake (Σ androgen-disruptor) was 97% higher in nail salon workers (GM = 2.6; GSD = 1.7
264 $\mu\text{g}/\text{kg}/\text{day}$) compared to NHANES (GM = 1.3; GSE = 1.1 $\mu\text{g}/\text{kg}/\text{day}$) ($p < 0.0001$) (**Figure 1**).
265 Among women, the percent difference between workers and NHANES Asian Americans was
266 81% ($p = 0.0004$). However, the maximum NHANES cumulative exposure of 39 $\mu\text{g}/\text{kg}/\text{day}$ was
267 over five times greater than the maximum nail salon worker cumulative exposure of 6.7
268 $\mu\text{g}/\text{kg}/\text{day}$. The Σ androgen-disruptor distributions for pooled and female-only NHANES Asian
269 Americans were very similar, except for at the upper tail end of the distribution, where most
270 extreme cumulative exposure concentrations belonged to women. Thus, the NHANES 95th

271 percentile for women (8.5 $\mu\text{g}/\text{kg}/\text{day}$) was substantially higher than the pooled NHANES 95th
272 percentile (5.2 $\mu\text{g}/\text{kg}/\text{day}$). None of the nail salon workers exceeded the female-only NHANES
273 95th percentile, but two nail salon workers (both women) exceeded the pooled NHANES 95th
274 percentile. Twelve workers (70%), including both men, were above the NHANES 75th percentile
275 for female-only and pooled Asian Americans (**Figure 1**).

276 The supplementary analysis exploring alternate cumulative exposure metrics (*i.e.*,
277 alternate approaches to urine dilution correction and daily intake estimation) produced similar
278 results between supplementary cumulative exposure metrics and our original cumulative
279 exposure metric (Σ androgen-disruptor). This indicates that differences in cumulative phthalates
280 exposure between nail salon workers and the Asian American general population did not depend
281 on whether or not urine dilution corrections or parent compound back-calculations were applied
282 to phthalate metabolite concentrations measured in urine. We thus reported results solely for the
283 original cumulative phthalates exposure metric (Σ androgen-disruptor).

284 All creatinine-corrected urinary phthalate metabolite concentrations measured among nail
285 salon workers in this study were similar to or higher than concentrations reported in a previous
286 biomonitoring study of the general population in Vietnam (**Table 5**).³⁸ However, lower
287 creatinine-corrected urinary concentrations were observed in this study compared to nail salon
288 workers sampled in 2003–4, except for MiBP which was twice as high in our nail salon worker
289 population.²⁴ Besides MEP, non-creatinine corrected metabolite concentrations in this study were
290 similar to or higher than those measured in epidemiology studies that reported a significant
291 association with adverse male developmental endpoints, such as decreased anogenital distance
292 (AGD), reductions in penile length, and reduced masculine play among boys (**Table 6**).^{39–42}

293

294 **Comment**

295 This pilot study of 17 nail salon workers provides evidence of elevated individual
296 metabolite and cumulative phthalates exposure in comparison to a national sample of the U.S.
297 Asian American population. Specifically, nail salon workers had significantly higher levels of
298 MnBP, MiBP, and MEHP, as well as higher levels of exposure to multiple phthalates that were
299 combined in a summary metric based on their relative toxicities (Σ androgen-disruptor). To our
300 knowledge, this is the first biomonitoring assessment of phthalates in an exclusive sample of
301 Vietnamese nail salon workers in California, who comprise a uniquely vulnerable occupational
302 group. This pilot study suggests that nail salon workers are exposed to higher levels of
303 biologically relevant phthalate combinations than the general population.

304 Individual metabolite concentrations exceeded the NHANES 95th percentile in several
305 nail salon workers, and for more than one metabolite in two participants, indicating that some
306 workers may be simultaneously exposed to phthalate combinations at very high levels relative to
307 the general Asian American population. Most nail salon workers had higher cumulative
308 phthalates daily intake than the NHANES 75th but not 95th percentiles. However, the NHANES
309 Asian American comparison population conceivably might include Vietnamese nail salon
310 workers, which could have skewed the distribution (and 95th percentile) towards the upper end of
311 extreme values. Due to existing evidence that combined phthalate exposures may have greater
312 adverse health effects than individual phthalate exposures, future studies in a larger sample of
313 nail salon workers could examine whether these pilot findings can be replicated.^{23,44-46}

314 While this analysis did not assess direct connections between phthalates and health
315 impacts, MnBP, MiBP, and MEHP concentrations were similar to or above those measured in
316 studies reporting adverse developmental endpoints in male offspring.^{39-42,44} For example, in a

317 large prospective cohort study across four major U.S. cities ($N = 753$) that found a significant
318 association between MEHP and reduced anogenital distance among baby boys, Swan *et al.*
319 (2015) reported a non-creatinine corrected GM of 1.9 ng/mL (95% CI: 1.8, 2.1), which was >1.5
320 times lower than the GM of 3.5 ng/mL (95% CI: 2.4, 5.3) observed among female nail salon
321 workers in this study.⁴⁰ These exposure levels are of potential concern for women in the nail
322 salon workforce who are of reproductive age and may become pregnant.

