

## Manuscript Details


<b>Manuscript number</b>	ENVPOL_2018_4104_R2
<b>Title</b>	Bisphenols (A, S, and F) affect the hormonal activity of pharmaceuticals - study of <i>Saccharomyces cerevisiae</i>
<b>Article type</b>	Research Paper

### Abstract

Pharmaceuticals and analogs of bisphenol A (BPA) are increasingly threatening environmental pollutants. In this study, mixtures of selected pharmaceuticals (diclofenac sodium salt, chloramphenicol, oxytetracycline hydrochloride, fluoxetine hydrochloride, estrone, ketoprofen, progesterone, gemfibrozil and androstenedione) were prepared with BPA and its two analogs (namely, bisphenols F and S) at such ratios to reflect environmentally detectable levels. Then, the mixture solutions were studied with a XenoScreen YES/YAS assay to determine the variations in the initial hormonal response of each pharmaceutical compound due to the presence of a bisphenol analog. The results obtained were modeled with the concentration addition (CA) and independent action (IA) approaches, the trueness of which was studied with model deviation ratios (MDR). The estrogenic agonistic activity of the drugs studied was most strongly affected by the presence of BPA in solution (twenty-one cases of synergy observed for CA models versus twelve cases of antagonism in the case of IA predictions). BPS shows a strong agonistic estrogenic impact on most of the drugs studied at medium and high concentration levels; androgenic agonistic activity was also impaired with elevated concentrations of BPS. Increasing the concentration of BPF in a reaction mixture also increased the number of YES+ synergism incidences (for CA modeling). Estrone, progesterone and androstenedione were mostly affected by the highest BPF concentrations studied in the case of androgenic agonistic research performed.

<b>Keywords</b>	bisphenol A, bisphenol A analogues, pharmaceuticals, endocrine disruptors of mixtures, environmental pollution
<b>Corresponding Author</b>	Błażej Kudłak
<b>Corresponding Author's Institution</b>	GUT
<b>Order of Authors</b>	Błażej Kudłak, Monika Wieczerzak, Jacek Namieśnik

Pharmaceuticals + bisphenols (A, S, F)



XenoScreen  
YES/YAS

Mixtures  
toxicity  
models



1 Bisphenols (A, S, and F) affect the basic hormonal activity determined for pharmaceuticals – study of  
2 *Saccharomyces cerevisiae*

3 Kudłak Błażej<sup>1\*</sup>, Monika Wiczerzak<sup>1</sup>, Jacek Namieśnik<sup>1</sup>

4 <sup>1</sup>Department of Analytical Chemistry, Faculty of Chemistry, Gdańsk University of Technology,  
5 Narutowicza Str. 11/12, 80-233 Gdańsk

6 \* Corresponding author: blakudla@pg.edu.pl, phone no. +48583472128, ORCID no. 0000-0002-2237-  
7 2927

8 *Abstract:* Pharmaceuticals and analogs of bisphenol A (BPA) are increasingly threatening  
9 environmental pollutants. In this study, mixtures of selected pharmaceuticals (diclofenac sodium salt,  
10 chloramphenicol, oxytetracycline hydrochloride, fluoxetine hydrochloride, estrone, ketoprofen,  
11 progesterone, gemfibrozil and androstenedione) were prepared with BPA and its two analogs  
12 (namely, bisphenols F and S) at such ratios to reflect environmentally detectable levels. Then, the  
13 mixture solutions were studied with a XenoScreen YES/YAS assay to determine the variations in the  
14 initial hormonal response of each pharmaceutical compound due to the presence of a bisphenol  
15 analog. The results obtained were modeled with the concentration addition (CA) and independent  
16 action (IA) approaches, the trueness of which was studied with model deviation ratios (MDR). The  
17 estrogenic agonistic activity of the drugs studied was most strongly affected by the presence of BPA  
18 in solution (twenty-one cases of synergy observed for CA models *versus* twelve cases of antagonism  
19 in the case of IA predictions). BPS shows a strong agonistic estrogenic impact on most of the drugs  
20 studied at medium and high concentration levels; androgenic agonistic activity was also impaired  
21 with elevated concentrations of BPS. Increasing the concentration of BPF in a reaction mixture also  
22 increased the number of YES+ synergism incidences (for CA modeling). Estrone, progesterone and  
23 androstenedione were mostly affected by the highest BPF concentrations studied in the case of  
24 androgenic agonistic research performed.

25 *Keywords:* bisphenol A, bisphenol A analogs, pharmaceuticals, endocrine disruptors of mixtures,  
26 environmental pollution

27 *Capsule:* Analogs of BPA affect endocrine potential of numerous pharmaceuticals; the extent and  
28 magnitude of disruption is compound and concentration dependent.

## 29 1. Introduction

30 Comprehensive studies on the environmental fate and impact of pharmaceuticals (and their  
31 residues) as well as plasticizers on living organisms are a relatively new research topic. Unfortunately,  
32 many studies and literature reports in this area concern only the instrumental quantification of the

33 presence of a given xenobiotics (and in best case scenario - possible transformation products).  
34 Certainly, this type of information is very useful, but may be insufficient to determine the impact of  
35 given pharmaceuticals on living organisms existing in a particular environment. Most importantly,  
36 residues of pharmaceuticals occur in the environment in mixtures with other pollutants, and the  
37 degree of their toxicity may vary depending on the influence of environmental factors (such as pH,  
38 salinity, and ion co-presence (Wieczerzak et al. 2018).

39 Bisphenols (BPs) are quite widely used and have been detected in significant amounts in  
40 drinking water, foods (especially pre-packaged foods) and beverages, as well as in environmental  
41 samples (Eladak et al. 2015; Danzl et al. 2009). In 2015, Corrales et al. have reviewed over 500  
42 publications dealing with the prevalence of BPA, noting that the average amount of BPA detected in  
43 wastewater treatment plants (WWTP) effluents worldwide ranged from 5 up to 370  $\mu\text{g/L}$ , and  
44 surface waters samples may contain even 56  $\mu\text{g/L}^{-1}$  of BPA; however, salty waters of the Baltic Sea  
45 may contain up to 67.7 ng/L according to Staniszewska et al. (2014). Lower levels of BPA were  
46 reported in potable tap water samples levels, up to 1.3  $\mu\text{g/L}$  (France) (Colin et al. 2014). The amount  
47 of BPA polluting sludges and biosolids has been reported to vary from 10 to > 100 000  $\mu\text{g/kg}$  in  
48 industrial areas (dry weight) (Meesters and Schroder 2002).

49 The literature is not rich in data on BPA analogs; the analysis of wastewater from WWTPs in  
50 Slovakia revealed that only BPF and BPS (but not other BPs) were detected in the WWTP influents (in  
51 amounts of 36.7 ng/L and 40.6 ng/L, respectively) (Česen et al. 2018). Another study detected  
52 concentrations of BPF as high as 2850 ng/L in the Tamagawa River in Japan (Yamazaki et al. 2015).  
53 Liao and Kannan in 2013 studied a variety of food samples from the US and determined that the  
54 highest amount of BPF (1130 ng/g) was present in samples of mustard (dressing) and ginger;  
55 additionally, the studies confirmed that canned foods contained higher concentrations of bisphenols  
56 than foods stored in glass, paper or even plastic containers (Liao and Kannan 2013).

57 The largest load of pharmaceuticals is introduced into the environment as a result of  
58 activities of the pharmaceutical industry, hospital facilities and households (Santos et al. 2010),  
59 veterinary and agriculture as well as in animal breeding (Li 2014). Analgetics, anti-inflammatory drugs  
60 and anticoagulants are the most frequently detected groups of pharmaceutical residues; ibuprofen,  
61 diclofenac and ketoprofen (active ingredients of non-steroid anti-inflammatory drugs) are most  
62 frequently found in soil and water samples. The second most frequently detected group of  
63 pharmaceutical residues comprises antibiotics and antifungal agents such as oxytetracycline and  
64 chloramphenicol, which have been detected in surface waters of Nigeria at concentration levels of  
65 460 ng/L and 600 ng/L, respectively (Olatunde et al. 2014). Androgens as well as estrogens such as  
66 androstenedione, progesterone and estrone have been detected in surface and wastewaters in the  
67 following amounts: >100 ng/L, 66 ng/L, and 36 ng/L, respectively (Kim et al. 2007; Chang et al. 2011).



68 In environmental samples, residues of anti-epileptic and antidepressant drugs have also been found;  
69 among them, fluoxetine is one of the most frequently detected, and its average surface water  
70 concentrations ranges globally from 0.012 to 1.4 µg/L (Weinberger and Klaper 2014). Studies have  
71 shown that lipid regulators (such as gemfibrozil) are also present in the environment at  
72 concentration of 70.27 ng/L e.g. in the Llobregat River (Osorio et al. 2016).

73 Environmental contamination still seems to be underestimated by policy makers and  
74 entrepreneurs. Scientists continue to learn how to better quantitatively and qualitatively determine  
75 the concentrations of pollutants in complex mixtures to assess acute and chronic exposure of  
76 different organs/tissues/organisms to single compounds belonging to different groups and to predict  
77 their impact on ecosystems. Tanaka et al. (2018) confirmed that a time-weighted average  
78 concentration exposure to pyriproxyfen during a period of sensitivity affects the sex ratio, causing  
79 approximately equivalent population-level effects as reproductive inhibition regardless of the  
80 exposure scenario. Wan et al. (2018) concluded that one in-unit increase in urinary BPS was  
81 correlated with a 0.72-day increase in pregnancy duration, and in case of fetal sex each in-unit  
82 increase in maternal urinary BPS was associated with increased gestational age; on the other hand, in  
83 this study no associations of BPS with birth weight or length were found. Chen et al. (2018)  
84 confirmed the presence of seven bisphenols and TCS in 283 urine samples collected from children  
85 from South China aged between 3 and 11 years and noticed that age, but not gender, was negatively  
86 associated with urinary levels of BPA and BPS.

87 Synergism and antagonism are two basic phenomena that may describe effect of one  
88 substance/factor combination (Wieczerek et al. 2015 and 2016). Among several mathematical  
89 models enabling prediction if any of the two phenomena occurred the concentration addition (CA)  
90 and independent action (IA) are most commonly used. Briefly the CA model is used to study if  
91 analytes in a mixture exhibit a similar mode of action. The concept is that the similarly acting  
92 substances act jointly in an additive manner when present together in mixture. The IA model should  
93 be used to test toxicants of dissimilar mode of action when present in a mixture – assumption is done  
94 that they act independently. This model is rather a form of a statistical approach to predict if one of  
95 multiple events could occur.

