Using An *In Silico* NAMs Approach To Predict Bioaccumulation In Fish:

A Case Study For Anionic Surfactants Within A Regulatory Context





Introduction

- Bioaccumulation endpoint required for registered substances exceeding the 100 t/y threshold (Annex IX)
 - Hyalella azteca bioconcentration test (HYBIT)
 - Intrinsic hepatic/S9 clearance in vitro assays (OECD 319/IVIVE methods)
 - QSAR models e.g. Episuite, T.E.S.T, VEGA

- No longer possible to waive BCF based on $logK_{ow}$
- Experimental methods technically challenging for surfactants
- Computational methods also have limited reliability
- Weight of Evidence (WoE) approach using logK_{mw} in conjunction with toxicokinetic models

Specific consideration for surfactants



Case study – alkyl isethionates



- SLI = Sodium Lauryl Isethionate
- SLMI = Sodium Lauryl Methyl Isethionate
- SCI = Sodium Cocoyl Isethionate
- DEFI = De-Esterified Fatty Isethionate

C12 chain

- C12 chain + methyl branch
- C8-C18 (predominately C12-C14)
- C8-C18 (predominately, C12, 16, 18)
- pKa = 1.08 (will exist in the ionised form under environmental conditions)



Tiered approach

Droge et al (2021) Environ. Sci.: Processes Impacts, 2021,23, 1930-1948



Tier 1 – BCF screening equation using membrane-water partition/distribution coefficient (log*K*/*D*_{mlw})

In silico profiling

Realistic sorption affinity to fish tissue NO BIOTRANSFORMATION INCLUDED

Tier 2 – Higher tier model refinement (BIONIC v3)

INCLUDES BIOTRANSFORMATION



In silico screening

• Bioaccumulation profiling conducted for all components in each substance



Laboratory of Mathematical Chemistry Catalogic

Bioaccumulation – Metabolism Alerts Bioaccumulation – Metabolism half-lives

'Fast' or 'very fast' biotransformation/ metabolism half-lives for all components LogBCF generated using the BCF baseline model DP v.02.08 from CATALOGIC v5.16.1

Positive correlation with chain length, all components < 2000 L/kg but this is logK_{ow} based therefore of limited applicability to surfactants



Tier 1 – Log*D*_{mlw} baseline screening

 $BCF_{baseline}$ (ionic surfactants) = 0.0125 * D_{mlw} where 0.0125 = phospholipid fraction of fish

or

 $logBCF = logD_{mlw} - 1.9$

Screening cut-offs: ≥ 5.2 (ionic) = BCF ≥ 2000 potentially B ≥ 5.6 (ionic) = BCF ≥ 5000 potentially vB





Droge et al (2021) Environ. Sci.: Processes Impacts, 2021,23, 1930-1948

(7)

Tier 1 – Log *D*_{mlw} baseline screening

| Name | Chain length (CL) | logD _{MLW} | logBCF | BCF (L/kg) |
|---|----------------------|---------------------|--------|------------|
| Sodium caproyl isethionate | 8 | 3.50 | 1.60 | 39.81 |
| Sodium decanoyl isothionate | 10 | 3.63 | 1.73 | 53.70 |
| Sodium lauroyl isethionate | 12 | 4.42 | 2.52 | 331.13 |
| Sodium myristoyl isethionate | 14 | 4.95 | 3.05 | 1122.02 |
| Sodium palmitoyl isethionate | 16 | 5.41 | 3.51 | 3235.94 |
| Sodium stearoyl isethionate | 18 | 5.92 | 4.02 | 10568.18 |
| Sodium lauroyl methyl Isethionate | 12(1) | 4.79 | 2.89 | 776.25 |



Tier 2 BIONIC model



Armitage, J. M., Erickson, R. J., Luckenbach, T., Ng, C. A., Prosser, R. S., Arnot, J. A., Schirmer, K., & Nichols, J. W. (2017). Assessing the bioaccumulation potential of ionizable organic compounds: Current knowledge and research priorities. Environmental Toxicology and Chemistry, 36(4), 882–897. https://doi.org/10.1002/etc.3680



https://sites.google.com/view/bionic-v3/home

In vitro hepatic clearance S9 assay (OECD 319B)



| | S9 IVIVE Biotransformation | | | | |
|----------|-------------------------------------|------------------------|--|--|--|
| | k _e (min ⁻¹) | t _{1/2} (min) | | | |
| C12 | 0.03 | 21.71 | | | |
| C14 | 0.01 | 89.10 | | | |
| C16 | 0.01 | 57.05 | | | |
| C18 | 0.01 | 58.04 | | | |
| C12 | 0.01 | 54.89 | | | |
| branched | | | | | |







BIONIC - *In vitro in vivo* extrapolation (IVIVE)

Special consideration for C8 & C10 isethionate constituents

- Ribbenstedt et al reports lowest detectable clearance rate (LL-S9) in OECD 319B for surfactants = 0.15 h⁻¹
- For surfactants without significant clearance but for which homologues did show clearance, estimated reaction rate of :

<u>LL-S9</u> 3

C12 clearance rate = 1.916 h⁻¹ (measured)