323 MnBP, MEHP, and MEP concentrations measured in this study were lower than those
324 collected seven years prior, reflecting U.S. biomonitoring trends for these metabolites between
325 2001 and 2012.²⁴ Similarly, MiBP concentrations were two times higher in the current nail salon
326 worker population, which is consistent with a reported >100% increase in urinary MiBP levels
327 over the last decade.⁴⁷ These temporal changes may reflect product reformulations in response to
328 increased phthalates scrutiny and consumer preferences for safer alternatives over the last
329 decade.⁴⁷⁻⁴⁹ Due to the U.S. Food and Drug Administration's (FDA) limited oversight over
330 cosmetic ingredients, large public campaigns in recent years have pressured beauty companies,
331 such as OPI, Sally Hansen, and Revlon, to remove phthalates from nail polish and other personal
332 care products.⁵⁰ Subsequent data suggest that DiBP may be replacing the better-known DnBP,
333 which has long been used as a hardener in nail polish to preserve shape and color.^{47,48,51-53}
334 However, DnBP is still detected in many nail care products, including those claiming to be
335 phthalate free,^{15,17} and both compounds contribute to androgen-mediated risks associated with
336 phthalate co-exposures.^{23,54} Continued product testing and biomonitoring research will be
337 required to evaluate these trends going forward.

338 While absolute levels have changed over time, the difference between nail salon workers
339 and the general population remained relatively constant between the previous study (which

340 compared samples collected from workers in 2003–4 to NHANES 2001–2)²⁴ and our study
341 (which compared samples collected from workers in 2011 to NHANES 2011–12). Both studies
342 found higher MnBP and MiBP concentrations among nail salon workers, which is consistent
343 with common use of their parent compounds in nail and other beauty products.^{25,47} MEP levels
344 were substantially but not significantly higher among nail salon workers in both studies.
345 Although typically associated with personal care product use in non-occupational
346 populations,^{18,19,25,55} MEP exposures at the nail salon may be negligible relative to high
347 background concentrations measured in the general population. Indeed, MEP levels were the
348 highest observed in our study as well as previous studies assessing this compound in the U.S.
349 population.^{32,47}

350 Our MEHP results are also consistent with prior research which found the highest MEHP
351 concentrations among nail salon workers,²⁴ despite DEHP's prevalent association with dietary
352 intake from food packaging and processing equipment, rather than from cosmetic or beauty
353 product use.⁴⁴ Levels were nearly five times that of U.S. adults and higher than every other
354 occupational group evaluated (including phthalate and PVC manufacturing workers).²⁴ Oxidative
355 (secondary) metabolites of DEHP were not significantly elevated in nail salon workers, which
356 suggested the possibility of an unknown DEHP source that may be unique to nail salons. We
357 speculate that acrylic nail powder may be a possible unique MEHP exposure source in this
358 workforce, as it contains a catalyst that metabolizes to benzoic acid.^{56,57} Given that MEHP is an
359 ester derivative of benzoic acid, acrylic nail powder may conceivably be a direct source of
360 MEHP exposure in nail salons, which would explain why higher primary but not secondary
361 metabolites (which can only be formed in the liver) were observed previously. However, a major
362 limitation of our study is that we did not measure oxidative metabolites for DEHP, which

363 constitute a larger fraction of absorbed parent compound dose than MEHP. Consequently,
364 measuring MEHP alone might underestimate DEHP daily intake. Additionally, oxidative
365 metabolites are less sensitive than primary monoesters to laboratory contamination because they
366 are formed solely from phthalate metabolism in the liver.⁵⁸ Future biomonitoring studies that
367 evaluate DEHP should include at least one oxidized metabolite.

368 Other study limitations should be addressed in future work. First, our sample size was too
369 small to predict phthalate metabolite and cumulative exposure concentrations from questionnaire
370 data on worker and salon characteristics, thus limiting statistical power to identify specific
371 occupational sources of phthalates exposure. Forthcoming research on nail salon exposures
372 should also include the collection of pre-shift urine samples in addition to air samples collected
373 during the shift, which would help differentiate between occupational and non-occupational
374 (environmental) exposures. The addition of pre-shift urine samples may be the best way to assess
375 phthalate exposures in nail salon workers, given the short metabolic half-lives of phthalates (less
376 than 24 hours).²⁶ Including questionnaire data about non-occupational exposure sources, such as
377 at-home personal care product use and dietary behaviors, would also facilitate delineation
378 between occupational and environmental exposures. Additionally, while prior research has
379 demonstrated moderate long-term reliability of urine spot samples in adults for some
380 metabolites, including MEP and MnBP, studies evaluating reproducibility in other populations
381 are somewhat equivocal.⁵⁹⁻⁶¹ Furthermore, intra-person variability may be higher in the
382 workplace due to short-term exposure spikes from specific job tasks.²⁶ Longitudinal data
383 collection could help resolve this issue in future studies.

