

CADASTER MODELS FOR BROMINATED FLAME RETARDANTS

Ester Papa, Simona Kovarich and Paola Gramatica

QSAR Research Unit in Environmental Chemistry and Ecotoxicology
 DBSF - University of Insubria (Varese, Italy)
 e-mail: ester.papa@uninsubria.it30



The EU-REACH regulation encourages the use of alternative *in vitro* and *in silico* methods in order to minimize animal testing, costs and time. In this context the use of Quantitative Structure Activity Relationships (QSAR) becomes particularly useful to predict unknown activities/properties for existing or even not yet synthesized chemicals. The development and validation of QSAR models for four classes of emerging pollutants (brominated flame retardants, fragrances, perfluorinated compounds and (benzo)triazoles) is the central topic of Work Package 3 (WP3) within the FP7 European project CADASTER (CAse studies on the Development and Application of In-Silico Techniques for Environmental hazard and Risk assessment). The final goal of the project is to exemplify the integration of information, models and strategies for carrying out hazard and risk assessments for large numbers of substances, organized in the four representative chemical classes. In this study are presented the QSAR models that were developed for Brominated Flame Retardants (BFRs) during the first year of the project. Briefly, QSPR models were developed for some SIDS physico-chemical properties (i.e. Henry's law constant, vapour pressure, water solubility, LogKOW, LogKOA, photodegradation rate) and then compared with publicly available EPI Suite models. In addition, endocrine disrupting activities of BFRs3, 4 (i.e. interaction with Aryl hydrocarbon receptor, Estrogen receptor, Progesterone receptor, Androgen receptor, T4-TTR competition and E2SULT inhibition) were modelled by both regression (MLR)5 and classification (K-NN) methods. All the QSAR models were developed taking into account the OECD principles for validation, for regulatory purposes, of QSARs6. This implied internal and external validations, the analysis of the applicability domain and, when possible, a mechanistic interpretation of the models.

FINAL GOAL of CADASTER (1)
 to exemplify the integration of information, models and strategies for carrying out hazard and risk assessments for four classes of emerging pollutants:

- Brominated Flame Retardants
- Perfluorinated Compounds
- Fragrances
- Triazoles/ benzotriazoles

- WP2 Collection of data and models
- WP3 Development and validation of QSARs
- WP4 Integration of QSARs within hazard and risk assessment
- WP5 Development of website and stand-alone tools for dissemination and project results

MOLECULAR DESCRIPTORS
 The chemical structures of BFRs were drawn using the Semi-empirical method AM1 in the HYPERCHEM program (ver. 7.03 for Windows, 2002) and used as input files for descriptors calculation. 701 molecular descriptors (0D; 1D; 2D; 3D) were computed by the software DRAGON (ver. 5.5 for Windows, 2007).

DESCRIPTOR SELECTION
 The ALL Subset Selection method was applied to select the best subset of variables.

QSAR DEVELOPMENT
 REGRESSION MODELS → Multiple linear regression (OLS)
 CLASSIFICATION MODELS → K-NN classification method

VALIDATION AND APPLICABILITY DOMAIN (AD)
 Models were developed taking into account the OECD principles for QSAR validation for regulatory purposes (2):

- Internal and, when possible, external validation
- Applicability Domain (AD% for more than 200 BFRs) verified by leverage approach (regression models) or by descriptor's range and similarity (classification models)

QSAR MODELS FOR PHYSICO-CHEMICAL PROPERTIES

Property	Endpoint	N _{obj}	Descriptors	R ²	Q ² _{LOO}	AD (% of 220 BFRs)
Melting Point	MP*	25	X2A	0.84	0.82	98.6
Vapour Pressure	Log VP*	34	T(O..Br)	0.99	0.98	91.4
K _{OA}	Log K _{OA} *	30	T(O..Br)	0.97	0.97	90.4
K _{OW}	Log K _{OW} *	20	T(O..Br)	0.96	0.96	93.6
Photolysis rate	Log K _p	15	MW	0.95	0.94	91.0
Photolysis half-life	Log HL _p	15	T(O..Br)	0.94	0.93	83.9

* Externally validated models (0.92 < Q²_{ext} < 0.99)

PCA on predictions for 209 PBDEs

Tri-Penta BDE

- ✓ Higher volatility
- ✓ Higher persistence
- ✓ High lipophilicity 5.3 < LogK_{OW} < 7.2

Potential for LRT !!

