

Combined effects of environmental xeno-estrogens within multi-component mixtures: Comparison of in vitro human- and zebrafish-based estrogenicity bioassays

Hélène Serra, Martin Scholze, Rolf Altenburger, Wibke Busch, Hélène

Budzinski, François Brion, Selim Aït-Aïssa

▶ To cite this version:

Hélène Serra, Martin Scholze, Rolf Altenburger, Wibke Busch, Hélène Budzinski, et al.. Combined effects of environmental xeno-estrogens within multi-component mixtures: Comparison of in vitro human- and zebrafish-based estrogenicity bioassays. Chemosphere, 2019, 227, pp.334-344. 10.1016/j.chemosphere.2019.04.060. hal-02337028

HAL Id: hal-02337028 https://hal.science/hal-02337028

Submitted on 3 Aug 2021

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers. L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

1	Combined effects of environmental xeno-estrogens within multi-component mixtures:
2	comparison of in vitro human- and zebrafish-based estrogenicity bioassays
3	Hélène Serra ^{1,2} , Martin Scholze ³ , Rolf Altenburger ⁴ , Wibke Busch ⁴ , Hélène Budzinski ² , François
4	Brion ¹ , Selim Aït-Aïssa ^{1,*}
5	
6	¹ Institut National de l'Environnement Industriel et des risques (INERIS), Unité Ecotoxicologie in
7	vitro et in vivo, UMR-I 02 SEBIO, 60550 Verneuil-en-Halatte, France
8	² UMR-CNRS EPOC/LPTC, Université de Bordeaux, Talence, France
9	³ Brunel University London, Uxbridge, United Kingdom
10	⁴ UFZ– Helmholtz Centre for Environmental Research, Leipzig, Germany
11	
12	*Corresponding author. Email: selim.ait-aissa@ineris.fr
12	

ABSTRACT

Some recent studies showed that in vitro bioassays based on fish or human estrogen 15 receptor (ER) activation may have distinct responses to environmental samples, highlighting 16 the need to better understand bioassay-specific ER response to environmental mixtures. For 17 this purpose, we investigated a 12-compound mixture in two mixture ratios (M1 and M2) on 18 zebrafish (zf) liver cells stably expressing zfER α (ZELH α cells) or zfER β 2 (ZELH β 2 cells) 19 and on human ER-reporter gene (MELN) cells. The mixture included well-known ER ligands 20 bisphenol A (BPA) and genistein (GEN), and other compounds representatives of a 21 freshwater background contamination. In this context, the study aimed at assessing the 22 robustness of concentration addition (CA) model and the potential confounding influence of 23 24 other chemicals by testing subgroups of ER activators, ER inhibitors or ER activators and 25 inhibitors combined. Individual chemical testing showed a higher prevalence of ER inhibitors in zebrafish than human cells (e.g. propiconazole), and some chemicals inhibited zfER but 26 27 activated hER response (e.g. benzo(a)pyrene, triphenylphosphate). The estrogenic activity of M1 and M2 was well predicted by CA in MELN cells, whereas it was significantly lower than 28 predicted in ZELH^β2 cells, contrasting with the additive effects observed for BPA and GEN 29 30 binary mixtures. When testing the subgroups of ER activators and inhibitors combined, a deviation from additivity was caused by zebrafish-specific inhibiting chemicals. This study 31 32 provides novel information on the ability of environmental pollutants to interfere with zfER signaling and shows that non-estrogenic chemicals can influence the response to a mixture of 33 xeno-estrogens in a bioassay-specific manner. 34

35 KEY WORDS: estrogenicity, anti-estrogen, mixture, *in vitro* reporter gene, human, zebrafish

36

1. Introduction

38 The occurrence of numerous endocrine disrupting chemicals (EDC) in aquatic ecosystems has raised concern over their potential adverse effects in aquatic organisms, such as fish (Sumpter, 39 40 2005). Many EDCs, such as natural and synthetic hormones, pesticides or industrial chemicals, are xeno-estrogens, *i.e.* they bind the estrogen receptors (ERs) and subsequently alter the 41 transcription of target genes involved in key physiological functions (Sumpter, 2005). In vitro 42 43 bioassays based on ER transactivation have been used to assess the estrogenic activity of 44 chemicals, but also of environmental samples (Jarošová et al., 2014; Snyder et al., 2001; 45 Zacharewski, 1997). In case of environmental monitoring, they are expected to enable an 46 integrative detection of various ER-active contaminants within complex environmental mixtures considering both known and unknown xeno-estrogens. They provide a unique quantitative 47 48 response which may be summarized as estradiol-equivalent (E2-Eq, Kase et al., 2018, Jarošová et al., 2014). 49

50 To date, a large majority of in vitro bioassays used in environmental bio-monitoring are 51 based on mammalian or yeast cell systems that stably express a reporter gene which expression is 52 controlled by the human ER subtype α (hER α) (Könemann et al., 2018; Kunz et al., 2015; Leusch 53 et al., 2010). However, the relevance of using human-based assay to assess hazard and risk for 54 aquatic species is a question of concern in environmental assessment (Hotchkiss et al., 2008). For 55 instance, humans express two ER subtypes, ER α and ER β , but most teleost fish express at least 56 three ER subtypes, ERa, ERb1 and ERb2 (Menuet et al., 2002; Tohyama et al., 2015). Fish and 57 human ER have relatively low sequence homologies in their ligand binding domain (Menuet et al., 2002; Tohyama et al., 2015). These structural differences are believed to contribute to the 58 59 distinct sensitivity to certain xeno-estrogens (Miyagawa et al., 2014), along with other factors linked to the cell specificities, such as cell metabolic capacities (Le Fol et al., 2015), 60 61 presence/absence of transcriptional cofactors or cross-talks with other signalling pathways (Navas and Segner, 2000; Ohtake et al., 2003). 62

In a recent study, we reported that some surface water samples were active on a zebrafish 63 liver cell line stably expressing zebrafish ER^β2 (zfER^β2), the ZELH^β2 cells, but not on human 64 65 breast cancer MELN cells that endogenously express hER α (Sonavane et al., 2016). Similarly, 66 some effluent extracts from sewage treatment plants produced very different *in vitro* responses in cells expressing human or medaka ERa (Ihara et al., 2014). These differences were further 67 68 confirmed *in vivo* by measuring vitellogenin induction in exposed male medaka (Ihara et al., 69 2015). In the latter study, the estrogenic chemicals identified were not sufficient to explain the 70 distinct response of fish bioassays. However, the authors showed that the anti-estrogenic activity 71 measured in the samples may contribute to the different responses of medaka and human ER.

72 Several studies have addressed the combined effect of ER ligands in reconstituted 73 mixtures, generally concluding on their additive effects based on concentration addition (CA) 74 predictions (Kortenkamp, 2007). However, xeno-estrogens occur in the aquatic ecosystem 75 together with other chemicals that have various and distinct modes of action (e.g. Escher et al., 76 2014; Neale et al., 2015, Busch et al., 2016). To date, few studies have investigated additive 77 effects of xeno-estrogens in more diverse exposure scenarios, such as with non- or weak 78 estrogenic chemicals (Evans et al., 2012) or with anti-estrogenic chemicals (Yang et al., 2015). Recently, a mixture of 12 selected environmental chemicals was tested in zebrafish and human-79 80 based bioassays as part of a larger round-robin study. The aim was to investigate whether the 81 estrogenic activity of the ER ligands in this mixture (e.g. genistein and bisphenol A) was 82 detectable against the background of the other environmental pollutants (Altenburger et al., 2018). This study concluded that in human MELN cells the overall estrogenic activity of the mixtures 83 84 was accurately predicted by an assumed additivity of the estrogenic chemicals. However, in 85 zebrafish ZELH β 2 cells the measured estrogenic response of the mixture was lower than expected. The reasons of this discrepancy between human and zebrafish-based ER-reporter gene 86 87 assays were unknown, and therefore raised the question about potential limitations of a presumed 88 CA additivity.

89 In this context, the present study was designed to investigate the different responses of zebrafish- and human-based in vitro reporter gene assays to chemical mixtures. We hypothesized 90 91 that estrogenic chemicals within environmental mixtures have additive effects following default 92 model of CA that are well detected by zebrafish and human-based bioassays. In such way, we investigated (1) the additivity of xeno-estrogens in zebrafish and human-based bioassays and (2) 93 94 the influence of non-estrogenic chemicals of the mixtures. As in Altenburger et al. (2018), we 95 used the same 12-compound mixture in two different mixture ratios (M1 and M2), which included 96 xeno-estrogens (e.g. bisphenol A and genistein), and non-estrogenic chemicals representatives of 97 a freshwater contamination background. The general experimental set-up design is outlined in 98 Figure 1. Firstly, each chemical was tested for both estrogenic and anti-estrogenic activities in zebrafish-and human-based bioassays. Secondly, combinations of chemicals that proved to be 99 100 active at M1 and M2 mixture ratios (either ER activating, ER inhibiting, or both) were tested and 101 then discussed in relation to the outcomes from the 12-component mixture response. The 102 concentration addition model was used to evaluate the additivity of active chemicals in each 103 mixture scenario.