384 Lastly, although nail salon workers in this study were compared to NHANES Asian
385 Americans of the same age range sampled within a year of workers in this study, some non-

386 occupational differences between the groups could potentially explain exposure disparities. For
387 example, workers in this study were Vietnamese-born, while the NHANES Asian American
388 population may include second or third generation immigrants. Vietnamese immigrants might
389 use different personal care products or eat different foods than those born in the United States,
390 which could result in observed exposure disparities between workers and the NHANES sample
391 that are not occupationally based. However, Guo *et al.* (2011) biomonitored 30 people in
392 Vietnam and reported equal or lower creatinine-corrected phthalate metabolite levels than
393 workers in this study,³⁸ suggesting our findings are not likely to be due to cultural differences in
394 personal care product use or diet originating from the country of origin. Other differences
395 between the groups, such as location, sampling strategy (convenience rather than multistage
396 probability), data collection time of day (post-shift compared to random), and month or season of
397 sampling (summer rather than throughout the year), might also partially explain exposure
398 differences.

399 Despite limitations, findings from this pilot study suggest that nail salon workers are
400 disproportionately exposed to multiple phthalates daily at levels associated with adverse effects
401 on reproductive health and development. Comparing Vietnamese nail salon workers to a national
402 sample of Asian Americans provides useful insight and supportive evidence that higher
403 concentrations of individual metabolites and potency weighted cumulative phthalates levels may
404 be due to workplace exposures. Further research should more broadly characterize phthalate
405 exposures and their health implications in this workforce. Continued efforts should be made to
406 identify workplace practices that minimize exposure (*i.e.*, ventilation and glove use) as well as
407 upstream opportunities for promoting safer alternatives.

408 **Acknowledgements**

409 We would like to thank the nail salon workers and owners who participated in this study.

410 **References**

- 411 1. American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists (ACOG). Committee opinion no.
412 575: Exposure to toxic environmental agents. *Obstet Gynecol.* 2013;122:931-934.
- 413 2. Di Renzo GC, Conry JA, Blake J, et al. International Federation of Gynecology and
414 Obstetrics opinion on reproductive health impacts of exposure to toxic environmental
415 chemicals. *Int J Gynecol Obstet.* 2015;131(3):219-225. doi:10.1016/j.ijgo.2015.09.002
- 416 3. Zota AR, Shamasunder B. The environmental injustice of beauty: framing
417 chemical exposures from beauty products as a health disparities concern. *Am J Obstet*
418 *Gynecol.* 2017;217(4):418.e1-418.e6. doi:10.1016/j.ajog.2017.07.020
- 419 4. NAILS Magazine. *2015-16 Big Book Industry Statistics: Everything You Need to Know*
420 *about the Nail Industry.*; 2015:36-52. [http://files.nailsmag.com/Feature-Articles-in-](http://files.nailsmag.com/Feature-Articles-in-PDF/NABB2015-16stats.pdf)
421 [PDF/NABB2015-16stats.pdf](http://files.nailsmag.com/Feature-Articles-in-PDF/NABB2015-16stats.pdf). Accessed December 21, 2016.
- 422 5. Beauty Market Spending - How Much Women Spend On Nails.
423 <http://www.refinery29.com/2013/01/42311/nail-art-market-increases>. Accessed June 12,
424 2017.
- 425 6. NAILS Magazine. *2014-15 Big Book Industry Statistics: Everything You Need to Know*
426 *about the Nail Industry.*; 2014. [http://files.nailsmag.com/Market-Research/NABB2014-](http://files.nailsmag.com/Market-Research/NABB2014-2015-Stats-2-1.pdf)
427 [2015-Stats-2-1.pdf](http://files.nailsmag.com/Market-Research/NABB2014-2015-Stats-2-1.pdf).
- 428 7. NAILS Magazine. *2013-2014 Big Book Industry Statistics: Everything You Need to Know*
429 *about the Nail Industry.*; 2013:1-12. [http://files.nailsmag.com/site/NAIIS-Magazine-Big-](http://files.nailsmag.com/site/NAIIS-Magazine-Big-Book-2014.pdf)
430 [Book-2014.pdf](http://files.nailsmag.com/site/NAIIS-Magazine-Big-Book-2014.pdf). Accessed October 15, 2011.
- 431 8. Federman MN, Harrington DE, Krynski KJ. Vietnamese manicurists: Are immigrants
432 displacing natives or finding new nails to polish? *Ind Labor Relat Rev.* 2006;59:302-318.
- 433 9. Sheriff RL. *Pedicures at What Price?* Sacramento, CA: California Senate Office of
434 Research; 2008:1-8.
435 <http://sor.senate.ca.gov/sites/sor.senate.ca.gov/files/Pedicures%20At%20What%20Price.pdf>
436 [f](http://sor.senate.ca.gov/sites/sor.senate.ca.gov/files/Pedicures%20At%20What%20Price.pdf). Accessed July 1, 2012.
- 437 10. Nir SM. The price of nice nails. *New York Times.*
438 [https://www.nytimes.com/2015/05/10/nyregion/at-nail-salons-in-nyc-manicurists-are-](https://www.nytimes.com/2015/05/10/nyregion/at-nail-salons-in-nyc-manicurists-are-underpaid-and-unprotected.html?_r=0)
439 [underpaid-and-unprotected.html?_r=0](https://www.nytimes.com/2015/05/10/nyregion/at-nail-salons-in-nyc-manicurists-are-underpaid-and-unprotected.html?_r=0). Published 2015.
- 440 11. Quach T, Nguyen K, Doan-Billings P, Okahara L, Fan C, Reynolds P. A preliminary survey
441 of Vietnamese nail salon workers in Alameda County, California. *J Community Health.*
442 2008;33(5):336-343.