C8 & C10 clearance rate = $0.05 h^{-1}$ (estimated)





Ribbenstedt et al. *Environ Sci & Tech* **2022** 56 (10), 6305-6314 DOI: 10.1021/acs.est.1c05543

(11)

BIONIC outputs

| Chainlength | Uptake (L/kg/d) & Elimination rate constants (1/d)* | | | | Total Elimination | Tier 2 | Tier 1 | |
|--------------|--|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------------|---------------|------------|------------|
| | k _u | k _w | k _B | k _F | k _c | half-life (d) | BCF (L/kg) | BCF (L/KG) |
| C8 | 0.96 | 0.00185 | 0.04 | 0.0008 | 0.0016 | 15.28 | 21.90 | 39.81 |
| C10 | 1.46 | 0.00193 | 0.04 | 0.0008 | 0.0016 | 16.78 | 36.03 | 53.70 |
| C12 | 1.46 | 0.00087 | 0.24 | 0.0007 | 0.0016 | 2.84 | 6.76 | 331.13 |
| C14 | 21.96 | 0.00229 | 0.07 | 0.0008 | 0.0016 | 9.92 | 315.25 | 1122.02 |
| C16 | 49.38 | 0.00214 | 0.10 | 0.0007 | 0.0016 | 6.54 | 467.04 | 3235.94 |
| C18 | 106.91 | 0.00160 | 0.10 | 0.0004 | 0.0016 | 6.51 | 1005.14 | 10568.18 |
| C12 branched | 11.05 | 0.00227 | 0.11 | 0.0008 | 0.0016 | 6.00 | 96.47 | 776.25 |

 k_{U} = gill uptake, k_{w} = gill elimination, k_{B} = biotransformation, k_{F} = faecal elimination, k_{G} - growth dilution



Final Weight of Evidence approach (submitted under Annex XI, section 1.2 "weight of evidence")



Alkyl isethionates have a low potential for bioaccumulation – further testing is scientifically unjustified and contrary to Article 25 of REACH



Future recommendations

 Standardised, robust and reliable empirical/computational methods for logK_{MW} e.g. OECD Guideline?

3.12.P-Tu247 Coarse-Grained Simulations of Passive Partitioning of Ionic Surfactants into Cell Membranes

Coarse-Grained Molecular Dynamics Simulations of Passive Partitioning of Ionic Surfactants into Cell Membranes

Eoin Kearney¹, Mark A, Miller¹, Elin Barrett², Adriana Bejarano³, Jens Bietz⁴, Kristin Connors⁵, James Dawick⁶, Steven Droge², Marc Geurts⁹, Geoff Hodges², Diederlik, Schowanek⁸ and Sabrina Wilhelm⁹ Department of Chenistry, Durham University, UK, Q) Indues¹ - Salety and Environmental Assaurace Centre (SRA), UK, G) Shell Global Solutions, UK (Q) Charinet Goodate, Deutschland; Gnöh (3) Procter & Indue Brussels Innovations Centre, Belgium (6) Innoget: Limited, UK (7) Environmental Risk Assessment, Wageningen Environmental Research, Netherlands, (8) <u>Nouryon</u>, Chemicals 8.V., Netherlands, (9) BAS² conal Care and Automicon Gnöht, German

Objectives Computational Methods: Molecular Dynamics Simulation cg param is a python script to convert a SMILES code into a coarse-grained structure Environment and Health - Rick Assessment & Management (ERASM) is a joint research ready for simulation in a coarse-grained membrane platform of the European Detergents and Surfactants Industries, The ERASM 'Membrane Water Partitioning of Surfactants' project aims to evaluate the alignment between 3 The script uses two main parts: experimental and 3 computational methods to measure the phospholipid membrane-A graph-based spectral mapping algorithm to break large molecules up into roughl water partition ratio (Kmm) for 12 surfactant structures, covering 4 surfactant types. This four-atom beads while preserving symmetry. poster focuses on computational methods. □ ALOGPS [2] a web-based neural network to generate log Kow values for the fragmen For the underpinning experimental work see poster 3.01P-Th136 (Droge et al.). allowing parameterisation into the Martini force field [3]. Previously our group developed an automatic coarse-graining script to allow rapid setup of membrane-water partitioning simulations using molecular dynamics. Water Membrane Water We aim to derive best practice for use of the Martini coarse-grained force field for Coarse Grain simulation of charged surfactants, and ultimately to benchmark it and other computational me Background Membrane-water partitioning K. (or D...) is a key metric for baseline to

<u>3.01.P-Th136 Assessment of Methods for Determining The</u> <u>Membrane-Water Partition Ratio for Surfactants</u>



Investigate use of BIONIC v3 model across a wider range of surfactants types/classes to understand its applicability and limitations



Thank You

Andrea Gredelj (Unilever) **Geoff Hodges (Unilever) Steve Gutsell (Unilever)** Nicola Haywood (Unilever) **James Dawick (Innospec)** Lauren McAnally (Innospec) **Marc Geurts (Nouryon)**



James Armitage (for answering our questions on BIONIC!)