104

2. Material and methods

105

2.1 Chemical selection, mixtures design and experimental approach

106 Twelve environmentally relevant chemicals were selected following (1) a prioritization 107 exercise based on occurrence, hazard and available environmental quality standard (Busch et al., 108 2016), and (2) a screening of prioritized contaminants through multiple bioassays (Neale et al., 2017a). As a result, two fixed-ratio mixtures of 12 chemicals with dissimilar mode of actions were 109 110 designed (Table SI-1) and tested as part of a benchmarking exercise (Altenburger et al., 2018). 111 The first mixture ratio (M1) was composed in such way that the diverse bioactivities of the individual chemicals had a chance to be detected experimentally by an array of 19 bioassays. The 112 second mixture ratio (M2) was chosen to mimic a realistic freshwater contamination scenario. In 113

the current study, all 12 chemicals were tested individually for their capacity to induce or inhibit 114 ER-mediated luciferase response in different cellular assays. Based on the information on the 115 activity of individual chemicals in each bioassay, chemicals predicted to contribute to M1 and M2 116 117 responses based on CA prediction were identified. Based on toxic unit distribution (as defined in Scholtz et al., 2017), only chemicals expected to contribute to at least 1% of the total response at 118 119 non-cytotoxic concentrations were selected. Subgroup mixtures were then designed containing 120 either only ER activators or only ER inhibitors, or both ER activators and inhibitors (Figure 1, 121 Table 1). These mixtures were designed such that their relative concentration ratios agreed to that 122 from the original M1 and M2 mixtures (i.e. real sub-mixtures), to allow the best possible 123 comparison to the outcomes from the 12 compound mixtures.

124

2.2 Chemicals and reagents

125 17β-estradiol (E2, CAS#50-28-2, purity of >98%), triclosan (TCS, CAS#3380-34-5, purity 126 of 97% - 103%), bisphenol A (BPA, CAS#80-05-7, purity of 97%), genistein (GEN, CAS#446-127 72-0, purity of > 98%), propiconazole (CAS#60207-90-1, purity of >98%), diclofenac (CAS#15307-79-6), diazinon (CAS#333-41-5, purity of >98%), diuron (CAS#330-54-1, purity 128 129 >98%), cyprodinil (CAS#121552-61-2, purity of >98%), triphenylphosphate (TPP, CAS#115-86-6, purity >99%), benzo(a)pyrene (BaP, CAS#50-32-8, purity >96%), benzo(b)fluoranthene (BbF, 130 CAS#205-99-2, purity of 98%), chlorophene (CAS#120-32-1, purity of 95%), hydroxy-tamoxifen 131 132 (OH-TAM, CAS#68392-35-8, purity of >98%) and dimethylsulfoxide (DMSO) were purchased from Sigma-Aldrich (France). The cell culture medium and reagents Leibovitz 15 culture medium 133 (L-15), fetal calf serum (FCS), 4-(2-hydroxy-ethyl)-1-piperazineethanesulfonic acid (HEPES), 134 135 3-[4,5-dimethylthiazol-2-yl]-2,5-diphenylepidermal growth factor (EGF), G418, 136 tetrazoliumbromide (MTT) and D-luciferin were purchased from Sigma Aldrich (St-Quentin Fallavier, France); Dulbecco's Modified Eagle Medium (DMEM), DMEM High Glucose (DMEM 137 138 HG) powder, F-12 nutrient mixture (Ham's F12) powder, penicillin and streptomycin were purchased from Gibco (France); insulin, hygromycin B and sodium bicarbonate were purchasedfrom Dominique Dutscher (France).

141

2.3 In vitro bioassays: cell lines, luciferase and cell viability assays

The zebrafish in vitro assays have been derived from the zebrafish liver (ZFL) cell line 142 143 (Cosnefroy et al., 2012). ZFL were stably transfected, first, with an ERE-driven firefly luciferase gene, yielding the ZELH cell line, and then either with zfERa subtype, yielding the ZELHa cell 144 line, or with $zfER\beta2$ subtype yielding the ZELH $\beta2$ cell line (Cosnefroy et al., 2012). 145 146 Establishment of these cell models and their response to different classes of well-known xenoestrogens have been previously described (Cosnefroy et al., 2012; Sonavane et al., 2016). The 147 human-derived MELN cell line (Balaguer et al., 1999) was kindly provided by Dr Patrick 148 Balaguer (INSERM Montpellier, France). It is derived from the breast cancer MCF-7 cells, which 149 150 endogenously express the hER α , but no functional hER β (P. Balaguer, *personal communication*). 151 MELN cells were stably transfected with an ERE-driven firefly luciferase reporter gene.

152 Conditions for routine cell culture have been detailed previously (Balaguer et al., 1999; Cosnefroy et al., 2012). The cells used were pathogen-free and controlled on a regular basis. For 153 154 exposure experiments, ZELH-derived cells were seeded in 96-well white opaque culture plates 155 (Greiner CellStar[™], Dutscher, France) at 25,000 cells per well in phenol red-free LDF-DCC 156 medium (containing L-15 50%, DMEM HG 35%, Ham's F12 15%, HEPES 15 mM, 0.15 g/L 157 sodium bicarbonate, 0.01 mg/mL insulin, 50 ng/mL EGF, 50 U/mL penicillin and streptomycin 158 antibiotics, 5% v/v stripped serum). MELN were seeded at 80,000 cells per well in phenol red-free DMEM medium containing 5% v/v stripped serum. Cells were left to adhere for 24h. Then, they 159 160 were exposed in triplicates to serial dilutions of test compound for either 72h at 28°C for zebrafish 161 cells or 16h at 37°C for MELN cells. Each plate included both solvent and positive controls (in two triplicates each). E2 was used as a positive quality control for ER activation, and hydroxy-162 tamoxifen (OH-TAM) for ER inhibition. In addition, a serial dilution of 7 to 8 concentrations of 163

E2 was tested in each experiment. At the end of exposure, the culture medium was removed and
replaced by 50 μL per well of medium containing 0.3 mM luciferin. The luminescence signal was
measured in living cells using a microtiter plate luminometer (Synergy H4, BioTek).

167 The cell viability was assessed by using the 3-(4,5-dimethyl-thiazol-2-yl)-2,5diphenyl 168 tetrazolium bromide (MTT) assay (Mosmann, 1983). After cell exposure, the culture medium was 169 removed and replaced by 100 μ L of medium containing 0.5 mg/mL MTT. Cells were incubated 170 for 3h. In metabolically active cells, MTT is reduced onto a blue formazan precipitate, which is 171 dissolved by adding 100 μ L of DMSO after removal of MTT-containing medium. Plates were 172 read at 570 nm against a 640 nm reference wavelength on a microplate reader (KC-4, BioTek 173 Instruments, France) and results are expressed as absorbance units relative to control cells.

174

2.4 Testing of multi-component mixtures

The mixture compositions are given in Table SI-1, SI-2 and SI-3. The two 12-component 175 176 mixtures were prepared in methanol (as part of a round robin study on bioassays, Altenburger et al., 2018). Stocks solutions and serial dilutions of single chemicals and 2-, 3-, 4- and 5-component 177 178 mixtures were prepared in DMSO. The response of MELN cells to TPP and BPA using either 179 DMSO or methanol as vehicle were similar (data not shown), thus, no significant effect of the 180 solvent was to expect. To investigate the anti-estrogenic activity of the chemicals or mixtures, the 181 cells were exposed in the presence of E2 at a concentration leading to 80% of maximal response, 182 i.e. 0.1 nM in MELN and ZELH² and 1 nM in ZELH^a assays. The ZELH cells, that correspond 183 to the parent cell line of ZELH α and ZELH β 2 cells but lack functional ER, were used additionally as a control for non-specific luciferase modulation. As for the other cell lines, cytotoxicity was 184 185 measured in parallel in the way previously described. Final solvent concentrations in culture 186 medium were 0.1% v/v (agonist assay) or 0.15% v/v (in case of co-exposure with E2), which do not affect luciferase expression or cell viability. Stock solutions of chemicals in DMSO and 187 methanol were maintained at -20°C for up to three months. 188

189 *2.5 Data analysis*

190

2.5.1 Data treatment and analysis

191 Luciferase activity (LUC) was normalized to a response range between 0 and 1 on an192 experiment-to-experiment basis as follows:

193
$$Response = \frac{LUC_{chemical} - LUC_{control}}{LUC_{E2} - LUC_{control}}$$
(1)

where LUC_{chemical} is the luminescent signal induced by the tested chemical, LUC_{control} is the 194 average luminescent signal of the solvent controls and LUC_{E2} is the average luminescent signal of 195 196 the E2 positive controls. Only non-cytotoxic concentrations (i.e. more than 80 % of cell viability in the MTT assay) were considered for data analysis. Concentration-effect data analysis was 197 198 performed in the same way for individual compounds and mixtures. In short, a nonlinear 199 regression model best-fit approach was used to describe pooled data sets in the best possible way (Scholze et al., 2001). If different regression functions led to similar goodness-of-fits, the logit 200 201 model (which is a re-parameterised form of the Hill equation) was given preference. To account 202 for inter-study variations we included experiments as random factor in the best-fit data analysis (nonlinear mixed effect model). A detailed description can be found in Altenburger et al. (2018). 203

204

2.5.2 Mixture prediction and uncertainty assessment

The combined response from individual substances was assumed to follow the concept of concentration addition (CA). Here we used the standard form of non-interaction, i.e.:

207
$$\sum_{i=1}^{n} \left(\frac{Ci}{ECxi}\right) = 1$$
(2)

where Ci is the concentration of the ith substance in the mixture expected to produce a mixture response X, and *ECxi* the concentration of the ith substance leading to the same response X as expected for the mixture.