- 443 12. Quach T, Tsoh J, Le G, et al. Identifying and understanding the role of key stakeholders in
444 promoting worker health and safety in nail salons. *J Health Care Poor Underserved*.
445 2015;26(2):104-115. doi:10.1353/hpu.2015.0060
- 446 13. National Healthy Nail and Beauty Salon Alliance | California Healthy Nail Salon
447 Collaborative. <http://www.cahealthynailsalons.org/alliance/>. Accessed July 8, 2017.
- 448 14. Healthy Nail Salon Program. SF Environment. A Department of the City and County of San
449 Francisco. <https://sfenvironment.org/article/healthy-nail-salon-program>. Published 2016.
450 Accessed March 21, 2017.
- 451 15. Guo D Batarseh, P, Wong, J, Raphael, D. *Summary of Data and Findings from Testing of a*
452 *Limited Number of Nail Products*. Berkeley, CA: California Environmental Protection
453 Agency Department of Toxic Substances Control; 2012.
454 https://www.dtsc.ca.gov/PollutionPrevention/upload/NailSalon_Final.pdf.
- 455 16. Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC), Safer Consumer Products Branch. *Three*
456 *Year Priority Product Work Plan 2018-2020*. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency;
457 2018:29. [https://www.dtsc.ca.gov/SCP/upload/Final_2018-](https://www.dtsc.ca.gov/SCP/upload/Final_2018-2020_Priority_Product_Work_Plan.pdf)
458 [2020_Priority_Product_Work_Plan.pdf](https://www.dtsc.ca.gov/SCP/upload/Final_2018-2020_Priority_Product_Work_Plan.pdf).
- 459 17. Guo Y, Kannan K. A survey of phthalates and parabens in personal care products from the
460 United States and its implications for human exposure. *Environ Sci Technol*.
461 2013;47(24):14442-14449. doi:10.1021/es4042034
- 462 18. Parlett LE, Calafat AM, Swan SH. Women's exposure to phthalates in relation to use of
463 personal care products. *J Expo Sci Environ Epidemiol*. 2013;23(2):197-206.
464 doi:10.1038/jes.2012.105
- 465 19. Giulivo M, Lopez de Alda M, Capri E, Barceló D. Human exposure to endocrine disrupting
466 compounds: Their role in reproductive systems, metabolic syndrome and breast cancer. A
467 review. *Environ Res*. 2016;151:251-264. doi:10.1016/j.envres.2016.07.011
- 468 20. Ejaredara M, Nyanzaa EC, Eyckeb KT, Dewey D. Phthalate exposure and childrens
469 neurodevelopment: A systematic review. *Environ Res*. 2015;142:51-60.
- 470 21. Werner EF, Braun JM, Yolton K, Khoury JC, Lanphear BP. The association between
471 maternal urinary phthalate concentrations and blood pressure in pregnancy: The HOME
472 Study. *Environ Health*. 2015;14. doi:10.1186/s12940-015-0062-3
- 473 22. Gore AC, Chappell VA, Fenton SE, et al. EDC-2: The Endocrine Society's Second
474 Scientific Statement on Endocrine-Disrupting Chemicals. *Endocr Rev*. 2015;36(6):E1-
475 E150. doi:10.1210/er.2015-1010
- 476 23. National Research Council. *Phthalates and Cumulative Risk Assessment: The Task Ahead*.
477 Washington, D.C.: The National Academies Press; 2008. <https://doi.org/10.17226/12528>.
478 Accessed October 15, 2011.