96 In this study, BPS and BPF were selected as plausible mixture components (next to BPA) due  
97 to fact that manufacturers are gradually replacing BPA with these compounds to comply with  
98 restrictions and regulations on BPA (Chen et al. 2016, IRIS 1988, Rochester 2013). BPS is also used as  
99 an anticorrosive agent in epoxy glues or as a reagent in polymer reactions; the presence of BPS has  
100 also been confirmed in canned foodstuffs. BPS is less prone to environmental degradation than BPA  
101 and BPF and has been found in over 80% of the urine samples studied. BPF, on the other hand, is  
102 used in manufacturing to increase the durability and thickness of the materials produced (not to



103 mention its usage in liners, lacquers, adhesives, plastics, coating of drink containers and food cans  
104 and dental sealant). BPF was confirmed to cause genotoxicity when introduced to Hep G2 cells, and  
105 its endocrine potential is also well confirmed. Due to the confirmed endocrine potential of numerous  
106 pharmaceuticals (Wieczerek et al. 2016) and BPA analogs (Owczarek et al. 2018a and 2018b), it is  
107 important to study the behavior of these common environmental pollutants when present in  
108 mixtures, which was the goal of this study.

## 109 2. *Materials and methods*

### 110 2.1. *Chemicals and reagents*

111 The model substances selected for the study, diclofenac sodium salt (diclofenac s.) (CAS no.  
112 153907-79-6), chloramphenicol (CAS no. 56-75-7), oxytetracycline hydrochloride (oxytetracycline h.)  
113 (CAS no. 2058-46-0), fluoxetine hydrochloride (fluoxetine h.) (CAS no. 56296-78-7), estrone (CAS no.  
114 53-16-7), ketoprofen (CAS no. 22071-15-4), progesterone (CAS no. 57-83-0), gemfibrozil (CAS no.  
115 25812-30-0), androstenedione (CAS no. 63-05-8), bisphenol A (CAS no. 80-05-7), bisphenol S (CAS no.  
116 80-09-1) and bisphenol F (CAS no. 620-92-8), were purchased from Sigma Aldrich (Germany), and  
117 they were of analytical grade (>99%). A set of XenoScreen YES/YAS reagents was purchased from  
118 Xenometrix AG (Switzerland), namely, a vial with hER $\alpha$  (YES) yeasts (to determine estrogenic activity)  
119 and hAR $\alpha$  (YAS) yeasts (to determine androgenic activity) immobilized and dormant on the filtration  
120 paper, basal medium, vitamin solution, L-aspartic acid solution, L-threonine solution, CuSO $_4$  solution,  
121 17 $\beta$ -oestradiol (E2, YES+ (agonist) control), 5 $\alpha$ -dihydrotestosterone (DHT, YAS+ (agonist) control), 4-  
122 hydroksytamoxiphyne (HT, YES- (antagonist) control), and flutamide (FL, YAS- (antagonist) control).  
123 DMSO (dimethyl sulphoxide, CAS no. 67-68-5) and CPRG (chlorophenol red- $\beta$ -D-galactopyranoside)  
124 (CAS no. 99792-79-9) dye were purchased from Sigma Aldrich (Germany). Measurements of the  
125 OD $_{690}$  cell density (wavelength 690 nm) and of the intensity of the CPRG transformation product  
126 OD $_{570}$  (wavelength 570 nm) were performed with a TECAN Infinite M200 spectrophotometer.

127

### 128 2.2. *XenoScreen YES/YAS methodology*

129 To investigate the endocrine potential of the solutions, a slightly modified protocol for  
130 XenoScreen YES/YAS was utilized. *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* yeast cells were cultivated from the filter  
131 papers in a growth medium (basic medium with a vitamin solution and a solution of L-threonine, L-  
132 aspartic acid and copper (II) sulfate (VI)). Then, 5 mL of the growth medium was transferred to  
133 labeled culture bottles with caps with a gas permeable filter. Afterwards, the yeast disks were  
134 sterilely transferred and placed on an orbital shaker set at 32 °C and 100 rpm for 48 h. Then, 100  $\mu$ L  
135 of DMSO was added to each control vial containing the standards: E2 (17 $\beta$ -oestradiol control of YES  
136 agonist), DHT (5 $\alpha$ -dihydrotestosterone control of YAS agonist), HT (4-hydroxytamoxifen control of

137 YES antagonist), and FL (flutamide control of YAS antagonist). Test plates were prepared in such a  
138 way that the controls were in duplicate in eight serial dilutions:

139 - YES agonist plate E2 (min. concentration  $1 \cdot 10^{-11}$  M, max. concentration  $1 \cdot 10^{-8}$  M),

140 - YES antagonist plate HT (min. concentration  $1 \cdot 10^{-8}$  M, max. concentration  $1 \cdot 10^{-5}$  M; additionally, in  
141 the entire plate, E2 was present at a constant concentration of  $1 \cdot 10^{-9}$  M),

142 - YAS agonist plate DHT (min. concentration  $1 \cdot 10^{-9}$  M, max. concentration  $1 \cdot 10^{-6}$  M),

143 - YAS antagonist plate FL (min. concentration  $1 \cdot 10^{-7}$  M, max. concentration  $1 \cdot 10^{-4}$  M; additionally, in  
144 the entire plate, DHT was present at a constant concentration of  $3 \cdot 10^{-8}$  M).

145 The addition of E2 or DHT at the same concentration as the entire YES or YAS antagonist  
146 plate, respectively, was intended to help examine (confirm/deny) the andro- and estrogenic  
147 antagonistic activity of the samples. A substance with antagonist properties competes with the E2 or  
148 DHT present on the plate and binds to the receptor without inducing the expression of  $\beta$ -  
149 galactosidase. Without the enzyme, substrate staining does not occur. However, if the test sample  
150 does not contain antagonistic substances, then the E2 and DHT present in the wells bind with the  
151 receptor, expressing  $\beta$ -galactosidase; thus, the staining of the substrate occurs.

152 Twenty microliters of adjusted drug sample and sixty  $\mu$ L of 6 mM CRPG dye were added to  
153 each assay well. Pharmaceuticals were mixed in three concentration ratios in such a way as to detect  
154 a broad range of possible interactions. All of the studies on the mixtures were performed in  
155 triplicate; furthermore, controls were made for pure substances in duplicate, and YES and YAS  
156 suspensions of yeast cultures (100  $\mu$ L; yeast cell density  $>0.3$  OD<sub>690</sub>) were added into the agonist and  
157 antagonist YES and YAS plates, respectively. Assay plates were sealed with semipermeable  
158 membranes and placed in the zipper bag moistened with watered gauze on an orbital shaker for 48 h  
159 at 32 °C and 100 rpm. After 48 h of incubation, the cell density determined by OD was read at a  
160 wavelength of 690 nm, and the color intensity at a wavelength of 570 nm was determined.  
161 Afterwards, the activity of  $\beta$ -galactosidase was calculated as the ratio of  $[(OD_{570}-OD_{690})/OD_{690}]$ . All  
162 experiments were run and measured in triplicate.

163 To determine whether the addition of selected bisphenol analogs to the pharmaceutical  
164 solutions would affect the endocrine potential, pre-concentrated solutions of pharmaceuticals were  
165 prepared. The study of the effects of BPA analogues on the toxicity of the pharmaceuticals was  
166 conducted at three concentration levels (listed for each substance in Table 1).

### 167 2.3. Calculation of MDR values

168 In order to determine whether the presence of one compound in a binary mixture with another  
169 substance would affect the endocrine potential against *Saccharomyces cerevisiae*, the mixtures were  
170 prepared such that the compounds were present in appropriate ratios to reflect, respectively, the C1  
171 concentration of first substance with the C1, C2 or C3 concentration of the second substance;



172 subsequently the C2 concentration of the first substance with the C1, C2 or C3 concentration of  
173 second substance, etc. C2 represents the concentration of analyte's solutions calculated from the  
174 XenoScreen YES/YAS test, and it is summarized in Table 1. C1 represents the concentrations of  
175 substance reduced to 50% of C2, and respectively C3 is the concentration elevated to 150% of C2 -  
176 the same scheme was applied to each pharmaceutical studied.

177 The toxicological effect of a mixture of pharmaceuticals with BPA and its analogues on *S.*  
178 *cerevisiae* cells was mathematically assessed with both the Concentration Addition - CA and  
179 Independent Action - IA models using equations 1 and 2, respectively (Kudłak et al. 2016, Wiczerzak  
180 et al. 2015):

181

$$182 \quad EC_{X_{Mix}} = \left( \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{P_i}{EC_{x_i}} \right)^{-1} \quad (\text{eq. 1.})$$

183 where:

184 -  $EC_{X_{mix}}$  is the  $x_{mix}$  effect caused by the total concentration of the mixture of studied chemicals  
185 (components) (Expected value);

186 -  $p_i$  indicates the fraction of component  $i$  in the mixture, calculated on the basis of the  
187 concentration of component  $i$  in the mixture;

188 -  $n$  indicates the number of components in the mixture;

189 - and  $EC_{x_i}$  indicates the  $x_i$  effect caused by component  $i$  at a given studied concentration in  
190 the mixture.

191

$$192 \quad E(C_{mix}) = 1 - \prod_{i=1}^n (1 - E(c_i)) \quad (\text{eq. 2.})$$

193 where:

194 -  $EC_{mix}$  is the overall effect expressed as a fraction of the maximal possible effect of a mixture  
195 of chemical  $i$  (expected value);

196 -  $c_i$  indicates the concentration of component  $i$  in the mixture;

197 -  $n$  indicates the number of components in the mixture;

198 -  $E(c_i)$  indicates the effect of component  $i$ , applied separately.

199 To verify the difference between the predicted and observed effect, the Model Deviation  
200 Ratio (MDR) approach was applied, defined as shown in equation 3 (Wiczerzak et al. 2016; Kudłak et  
201 al. 2016):

202



203 
$$MDR = \frac{Expected}{Observed} \quad (\text{eq. 3.})$$

204 where:

205 - *Expected* is the effective toxicity (raw values of genotoxicity calculated according to eq. 1. or 2.) of  
206 the mixture predicted by the CA or IA model, and

207 - *Observed* is the effective toxicity (raw values of genotoxicity calculated) for the mixture obtained  
208 during the toxicity studies.