To account for the statistical uncertainty in the CA prediction, a combination of Monte-Carlo 211 (MC) simulations and bootstrapping nonlinear regression functions (Tibshirani and Efron, 1993) 212 was conducted to simulate approximate 95% confidence limits around the predicted mean 213 214 response of the mixture. Here the MC step is responsible for linking the data input from the single compounds (i.e. estimates about ECs or individual effects) to the mixture prediction, and the 215 216 bootstrapping step is responsible for generating data information relevant for input variables (i.e. 217 uncertainty distributions around the single substance EC's or effects). We followed a parametric 218 bootstrap with resamples drawn from the fitted nonlinear mixed effect model. Differences 219 between predicted and observed mixture effects (concentration) were deemed statistically 220 significant when the 95% confidence belts of the prediction did not overlap with those of the experimentally observed mixture effects (Altenburger et al., 2018). The comparative assessment 221 222 was performed on mixture concentrations leading to 20% ER activation (EC20) or inhibition (IC20). 223

3. Results

225

3.1. Activation and inhibition of ER response by single chemicals

The results of ER activation and inhibition by all 12 chemicals and the reference compounds (E2 and OH-TAM) on MELN, ZELH α and ZELH β 2 cells are presented in Table 2, and the concentration-response data are provided in supplementary information (Figure SI-1 for ER activation and SI-2 for ER inhibition).

As expected, genistein and BPA were active in all cell lines, but at different sensitivity and efficacy levels. MELN cells responded to BPA with an EC20 of 0.12 μ M and a maximal induction of 86% of the positive E2 control response, while ZELH α and ZELH β 2 cells showed a lower sensitivity with an EC20 of 2.1 μ M and 5.0 μ M, respectively, and a maximum luciferase induction around 30 % (Table 2). In case of genistein, MELN (EC20 of 0.0121 μ M) and ZELH β 2 cells (EC20 of 0.015 μ M) were more responsive than ZELH α cells (EC20 of 1.4 μ M). BaP, TPP and diazinon weakly induced luciferase activity in MELN cells with an EC20 of 0.57 μ M, 4.1 μ M and 15 μ M, respectively, whereas no activity was recorded at non-cytotoxic concentrations in zebrafish cells. No other chemicals showed any estrogenic response up to 30 μ M in any bioassays.

240 The inhibition of ER response by the 12 chemicals revealed distinct response between the bioassays (Table 2). Overall, several chemicals were identified as new ER inhibitors, mainly in 241 242 ZELH-zfERs cells. TPP and BaP decreased ER response in ZELHa and ZELHb2 cells at 243 concentrations where they did not affect cell viability or the luciferase activity in the ER-negative ZELH cells. Conversely, benzo(b)fluoranthene and propiconazole decreased E2-induced 244 luciferase activity up to 90% in ZELHa and ZELHB2 and in ER-negative ZELH cells. Cyprodinil 245 246 decreased E2-induced luciferase activity across all the cell lines with similar sensitivity, 247 suggesting a likely non-specific effect of this chemical on luciferase activity (Table 2, Figure SI-248 3).

249

3.2. Combined effects of xeno-estrogens in multi-component mixtures

250 The concentration-response curves estimated for the single chemicals were used to predict the ER activation and ER inhibition of M1 and M2 mixtures using the CA model. Since CA can 251 252 describe only ER activation or ER inhibition, but not their co-occurrence, the additive response of 253 a mixture containing both ER activators and inhibitors is predicted solely from the ER activators 254 in case of ER activation or from the ER inhibitors in case of ER inhibition. Therefore, the chemicals expected to induce ER activation or ER inhibition in M1 and M2 mixtures were 255 identified for each cell line based on CA prediction. They were then tested as subgroup mixtures 256 257 containing either ER activating (M1_A, M2_A), ER inhibiting (M1_I, M2_I), or both ER 258 activating and inhibiting chemicals (M1 A+I, M2 A+I) (Table 1). The relative concentration 259 ratios were always kept in accordance to the 12-compound mixtures M1 and M2. All subgroup

mixture results are presented in Figure 2 (mixture composition according to M1) and Figure 3 (mixture composition according to M2), together with the outcomes for M1 and M2 (Altenburger et al., 2018). Details about the mixture composition are given in Tables SI-1 (12-component mixtures) and in SI-2 and SI-3 (subgroup mixtures).

264

3.2.1 Additivity of ER activating or inhibiting chemicals

Regarding subgroup mixtures of ER activating chemicals, there was overall a good 265 agreement between observed and predicted EC20 across all cell lines and for both mixtures M1 266 and M2 compositions. In MELN cells, TPP, BPA and genistein at M1 mixture ratio had additive 267 268 effects very well predicted by CA model with a ratio between observed and predicted EC20 of 1.3 (M1_A_{MELN}, Figure 2A, Table 3). In comparison, the measured estrogenic activity of BPA and 269 genistein in M2 A_{MELN} was below the predicted response, although not statistically significant 270 271 (M2_A_{MELN}, Figure 3A, Table 4). BPA and genistein were the only two identified estrogenic 272 chemicals in ZELH α and ZELH β 2 cells. Their binary mixture induced an estrogenic response in a 273 good agreement with CA prediction at M1 and M2 concentration ratios in ZELHa (Figure 2E and 274 3E) and ZELH^β2 cells (Figure 2I and 3I). The ratio of observed against predicted EC20 was of 275 0.40 and 0.55 in ZELH α cells, and 0.71 and 0.73 in ZELH β 2 cells for M1 and M2, respectively.

276 As observed for single chemicals, ER inhibiting chemicals were more prevalent in ZELHa 277 and ZELH^β2 cells than in MELN cells. In MELN cells, cyprodinil was predicted to inhibit E2 278 response in M1, but only at high concentrations (M1_I_{MELN}, Figure 2B), and no inhibiting 279 chemical was identified for M2. In contrast, TPP, chlorophene and propiconazole were identified as ER inhibiting chemicals of M1 in ZELHa and ZELHB2 cells. In subgroup mixtures, they 280 281 induced a strong ER inhibition in ZELHα (M1_I_{ZELHα}, Figure 2F) and ZELHβ2 cells (M1_I_{ZELHβ2}, 282 Figure 2J), well predicted by the CA model (EC20 ratio of 0.87 and 0.83, respectively). Similarly, the subgroup mixtures of ER inhibitors based on M2 mixture ratio induced a strong inhibition, 283 well predicted by CA model (M2_I_{ZELHa}, figure 3F and M2_I_{ZELHB2}, Figure 3J, respectively). 284

Overall, the combined effects of ER activating or ER inhibiting chemicals were in goodagreement with CA predictions for both M1 and M2 mixture ratios and across all cell lines.

287 3.2.2 Estrogenic response to the 12-component mixtures: influence of inhibiting 288 chemicals

For each cell line, the combined effects of activator and inhibitor subgroup mixtures (M1_A+I and M2_A+I) were determined and compared to the results of the 12 component mixtures M1 and M2 (Figures 2 and 3, right part). The observed and predicted EC20 or IC20 of each mixture are presented in Tables 3 (M1) and 4 (M2).

In MELN cells, the estrogenic activity of M1_A+I_{MELN} (Figure 2C) was well predicted by CA, and this accuracy was not impacted negatively by the presence of 9 other environmental substances (M1, Figure 2D). No active ER inhibitors were present at non-cytotoxic concentration in the mixture M2, and therefore a mixture of activators and inhibitors was not tested. Nevertheless, the mixture effect of all 12 substances was well explained by the additivity of the only two estrogenic chemicals identified, BPA and genistein (M2, Figure 3D).

299 In zebrafish ZELHa cells, M1 was not expected to induce any estrogenic response in the 300 range of tested concentrations, and indeed no estrogenic response was observed neither with the 5-component mixture (M1_A+I_{ZELHa}, Figure 2G) nor with the 12-component mixture M1 (Figure 301 302 2H). Conversely, a strong ER inhibiting response was measured (up to 80% inhibition) for both 303 the 5- and 12-component mixtures, which was well predicted by the CA model (IC20 ratio of 0.74 304 and 0.95, respectively). Thus, the ER inhibition measured remained unaffected by addition of 305 estrogenic and inactive chemicals, including ER inhibiting chemicals present at non-effective 306 concentrations (e.g. cyprodinil). In case of M2, the estrogenic activity of ER activating and 307 inhibiting chemicals was correctly predicted by CA model (Figures 3G and 3H). However, the 308 estrogenic activity measured was lower than that of BPA and genistein binary mixture results 309 (Figure 3E), suggesting an influence of ER inhibiting compounds.