Papa et al. (2009) QSAR Comb. Sci., 28, 790-796. (3)

T(O..Br) → descriptor related to both the number and position of Br substituents

QSAR MODELS FOR ENDOCRINE DISRUPTION POTENCY

Activity	Endpoint	N _{obj}	Descriptors	R ²	Q ² _{LOO}	AD % of 243 BFRs
AhR rel. binding affinity	Log RBA *	18	L1v, Mor22u	0.82	0.73	75
EROD induction	Log 1/EC ₅₀ EROD _{ind}	8	piID	0.85	0.75	93
AhR agonism	Log 1/EC ₅₀ DR _{ag}	8	Mor08e	0.91	0.85	81
ER agonism	Log 1/EC ₅₀ ER _{ag}	8	RGyr	0.95	0.88	99
PR antagonism	Log 1/IC ₅₀ PR _{ant} *	19	RDF045m, GATS4m	0.87	0.82	93
T4-TTR rel. competition	Log T4 _{rep} *	17	qpmx, MATS6v	0.94	0.91	98
E2SULT rel. inhibition	Log E2SULT _{rep} *	21	B08(C-O), GGI7	0.88	0.84	100

* Externally validated models (0.95 < Q²_{ext} < 0.99)

Importance of variables related to electronic properties, such as electronegativity or the charge distribution along the molecules (Mor08e, qpmx, GGI7), and to molecular size and complexity (L1v, RGyr, piID)

Papa et al. (2010) Chem. Res. Toxicol. 23, 946-954. (7)

CLASSIFICATION MODELS

Endpoint	Descriptors	k	Real class	Assigned class			NER _{class} %	NER%
				1	2	3		
DR _{ag}	F04(O-Br), RDF055v	4	1	15	14	1	93.3	95.8
				2	9	0	100	
DR _{ant}	Jhelm, BEHm7	1	1	15	13	2	86.7	91.7
				2	9	0	100	
ER _{ag}	Ms, BEHv7	1	1	16	15	1	93.7	95.8
				2	8	0	100	
ER _{ant}	QW, nAROH	1	1	16	15	1	93.7	95.8
				2	8	0	100	
AR/PR _{ant}	GGI8	1	1	5	5	0	100	100
				2	19	0	100	
T4-TTR _{comp}	DISPe, nAROH	3	1	12	10	2	83.3	89.6
				2	9	1	88.9	
				3	8	0	100	
E2SULT _{inh}	Mar21v, qpmx	1	1	8	8	0	100	89.6
				2	12	1	83.3	
				3	9	0	100	

External validation (87 < NERext% < 100)

1 = INACTIVE (no ED potency)
 2 = ACTIVE (low-high ED potency)
 CLASSES (8,9)

1 = INACTIVE
 2 = MODERATELY ACTIVE
 3 = VERY ACTIVE

✓ PBDE congeners without (or few) ortho-substituents show higher affinity with the Ah Receptor

Submitted to ES&T

✓ ED activity of BFRs (DR_{ag}/ant-, ER_{ant}-, AR/PR_{ant}-, T4-TTR_{comp}-, E2SULT_{inh}-) is strongly increased by aromatic -OH group.

Screening of 243 BFRs (including three deca-BDE alternatives) according to their ED potency

Identification of most dangerous compounds for each ED activity

COMPARISON WITH SOME EXISTING MODELS

Endpoint	RMSE Papa et al. (2009)	RMSE EPI Suite (4)
MP	18.92	57.47
Log K _{OA}	0.23	0.81
Log K _{OW}	0.19	0.91

Comparison of Exp. Data vs Predictions by AD HOC models & general model (K_{OA}WIN)

Fig. 2 shows that AD HOC models have higher accuracy in prediction than the general K_{OA}WIN model, independently of the bromination degree.

Fig. 3. The increasing Δ among predicted values of AD HOC models vs K_{OA}WIN highlights the risk of overestimation of the predicted property by general models, in particular for highly brominated PBDEs.

LogK_{OA} - Predictions for 209 PBDEs

Y_{papa} = Predictions by our model (range LogKoa: 7.32 - 15.09)
 Y_{KoaWIN} = Predictions by KoaWIN (Δmax = 3.33 log units; range LogKoa: 6.81-18.23)
 Y_{Xu} = Predictions by Xu et al. (2007) (Δmax = 1.06 log units; range LogKoa: 7.4-15.73)

n° Br increase → Δ increase

Fig. 3

REFERENCES
 (1) FP7 European project Cadaster (CAse studies on the Development and Application of In-Silico Techniques for Environmental hazard and Risk assessment); www.cadaster.eu;
 (2) Available online at: http://www.oecd.org/document/23/ (accessed April 2009);
 (3) Papa et al. 2009, QSAR Comb. Sci., 28, 790-796;
 (4) EPI Suite v. 4.0, 2000-2008 - U.S. Environmental Protection Agency;
 (5) Chen J.W. et al., 2003, Chemosphere 51, 577-584;

(6) Xu H.-Y. et al., 2007, Chemosphere 66, 1998-2010;
 (7) Papa E. et al. 2010, Chem. Res. Toxicol. 23, 946-954;
 (8) Hamers T. et al., 2006, Tox.Sci., 92, 157-173;
 (9) Hamers T. et al., 2008, Mol. Nutr. Food. Res. 52, 284-298.

Financial support, given by European Union through the project CADASTER (FP7-ENV-2007-1-212668), is gratefully acknowledged