209 MDR values lower than 0.50 are indicators of synergic behavior of substances present in  
210 mixture while values >2.00 justify the statement of antagonistic action of analytes studied; MDR  
211 values within 0.50–0.71 and 1.40–2.00 mean, respectively, under- and overestimation of calculated  
212 models.

### 213 3. *Results and discussion*

#### 214 3.1. *Results of hormonal activity studies of selected analytes*

215 Based on previous experience and in relation to published data, the proper concentrations (3  
216 constant levels for each analyte) were selected for the studies (as presented in Table 1) to reflect the  
217 environmental concentration levels of the analytes. Then, mixtures of BPA analogs with respective  
218 pharmaceuticals were prepared, and their endocrine potential was studied as described in  
219 subchapter 2.3.

220 **Table 1.**

221

#### 222 3.2. *Results for BPA impact on the hormonal activity of pharmaceuticals*

223 BPA is a well-known to bind both nuclear estrogen receptors (ER $\alpha$  and ER $\beta$ ) and strongly  
224 binds to estrogen related receptors  $\gamma$  (ERR- $\gamma$ ). In other studies it has been shown that BPA also acts as  
225 a weak antagonist of androgen receptors (AR) (Stossi et al. 2014). This type of multiple mechanisms  
226 of interaction on receptors contributes to the observation of many different effects, both estrogenic  
227 and androgenic.

228 The MDR values presenting a variation of modeled values from measured values in the case  
229 of studies of BPA impact on the endocrine potential of selected drugs are given in Table 2 below.

230

231 **Table 2.**

232

##### 233 3.2.1. *YES+*

234 The estrogenic agonistic activity of the drugs studied seems to be most strongly affected by  
235 the presence of BPA in solution. In twenty one cases (mixtures with diclofenac, chloramphenicol,  
236 oxytetracycline and fluoxetine) synergy was observed for the CA models, whereas antagonism was

237 observed only for progesterone and gemfibrozil in the case of twelve IA predictions (please refer to  
238 Table C in the electronic supplementary material for details on the percentile values for the MDRs of  
239 the experiments on BPA YES+).

240 Antagonism was observed for IA model for mixtures of gemfibrozil (at all concentrations  
241 levels) with BPA (only for the lowest concentration - C1). Cases of antagonism were observed also for  
242 all mixtures of BPA and progesterone. Although the tests performed do not answer the question  
243 what is happening at the cellular level, so reference data were needed to better interpret the test  
244 results. The literature is a bit skimpy regarding the impact of BPA on gemfibrozil, but it can contain  
245 data on the effect of BPA, in clinical trials, on the development of progesterone resistance, which  
246 may explain the strong antagonism observed in these mixtures (Aldad et al. 2011).

247 In twenty one cases (mixtures with diclofenac, chloramphenicol, oxytetracycline and  
248 fluoxetine) synergy was observed for the CA models with the strongest synergism shown for BPA and  
249 oxytetracycline h. pair (please refer to Table C in the electronic supplementary material for details on  
250 the percentile values for the MDRs of the experiments on BPA YES+). In these cases the metabolic  
251 pathway of these substances may be responsible, because the enzymes from the P450 group (CYP1A,  
252 CYP2A, etc.) are involved in the detoxification of all these substances, the occurrence of two  
253 substances that involve the same detoxification enzymes may burden the system leading to greater  
254 toxicity (endocrine disruption) (Hanioka et al. 2000; DrugBank 2018a, 2018b, 2018c, ). Similar results  
255 for agonist interactions were obtained for the combination of these drugs with BPS and BPF.  
256 However, this should be verified in further studies.

### 257 3.2.2. YES-

258 Estrogenic antagonistic activity was not affected by the presence of BPA in a synergic  
259 manner; no such cases are observed. Seventeen cases of antagonistic behavior were confirmed for  
260 mixtures with chloramphenicol, fluoxetine, progesterone and gemfibrozil with IA model (please refer  
261 to Table D in the electronic supplementary material for details on the percentile values for the MDRs  
262 of the experiments on BPA YES-). The most antagonistically potent to estrogen receptors was the  
263 mixture of BPA and fluoxetine (at all concentrations studied); however, the observed phenomenon  
264 had a weak character and was strengthened with increasing concentration of both substances  
265 (please refer to Table D in the electronic supplementary material for details).

### 266 3.2.3. YAS+

267 BPA at the lowest concentration level studied (C1) was adequately modeled with the CA  
268 approach (one case of synergism for androstenedione can be noticed, the number of observed cases  
269 of synergy increases with increasing concentration of BPA in the mixture) while IA shows several  
270 cases of antagonism (for diclofenac, chloramphenicol, oxytetracycline, fluoxetine and gemfibrozil). At  
271 higher concentration levels synergism was observable for mixtures with estrone, progesterone and



272 androstenedione (with CA approach) showing the importance of BPA in cases of co-presence with  
273 these hormonal chemicals. In the case of androgenic agonistic effects, all observed cases of synergy  
274 were in mixtures of BPA with hormonal substances. The IA models showed twenty cases of  
275 antagonistic action (as presented in table 2) (please refer also to Table E in the electronic  
276 supplementary material for details on the percentile values for the MDRs of the experiments on BPA  
277 YAS+).

#### 278 3.2.4. YAS-

279 In the case of androgenic antagonistic studies, no cases of synergism were observed for  
280 either the IA or CA models. Interestingly, antagonistic behavior was observed only for the highest  
281 concentration level of fluoxetine (four cases) (please refer to Table F in the electronic supplementary  
282 material for details on the percentile values for the MDRs of the experiments on BPA YAS-).

283

### 284 3.3. Results of BPS impact on the hormonal activity of pharmaceuticals

285 BPS (just like BPA) is able to easily bind to nuclear receptors (the data shows that this bond is  
286 weaker than of BPA and estradiol); there also some studies that show androgenic activity of BPS  
287 (Rochester and Bolden 2015). The results obtained for BPS and BPF (described below) are similar to  
288 what could indicate a similar mechanism of action in mixtures. The MDR values presenting a variation  
289 of modeled values from measured ones in the case of studies of BPS impact on the endocrine  
290 potential of selected drugs are given in table A (placed in electronic supplementary material).

#### 291 3.3.1. YES+

292 BPS showed strong agonistic estrogenic impact on most of the drugs studied at a medium  
293 (C2) and high (C3) concentration of BPS. Forty cases of synergism (with diclofenac, chloramphenicol,  
294 oxytetracycline, fluoxetine, ketoprofen, progesterone and gemfibrozil) and nine cases of  
295 underestimation were observed for the CA models. The strongest synergistic effect was observed for  
296 gemfibrozil at the level C2 and BPS at the highest concentration (C3). With the increase in BPS  
297 concentration, one can observe a "transition" from antagonistic interactions to synergistic properties  
298 for progesterone, androstenedione, chloramphenicol and gemfibrozil couples, which would mean  
299 that the higher concentration of BPS in these mixtures affect dominantly estrogen receptors, which  
300 may be related to the metabolic pathway of these substances. At the lowest concentration level of  
301 BPS studied almost no impact on other analytes was found with the possible exception of  
302 androstenedione where antagonistic behavior was observed for both models used; with increasing  
303 concentration of BPS there was a tendency for underestimating the impact of BPS and even  
304 exhibiting synergic action (please refer to Table G in the electronic supplementary material for details  
305 on the percentile values for the MDRs of the experiments on BPS YES+).

#### 306 3.3.2. YES-

307 The impact of BPS on the estrogenic antagonistic properties of selected pharmaceuticals was  
308 adequately modeled with both the CA and IA approaches. IA showed twenty-four cases of  
309 antagonistic activity (mostly at the lowest concentration level of BPS) for mixtures with diclofenac,  
310 chloramphenicol, progesterone, gemfibrozil and the lowest concentration levels of oxytetracycline  
311 and fluoxetine (with the highest MDR values for 2.74 for BPS (C1) and gemfibrozil (C3)); (refer to  
312 Tables A and G in the electronic supplementary material for details on the results and on the  
313 percentile values for the MDRs of the experiments on BPS YES-).

#### 314 3.3.3. YAS+

315 Synergism and underestimation were observed in forty five cases of CA modeling while the IA  
316 models showed five cases of antagonistic behavior of BPS on drugs when androgenic agonistic  
317 behavior is concerned. BPS had a synergic impact on estrone, progesterone and androstenedione,  
318 confirming the environmental threats posed by this substance (please refer to Table I in the  
319 electronic supplementary material for details on the percentile values for the MDRs of the  
320 experiments o BPS YAS+).

#### 321 3.3.4. YAS-

322 The androgenic antagonistic impact of BPS was noted in only four cases of IA modeling (for  
323 fluoxetine and estrone). In other cases both models adequately forecast the behavior of BPS-drug  
324 mixtures (MDR values close to 1.00) (please refer to Table J in the electronic supplementary material  
325 for details on the percentile values for the MDRs of the experiments on BPS YAS-).

326

### 327 3.4. Results of BPF impact on the hormonal activity of pharmaceuticals

328 BPF (similarly to its analogs) shows estrogenic and antiandrogenic properties ((Rochester and  
329 Bolden 2015). The results obtained were similar to the BPF, both agonistically and antagonistically to  
330 estrogen and androgenic receptors, suggesting similarity in MOD. The MDR values presenting a  
331 variation of the modeled values from measured values in the case of studies of BPS impact on the  
332 endocrine potential of selected drugs are given in table B (in electronic supplementary material).

333

#### 334 3.4.1. YES+

335 The strongest synergistic effect was observed for gemfibrozil at the level C3 and BPF at the  
336 highest concentration (C3). As in the case of BPS, with increase of BPF concentration, a "transition"  
337 from antagonistic interactions to synergistic properties can be observed for progesterone,  
338 androstenedione, chloramphenicol and gemfibrozil pairs. At the lowest concentration level studied  
339 BPF did not show any synergic impact on the estrogenic agonistic activity of the drugs selected. Such  
340 behavior (for CA modeling) was observable in numerous cases with increasing concentration levels of  
341 BPF. Only the activity of estrone was not greatly impacted by the presence of BPF. No antagonistic



342 behavior of BPF with the CA modeling approach was observed, and seven cases of antagonism were  
343 detected with IA modeling (for progesterone, androstenedione and chloramphenicol) (please refer to  
344 Table I in the electronic supplementary material for details on the percentile values for the MDRs of  
345 the experiments on BPF YES+).