- 479 24. Hines CJ, Nilsen Hopf NB, Deddens JA, et al. Urinary phthalate metabolite concentrations
480 among workers in selected industries: A pilot biomonitoring study. *Ann Occup Hyg.*
481 2009;53(1):1-17. doi:10.1093/annhyg/men066
- 482 25. Kwapniewski R, Kozaczka S, Hauser R, Silva MJ, Calafat AM, Duty SM. Occupational
483 exposure to dibutyl phthalate among manicurists. *J Occup Environ Med.* 2008;50(6):705-
484 711. doi:10.1097/JOM.0b013e3181651571
- 485 26. Quach T, Varshavsky J, Von Behren J, et al. Reducing chemical exposures in nail salons
486 through owner and worker trainings: An exploratory intervention study. *Am J Ind Med.*
487 2013;56(7):806-817. doi:10.1002/ajim.22146
- 488 27. Silva MJ, Reidy JA, Herbert AR, Preau JL, Needham LL, Calafat AM. Detection of
489 Phthalate Metabolites in Human Amniotic Fluid. *Bull Environ Contam Toxicol.*
490 2004;72(6):1226-1231.
- 491 28. Johnson C, Paulose-Ram R, Ogden C, et al. *National Health and Nutrition Examination*
492 *Survey: Analytic Guidelines, 1999-2010.* National Center for Health Statistics, Department
493 of Health and Human Services; 2013.
494 http://www.cdc.gov/nchs/data/series/sr_01/sr01_056.pdf.
- 495 29. Silva MJ, Samandar E, Preau JL Jr, Reidy JA, Needham LL, Calafat AM. Quantification of
496 22 phthalate metabolites in human urine. *J Chromatogr B Analyt Technol Biomed Life Sci.*
497 2007;860(1):106-112. doi:10.1016/j.jchromb.2007.10.023
- 498 30. Barr DB Wilder, LC.Caudill, SP.Gonzalez, AJ.Needham, LL.Pirkle, JL. Urinary Creatinine
499 Concentrations in the U.S. Population: Implications for Urinary Biologic Monitoring
500 Measurements. *Environ Health Perspect.* 2005;113(2):192-200.
- 501 31. Hays SM, Aylward LL, Blount BC. Variation in Urinary Flow Rates According to
502 Demographic Characteristics and Body Mass Index in NHANES: Potential Confounding of
503 Associations between Health Outcomes and Urinary Biomarker Concentrations. *Environ*
504 *Health Perspect.* 2015;123(4):293-300. doi:10.1289/ehp.1408944
- 505 32. Varshavsky JR, Zota AR, Woodruff TJ. A novel method for calculating potency-weighted
506 cumulative phthalates exposure with implications for identifying racial/ethnic disparities
507 among U.S. reproductive-aged women in NHANES 2001–2012. *Environ Sci Technol.*
508 2016;50(19):10616-10624. doi:10.1021/acs.est.6b00522
- 509 33. Varshavsky JR, Morello-Frosch R, Woodruff TJ, Zota AR. Dietary sources of cumulative
510 phthalates exposure among the U.S. general population in NHANES 2005–2014. *Environ*
511 *Int.* 2018;115:417-429. doi:10.1016/j.envint.2018.02.029
- 512 34. Anderson WA, L. C, Hird S, Jeffery J, Scotter MJ. A twenty-volunteer study using
513 deuterium labelling to determine the kinetics and fractional excretion of primary and
514 secondary urinary metabolites of di-2-ethylhexyl phthalate and di-iso-nonyl phthalate. *Food*
515 *Chem Toxicol.* 2011;49:2022-2029.

- 516 35. Kohn MC Parham, F, Masten, SA. Portier, CJ. Shelby, MD. Brock, JW. Needham, LL.
517 Human exposure estimates for phthalates. *Environ Health Perspect.* 2000;108(10):A440-
518 A442.
- 519 36. Christensen K, Sobus J, Phillips M, Blessinger T, Lorber M, Tan Y-M. Changes in
520 epidemiologic associations with different exposure metrics: A case study of phthalate
521 exposure associations with body mass index and waist circumference. *Environ Int.*
522 2014;73:66-76. doi:10.1016/j.envint.2014.07.010
- 523 37. O'Brien KM, Upson K, Cook NR, Weinberg CR. Environmental Chemicals in Urine and
524 Blood: Improving Methods for Creatinine and Lipid Adjustment. *Environ Health Perspect.*
525 2016;124(2):220-227. doi:10.1289/ehp.1509693
- 526 38. Guo Y, Alomirah H, Cho H-S, et al. Occurrence of phthalate metabolites in human urine
527 from several Asian countries. *Environ Sci Technol.* 2011;45(7):3138-3144.
528 doi:10.1021/es103879m
- 529 39. Swan SH, Liu F, Hines M, et al. Prenatal phthalate exposure and reduced masculine play in
530 boys. *Int J Androl.* 2010;33(2):259-269. doi:10.1111/j.1365-2605.2009.01019.x
- 531 40. Swan SH, Sathyanarayana S, Barrett ES, et al. First trimester phthalate exposure and
532 anogenital distance in newborns. *Hum Reprod.* 2015;30(4):963-972.
533 doi:10.1093/humrep/deu363
- 534 41. Bustamante-Montes LP, Hernández-Valero MA, Flores-Pimentel D, et al. Prenatal exposure
535 to phthalates is associated with decreased anogenital distance and penile size in male
536 newborns. *J Dev Orig Health Dis.* 2013;4(4). doi:10.1017/S2040174413000172
- 537 42. Suzuki Y, Yoshinaga J, Mizumoto Y, Serizawa S, Shiraishi H. Foetal exposure to phthalate
538 esters and anogenital distance in male newborns. *Int J Androl.* 2012;35(3):236-244.
539 doi:10.1111/j.1365-2605.2011.01190.x
- 540 43. Bornehag C-G, Carlstedt F, Jönsson BA, et al. Prenatal phthalate exposures and anogenital
541 distance in Swedish boys. *Environ Health Perspect.* 2015;123(1):101-107.
542 doi:10.1289/ehp.1408163
- 543 44. Swan SH, Main KM, Liu F, et al. Decrease in anogenital distance among male infants with
544 prenatal phthalate exposure. *Env Health Perspect.* 2005;113(8).
545 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1289%2Fehp.8100>.
- 546 45. Swan S. Environmental phthalate exposure in relation to reproductive outcomes and other
547 health endpoints in humans. *Env Res.* 2008;108:177-184.
- 548 46. Howdeshell KL, Rider CV, Wilson VS, Furr JR, Lambright CR, Gray LE. Dose Addition
549 Models Based on Biologically Relevant Reductions in Fetal Testosterone Accurately
550 Predict Postnatal Reproductive Tract Alterations by a Phthalate Mixture in Rats. *Toxicol*
551 *Sci.* 2015;148(2):488-502. doi:10.1093/toxsci/kfv196