In zebrafish ZELH^β2 cells, an estrogenic response was expected according to CA for the 310 mixture of activators and inhibitors, as supported by the additive outcomes from the binary 311 312 mixture of BPA and genistein (M1_A_{ZELH62}, Figure 2I). However, M1_A+I_{ZELH62} did not induce any estrogenic response at test concentrations (Figure 2K). Instead, a strong inhibition of ER 313 response was measured, which was in line with the M1_IZELHB2 results and CA prediction (Figure 314 315 2J). As observed for the subgroup mixture of ER activating and inhibiting chemicals (M1 A+I_{ZELHB2}), M1 mixture did not induce any estrogenic activity but inhibited E2-induced 316 317 response (Figure 2H). Hence, these results indicate that inhibiting chemicals in M1 indeed 318 influenced ER response in ZELH^β2 cells. Compared with M1, the estrogenic activity measured 319 for the subgroup mixture of ER activators and inhibitors corresponding to M2 mixture ratio was well predicted by CA model (M2_A+ I_{ZELHB2}, Figure 3K), although the maximal efficacy 320 321 observed was well below the one of the BPA and genistein binary mixture (M2_AZELHB2, Figure 322 31). When ER activating and inhibiting chemicals were grouped with inactive chemicals in M2, the estrogenic activity was well predicted by CA up to 20% (Figure 3L), but the maximal 323 estrogenic response remained lower than expected based on the M2_AZELHB2 mixture results 324 (Figure 3I). In comparison, the inhibition of ER response was well predicted by CA for both 325 M2 A+I_{ZELHB2} (Figure 3K) and M2 (figure 3L). The results of the 4-component mixture 326 327 M2_A+I_{ZELHB2} on ZELHB2 cells are very similar to M2 results, considering both ER activation and inhibition (Figure 3K and 3L). 328

329

4. DISCUSSION

330 The current study investigated the distinct responses of zebrafish ZELH α and ZELH β 2 and human 331 MELN cells ER reporter gene bioassays to 12-component mixtures composed of xeno-estrogens 332 and other environmental relevant chemicals (Altenburger et al., 2018). By using a stepwise 333 experimental approach from individual chemicals to subgroup mixture testing, we were able to explain the distinct response of human and zebrafish bioassays to the same 12-componentmixtures.

336

4.1. Distinct responses of human and zebrafish cell lines to individual chemicals

BPA and genistein are well-known ER agonist ligands and were indeed active in all ERbased bioassays, in agreement with previous studies using the same cellular models (Balaguer et al., 1999; Cosnefroy et al., 2012; Le Fol et al., 2017; Sonavane et al., 2016). Apart from these two compounds, the screening of individual chemicals highlighted some marked differences between cell assays for some of the 10 chemicals.

342 One major outcome relates to the higher prevalence of chemicals inhibiting E2-induced luciferase activity in ZELH-zfERs cells than in MELN cells (Table 2). Some chemicals had 343 opposite responses in zebrafish and human cells. For instance, BaP -a known AhR-ligand- and 344 345 TPP were estrogenic in MELN cells but decreased E2-induced response in ZELHα and ZELHβ2 cells. The mechanistic interaction between AhR and ER signalling pathways has been 346 documented in human (Matthews and Gustafsson, 2006; Ohtake et al., 2003) and in fish (e.g. 347 348 Navas and Segner, 2000). The prototypical AhR ligand TCDD was shown to induce a weak estrogenic response in MELN cells (Balaguer et al., 1999) while it decreased E2 response in all 349 350 ZELH-zfER cells (Sonavane, 2015). The distinct responses to BaP in ZELH-zfERs and MELN 351 cells might thus be explained, at least partially, by AhR-ER interactions. In comparison, less 352 information is available on the ability of TPP to interact with ER signalling. Previous studies have reported a weak agonist effect on hERa transactivation (Kojima et al., 2013), as observed in the 353 354 current study in MELN cells, while some TPP metabolites are reported to have an anti-estrogenic 355 activity on hER^β transactivation (Kojima et al., 2016). However, TPP was unable to induce the 356 ER-regulated brain aromatase expression gene in transgenic cyp19a1b-GFP zebrafish embryos 357 (Neale et al., 2017a). Considering the anti-estrogenic activity of TPP evidenced in zebrafish liver

358 cells, further research would be warranted to assess whether TPP (or metabolites) either binds
359 directly zfERs or alters zfER transactivation through cross-talk(s) with other signaling pathways.

Other chemicals, such as propiconazole and cyprodinil, decreased E2-induced estrogenic 360 361 activity in an ER non-specific manner, i.e. they decreased firefly luciferase also in the parent cell 362 line ZELH that does not express functional zfER (Table 2, Figure SI-5). Such inhibition may 363 reflect either a direct effect on luciferase enzyme or an indirect effect on baseline transcriptional machinery in the promoter region of the reporter gene, irrespectively of ER activity. Despite a 364 weak estrogenic activity on hERa reported in vitro (Medjakovic et al., 2014; Schlotz et al., 2017), 365 366 cyprodinil decreased firefly luciferase activity in all cells, irrespectively of E2 addition. The structural similarities of cyprodinil with known firefly luciferase inhibitor (Auld and Inglese, 367 2004) and its capacity to interfere with ATP production (Coleman et al., 2012) suggest a possible 368 369 effect on the reporter gene system. In case of propiconazole, a weak hERa agonist activity was 370 reported in the high µM range in MVLN cells (Kjeldsen et al., 2013) and anti-proliferative effects 371 measured in MCF-7 cells (Kjaerstad et al., 2010). In fish, interference of propiconazole with 372 estrogen signalling pathway has been reported in vivo (Skolness et al., 2013) but no information 373 on ER agonist or antagonist activity is available. Thus, additional assays would be warranted to assess the specific activity of propiconazole and cyprodinil on ER-signalling pathway in 374 375 zebrafish.

376

4.2. Deciphering cell-specific response to xeno-estrogen mixtures

BPA and genistein were the main drivers for ER agonistic response in M1 and M2. When combined as binary mixture, they induced in all zebrafish and human-based bioassays responses that were in good agreement with CA predictions. This additivity is consistent with several previous studies which reported additive effects of selected estrogens on different biological models such as mammalian cells (Ghisari and Bonefeld-Jorgensen, 2009; Heneweer et al., 2005) or *in vitro* fish cells (Le Page et al., 2006; Petersen and Tollefsen, 2011) and *in vivo* in fish (Brian et al., 2005; Brion et al., 2012). Furthermore, our results demonstrate for the first time the
suitability of the ZELH-zfER cell line to investigate mixture effects of ER agonists at the receptor
level in a zebrafish cell context.

386 The screening for anti-estrogenic activity showed that some inhibiting chemicals active on 387 ZELH-zfER cells were present at effective concentrations in M1 and M2, e.g. TPP and 388 propiconazole. Although the underlying mechanism of ER inhibition remains unclear, the subgroup mixtures of inhibiting chemicals had additive effects in ZELHa and ZELHB2 cells, in 389 390 all co-exposure scenario, i.e. with inactive and/or estrogenic chemicals. In case of M1, a 391 decreased luciferase activity was also observed in ZELH cells, well predicted by the additive effects of TPP and propiconazole (Figure SI-4). These results indicate that the inhibition observed 392 393 in ZELH-zfERs cells for M1 may involve non-ER specific luciferase inhibition.

394 Interestingly, we observed in ZELH β 2 cells that the addition of the inhibiting chemicals to the binary mixture of BPA and genistein resulted in a decrease in the expected estrogenic 395 response to a similar level as observed in the 12-component mixtures M1 and M2. In case of M1, 396 397 the presence of inhibiting chemicals silenced entirely the estrogenic activity expected, whereas in 398 M2, only the efficacy of the response was decreased. To a lesser extent, a similar trend was 399 observed for M2 in ZELHa cells. The experimental approach consisting of testing ER activating 400 and inhibiting chemicals separately and then together allowed us to evidence the role of inhibiting 401 chemicals in the deviation from expected additivity of genistein and BPA in ZELH^β2 cells. The 402 experimental results from the stepwise testing approach demonstrate that the response to the 12-403 chemical mixtures in each bioassay can be explained knowing the individual responses of the 12 404 chemicals.

405

4.3. Differences between zebrafish and human-based bioassay responses

Our results highlight marked differences between human and zebrafish cells responses. 406 Each cell line displays cell-specific features, such as co-activator recruitment or metabolic 407 capacities. For instance, ZELH cells originate from zebrafish liver cells and have retained some 408 metabolic capacities qualitatively similar to zebrafish hepatocytes but distinct from MELN cells 409 410 (Le Fol et al., 2015), which may have played a role in the specific response to inhibiting 411 chemicals in our study. Indeed, metabolism has been previously suggested to negatively influence 412 the response to xeno-estrogen mixtures in rainbow trout hepatocytes (Petersen and Tollefsen, 413 2011) and in the E-SCREEN assay (Evans et al., 2012). The characterization of internal 414 concentrations of chemicals in MELN and ZELH-zfER cells would be needed to estimate the 415 influence of metabolism on the xeno-estrogen response.