#### 346 3.4.2. YES-

347 For the estrogenic antagonistic impact of BPF only one case of synergism (with ketoprofen)  
348 was observed while sixteen results confirm underestimation by CA modeling. Antagonistic behavior is  
349 more likely and was observed in fourteen cases, and forty-four overestimations were noted as a  
350 result of IA modeling (refer to table B for details) (please refer also to Table L in the electronic  
351 supplementary material for details on the percentile values for the MDRs of the experiments on BPF  
352 YES-).

#### 353 3.4.3. YAS+

354 Androgenic agonistic endpoints were in most cases not affected by the presence of mixtures  
355 of the lowest BPF concentration with the drugs studied. Several exceptions include ten synergic  
356 mixtures of BPF with estrone, progesterone and androstenedione and two antagonistic mixtures with  
357 diclofenac and chloramphenicol (in IA studies); at higher concentration levels BPF showed a synergic  
358 impact on the drugs studied. Thirty nine cases of underestimation were present in the CA studies,  
359 and twenty-six cases of overestimation were found for IA modeling (please refer to Table M in the  
360 electronic supplementary material for details on the percentile values for the MDRs of the  
361 experiments on BPF YAS+).

#### 362 3.4.4. YAS-

363 Androgenic antagonistic activity seemed to be only slightly impacted by mixtures of BPF and  
364 the drugs studied. Such synergic impact was seen for six mixtures with chloramphenicol while five  
365 antagonistic incidences were observed for diclofenac and fluoxetine (for IA modeling) (please refer to  
366 Table N in the electronic supplementary material for details on the percentile values for the MDRs of  
367 the experiments on BPF YAS-).

### 369 4. Conclusions

370 As stated in this research, the variations in endocrine potential are to a great extent  
371 concentration dependent. YES+ and YAS+ activity in most cases was affected in a synergic manner  
372 while YES- and YAS- were affected in an antagonistic manner in most of experiments performed. As  
373 can be easily noticed, the magnitudes of interactions were dependent on the chemicals (BPA, BPS or  
374 BPF) admixed in solution as well as their concentration levels.

375 Certainly, the work does not give the ultimate answer on possible interactions of BPA  
376 analogues and pharmaceuticals but constitutes one of next steps and guidelines proving the  
377 necessity of taking into account phenomena of antagonism or synergism when studying target-  
378 oriented processes occurring at levels of ecosystems. Future research should focus on studying  
379 higher order mixtures of pollutants of persistent character belonging to other chemical groups (e.g.,  
380 derivatives of bisphenol A, diglycidyl ether, other pharmaceuticals, pesticides, etc.) as well as their  
381 degradation products and on wider sets of bioassays with varying biotest endpoints. BPS and BPF are  
382 unfortunately considered to be safe replacements of BPA; therefore, their amount in the  
383 environment starts increasing and for this reason it is important to monitor them in terms of their  
384 properties also in mixtures – what always happens in case of environmental samples (especially due  
385 to the fact that the literature data is less rich in information about BPS, BPS than in BPA). In this way  
386 the information coming from instrumental studies will be broadened with newly developed, accurate  
387 mathematical models describing the environmental threat posed by mixtures of pollutants.

388

389 *Acknowledgements:*

390 The work has been co-financed by the National Science Center, Poland, with grant no.  
391 2017/01/X/ST4/00474.

392 *References*

393 Aldad, T. S., Rahmani, N., Leranth, C., & Taylor, H. S. (2011). Bisphenol-A exposure alters endometrial  
394 progesterone receptor expression in the nonhuman primate. *Fertility and sterility*, 96(1), 175-179.

395 Caban, M., Lis, E., Kumirska, J., Stepnowski, P. (2015). Determination of pharmaceutical residues in  
396 drinking water in Poland using a new SPE-GC-MS (SIM) method based on Speedisk extraction disks  
397 and DIMETRIS derivatization. *Science of the Total Environment*, 538, 402-411.

398 Česen, M., Heath, D., Krivec, M., Košmrlj, J., Kosjek, T., Heath, E. (2018). Seasonal and spatial  
399 variations in the occurrence, mass loadings and removal of compounds of emerging concern in the  
400 Slovene aqueous environment and environmental risk assessment. *Environmental Pollution*, 242,  
401 143-154.

402 Chen, D., Kannan, K., Tan, H., Zheng, Z., Feng, Y. L., Wu, Y., Widelka, M. (2016). Bisphenol analogues  
403 other than BPA: environmental occurrence, human exposure, and toxicity: a review. *Environmental  
404 science & technology*, 50(11), 5438-5453.

405 Chen Y., Fang J., Ren L., Fan R., Zhang J., Liu G., Zhou L., Chen D., Yu Y., Lu S., (2018) Urinary  
406 bisphenol analogues and triclosan in children from south China and implications for human exposure,  
407 *Environmental Pollution* 238:299-305.



408 Chang, H., Wan, Y., Wu, S., Fan, Z., Hu, J. (2011). Occurrence of androgens and progestogens in  
409 wastewater treatment plants and receiving river waters: Comparison to estrogens. *Water Research*,  
410 45(2), 732-740.

411 Colin, A., Bach, C., Rosin, C., Munoz, J. F., Dauchy, X. (2014). Is drinking water a major route of human  
412 exposure to alkylphenol and bisphenol contaminants in France? *Archives of Environmental  
413 Contamination and Toxicology*, 66(1), 86-99.

414 Corrales, J., Kristofco, L. A., Steele, W. B., Yates, B. S., Breed, C. S., Williams, E. S., Brooks, B. W.  
415 (2015). Global assessment of bisphenol A in the environment: review and analysis of its occurrence  
416 and bioaccumulation. *Dose-Response*, 13(3), 1-29.

417 Danzl, E., Sei, K., Soda, S., Ike, M., Fujita, M. (2009). Biodegradation of bisphenol A, bisphenol F and  
418 bisphenol S in seawater. *International journal of environmental research and public health*, 6(4),  
419 1472-1484

420 Eladak S., Grisin T., Moison D., Guerquin M-J., N'Tumba-Byn T., Pozzi-Gaudin S., Benachi A., Livera G.,  
421 Rouiller-Fabre V., Habert R., (2015). A new chapter in the bisphenol A story: bisphenol S and  
422 bisphenol F are not safe alternatives to this compound. *Fertility and sterility*, 103(1), 11-21.

423 Halling-Sørensen, B., Nielsen, S. N., Lanzky, P. F., Ingerslev, F., Lützhøft, H. H., Jørgensen, S. (1998).  
424 Occurrence, fate and effects of pharmaceutical substances in the environment-A review.  
425 *Chemosphere*, 36(2), 357-393.

426 Hanioka, N., Jinno, H., Tanaka-Kagawa, T., Nishimura, T., & Ando, M. (2000). Interaction of bisphenol  
427 A with rat hepatic cytochrome P450 enzymes. *Chemosphere*, 41(7), 973-978.

428 <https://www.drugbank.ca/drugs/DB00472> accessed: November 2018a  
429 <https://www.drugbank.ca/drugs/DB00446> accessed: November 2018b  
430 <https://www.drugbank.ca/drugs/DB00586> accessed: November 2018c

431 Integrated Risk Information System (IRIS) U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Chemical  
432 Assessment Summary, accessed on 27.10.2018 on  
433 [https://cfpub.epa.gov/ncea/iris/iris\\_documents/documents/subst/0356\\_summary.pdf](https://cfpub.epa.gov/ncea/iris/iris_documents/documents/subst/0356_summary.pdf)

434 Kim, S. D., Cho, J., Kim, I. S., Vanderford, B. J., Snyder, S. A. (2007). Occurrence and removal of  
435 pharmaceuticals and endocrine disruptors in South Korean surface, drinking, and waste waters.  
436 *Water Research*, 41(5), 1013-1021.

437 Küster, A., Adler, N. (2014). Pharmaceuticals in the environment: scientific evidence of risks and its  
438 regulation. *Phil. Trans. R. Soc. B*, 369(1656), 20130587.

439 Li, W. C. (2014). Occurrence, sources, and fate of pharmaceuticals in aquatic environment and soil.  
440 *Environmental Pollution*, 187, 193-201.





441 Liao, C., Kannan, K. (2013). Concentrations and profiles of bisphenol A and other bisphenol analogues  
442 in foodstuffs from the United States and their implications for human exposure. *Journal of*  
443 *Agricultural and Food Chemistry*, 61(19), 4655-4662.

444 Lolić, A., Paíga, P., Santos, L. H., Ramos, S., Correia, M., Delerue-Matos, C. (2015). Assessment of non-  
445 steroidal anti-inflammatory and analgesic pharmaceuticals in seawaters of North of Portugal:  
446 occurrence and environmental risk. *Science of the Total Environment*, 508, 240-250.

447 Martínez, C., Ramírez, N., Gómez, V., Pocurull, E., Borrull, F. (2013). Simultaneous determination of  
448 76 micropollutants in water samples by headspace solid phase microextraction and gas  
449 chromatography–mass spectrometry. *Talanta*, 116, 937-945.

450 Meesters, R. J., Schröder, H. F. (2002). Simultaneous determination of 4-nonylphenol and bisphenol A  
451 in sewage sludge. *Analytical Chemistry*, 74(14), 3566-3574.

452 Olatunde, O. J., Olatunbosun, O., Olatunde, A., Anyakora, C., Christopher, K. (2014). Occurrence of  
453 selected veterinary pharmaceuticals in water from a fish pond settlement in Ogun State, Nigeria.  
454 *International Journal of Environmental Monitoring and Analysis*, 2(4), 226.

455 Osorio, V., Larrañaga, A., Aceña, J., Pérez, S., Barceló, D. (2016). Concentration and risk of  
456 pharmaceuticals in freshwater systems are related to the population density and the livestock units  
457 in Iberian Rivers. *Science of the Total Environment*, 540, 267-277.

458 Owczarek, K., Kudłak, B., Simeonov, V., Mazerska, Z., Namieśnik, J., (2018a). Binary Mixtures of  
459 Selected Bisphenols in the Environment: Their Toxicity in Relationship to Individual Constituents.  
460 *Molecules*, 23, 3226.

461 Owczarek, K., Kubica, P., Kudłak, B., Rutkowska, A., Rachoń, D., Namieśnik, J., Wasik, A. (2018b).  
462 Determination of trace levels of eleven bisphenol A analogues in human blood serum by high  
463 performance liquid chromatography–tandem mass spectrometry. *Science of the Total Environment*,  
464 628–629, 1362–1368.