- 552 47. Zota AR, Calafat AM, Woodruff TJ. Temporal trends in phthalate exposures: Findings from
553 the National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey, 2001-2010. *Environ Health*
554 *Perspect.* 2014;122(3):235-241. doi:10.1289/ehp.1306681
- 555 48. Campaign for Safe Cosmetics. *A Little Prettier Cosmetic: Companies Deny Health*
556 *Problems Related to Phthalates, but Are They Secretly Reformulating?;* 2008.
557 <http://www.safecosmetics.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/02/A-Little-Prettier.pdf>.
- 558 49. Campaign for Safe Cosmetics. *Market Shift: The Story of the Compact for Safe Cosmetics*
559 *and the Growing Demand for Safer Products.;* 2011. [http://www.safecosmetics.org/wp-](http://www.safecosmetics.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/02/Market-Shift-report.pdf)
560 [content/uploads/2015/02/Market-Shift-report.pdf](http://www.safecosmetics.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/02/Market-Shift-report.pdf).
- 561 50. Oregon Environment Council. *Pollution in People.;* 2007. [http://www.oeconline.org/our-](http://www.oeconline.org/our-work/healthier-lives/pollutioninpeople/report/chapter1)
562 [work/healthier-lives/pollutioninpeople/report/chapter1](http://www.oeconline.org/our-work/healthier-lives/pollutioninpeople/report/chapter1).
- 563 51. Hubinger JC. A survey of phthalate esters in consumer cosmetic products. *J Cosmet Sci.*
564 2010;61:457-465.
- 565 52. Hubinger JC, Havery DC. Analysis of consumer cosmetic products for phthalate esters. *J*
566 *Cosmet Sci.* 2006;57:127-137.
- 567 53. Dodson RE, Nishioka M, Standley LJ, Perovich LJ, Brody JG, Rudel RA. Endocrine
568 Disruptors and Asthma-Associated Chemicals in Consumer Products. *Environ Health*
569 *Perspect.* 2012;120(7):935-943. doi:10.1289/ehp.1104052
- 570 54. Howdeshell KL, Hotchkiss AK, Gray Jr. LE. Cumulative effects of antiandrogenic
571 chemical mixtures and their relevance to human health risk assessment. *Int J Hyg Environ*
572 *Health.* 2017;220(2, Part A):179-188. doi:10.1016/j.ijheh.2016.11.007
- 573 55. Buckley JP, Palmieri RT, Matuszewski JM, et al. Consumer product exposures associated
574 with urinary phthalate levels in pregnant women. *J Expos Sci Env Epidemiol.*
575 2012;22(5):468-475.
- 576 56. Wibbertmann A, Kielhorn J, Koennecker G, Mangelsdorf I, Melber C. *Benzoic Acid and*
577 *Sodium Benzoate.* Geneva: Joint sponsorship of the United Nations Environment
578 Programme, the International Labour Organization, and the World Health Organization;
579 2000. http://www.who.int/ipcs/publications/cicad/cicad26_rev_1.pdf. Accessed May 2,
580 2013.
- 581 57. Roy S. The Chemistry of Acrylics. *NAILS Mag.* 2009.
582 <http://www.nailsmag.com/article/82078/the-chemistry-of-acrylics>.
- 583 58. Hauser R, Calafat AM. Phthalates and human health. *Occup Environ Med.* 2005;62:806-
584 818.
- 585 59. Adibi JJ, Whyatt RM, Williams PL, et al. Characterization of phthalate exposure among
586 pregnant women assessed by repeat air and urine samples. *Environ Health Perspect.*
587 2008;116(4):467-473. doi:10.1289/ehp.10749

- 588 60. Fromme H, Bolte G, Koch HM, et al. Occurrence and daily variation of phthalate
589 metabolites in the urine of an adult population. *Int J Hyg Environ Health*. 2007;210(1):21-
590 33. doi:10.1016/j.ijheh.2006.09.005
- 591 61. Hauser R, Meeker JD, Park S, Silva MJ, Calafat AM. Temporal variability of urinary
592 phthalate metabolite levels in men of reproductive age. *Environ Health Perspect*.
593 2004;112(17):1734-1740. doi:10.1289/ehp.7212
- 594

595 **Tables 1–6**

596

Table 1 Characteristics of Vietnamese nail salon workers in California ($n = 17$)