416 To further investigate the relevance of the estrogenic mixture response in fish, both M1 417 and M2 were tested on transgenic zebrafish embryos expressing GFP under control of cyp19a1b 418 promoter in radial glial cells in the EASZY assay (Brion et al., 2012). Indeed, in previous studies, 419 we showed that ZELH-zfER response profile to individual chemicals or environmental samples 420 was better correlated than the MELN assay with in vivo estrogenic activity measured in the 421 EASZY assay (Neale et al., 2017b; Sonavane et al., 2016). As a result, no estrogenic activity was 422 measured for both M1 and M2 mixtures because of a high embryo mortality, especially for M1 423 (Altenburger et al., 2018). Thus, we could not confirm in vitro combined effects in zebrafish in 424 vivo.

425

4.4. Implication for quantifying the estrogenic activity of samples

A consistent body of literature exist regarding the assessment of additivity of xenoestrogens according to CA. However, very few studies investigated the robustness and validity of CA model in more complex and realistic mixture scenarios. In the current study, the main factors differentiating zebrafish and human ER response to M1 and M2 was the presence of inhibiting chemicals that had higher influence on zfER activation in zebrafish cells. This agrees well with the findings of Ihara et al. (2014) that evidenced that anti-estrogenic activity in wastewater
treatment plant extracts was a key factor to explain the different estrogenic activity measured in
human and medaka ERα transactivation *in vitro*.

The 12-component mixtures were designed to mimic a simplified scenario of 434 435 environmental surface water contamination. To assess whether the mixture context would have 436 influenced the quantification of estrogenic activity mediated by xeno-estrogens, the mixture results were used to quantify estradiol-equivalents (E2-Eq) in each bioassay (Table SI-4). Overall, 437 M2 was predicted to be more estrogenic (mean E2-Eq > 10 μ M) than M1 (mean E2-Eq < 1 μ M). 438 439 In MELN cells, the estrogenicity of M1 and M2 was almost not affected by the mixture context: 440 the ratio of observed to predicted E2-Eq was close to 1 for both mixtures. In contrast, ZELHa and 441 ZELH β 2 responses to xeno-estrogens in this specific mixture scenario were more susceptible to 442 co-occurrence of inhibiting chemicals: the estrogenic activity was underestimated in M1 and M2, 443 whenever quantified. In case of ZELH β 2 cells, similar IC20 were derived for both M1 and M2, 444 however, the inhibiting chemicals abolished the estrogenic response in case of M1, while they 445 only partially decreased the maximal efficacy level in case of M2, without altering significantly 446 the EC20 measured. These results suggest the presence of a balance between estrogenic and ER inhibiting chemicals which can influence the detection, and thus the quantification, of xeno-447 estrogens in ZELH β 2 cells. 448

449 **5. CONCLUSION**

In summary, this study demonstrates that BPA and genistein had additive effects *in vitro* in zebrafish bioassays, comforting their use to assess combined effects of xeno-estrogens. In addition, we show that the distinct responses of zebrafish and human-based bioassays to a 12component mixture were due to newly identified ER inhibiting chemicals selectively active in ZELH α and ZELH β 2 cells (e.g. TPP, propiconazole) and altering zfER response to xenoestrogens. In the context of water bio-monitoring, this study illustrates the need for a mindful 456 consideration of the bioassay specificities (e.g. fish *vs* human ER, cell context) to ensure a proper 457 interpretation of results, as environmental chemicals may interfere with ER response, positively or 458 negatively, in a cell-specific manner. In future works, comparative assessment of real water 459 samples using human and zebrafish bioassays will help further documenting the environmental 460 relevance of such cross-species differential effects to complex mixtures.

461 ACKNOWLEDGMENT

This work was supported by the EU Seventh Framework Programme as a part of SOLUTIONS project (FP7-ENV-2013-two-stage) under grant agreement number 603437, and by the French Ministry of Ecology (P190-Ecotoxicologie, P181-DRC50). We wish to thank Emmanuelle Maillot-Maréchal for her precious technical help with the cell cultures.

466 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

467 The authors declare that no conflict of interest regarding the publication of this paper.

468

469 **AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS:**

- 470 H.S., M.S., R.A., W.B., H.B., F.B and S.A conceived and designed the experiments; H.S. has
- 471 performed the experiments; H.S. and M.S. analysed the data; H.S., M.S. and S.A. have written the
- 472 manuscript; all authors have read and approved the final manuscript.
- 473

474 REFERENCES

- Altenburger, R., Scholze, M., Busch, W., Escher, B.I., Jakobs, G., Krauss, M., Krüger, J., Neale, P.A.,
 Ait-Aissa, S., Almeida, A.C., Seiler, T.-B., Brion, F., Hilscherová, K., Hollert, H., Novák, J.,
 Schlichting, R., Serra, H., Shao, Y., Tindall, A., Tolefsen, K.-E., Umbuzeiro, G., Williams,
 T.D., Kortenkamp, A., 2018. Mixture effects in samples of multiple contaminants An
 inter-laboratory study with manifold bioassays. Environ. Int. 114, 95–106.
 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envint.2018.02.013
- Auld, D.S., Inglese, J., 2004. Interferences with Luciferase Reporter Enzymes, in: Sittampalam,
 G.S., Coussens, N.P., Nelson, H., Arkin, M., Auld, D., Austin, C., Bejcek, B., Glicksman, M.,
 Inglese, J., Iversen, P.W., Li, Z., McGee, J., McManus, O., Minor, L., Napper, A., Peltier,

- 484 J.M., Riss, T., Trask, O.J., Weidner, J. (Eds.), Assay Guidance Manual. Eli Lilly & Company 485 and the National Center for Advancing Translational Sciences, Bethesda (MD).
- Balaguer, P., Francois, F., Comunale, F., Fenet, H., Boussioux, A.M., Pons, M., Nicolas, J.C.,
 Casellas, C., 1999. Reporter cell lines to study the estrogenic effects of xenoestrogens.
 Sci. Total Environ. 233, 47–56. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0048-9697(99)00178-3
- Brian, J.V., Harris, C.A., Scholze, M., Backhaus, T., Booy, P., Lamoree, M., Pojana, G., Jonkers, N.,
 Runnalls, T., Bonfà, A., Marcomini, A., Sumpter, J.P., 2005. Accurate Prediction of the
 Response of Freshwater Fish to a Mixture of Estrogenic Chemicals. Environ. Health
 Perspect. 113, 721–728. https://doi.org/10.1289/ehp.7598
- Brion, F., Le Page, Y., Piccini, B., Cardoso, O., Tong, S.-K., Chung, B., Kah, O., 2012. Screening
 Estrogenic Activities of Chemicals or Mixtures In Vivo Using Transgenic (cyp19a1b-GFP)
 Zebrafish Embryos. Plos One 7, e36069. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0036069
- 496 Busch, W., Schmidt, S., Kuehne, R., Schulze, T., Krauss, M., Altenburger, R., 2016. Micropollutants 497 in European rivers: A mode of action survey to support the development of effect-based 498 monitoring. Environ. Toxicol. Chem. 35, 1887-1899. tools for water 499 https://doi.org/10.1002/etc.3460
- 500 Coleman, M.D., O'Neil, J.D., Woehrling, E.K., Ndunge, O.B.A., Hill, E.J., Menache, A., Reiss, C.J., 501 2012. A Preliminary Investigation into the Impact of a Pesticide Combination on Human 502 Neuronal and Glial Cell Lines In Vitro. PLoS ONE 7. 503 https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0042768
- Cosnefroy, A., Brion, F., Maillot-Maréchal, E., Porcher, J.-M., Pakdel, F., Balaguer, P., Aït-Aïssa, S.,
 2012. Selective activation of zebrafish estrogen receptor subtypes by chemicals by using
 stable reporter gene assay developed in a zebrafish liver cell line. Toxicol. Sci. Off. J. Soc.
 Toxicol. 125, 439–449. https://doi.org/10.1093/toxsci/kfr297
- 508 Escher, B.I., Allinson, M., Altenburger, R., Bain, P.A., Balaguer, P., Busch, W., Crago, J., Denslow, 509 N.D., Dopp, E., Hilscherova, K., Humpage, A.R., Kumar, A., Grimaldi, M., Jayasinghe, B.S., 510 Jarosova, B., Jia, A., Makarov, S., Maruya, K.A., Medvedev, A., Mehinto, A.C., Mendez, 511 J.E., Poulsen, A., Prochazka, E., Richard, J., Schifferli, A., Schlenk, D., Scholz, S., Shiraish, 512 F., Snyder, S., Su, G., Tang, J.Y.M., van der Burg, B., van der Linden, S.C., Werner, I., 513 Westerheide, S.D., Wong, C.K.C., Yang, M., Yeung, B.H.Y., Zhang, X., Leusch, F.D.L., 2014. 514 Benchmarking Organic Micropollutants in Wastewater, Recycled Water and Drinking 515 with Environ. Technol. 48, 1940-1956. Water In Vitro Bioassays. Sci. 516 https://doi.org/10.1021/es403899t
- Evans, R.M., Scholze, M., Kortenkamp, A., 2012. Additive Mixture Effects of Estrogenic Chemicals
 in Human Cell-Based Assays Can Be Influenced by Inclusion of Chemicals with Differing
 Effect Profiles. PLOS ONE 7, e43606. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0043606
- Ghisari, M., Bonefeld-Jorgensen, E.C., 2009. Effects of plasticizers and their mixtures on estrogen
 receptor and thyroid hormone functions. Toxicol. Lett. 189, 67–77.
 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.toxlet.2009.05.004