465 Rocha, M. J., Cruzeiro, C., Rocha, E. (2013). Quantification of 17 endocrine disruptor compounds and  
466 their spatial and seasonal distribution in the Iberian Ave River and its coastline. *Toxicological &*  
467 *Environmental Chemistry*, 95(3), 386-399.

468 Rochester, J. (2013). Bisphenol A and human health: a review on the literature, *Reprod. Toxicol*, 42,  
469 132-155.

470 Rochester, J. R., & Bolden, A. L. (2015). Bisphenol S and F: a systematic review and comparison of the  
471 hormonal activity of bisphenol A substitutes. *Environmental health perspectives*, 123(7), 643-650.

472 Sánchez-Avila, J., Fernandez-Sanjuan, M., Vicente, J., Lacorte, S. (2011). Development of a multi-  
473 residue method for the determination of organic micropollutants in water, sediment and mussels  
474 using gas chromatography–tandem mass spectrometry. *Journal of Chromatography A*, 1218(38),  
475 6799-6811.





476 Sánchez-Avila J., Tauler R., Lacorte, S. (2012). Organic micropollutants in coastal waters from NW  
477 Mediterranean Sea: Sources distribution and potential risk. *Environment Internatioanl* 46:50-62.

478 Santos, L. H., Araújo, A. N., Fachini, A., Pena, A., Delerue-Matos, C., Montenegro, M. C. B. S. M.  
479 (2010). Ecotoxicological aspects related to the presence of pharmaceuticals in the aquatic  
480 environment. *Journal of hazardous materials*, 175(1-3), 45-95.

481 Staniszewska, M., Falkowska, L., Grabowski, P., Kwaśniak, J., Mudrak-Cegiołka, S., Reindl, A. R.,  
482 Sokołowski A., Szumiło E., Zgrundo, A. (2014). Bisphenol A, 4-tert-octylphenol, and 4-nonylphenol in  
483 the Gulf of Gdańsk (Southern Baltic). *Archives of Environmental Contamination and Toxicology*, 67(3),  
484 335-347.

485 Stossi, F., Bolt, M. J., Ashcroft, F. J., Lamerdin, J. E., Melnick, J. S., Powell, R. T., Dandekar R.D.,  
486 Mancini M.D., Walker C.L., Jo Westwick J.K., Mancini, M. A. (2014). Defining estrogenic mechanisms  
487 of bisphenol A analogs through high throughput microscopy-based contextual assays. *Chemistry &*  
488 *Biology*, 21(6), 743-753.

489 Szczepańska, N., Namieśnik, J., Kudlak, B. (2016). Assessment of toxic and endocrine potential of  
490 substances migrating from selected toys and baby products. *Environmental Science and Pollution*  
491 *Research*, 23(24), 24890-24900.

492 Tanaka Y., Nakamura K., Oda S., Watanabe H., Tatarazako N., (2018). Estimation of population-  
493 level effect of the endocrine disruptor pyriproxyfen in *Daphnia magna* by using changes in sex ratio  
494 and reproductive output, *Ecotoxicology and Environmental Safety* 156, 463-475.

495 Wan Y., Huo W., Xu S., Zheng T., Zhang B., Li Y., Zhou A., Zhang Y., Hu J., Zhu Y., Chen Z., Lu S., Wu C.,  
496 Jiang M., Jiang Y., Liu H., Yang X., Wei Xia (2018). Relationship between maternal exposure to  
497 bisphenol S and pregnancy duration, *Environmental Pollution* 238:717-724.

498 Weinberger II, J., Klaper, R. (2014). Environmental concentrations of the selective serotonin reuptake  
499 inhibitor fluoxetine impact specific behaviors involved in reproduction, feeding and predator  
500 avoidance in the fish *Pimephales promelas* (fathead minnow). *Aquatic toxicology*, 151, 77-83.

501 Wiczerzak, M., Kudlak, B., Namieśnik, J. (2015). Environmentally oriented models and methods for  
502 the evaluation of drug× drug interaction effects. *Critical Review in Analytical Chemistry*, 45, 131-155.)

503 Wiczerzak, M., Kudlak, B., Yotova, G., Nedyalkova, M., Tsakovski, S., Simeonov, V., Namieśnik, J.  
504 (2016). Modeling of pharmaceuticals mixtures toxicity with deviation ratio and best-fit functions  
505 models. *Science of Total Environment*, 571, 259-268.

506 Wiczerzak, M., Kudlak, B., Yotova, G., Tsakovski, S., Simeonov, V., & Namieśnik, J. (2018a). Impact of  
507 inorganic ions and pH variations on toxicity and endocrine potential of selected environmentally  
508 relevant pharmaceuticals. *Environmental Pollution*, 237, 549-558.

509 Xue, J., Liu, W., Kannan, K. (2017). Bisphenols, benzophenones, and bisphenol A diglycidyl ethers in  
510 textiles and infant clothing. *Environmental Science & Technology*, 51(9), 5279-5286.



511 Yamazaki, E., Yamashita, N., Taniyasu, S., Lam, J., Lam, P. K., Moon, H. B., Jeong Y., Kannan P.,  
512 Achyuthan H., Munuswamy N., Kannan, K. (2015). Bisphenol A and other bisphenol analogues  
513 including BPS and BPF in surface water samples from Japan, China, Korea and India. *Ecotoxicology*  
514 and *Environmental Safety*, 122, 565-572.

Table 1. Concentration values of analytes (of bisphenol analogues and pharmaceuticals) selected and used during research

	C1	C2	C3
	μM		
BPA	0.548	1.368	2.190
BPS	0.274	0.684	1.095
BPF	0.274	0.684	1.095
Diclofenac s.	5.750	14.375	23.000
Chloramphenicol	8.704	21.759	34.816
Oxytetracycline h.	5.750	14.375	23.000
Fluoxetine h.	8.299	20.748	33.197
Estrone	8.531	21.329	34.127
Ketoprofen	6.865	17.162	27.460
Progesterone	9.516	23.791	38.065
Gemfibrozil	3.736	9.339	14.943
Androstenedione	6.530	16.326	26.121

Table 2. MDR values variations depending on BPA concentration change for solutions of selected pharmaceuticals studied (red - synergism, blue - antagonism, green - overestimation, yellow - underestimation, for values of particular concentrations C1, C2 and C3 of all analytes please refer to Table 1.)

		YES+						YES-						YAS+						YAS-					
		MDR						MDR						MDR						MDR					
		BPA C1		BPA C2		BPA C3		BPA C1		BPA C2		BPA C3		BPA C1		BPA C2		BPA C3		BPA C1		BPA C2		BPA C3	
		CA	IA	CA	IA	CA	IA	CA	IA	CA	IA	CA	IA	CA	IA	CA	IA	CA	IA	CA	IA	CA	IA	CA	IA
Diclofenac	C1	0.76	1.49	0.44	1.12	0.33	0.97	0.92	1.64	0.88	1.63	0.83	1.51	1.09	2.22	0.72	1.51	0.68	1.36	1.07	1.93	0.91	1.60	0.95	1.66
	C2	0.78	1.51	0.50	1.30	0.32	1.02	0.90	1.52	0.88	1.57	0.92	1.59	1.05	1.85	0.96	1.75	0.87	1.57	0.87	1.52	0.90	1.53	0.90	1.50
	C3	0.92	1.81	0.53	1.45	0.36	1.23	0.92	1.56	0.93	1.65	0.98	1.70	1.06	1.82	0.91	1.63	0.89	1.58	0.91	1.57	0.92	1.55	0.94	1.53
Chloramphenicol	C1	0.57	1.42	0.37	1.28	0.24	1.00	1.02	1.82	1.03	1.92	0.93	1.70	1.15	2.38	0.84	1.78	0.83	1.69	0.99	1.80	0.93	1.65	0.85	1.47
	C2	1.03	1.98	0.55	1.43	0.30	0.97	0.98	1.72	0.91	1.68	0.92	1.64	1.19	2.27	1.01	1.99	0.82	1.57	0.92	1.66	0.99	1.74	0.94	1.59
	C3	0.73	1.68	0.38	1.26	0.23	0.97	1.12	1.90	1.13	2.00	0.99	1.69	0.98	2.03	0.82	1.76	0.77	1.59	1.18	1.88	1.18	1.86	1.07	1.65
Oxytetracycline h.	C1	0.56	1.06	0.39	0.93	0.27	0.74	1.08	1.79	0.98	1.72	0.99	1.75	1.51	3.38	1.03	2.33	1.00	2.14	0.99	1.68	0.96	1.62	0.89	1.51
	C2	0.78	1.40	0.37	0.87	0.22	0.62	0.78	1.31	0.91	1.61	0.95	1.63	1.31	2.63	1.03	2.14	1.10	2.21	0.90	1.50	0.95	1.56	0.86	1.39
	C3	0.63	1.17	0.38	0.95	0.24	0.73	1.10	1.73	1.11	1.83	1.10	1.78	1.15	2.30	0.84	1.75	0.97	1.95	0.97	1.59	0.94	1.51	0.91	1.43
Fluoxetine h.	C1	0.66	1.35	0.43	1.18	0.29	0.95	1.14	2.03	1.09	2.01	1.11	2.01	0.74	1.86	0.66	1.67	0.62	1.47	0.86	1.84	0.76	1.54	0.68	1.31
	C2	0.65	1.48	0.41	1.35	0.27	1.12	1.34	2.36	1.22	2.24	1.26	2.23	1.08	2.56	0.99	2.45	0.79	1.85	0.85	2.30	0.75	1.95	0.76	1.81
	C3	0.77	1.74	0.42	1.35	0.36	1.48	1.20	2.11	1.33	2.45	1.27	2.24	1.13	2.41	0.86	1.91	1.17	2.51	1.19	2.19	1.35	2.42	2.00	3.43
Estrone	C1	0.94	1.45	0.79	1.33	0.81	1.46	0.99	1.69	0.88	1.54	0.86	1.59	0.62	0.97	0.45	0.97	0.35	0.96	0.86	1.70	0.81	1.52	0.80	1.47
	C2	0.88	1.30	0.88	1.38	0.77	1.28	1.08	1.80	0.98	1.62	0.90	1.57	0.74	0.96	0.60	0.96	0.50	0.94	0.91	1.73	0.89	1.59	0.84	1.46
	C3	0.96	1.38	0.96	1.45	0.87	1.40	1.07	1.75	1.02	1.65	0.94	1.59	0.81	1.00	0.67	0.95	0.60	0.96	0.93	1.77	0.80	1.44	0.88	1.50
Ketoprofen	C1	0.78	1.52	0.78	1.57	0.67	1.40	0.98	1.95	0.91	1.76	0.89	1.79	0.66	1.50	0.68	1.49	0.68	1.43	0.72	1.45	0.87	1.66	0.62	1.16
	C2	0.80	1.51	0.74	1.46	0.68	1.43	0.95	1.90	0.89	1.73	0.93	1.90	0.70	1.64	0.70	1.60	0.75	1.66	0.75	1.67	0.76	1.57	0.89	1.75
	C3	0.67	1.22	0.70	1.34	0.69	1.40	1.00	1.87	0.95	1.74	0.97	1.86	0.73	1.63	0.72	1.60	0.62	1.32	0.83	1.77	0.85	1.68	0.81	1.53
Progesterone	C1	1.06	3.82	0.80	2.92	0.64	2.50	1.09	2.11	1.00	1.89	0.94	1.85	0.61	0.95	0.43	0.93	0.34	0.94	0.82	1.48	0.78	1.36	0.71	1.24
	C2	1.07	4.02	0.86	3.39	0.71	3.06	1.04	2.03	0.97	1.85	0.95	1.91	0.66	0.85	0.55	0.89	0.44	0.85	0.80	1.27	0.85	1.31	0.73	1.12
	C3	1.05	3.81	0.82	3.16	0.74	3.11	1.03	1.99	0.95	1.78	1.05	2.08	0.76	0.93	0.59	0.83	0.53	0.87	0.81	1.27	0.77	1.17	0.76	1.13
Gemfibrozil	C1	1.19	2.41	0.84	1.74	0.81	1.70	1.10	2.24	0.91	1.81	0.84	1.70	1.30	2.93	0.90	1.93	0.87	1.80	0.89	1.73	0.91	1.71	0.95	1.78
	C2	0.99	2.14	0.85	1.89	0.79	1.87	0.98	2.11	0.88	1.81	0.85	1.83	1.24	2.35	1.23	2.32	1.16	2.19	0.87	1.70	0.95	1.77	1.00	1.80
	C3	0.94	2.22	0.81	1.98	0.72	1.89	0.96	2.12	0.81	1.71	0.72	1.58	0.94	2.11	0.85	1.87	0.87	1.84	0.88	1.74	0.95	1.77	1.00	1.80
Androstenedione	C1	1.10	1.99	0.85	1.62	0.77	1.53	1.12	2.08	0.97	1.81	0.97	1.87	0.39	0.77	0.29	0.94	0.19	0.85	0.87	1.36	0.77	1.26	0.65	1.16
	C2	0.97	1.56	1.00	1.70	0.84	1.52	0.99	1.70	0.97	1.66	0.90	1.62	0.63	0.97	0.42	0.96	0.29	0.90	0.86	1.20	0.81	1.18	0.70	1.07
	C3	1.08	1.87	0.89	1.61	0.99	1.90	0.92	1.72	0.87	1.58	0.96	1.84	0.66	0.88	0.55	0.94	0.43	0.92	0.95	1.39	0.92	1.33	0.80	1.17