Worker and salon characteristics	Mean (range)* or n (%)
Age	40 (23-57)*
Sex	
<i>Female</i>	15 (88%)
<i>Male</i>	2 (12%)
Birthplace	
<i>Vietnam</i>	17 (100%)
Preferred language(s)	
<i>Vietnamese</i>	17 (100%)
Average work hours per week ^a	34.5 (10–60)*
Salon volume (m ³)	274 (42–437)*
Number of services performed that day ^a	8 (1–17)*
Number of other workers that day ^a	4 (2–8)*
Number of salon customers that day ^a	22 (7–40)*
General reported glove use ^a	10 (67%)
Metal trash bin with tight fitting lid use ^a	9 (60%)
Ventilation practices that day ^a	
<i>Used a table fan</i>	7 (47%)
<i>Left windows open</i>	5 (33%)
<i>Left doors open</i>	14 (93%)
<i>Other ventilation practices</i>	10 (59%)
<i>Total number of ventilation practices</i>	3 (0–5)*

^a Restricted to $n = 15$ due to missing survey data for two workers.

597

Table 2 Comparison of creatinine-corrected phthalate metabolite concentrations ($\mu\text{g/g}$) between all nail salon workers and 2011–12 NHANES Asian Americans^a

Phthalate metabolites	All nail salon workers (<i>n</i> = 17)				All NHANES Asian Americans (<i>n</i> = 203)			
	GM (GSD)	Range	% >LOD ^b	% >NH _{p95}	GM (GSE)	Range	% >LOD ^b	NH _{p95}
Mono- <i>n</i> -butyl phthalate (MnBP)	23 (1.7)	9.9–61	94%	18%	8.2 (1.1)	0.44–930	90%	42
Mono-isobutyl phthalate (MiBP)	13 (2.3)	3.6–121	100%	12%	7.6 (1.1)	0.36–90	98%	31
Mono(2-ethylhexyl) phthalate (MEHP)	5.9 (1.8)	2.2–16	94%	6%	2.3 (1.1)	0.18–155	80%	14
Monoethyl phthalate (MEP)	38 (3.3)	8.1–497	100%	6%	301 (1.1)	0.75–1876	100%	355

NH_{p95} = NHANES 95th percentile. LOD = Limit of detection.

^a *P*-values of statistical tests of difference between all nail salon workers and NHANES Asian Americans: MnBP (<0.0001), MiBP (0.015), MEHP (<0.0001), and MEP (0.445).

^b Nail salon worker LOD = 1.20 $\mu\text{g/L}$ for MnBP, MiBP, and MEHP, and 3.56 $\mu\text{g/L}$ for MEP. NHANES LOD = 0.40, 0.20, 0.50, and 0.60 $\mu\text{g/L}$ for MnBP, MiBP, MEHP, and MEP, respectively.

598
599
600
601
602

Table 3 Comparison of creatinine-corrected phthalate metabolite concentrations ($\mu\text{g/g}$) between female nail salon workers and 2011–12 NHANES Asian American females^a

Phthalate metabolites	Female nail salon workers (<i>n</i> = 15)				Female NHANES Asian Americans (<i>n</i> = 97)			
	GM (GSD)	Range	% >LOD ^b	% >NH _{p95}	GM (GSE)	Range	% >LOD ^b	NH _{p95}
Mono- <i>n</i> -butyl phthalate (MnBP)	22 (1.6)	9.9–55	93%	13%	9.3 (1.1)	0.28–371	90%	44
Mono-isobutyl phthalate (MiBP)	11 (1.9)	3.6–62	100%	7%	7.5 (1.1)	0.14–66	98%	28
Mono(2-ethylhexyl) phthalate (MEHP)	5.6 (1.9)	2.2–16	93%	7%	2.6 (1.2)	0.35–160	80%	15
Monoethyl phthalate (MEP)	44 (3.3)	8.1–497	100%	7%	34 (1.1)	0.42–1293	100%	298

NH_{p95} = NHANES 95th percentile. LOD = Limit of detection.

^a *P*-values of statistical tests of difference between female nail salon workers and NHANES Asian American females: MnBP (<0.0001), MiBP (0.041), MEHP (0.0002), and MEP (0.455).

^b Nail salon worker LOD = 1.20 $\mu\text{g/L}$ for MnBP, MiBP, and MEHP, and 3.56 $\mu\text{g/L}$ for MEP. NHANES LOD = 0.40, 0.20, 0.50, and 0.60 $\mu\text{g/L}$ for MnBP, MiBP, MEHP, and MEP, respectively.