- Heneweer, M., Muusse, M., van den Berg, M., Sanderson, J.T., 2005. Additive estrogenic effects
 of mixtures of frequently used UV filters on pS2-gene transcription in MCF-7 cells.
 Toxicol. Appl. Pharmacol. 208, 170–177. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.taap.2005.02.006
- Hotchkiss, A.K., Rider, C.V., Blystone, C.R., Wilson, V.S., Hartig, P.C., Ankley, G.T., Foster, P.M.,
 Gray, C.L., Gray, L.E., 2008. Fifteen Years after "Wingspread"—Environmental Endocrine
 Disrupters and Human and Wildlife Health: Where We are Today and Where We Need to
 Go. Toxicol. Sci. 105, 235–259. https://doi.org/10.1093/toxsci/kfn030
- Ihara, M., Ihara, M.O., Kumar, V., Narumiya, M., Hanamoto, S., Nakada, N., Yamashita, N.,
 Miyagawa, S., Iguchi, T., Tanaka, H., 2014. Co-occurrence of Estrogenic and
 Antiestrogenic Activities in Wastewater: Quantitative Evaluation of Balance by in Vitro
 ERα Reporter Gene Assay and Chemical Analysis. Environ. Sci. Technol. 48, 6366–6373.
 https://doi.org/10.1021/es5014938
- 535 Ihara, M., Kitamura, T., Kumar, V., Park, C.-B., Ihara, M.O., Lee, S.-J., Yamashita, N., Miyagawa, S., Iguchi, T., Okamoto, S., Suzuki, Y., Tanaka, H., 2015. Evaluation of Estrogenic Activity of 536 537 Wastewater: Comparison Among In Vitro ERa Reporter Gene Assay, In Vivo Vitellogenin 538 Induction, and Chemical Analysis. Environ. Sci. Technol. 6319-6326. 49, 539 https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.est.5b01027
- Jarošová, B., Erseková, A., Hilscherová, K., Loos, R., Gawlik, B.M., Giesy, J.P., Bláha, L., 2014.
 Europe-wide survey of estrogenicity in wastewater treatment plant effluents: the need
 for the effect-based monitoring. Environ. Sci. Pollut. Res. 21, 10970–10982.
 https://doi.org/10.1007/s11356-014-3056-8
- 544 Kase, R., Javurkova, B., Simon, E., Swart, K., Buchinger, S., Könemann, S., Escher, B.I., Carere, M., 545 Dulio, V., Ait-Aissa, S., Hollert, H., Valsecchi, S., Polesello, S., Behnisch, P., di Paolo, C., 546 Olbrich, D., Sychrova, E., Gundlach, M., Schlichting, R., Leborgne, L., Clara, M., 547 Scheffknecht, C., Marneffe, Y., Chalon, C., Tusil, P., Soldan, P., von Danwitz, B., Schwaiger, 548 J., Palao, A.M., Bersani, F., Perceval, O., Kienle, C., Vermeirssen, E., Hilscherova, K., 549 Reifferscheid, G., Werner, I., 2018. Screening and risk management solutions for 550 steroidal estrogens in surface and wastewater. TrAC Trends Anal. Chem. 102, 343–358. 551 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.trac.2018.02.013
- 552Kjaerstad, M.B., Taxvig, C., Andersen, H.R., Nellemann, C., 2010. Mixture effects of endocrine553disrupting compounds in vitro. Int. J. Androl. 33, 425–433.554https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2605.2009.01034.x
- Kjeldsen, L.S., Ghisari, M., Bonefeld-Jørgensen, E.C., 2013. Currently used pesticides and their
 mixtures affect the function of sex hormone receptors and aromatase enzyme activity.
 Toxicol. Appl. Pharmacol. 272, 453–464. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.taap.2013.06.028
- Kojima, H., Takeuchi, S., Itoh, T., Iida, M., Kobayashi, S., Yoshida, T., 2013. In vitro endocrine
 disruption potential of organophosphate flame retardants via human nuclear receptors.
 Toxicology 314, 76–83. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tox.2013.09.004

- Kojima, H., Takeuchi, S., Van den Eede, N., Coyaci, A., 2016. Effects of primary metabolites of
 organophosphate flame retardants on transcriptional activity via human nuclear
 receptors. Toxicol. Lett. 245, 31–39. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.toxlet.2016.01.004
- Könemann, S., Kase, R., Simon, E., Swart, K., Buchinger, S., Schlüsener, M., Hollert, H., Escher, 564 565 B.I., Werner, I., Aït-Aïssa, S., Vermeirssen, E., Dulio, V., Valsecchi, S., Polesello, S., 566 Behnisch, P., Javurkova, B., Perceval, O., Di Paolo, C., Olbrich, D., Sychrova, E., Schlichting, 567 R., Leborgne, L., Clara, M., Scheffknecht, C., Marneffe, Y., Chalon, C., Tušil, P., Soldàn, P., 568 von Danwitz, B., Schwaiger, J., San Martín Becares, M.I., Bersani, F., Hilscherová, K., 569 Reifferscheid, G., Ternes, T., Carere, M., 2018. Effect-based and chemical analytical 570 methods to monitor estrogens under the European Water Framework Directive. TrAC 571 Trends Anal. Chem. 102, 225–235. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.trac.2018.02.008
- Kortenkamp, A., 2007. Ten Years of Mixing Cocktails: A Review of Combination Effects of
 Endocrine-Disrupting Chemicals. Environ. Health Perspect. 115, 98–105.
 https://doi.org/10.1289/ehp.9357
- Kunz, P.Y., Kienle, C., Carere, M., Homazava, N., Kase, R., 2015. In vitro bioassays to screen for
 endocrine active pharmaceuticals in surface and waste waters. J. Pharm. Biomed. Anal.
 106, 107–115. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpba.2014.11.018
- Le Fol, V., Aït-Aïssa, S., Cabaton, N., Dolo, L., Grimaldi, M., Balaguer, P., Perdu, E., Debrauwer, L.,
 Brion, F., Zalko, D., 2015. Cell-specific biotransformation of benzophenone-2 and
 bisphenol-s in zebrafish and human in vitro models used for toxicity and estrogenicity
 screening. Environ. Sci. Technol. 49, 3860–3868. https://doi.org/10.1021/es505302c
- Le Fol, V., Aït-Aïssa, S., Sonavane, M., Porcher, J.-M., Balaguer, P., Cravedi, J.-P., Zalko, D., Brion,
 F., 2017. In vitro and in vivo estrogenic activity of BPA, BPF and BPS in zebrafish-specific
 assays. Ecotoxicol. Environ. Saf. 142, 150–156.
 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecoenv.2017.04.009
- 586 Le Page, Y., Scholze, M., Kah, O., Pakdel, F., 2006. Assessment of Xenoestrogens Using Three 587 Distinct Estrogen Receptors and the Zebrafish Brain Aromatase Gene in a Highly 588 Responsive Glial Cell System. Environ. Health Perspect. 114, 752-758. 589 https://doi.org/10.1289/ehp.8141
- Leusch, F.D.L., De Jager, C., Levi, Y., Lim, R., Puijker, L., Sacher, F., Tremblay, L.A., Wilson, V.S.,
 Chapman, H.F., 2010. Comparison of Five in Vitro Bioassays to Measure Estrogenic
 Activity in Environmental Waters. Environ. Sci. Technol. 44, 3853–3860.
 https://doi.org/10.1021/es903899d
- Matthews, J., Gustafsson, J.-Å., 2006. Estrogen receptor and aryl hydrocarbon receptor signaling
 pathways. Nucl. Recept. Signal. 4. https://doi.org/10.1621/nrs.04016
- Medjakovic, S., Zoechling, A., Gerster, P., Ivanova, M.M., Teng, Y., Klinge, C.M., Schildberger, B.,
 Gartner, M., Jungbauer, A., 2014. Effect of Nonpersistent Pesticides on Estrogen
 Receptor, Androgen Receptor, and Aryl Hydrocarbon Receptor. Environ. Toxicol. 29,
 1201–1216. https://doi.org/10.1002/tox.21852