Table 2. MDR values variations depending on BPA concentration change for solutions of selected pharmaceuticals studied (legend for printed B&W version: MDR >2.0 exhibits antagonism, MDR < 0.5 shows synergism, MDR values within 0.50–0.71 and 1.40–2.00 values mean, respectively, under- and overestimation of presented models, for values of particular concentrations C1, C2 and C3 of all analytes please refer to Table 1.)

		YES+						YES-						YAS+						YAS-																													
		MDR												MDR												MDR												MDR											
		BPA C1		BPA C2		BPA C3		BPA C1		BPA C2		BPA C3		BPA C1		BPA C2		BPA C3		BPA C1		BPA C2		BPA C3		BPA C1		BPA C2		BPA C3																			
		CA	IA	CA	IA	CA	IA	CA	IA	CA	IA	CA	IA	CA	IA	CA	IA	CA	IA	CA	IA	CA	IA	CA	IA	CA	IA	CA	IA																				
Diclofenac	C1	0.76	1.49	0.44	1.12	0.33	0.97	0.92	1.64	0.88	1.63	0.83	1.51	1.09	2.22	0.72	1.51	0.68	1.36	1.07	1.93	0.91	1.60	0.95	1.66																								
	C2	0.78	1.51	0.50	1.30	0.32	1.02	0.90	1.52	0.88	1.57	0.92	1.59	1.05	1.85	0.96	1.75	0.87	1.57	0.87	1.52	0.90	1.53	0.90	1.50																								
	C3	0.92	1.81	0.53	1.45	0.36	1.23	0.92	1.56	0.93	1.65	0.98	1.70	1.06	1.82	0.91	1.63	0.89	1.58	0.91	1.57	0.92	1.55	0.94	1.53																								
Chloramphenicol	C1	0.57	1.42	0.37	1.28	0.24	1.00	1.02	1.82	1.03	1.92	0.93	1.70	1.15	2.38	0.84	1.78	0.83	1.69	0.99	1.80	0.93	1.65	0.85	1.47																								
	C2	1.03	1.98	0.55	1.43	0.30	0.97	0.98	1.72	0.91	1.68	0.92	1.64	1.19	2.27	1.01	1.99	0.82	1.57	0.92	1.66	0.99	1.74	0.94	1.59																								
	C3	0.73	1.68	0.38	1.26	0.23	0.97	1.12	1.90	1.13	2.00	0.99	1.69	0.98	2.03	0.82	1.76	0.77	1.59	1.18	1.88	1.18	1.86	1.07	1.65																								
Oxytetracycline h.	C1	0.56	1.06	0.39	0.93	0.27	0.74	1.08	1.79	0.98	1.72	0.99	1.75	1.51	3.38	1.03	2.33	1.00	2.14	0.99	1.68	0.96	1.62	0.89	1.51																								
	C2	0.78	1.40	0.37	0.87	0.22	0.62	0.78	1.31	0.91	1.61	0.95	1.63	1.31	2.63	1.03	2.14	1.10	2.21	0.90	1.50	0.95	1.56	0.86	1.39																								
	C3	0.63	1.17	0.38	0.95	0.24	0.73	1.10	1.73	1.11	1.83	1.10	1.78	1.15	2.30	0.84	1.75	0.97	1.95	0.97	1.59	0.94	1.51	0.91	1.43																								
Fluoxetine h.	C1	0.66	1.35	0.43	1.18	0.29	0.95	1.14	2.03	1.09	2.01	1.11	2.01	0.74	1.86	0.66	1.67	0.62	1.47	0.86	1.84	0.76	1.54	0.68	1.31																								
	C2	0.65	1.48	0.41	1.35	0.27	1.12	1.34	2.36	1.22	2.24	1.26	2.23	1.08	2.56	0.99	2.45	0.79	1.85	0.85	2.30	0.75	1.95	0.76	1.81																								
	C3	0.77	1.74	0.42	1.35	0.36	1.48	1.20	2.11	1.33	2.45	1.27	2.24	1.13	2.41	0.86	1.91	1.17	2.51	1.19	2.19	1.35	2.42	2.00	3.43																								
Estrone	C1	0.94	1.45	0.79	1.33	0.81	1.46	0.99	1.69	0.88	1.54	0.86	1.59	0.62	0.97	0.45	0.97	0.35	0.96	0.86	1.70	0.81	1.52	0.80	1.47																								
	C2	0.88	1.30	0.88	1.38	0.77	1.28	1.08	1.80	0.98	1.62	0.90	1.57	0.74	0.96	0.60	0.96	0.50	0.94	0.91	1.73	0.89	1.59	0.84	1.46																								
	C3	0.96	1.38	0.96	1.45	0.87	1.40	1.07	1.75	1.02	1.65	0.94	1.59	0.81	1.00	0.67	0.95	0.60	0.96	0.93	1.77	0.80	1.44	0.88	1.50																								
Ketoprofen	C1	0.78	1.52	0.78	1.57	0.67	1.40	0.98	1.95	0.91	1.76	0.89	1.79	0.66	1.50	0.68	1.49	0.68	1.43	0.72	1.45	0.87	1.66	0.62	1.16																								
	C2	0.80	1.51	0.74	1.46	0.68	1.43	0.95	1.90	0.89	1.73	0.93	1.90	0.70	1.64	0.70	1.60	0.75	1.66	0.75	1.67	0.76	1.57	0.89	1.75																								
	C3	0.67	1.22	0.70	1.34	0.69	1.40	1.00	1.87	0.95	1.74	0.97	1.86	0.73	1.63	0.72	1.60	0.62	1.32	0.83	1.77	0.85	1.68	0.81	1.53																								
Progesterone	C1	1.06	3.82	0.80	2.92	0.64	2.50	1.09	2.11	1.00	1.89	0.94	1.85	0.61	0.95	0.43	0.93	0.34	0.94	0.82	1.48	0.78	1.36	0.71	1.24																								
	C2	1.07	4.02	0.86	3.39	0.71	3.06	1.04	2.03	0.97	1.85	0.95	1.91	0.66	0.85	0.55	0.89	0.44	0.85	0.80	1.27	0.85	1.31	0.73	1.12																								
	C3	1.05	3.81	0.82	3.16	0.74	3.11	1.03	1.99	0.95	1.78	1.05	2.08	0.76	0.93	0.59	0.83	0.53	0.87	0.81	1.27	0.77	1.17	0.76	1.13																								
Gemfibrozil	C1	1.19	2.41	0.84	1.74	0.81	1.70	1.10	2.24	0.91	1.81	0.84	1.70	1.30	2.93	0.90	1.93	0.87	1.80	0.89	1.73	0.91	1.71	0.95	1.78																								
	C2	0.99	2.14	0.85	1.89	0.79	1.87	0.98	2.11	0.88	1.81	0.85	1.83	1.24	2.35	1.23	2.32	1.16	2.19	0.87	1.70	0.95	1.77	1.00	1.80																								
	C3	0.94	2.22	0.81	1.98	0.72	1.89	0.96	2.12	0.81	1.71	0.72	1.58	0.94	2.11	0.85	1.87	0.87	1.84	0.88	1.74	0.95	1.77	1.00	1.80																								
Androstenedione	C1	1.10	1.99	0.85	1.62	0.77	1.53	1.12	2.08	0.97	1.81	0.97	1.87	0.39	0.77	0.29	0.94	0.19	0.85	0.87	1.36	0.77	1.26	0.65	1.16																								
	C2	0.97	1.56	1.00	1.70	0.84	1.52	0.99	1.70	0.97	1.66	0.90	1.62	0.63	0.97	0.42	0.96	0.29	0.90	0.86	1.20	0.81	1.18	0.70	1.07																								
	C3	1.08	1.87	0.89	1.61	0.99	1.90	0.92	1.72	0.87	1.58	0.96	1.84	0.66	0.88	0.55	0.94	0.43	0.92	0.95	1.39	0.92	1.33	0.80	1.17																								



Bisphenols (A, S, and F) affect the basic hormonal activity determined for pharmaceuticals – study of  
*Saccharomyces cerevisiae*

Kudłak Błażej<sup>1\*</sup>, Monika Wiczerzak<sup>1</sup>, Namieśnik Jacek<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Department of Analytical Chemistry, Faculty of Chemistry, Gdańsk University of Technology,  
Narutowicza Str. 11/12, 80-233 Gdańsk

\* corresponding Author: blakudla@pg.edu.pl, phone no.: +48583472128, ORCID no.: 0000-0002-  
2237-2927

Table A. MDR values variations depending on BPS concentration change for solutions of selected pharmaceuticals studied (red - synergism, blue - antagonism, green - overestimation, yellow – underestimation, for values of particular concentrations C1, C2 and C3 of all analytes please refer to Table 1.)