603

Table 4 Comparison of non-creatinine-corrected phthalate metabolite concentrations ($\mu\text{g/L}$) between nail salon workers and 2011–12 NHANES Asian Americans^a

<i>Phthalate metabolites</i>	All nail salon workers (<i>n</i> = 17)	All NHANES Asian Americans (<i>n</i> = 203)	<i>p-value</i> ^b	Female nail salon workers (<i>n</i> = 15)	Female NHANES Asian Americans (<i>n</i> = 97)	<i>p-value</i> ^b	Male nail salon workers (<i>n</i> = 2)
	<i>GM (GSD)</i>	<i>GM (GSE)</i>		<i>GM (GSD)</i>	<i>GM (GSE)</i>		<i>Observed values</i>
MnBP	16 (2.4)	6.1 (1.2)	0.007	14 (2.1)	5.6 (1.2)	0.014	20, 105
MiBP	8.5 (3.0)	5.6 (1.1)	0.147	7.0 (2.2)	4.4 (1.1)	0.056	7.1, 209
MEHP	3.9 (2.2)	1.7 (1.1)	<0.001	3.5 (2.0)	1.6 (1.1)	0.001	5.9, 16
MEP	26 (3.5)	23 (1.1)	0.681	27 (3.7)	21 (1.1)	0.425	15, 16

^a Nail salon worker limit of detection (LOD) = 1.20 $\mu\text{g/L}$ for MnBP, MiBP, and MEHP, and 3.56 $\mu\text{g/L}$ for MEP. NHANES LOD = 0.40, 0.20, 0.50, and 0.60 $\mu\text{g/L}$ for MnBP, MiBP, MEHP, and MEP, respectively.

^b *P*-values from statistical tests of difference between nail salon workers and NHANES.

604

605
606

Table 5 Comparison of creatinine-corrected GM (range) of phthalate metabolite concentrations ($\mu\text{g/g}$) measured in this study to previous biomonitoring studies

Metabolites	This Study	Hines <i>et al.</i> (2009)²⁴	Guo <i>et al.</i> (2011)³⁸
MnBP	23 (3.0–105)	34 (<LOD–199)	17 (8.0–47)
MiBP	13 (1.7–209)	6.3 (<LOD–27)	12 (5.7–34)
MEHP	5.9 (<LOD–16)	19 (<LOD–1480)	2.4 (<LOD–5.3)
MEP	38 (5.7–399)	119 (17–1580)	6.5 (1.8–42)
<i>Study details</i>	17 post-shift samples collected from 100% Vietnamese nail salon workers in California, USA, 2011	25 post-shift urine samples collected from 88% Asian nail salon workers in Maryland, USA, 2003-4	30 samples collected from general population in Vietnam, 2006-7

607

Table 6 Comparison of non-creatinine-corrected phthalate metabolite concentrations ($\mu\text{g/L}$) measured in this study to previous epidemiology studies that reported significant associations between prenatal exposures and male developmental endpoints^a

	<i>This Study</i>					<i>Swan et al. (2005)</i> ⁴⁴	<i>Swan et al. (2010)</i> ³⁹	<i>Suzuki et al. (2012)</i> ⁴²	<i>Bustamante-Montes et al. (2013)</i> ⁴¹	<i>Swan et al. (2015)</i> ⁴⁰
Metabolites	GM	Mean	Range	Median	p75	Median (p75)			Mean (Range)	GM (p75)
MnBP	14	17	3.0–38	13	28	14 (31)**	13 (28)**	47 (65)	0.65 (0.25–1.6)	6.4 (17)
MiBP	7.0	9.1	1.7–26	8.5	13	2.5 (5.1)**	2.4 (5.1)**	n/a	n/a	4.0 (11)
MEHP	3.5	4.5	0.9–13	3.2	6.9	3.3 (9.0)	2.9 (6.2)	3.7 (7.1)**	4.0 (0.4–20)**	1.9 (4.7)**
MEP	27	66	4.7–399	18	68	128 (437)**	n/a	7.8 (32)	7.6 (0.27–27)	28 (81)
Sample size (N)	<i>17</i>					<i>85</i>	<i>74</i>	<i>111</i>	<i>73</i>	<i>753</i>

p75 = 75th percentile. Green color indicates associated metabolite concentrations that were similar or below those measured in this study.

^a Developmental endpoints examined in each study: Reduced anogenital distance [*Swan et al. (2005, 2015)*,^{40,44} *Suzuki et al. (2012)*,⁴² and *Bustamante-Montes et al. (2013)*⁴¹], reduced penile size [*Bustamante-Montes et al. (2013)*⁴¹], and reduced masculine play in young boys [*Swan et al. (2010)*³⁹].

** Denotes significant association.

609 **Figure 1 Legend**

610 **Figure 1** Comparison of cumulative phthalates daily intake (Σ androgen-disruptor) between nail salon
611 workers and NHANES 2011–12 Asian Americans. Boxes represent interquartile range (IQR: 25th to 75th
612 percentiles). Dark lines represent medians. Dashed lines represent geometric means. Dot-dashed lines
613 represent arithmetic means. Whiskers extend to min and max (Max = most extreme values within 1.5 •
614 IQR of the median for NHANES). NHANES outliers are represented by dark points, and hollow point
615 denotes outliers off the y-axis scale (a total of seven, five of which were women). Red line represents 95th
616 percentile for pooled NHANES Asian Americans ($n = 203$). Blue line represents 95th percentile for female
617 NHANES Asian Americans ($n = 97$). P -value of statistical tests of difference between nail salon workers
618 and NHANES Asian Americans < 0.0001 . * Indicates male nail salon worker observations ($n = 2$).