- Menuet, A., Pellegrini, E., Anglade, I., Blaise, O., Laudet, V., Kah, O., Pakdel, F., 2002. Molecular
 characterization of three estrogen receptor forms in zebrafish: Binding characteristics,
 transactivation properties, and tissue distributions. Biol. Reprod. 66, 1881–1892.
 https://doi.org/10.1095/biolreprod66.6.1881
- Miyagawa, S., Lange, A., Hirakawa, I., Tohyama, S., Ogino, Y., Mizutani, T., Kagami, Y., Kusano, T.,
 Ihara, M., Tanaka, H., Tatarazako, N., Ohta, Y., Katsu, Y., Tyler, C.R., Iguchi, T., 2014.
 Differing species responsiveness of estrogenic contaminants in fish is conferred by the
 ligand binding domain of the estrogen receptor. Environ. Sci. Technol. 48, 5254–5263.
 https://doi.org/10.1021/es5002659
- Mosmann, T., 1983. Rapid Colorimetric Assay for Cellular Growth and Survival Application. J.
 Immunol. Methods 65, 55–63. https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-1759(83)90303-4
- Navas, J.M., Segner, H., 2000. Modulation of trout 7-ethoxyresorufin-O-deethylase (EROD)
 activity by estradiol and octylphenol. Mar. Environ. Res. 50, 157–162.
- Neale, P.A., Ait-Aissa, S., Brack, W., Creusot, N., Denison, M.S., Deutschmann, B., Hilscherova, K.,
 Hollert, H., Krauss, M., Novak, J., Schulze, T., Seiler, T.-B., Serra, H., Shao, Y., Escher, B.I.,
 2015. Linking in Vitro Effects and Detected Organic Micropollutants in Surface Water
 Using Mixture-Toxicity Modeling. Environ. Sci. Technol. 49, 14614–14624.
 https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.est.5b04083
- Neale, P.A., Altenburger, R., Aït-Aïssa, S., Brion, F., Busch, W., de Aragão Umbuzeiro, G., Denison,
 M.S., Du Pasquier, D., Hilscherová, K., Hollert, H., Morales, D.A., Novák, J., Schlichting, R.,
 Seiler, T.-B., Serra, H., Shao, Y., Tindall, A.J., Tollefsen, K.E., Williams, T.D., Escher, B.I.,
 2017a. Development of a bioanalytical test battery for water quality monitoring:
 Fingerprinting identified micropollutants and their contribution to effects in surface
 water. Water Res. 123, 734–750. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.watres.2017.07.016
- Neale, P.A., Munz, N.A., Aït-Aïssa, S., Altenburger, R., Brion, F., Busch, W., Escher, B.I.,
 Hilscherová, K., Kienle, C., Novák, J., Seiler, T.-B., Shao, Y., Stamm, C., Hollender, J.,
 2017b. Integrating chemical analysis and bioanalysis to evaluate the contribution of
 wastewater effluent on the micropollutant burden in small streams. Sci. Total Environ.
 576, 785–795. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2016.10.141
- Ohtake, F., Takeyama, K., Matsumoto, T., Kitagawa, H., Yamamoto, Y., Nohara, K., Tohyama, C.,
 Krust, A., Mimura, J., Chambon, P., Yanagisawa, J., Fujii-Kuriyama, Y., Kato, S., 2003.
 Modulation of oestrogen receptor signalling by association with the activated dioxin
 receptor. Nature 423, 545–550. https://doi.org/10.1038/nature01606
- Petersen, K., Tollefsen, K.E., 2011. Assessing combined toxicity of estrogen receptor agonists in a
 primary culture of rainbow trout (Oncorhynchus mykiss) hepatocytes. Aquat. Toxicol.
 Amst. Neth. 101, 186–195. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aquatox.2010.09.018
- Schlotz, N., Kim, G.-J., Jäger, S., Günther, S., Lamy, E., 2017. In vitro observations and in silico
 predictions of xenoestrogen mixture effects in T47D-based receptor transactivation and
 proliferation assays. Toxicol. In Vitro 45, 146–157.
 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tiv.2017.08.017

- Scholze, M., Boedeker, W., Faust, M., Backhaus, T., Altenburger, R., Grimme, L.H., 2001. A
 general best-fit method for concentration-response curves and the estimation of loweffect concentrations. Environ. Toxicol. Chem. 20, 448–457.
- Skolness, S.Y., Blanksma, C.A., Cavallin, J.E., Churchill, J.J., Durhan, E.J., Jensen, K.M., Johnson,
 R.D., Kahl, M.D., Makynen, E.A., Villeneuve, D.L., Ankley, G.T., 2013. Propiconazole
 inhibits steroidogenesis and reproduction in the fathead minnow (Pimephales promelas).
 Toxicol. Sci. Off. J. Soc. Toxicol. 132, 284–297. https://doi.org/10.1093/toxsci/kft010
- Snyder, S.A., Villeneuve, D.L., Snyder, E.M., Giesy, J.P., 2001. Identification and Quantification of
 Estrogen Receptor Agonists in Wastewater Effluents. Environ. Sci. Technol. 35, 3620–
 3625. https://doi.org/10.1021/es001254n
- Sonavane, M., 2015. Intérêt d'une approche combinants bioessais in vitro et in vivo chez le
 poisson zèbre pour l'identification de perturbateurs endocriniens dans l'environnement
 aquatique.
- Sonavane, M., Creusot, N., Maillot-Maréchal, E., Péry, A., Brion, F., Aït-Aïssa, S., 2016. Zebrafishbased reporter gene assays reveal different estrogenic activities in river waters
 compared to a conventional human-derived assay. Sci. Total Environ. 550, 934–939.
 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2016.01.187
- Sumpter, J.P., 2005. Endocrine disrupters in the aquatic environment: An overview. Acta
 Hydrochim. Hydrobiol. 33, 9–16. https://doi.org/10.1002/aheh.200400555
- Tibshirani, R.J., Efron, B., 1993. An introduction to the bootstrap. Monogr. Stat. Appl. Probab. 57,
 1–436.
- Tohyama, S., Miyagawa, S., Lange, A., Ogino, Y., Mizutani, T., Tatarazako, N., Katsu, Y., Ihara, M., 661 662 Tanaka, H., Ishibashi, H., Kobayashi, T., Tyler, C.R., Iguchi, T., 2015. Understanding the 663 molecular basis for differences in responses of fish estrogen receptor subtypes to 664 environmental estrogens. Environ. Sci. Technol. 49, 7439-7447. 665 https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.est.5b00704
- Yang, R., Li, N., Rao, K., Ma, M., Wang, Z., 2015. Combined action of estrogen receptor agonists
 and antagonists in two-hybrid recombinant yeast in vitro. Ecotoxicol. Environ. Saf. 111,
 228–235. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecoenv.2014.09.025
- Zacharewski, 1997. In Vitro Bioassays for Assessing Estrogenic Substances. Environ. Sci. Technol.
 31, 613–623. https://doi.org/10.1021/es9605300

672

TABLES AND FIGURES

675	Table 1: Overview of mixtures and their abbreviations tested on four different cell lines.
676	More details about the composition of the mixtures are provided in the Supplementary
677	Information (Tables SI 1-3). ⁽¹⁾ published in Altenburger et al; ⁽²⁾ corresponds to cyprodinil
678	which was the only ER inhibitor.

	ER activ	vation	ER in	hibition
mixture	M1	M2	M1	M2
MELN				
activators	$M1_A_{MELN}$	$M2_A_{MELN}$	-	-
inhibitors	-	-	$M1_{MELN}^{(2)}$	-
activators + inhibitors	$M1_A+I_{MELN}$	-	$M1_A+I_{MELN}$	-
activators + inhibitors + inactives	M1 ⁽¹⁾	M2 ⁽¹⁾	M1	-
ZELHa				
activators	$M1_A_{ZELH\alpha}$	$M2_A_{ZEsLH\alpha}$	-	-
inhibitors	-	-	$M1_{ZELH\alpha}$	$M2_{I_{ZELH\alpha}}$
activators + inhibitors	M1_A+I _{ZELHα}	$M2_A+I_{ZELH\alpha}$	$M1_A + I_{ZELH\alpha}$	$M2_A+I_{ZELH\alpha}$
activators + inhibitors + inactives	M1 ⁽¹⁾	M2 ⁽¹⁾	M1	M2
ZELHβ2				
activators	$M1_A_{ZELH\beta2}$	$M2_A_{ZELH\beta2}$	-	-
inhibitors	-	-	$M1_{ZELH\beta2}$	$M2_{I_{ZELH\beta2}}$
activators + inhibitors	$M1_A+I_{ZELH\beta2}$	$M2_A+I_{ZELH\beta2}$	$M1_A + I_{ZELH\beta2}$	$M2_A+I_{ZELH\beta2}$
activators + inhibitors + inactives	M1 ⁽¹⁾	M2 ⁽¹⁾	M1	M2
ZELH				
inhibitors	-	-	$M1_{ZELH}$	$M2_{I_{ZELH}}$
inhibitors + inactives	-	-	M1	M2

Table 2: ER activation (EC20) and inhibition (IC20) of 12 test substances in MELN, ZELH α , ZELH β 2 and ZELH cells. Results are expressed in EC20 (activation) or IC20 (inhibition) are expressed in M concentration. E2 and OH-TAM were the positive control substances for ER activation and inhibition, respectively. Data originate from at least 2 independent experiments done in triplicates. Chemicals were tested in the 0.01 – 30×10^{-6} M range, except for genistein (from 10^{-9} M). All concentration-response data are presented in SI-1 and SI-2.