		YES+ MDR						YES- MDR						YAS+ MDR						YAS- MDR					
		BPS C1		BPS C2		BPS C3		BPS C1		BPS C2		BPS C3		BPS C1		BPS C2		BPS C3		BPS C1		BPS C2		BPS C3	
		CA	IA	CA	IA	CA	IA	CA	IA	CA	IA	CA	IA	CA	IA	CA	IA	CA	IA	CA	IA	CA	IA	CA	IA
Diclofenac	C1	0.69	1.46	0.49	1.40	0.22	0.95	1.17	2.43	0.91	2.14	0.67	1.48	1.21	2.22	0.63	1.28	0.63	1.27	0.90	1.45	0.91	1.48	0.78	1.27
	C2	0.77	1.52	0.49	1.35	0.28	1.19	0.97	2.06	0.89	2.20	0.56	1.32	0.74	1.29	0.70	1.36	0.56	1.08	0.97	1.51	0.91	1.45	0.85	1.36
	C3	0.73	1.49	0.51	1.46	0.29	1.31	1.29	2.57	0.97	2.25	0.67	1.47	0.78	1.39	0.73	1.43	0.69	1.34	0.90	1.41	0.88	1.41	0.87	1.39
Chloramphenicol	C1	0.80	1.69	0.46	1.35	0.23	1.05	1.06	2.37	0.94	2.42	0.52	1.26	1.05	1.93	0.82	1.68	0.69	1.37	0.97	1.55	0.96	1.56	0.81	1.31
	C2	0.93	1.83	0.60	1.64	0.25	1.10	1.06	2.13	0.85	1.98	0.63	1.40	1.02	1.77	0.94	1.82	0.76	1.44	1.05	1.63	0.97	1.55	0.90	1.43
	C3	0.84	1.70	0.49	1.40	0.24	1.09	1.17	2.29	0.94	2.12	0.66	1.43	1.04	1.87	0.96	1.92	0.67	1.31	0.93	1.46	0.93	1.49	0.90	1.44
Oxytetracycline h.	C1	1.04	2.02	0.49	1.27	0.21	0.82	1.08	2.09	0.74	1.61	0.66	1.38	0.88	1.68	0.67	1.42	0.68	1.39	0.93	1.50	0.87	1.42	0.92	1.50
	C2	0.94	1.86	0.46	1.26	0.29	1.25	1.08	1.93	0.74	1.49	0.75	1.46	0.90	1.59	0.79	1.55	0.76	1.47	0.96	1.51	0.99	1.58	0.93	1.48
	C3	0.84	1.55	0.38	0.97	0.26	1.01	0.89	1.64	0.62	1.30	0.61	1.23	0.99	1.66	0.77	1.44	0.79	1.45	0.97	1.51	0.97	1.54	0.88	1.40
Fluoxetine h.	C1	0.80	1.59	0.53	1.45	0.27	1.16	0.99	2.05	0.63	1.49	0.63	1.41	0.84	1.63	0.75	1.61	0.69	1.47	0.88	1.60	0.80	1.47	0.82	1.49
	C2	0.82	1.67	0.47	1.34	0.31	1.41	0.82	1.75	0.60	1.49	0.59	1.40	0.74	1.71	0.74	1.94	0.77	1.97	0.84	2.04	0.74	1.84	0.77	1.89
	C3	0.79	1.67	0.47	1.43	0.26	1.28	0.83	1.66	0.56	1.29	0.73	1.62	0.96	2.16	1.01	2.60	0.98	2.45	1.05	2.57	1.19	3.02	1.33	3.35
Estrone	C1	0.82	1.20	0.76	1.12	0.82	1.26	1.02	1.42	0.99	1.53	0.98	1.54	0.69	0.93	0.42	0.68	0.37	0.75	0.90	1.58	0.74	1.33	0.72	1.21
	C2	1.00	1.22	0.83	1.08	0.94	1.30	1.09	1.44	1.00	1.47	1.13	1.66	0.76	0.92	0.52	0.68	0.49	0.74	0.90	1.64	0.65	1.25	0.79	1.38
	C3	1.02	1.19	0.89	1.12	0.94	1.29	0.87	1.68	0.64	1.52	0.79	1.79	0.85	0.98	0.54	0.67	0.56	0.76	0.84	1.27	0.72	1.12	0.85	1.26
Ketoprofen	C1	0.67	1.12	0.30	0.87	0.25	0.94	0.81	1.54	0.57	1.31	0.67	1.46	0.95	1.84	0.95	1.84	0.69	1.36	0.82	1.34	0.81	1.35	0.69	1.08
	C2	0.91	1.43	0.31	0.83	0.28	0.99	0.78	1.60	0.59	1.49	0.76	1.86	0.89	1.81	0.89	1.81	0.68	1.40	0.83	1.44	0.59	1.06	0.70	1.18
	C3	0.83	1.14	0.39	0.82	0.48	1.29	0.86	1.58	0.66	1.48	0.74	1.61	0.98	1.93	0.98	1.93	0.69	1.38	0.74	1.31	0.63	1.17	0.78	1.32
Progesterone	C1	0.86	2.78	0.30	2.33	0.18	1.96	1.00	2.48	0.64	1.99	0.65	1.90	0.56	0.81	0.41	0.73	0.30	0.74	0.77	1.50	0.69	1.40	0.67	1.24
	C2	0.65	2.04	0.32	2.40	0.17	1.87	0.93	2.15	0.76	2.22	0.72	2.02	0.72	0.89	0.56	0.79	0.52	0.92	0.78	1.41	0.65	1.22	0.72	1.24
	C3	0.67	1.96	0.31	2.16	0.22	2.18	0.91	2.11	0.72	2.14	0.70	1.97	0.73	0.84	0.68	0.86	0.62	0.92	0.81	1.45	0.74	1.39	0.83	1.44
Gemfibrozil	C1	1.24	2.17	0.39	1.14	0.17	0.65	1.30	2.47	0.77	1.72	0.90	1.90	1.69	3.27	0.56	1.21	0.66	1.31	0.85	1.37	0.82	1.34	0.82	1.27
	C2	1.79	2.83	0.42	1.11	0.23	0.80	1.10	2.26	0.69	1.73	0.81	1.92	0.89	1.82	0.55	1.26	0.58	1.18	0.74	1.29	0.72	1.29	0.77	1.28
	C3	1.24	1.98	0.26	0.71	0.34	1.23	1.48	2.74	0.87	1.95	1.10	2.36	0.87	1.72	0.49	1.11	0.69	1.38	0.83	1.45	0.69	1.26	0.79	1.34
Androstenedione	C1	1.60	2.23	0.76	1.38	0.32	0.68	0.94	1.77	0.63	1.42	0.71	1.52	0.49	0.94	0.34	0.88	0.22	0.87	0.94	1.68	0.89	1.63	0.88	1.48
	C2	3.22	4.00	1.15	1.58	0.74	1.10	0.83	1.39	0.72	1.43	0.70	1.34	0.67	0.95	0.53	0.93	0.39	0.97	0.84	1.43	0.86	1.53	0.81	1.34
	C3	2.91	3.48	0.58	0.84	0.68	1.12	1.18	2.15	0.64	1.42	0.89	1.90	0.70	0.88	0.62	0.91	0.46	0.89	0.96	1.60	0.92	1.60	0.88	1.43





Electronic supplementary material

Table B. MDR values variations depending on BPF concentration change for solutions of selected pharmaceuticals studied (red - synergism, blue - antagonism, green - overestimation, yellow - underestimation, for values of particular concentrations C1, C2 and C3 of all analytes please refer to Table 1.)

		YES+						YES-MDR						YAS+						YAS-					
		BPF C1		BPF C2		BPF C3		BPF C1		BPF C2		BPF C3		BPF C1		BPF C2		BPF C3		BPF C1		BPF C2		BPF C3	
		CA	IA	CA	IA	CA	IA	CA	IA	CA	IA	CA	IA	CA	IA	CA	IA	CA	IA	CA	IA	CA	IA	CA	IA
Diclofenac	C1	0.77	1.98	0.33	1.39	0.27	1.15	1.02	2.24	0.69	1.57	0.66	1.52	1.26	2.57	0.73	1.45	0.65	1.32	1.31	2.55	1.14	2.12	1.05	1.94
	C2	0.65	1.77	0.29	1.34	0.26	1.27	0.91	1.96	0.74	1.65	0.73	1.71	0.84	1.69	0.71	1.39	0.56	1.13	0.99	1.96	0.97	1.81	0.95	1.75
	C3	0.70	1.91	0.31	1.49	0.28	1.38	0.95	2.07	0.78	1.76	0.74	1.75	0.97	1.63	0.81	1.35	0.76	1.30	1.01	1.88	0.91	1.59	0.91	1.59
Chloramphenicol	C1	0.77	1.94	0.38	1.57	0.29	1.25	1.31	2.53	0.88	1.76	0.82	1.70	1.17	2.48	0.68	1.40	0.61	1.27	0.86	1.61	0.75	1.32	0.74	1.27
	C2	0.76	1.91	0.28	1.18	0.29	1.31	1.13	2.18	0.91	1.82	0.90	1.88	0.74	1.59	0.63	1.31	0.49	1.06	0.47	1.26	0.47	1.15	0.46	1.08
	C3	0.84	2.03	0.42	1.69	0.31	1.34	1.28	2.38	1.04	2.01	0.98	1.99	0.76	1.42	0.64	1.17	0.60	1.13	0.43	1.19	0.42	1.05	0.42	1.04
Oxytetracycline h.	C1	0.77	1.72	0.30	1.04	0.27	0.96	0.93	1.84	0.73	1.49	0.66	1.39	0.96	1.81	0.85	1.57	0.73	1.40	0.97	1.54	0.94	1.44	0.81	1.25
	C2	0.72	1.60	0.29	1.05	0.25	0.93	0.92	1.68	0.86	1.63	0.74	1.46	0.92	1.65	0.88	1.55	0.69	1.25	0.98	1.49	0.99	1.44	0.96	1.39
	C3	0.79	1.70	0.32	1.11	0.30	1.09	1.18	2.10	0.76	1.40	0.82	1.57	1.00	1.69	0.93	1.55	0.85	1.46	1.04	1.58	0.99	1.44	0.91	1.32
Fluoxetine h.	C1	0.92	1.93	0.37	1.22	0.31	1.05	1.04	2.00	0.83	1.66	0.77	1.59	0.71	1.50	0.74	1.52	0.69	1.44	0.82	1.53	0.82	1.44	0.79	1.36
	C2	0.97	1.98	0.39	1.27	0.37	1.26	0.91	1.76	0.90	1.79	0.83	1.71	0.82	1.77	0.84	1.75	0.81	1.75	0.85	2.26	0.81	1.97	0.89	2.10
	C3	0.80	1.71	0.35	1.22	0.32	1.14	0.94	1.75	0.87	1.69	0.77	1.56	0.83	1.55	0.89	1.62	0.95	1.78	0.68	1.87	0.79	1.97	0.97	2.36
Estrone	C1	0.78	1.15	0.75	1.15	0.68	1.17	1.10	1.50	0.78	1.15	0.80	1.27	0.62	0.89	0.43	0.85	0.36	0.82	0.87	1.55	0.84	1.53	0.80	1.40
	C2	0.96	1.18	0.94	1.24	0.77	1.08	1.00	1.33	0.82	1.10	0.81	1.19	0.77	0.93	0.59	0.84	0.55	0.86	1.02	1.85	0.92	1.72	0.90	1.61
	C3	1.02	1.19	0.90	1.14	0.77	1.01	1.17	1.49	1.00	1.29	1.02	1.42	0.68	0.79	0.66	0.85	0.60	0.83	0.92	1.77	0.79	1.55	0.78	1.48
Ketoprofen	C1	0.60	0.92	0.43	0.91	0.35	0.75	0.95	1.49	0.67	1.07	0.69	1.22	0.74	1.17	0.70	1.16	0.68	1.18	0.80	1.28	0.82	1.34	0.79	1.26
	C2	0.93	1.46	0.52	1.19	0.49	1.13	0.69	1.33	0.47	0.88	0.58	1.28	0.71	1.36	0.62	1.18	0.56	1.13	0.85	1.41	0.77	1.31	0.74	1.23
	C3	0.66	0.94	0.54	1.07	0.44	0.89	0.89	1.50	0.68	1.11	0.64	1.22	0.63	1.11	0.63	1.11	0.76	1.43	0.79	1.27	0.80	1.31	0.82	1.31
Progesterone	C1	0.91	2.41	0.42	2.00	0.35	1.66	1.13	2.39	0.74	1.49	0.65	1.55	0.58	0.84	0.40	0.80	0.35	0.82	0.78	1.60	0.63	1.32	0.70	1.39
	C2	0.83	2.21	0.39	1.92	0.35	1.73	1.07	2.13	0.82	1.57	0.75	1.72	0.68	0.82	0.55	0.80	0.50	0.81	0.89	1.55	0.87	1.56	0.87	1.51
	C3	0.83	2.12	0.39	1.87	0.32	1.54	0.92	1.78	0.76	1.41	0.80	1.79	0.74	0.86	0.59	0.78	0.65	0.92	0.89	1.59	0.77	1.41	0.91	1.62
Gemfibrozil	C1	0.90	2.18	0.26	1.14	0.20	0.89	1.13	2.21	0.60	1.14	0.62	1.32	0.89	1.69	0.64	1.23	0.48	0.96	0.75	1.22	0.77	1.28	0.73	1.19
	C2	0.69	1.88	0.27	1.38	0.22	1.16	0.90	2.19	0.55	1.26	0.54	1.49	0.71	1.47	0.61	1.26	0.53	1.15	0.86	1.42	0.80	1.36	0.79	1.30
	C3	0.59	1.55	0.27	1.33	0.22	1.08	0.94	2.05	0.66	1.36	0.70	1.76	0.72	1.43	0.62	1.22	0.65	1.37	0.75	1.24	0.76	1.30	0.92	1.53
Androstenedione	C1	1.49	2.27	0.68	1.42	0.50	1.04	1.33	2.20	0.80	1.33	0.75	1.39	0.57	1.06	0.34	1.02	0.27	0.96	0.88	1.41	0.87	1.42	0.83	1.34
	C2	0.85	1.23	0.44	0.88	0.37	0.75	1.08	1.53	0.85	1.23	0.78	1.24	0.67	0.91	0.49	0.91	0.40	0.86	0.97	1.50	0.92	1.46	0.85	1.32
	C3	1.56	2.21	0.70	1.36	0.67	1.33	1.06	1.73	0.81	1.30	0.83	1.53	0.75	0.93	0.60	0.92	0.53	0.93	0.97	1.52	0.96	1.54	1.00	1.56

Electronic supplementary material

Table C. Percentile values for model deviation ratios (MDR) and numbers of cases for each group of CA and IA experiments of BPA YES+ toxicity studies.

	80%	90%	95%	99%	Synergism	Under-estimation	Over-estimation	Antagonism	Total
CA	0.89	0.99	1.06	1.11	21	14	0	0	81
IA	1.89	2.50	3.16	3.86	0	1	34	12	81

Table D. Percentile values for model deviation ratios (MDR) and numbers of cases for each group of CA and IA experiments of BPA YES- toxicity studies.

	80%	90%	95%	99%	Synergism	Under-estimation	Over-estimation	Antagonism	Total
CA	1.09	1.12	1.22	1.34	0	0	0	0	81
IA	2.00	2.11	2.24	2.38	0	0	63	17	81

Table E. Percentile values for model deviation ratios (MDR) and numbers of cases for each group of CA and IA experiments of BPA YAS+ toxicity studies.

	80%	90%	95%	99%	Synergism	Under-estimation	Over-estimation	Antagonism	Total
CA	1.03	1.15	1.23	1.35	12	21	1	0	81
IA	2.14	2.35	2.51	3.02	0	0	32	20	81

Table F. Percentile values for model deviation ratios (MDR) and numbers of cases for each group of CA and IA experiments of BPA YAS- toxicity studies.

	80%	90%	95%	99%	Synergism	Under-estimation	Over-estimation	Antagonism	Total
CA	0.95	1.00	1.18	1.48	0	4	1	0	81
IA	1.77	1.84	1.95	2.62	0	0	57	4	81

Table G. Percentile values for model deviation ratios (MDR) and numbers of cases for each group of CA and IA experiments of BPS toxicity studies.

	80%	90%	95%	99%	Synergism	Under-estimation	Over-estimation	Antagonism	Total
CA	0.86	1.02	1.24	2.97	40	9	2	2	81
IA	1.86	2.17	2.40	3.59	0	3	22	12	81

Table H. Percentile values for model deviation ratios (MDR) and numbers of cases for each group of CA and IA experiments of BPS YES- toxicity studies.

	80%	90%	95%	99%	Synergism	Under-estimation	Over-estimation	Antagonism	Total
CA	1.00	1.10	1.17	1.34	0	27	1	0	81
IA	2.14	2.29	2.43	2.61	0	0	46	24	81

Table I. Percentile values for model deviation ratios (MDR) and numbers of cases for each group of CA and IA experiments of BPS YAS+ toxicity studies.

	80%	90%	95%	99%	Synergism	Under-estimation	Over-estimation	Antagonism	Total
CA	0.88	0.98	1.02	1.30	11	34	1	0	81
IA	1.72	1.93	2.16	2.73	0	3	31	5	81

Table J. Percentile values for model deviation ratios (MDR) and numbers of cases for each group of CA and IA experiments of BPS YAS- toxicity studies.

	80%	90%	95%	99%	Synergism	Under-estimation	Over-estimation	Antagonism	Total
CA	0.93	0.97	0.99	1.22	0	9	0	0	81
IA	1.55	1.63	1.89	3.08	0	0	43	4	81

Table K. Percentile values for model deviation ratios (MDR) and numbers of cases for each group of CA and IA experiments of BPF YES+ toxicity studies.

	80%	90%	95%	99%	Synergism	Under-estimation	Over-estimation	Antagonism	Total
CA	0.79	0.91	0.96	1.50	43	12	2	0	81
IA	1.87	1.98	2.18	2.30	0	0	23	8	81

Table L. Percentile values for model deviation ratios (MDR) and numbers of cases for each group of CA and IA experiments of BPF YES- toxicity studies.

	80%	90%	95%	99%	Synergism	Under-estimation	Over-estimation	Antagonism	Total
CA	1.00	1.10	1.17	1.31	1	16	0	0	81
IA	1.88	2.13	2.21	2.41	0	0	44	14	81

Table M. Percentile values for model deviation ratios (MDR) and numbers of cases for each group of CA and IA experiments of BPF YAS+ toxicity studies.

	80%	90%	95%	99%	Synergism	Under-estimation	Over-estimation	Antagonism	Total
CA	0.82	0.89	0.96	1.19	10	39	0	0	81
IA	1.55	1.69	1.77	2.49	0	0	26	2	81

Table N. Percentile values for model deviation ratios (MDR) and numbers of cases for each group of CA and IA experiments of BPF YAS- toxicity studies.

	80%	90%	95%	99%	Synergism	Under-estimation	Over-estimation	Antagonism	Total
CA	0.96	0.99	1.02	1.18	6	3	0	0	81
IA	1.62	1.94	2.10	2.40	0	0	45	5	81