		ER activation (EC20)		ER inhibition (IC20)				
	MELN	ZELHa	ZELHβ2	MELN	ZELHa	ZELHβ2	ZELH	
	mean (95% CI)	mean (95% CI)	mean (95% CI)	mean (95% CI)	mean (95% CI)	mean (95% CI)	mean (95% CI)	
E2	3.4×10^{-12} (2.6 x10 ⁻¹² - 4.3 x10 ⁻¹²)	$1.3 \times 10^{-10} \\ (1.1 \times 10^{-10} - 1.6 \times 10^{-10})$	$\begin{array}{c} 6.0 \times 10^{-12} \\ (4.74 \times 10^{-12} - 7.7 \times 10^{-12}) \end{array}$	-	-	-	-	
OH-TAM	-	-	-	$5.2 \times 10^{-9} (4.5 \times 10^{-9} - 6.0 \times 10^{-9})$	$\frac{1.8 \times 10^{-9}}{(9.4 \times 10^{-10} - 3.4 \times 10^{-9})}$	$\frac{1.9 \times 10^{-9}}{(1.4 \times 10^{-9} - 2.8 \times 10^{-9})}$	> 3 × 10 ⁻⁵	
Bisphenol A	$\frac{1.2 \times 10^{-7}}{(8.2 \times 10^{-8} - 1.7 \text{ x} 10^{-7})}$	2.1×10 ⁻⁶ (1.3×10 ⁻⁶ - 3.6×10 ⁻⁶)	5.0 ×10 ⁻⁶ (2.4 ×10 ⁻⁶ - 6.1 ×10 ⁻⁶)	> 3 × 10 ⁻⁵	2.02 ×10 ⁻⁵ (1.1 ×10 ⁻⁵ - 3.6 ×10 ⁻⁵)	8.8 ×10 ⁻⁶ (8.7 ×10 ⁻⁷ - 1.3 ×10 ⁻⁵)	> 3 × 10 ⁻⁵	
Genistein	$\begin{array}{c} 1.21 \times 10^{-8} \\ (6.0 \times 10^{-9} - 2.9 \times 10^{-8}) \end{array}$	1.4 ×10 ⁻⁰⁶ (9.5 ×10 ⁻⁷ - 1.9 ×10 ⁻⁶)	1.5 ×10 ⁻⁸ (6.9 ×10 ⁻⁹ - 3.1 ×10 ⁻⁸)	> 3 × 10 ⁻⁵	> 3 × 10 ⁻⁵	> 3 × 10 ⁻⁵	> 3 × 10 ⁻⁵	
Diazinon	$\frac{1.5 \times 10^{-5}}{(1.2 \times 10^{-5} - 1.9 \times 10^{-5})}$	> 3 × 10 ⁻⁵	> 3 × 10 ⁻⁵	> 3 × 10 ⁻⁵	> 3 × 10 ⁻⁵	> 1 × 10 ⁻⁵	> 3 × 10 ⁻⁵	
Triphenylphosphate	4.1 ×10 ⁻⁶ (2.9 ×10 ⁻⁶ - 5.7 ×10 ⁻⁶)	> 3 × 10 ⁻⁵	> 3 × 10 ⁻⁵	> 3 × 10 ⁻⁵	8.0×10 ⁻⁶ (3.2×10 ⁻⁷ - 1.3×10 ⁻⁵)	1.7 ×10 ⁻⁶ (8.3 ×10 ⁻⁷ - 3.5 ×10 ⁻⁶)	1.1 ×10 ⁻⁵ (3.0 ×10 ⁻⁷ - 1.3 ×10 ⁻⁵)	
Benzo(a)pyrene	5.7 ×10 ⁻⁷ (4.6 ×10 ⁻⁷ - 7.2 ×10 ⁻⁷)	> 3 × 10 ⁻⁵	$> 3 \times 10^{-5}$	> 3 × 10 ⁻⁵	4.2×10 ⁻⁶ (2.5×10 ⁻⁶ - 7.3×10 ⁻⁶)	1.4 ×10 ⁻⁶ (7.7 ×10 ⁻⁷ - 2.4 ×10 ⁻⁶)	> 3 × 10 ⁻⁵	
Benzo(b)fluorantene	> 3 × 10 ⁻⁵	> 3 × 10 ⁻⁵	$> 3 \times 10^{-5}$	> 3 × 10 ⁻⁵	1.95 ×10 ⁻⁶ (1.1 ×10 ⁻⁶ - 3.4 ×10 ⁻⁶)	1.5×10^{-6} (5.4 ×10^{-7} - 4.1 ×10^{-6})	$\frac{1.8 \times 10^{-6}}{(7.2 \times 10^{-7} - 4.4 \times 10^{-6})}$	
Chlorophene	> 3 × 10 ⁻⁵	> 3 × 10 ⁻⁵	> 3 × 10 ⁻⁵	> 3 × 10 ⁻⁵	1.0×10 ⁻⁵ (2.6×10 ⁻⁶ - 1.7×10 ⁻⁵)	6.2 ×10 ⁻⁶ (3.4 ×10 ⁻⁶ - 9.8 ×10 ⁻⁶)	>1 ×10 ⁻⁵	
Propiconazole	> 3 × 10 ⁻⁵	> 3 × 10 ⁻⁵	$> 3 \times 10^{-5}$	> 3 × 10 ⁻⁵	8.1×10 ⁻⁶ (3.1×10 ⁻⁶ - 1.9×10 ⁻⁵)	4.4 ×10 ⁻⁶ (2.6 ×10 ⁻⁶ - 7.7 ×10 ⁻⁶)	2.4 ×10 ⁻⁶ (3.7 ×10 ⁻⁷ - 1.4 ×10 ⁻⁵)	
Cyprodinil	> 3 × 10 ⁻⁵	> 3 × 10 ⁻⁵	> 3 × 10 ⁻⁵	$\begin{array}{c} 4.9 \times 10^{-6} \\ (3.0 \times 10^{-6} - 8.1 \times 10^{-6}) \end{array}$	2.0×10 ⁻⁶ (1.2×10 ⁻⁶ - 3.4×10 ⁻⁶)	4.2 ×10 ⁻⁶ (1.4 ×10 ⁻⁶ - 1.3 ×10 ⁻⁵)	$\begin{array}{c} 4.1 \times 10^{-6} \\ (2.6 \times 10^{-6} - 1.6 \times 10^{-5}) \end{array}$	
Triclosan	> 3 × 10 ⁻⁵	$> 3 \times 10^{-5}$	> 3 × 10 ⁻⁵	> 3 × 10 ⁻⁵	> 3 × 10 ⁻⁵	> 3 × 10 ⁻⁵	> 3 × 10 ⁻⁵	
Diuron	> 3 × 10 ⁻⁵	> 3 × 10 ⁻⁵	> 3 × 10 ⁻⁵	> 3 × 10 ⁻⁵	> 3 × 10 ⁻⁵	> 3 × 10 ⁻⁵	> 3 × 10 ⁻⁵	
Diclofenac	> 3 × 10 ⁻⁵	$> 3 \times 10^{-5}$	> 3 × 10 ⁻⁵	> 3 × 10 ⁻⁵	$> 3 \times 10^{-5}$	> 3 × 10 ⁻⁵	> 3 × 10 ⁻⁵	

Table 3: Observed and predicted ER activation and inhibition for mixture M1 and its subgroups in MELN, ZELH α and ZELH β 2 cells. All concentrations are in M. (-) not tested as none of the individual compounds showed activity below its cytotoxic concentration range. (n.a.): the calculation is not applicable. Star indicates statistical significance (p<0.05). ^(a) re-calculated from Altenburger et al., 2018; ^(b) corresponds to cyprodinil which was the only ER inhibitor; ^(c) above cytotoxic concentration range.

		ER	activation (EC20)		ER inhibition (IC20)			
		Observed	Predicted	Ratio	Observed	Predicted	Ratio	
Cell line	Mixture (name)	Mean (95% CI)	Mean (95% CI)	obs/pred	Mean (95% CI)	Mean (95% CI)	obs/pred	
MELN	M1_A _{MELN}	$\frac{1.2 \times 10^{-6}}{(9.3 \times 10^{-7} - 1.6 \times 10^{-6})}$	8.9×10^{-7} (5.9 ×10 ⁻⁷ - 1.3 ×10 ⁻⁶)	1.3	-	-	-	
	$M1_I_{MELN}$	-	-	-	4.9 ×10 ^{-6 (b)} (3.0 ×10 ⁻⁶ - 8.2 ×10 ⁻⁶)	$4.9 \times 10^{-6} {}^{(b)} (3.0 \times 10^{-6} - 8.2 \times 10^{-6})$	1	
	$M1_A{+}I_{MELN}$	$\begin{array}{c} 2.1 \times 10^{-6} \\ (1.5 \times 10^{-6} - 2.9 \times 10^{-6}) \end{array}$	2.6×10^{-6} (1.7 ×10^{-6} - 3.8 ×10^{-6})	0.81	> 2 ×10 ^{-5 (4)}	$8.3 \times 10^{-5} (5.0 \times 10^{-5} - 1.4 \times 10^{-4})$	n.a.	
	M1	$\begin{array}{c} 6.1 \times 10^{-6} {}^{(a)} \\ (3.9 \times 10^{-6} - 9.2 \times 10^{-6}) \end{array}$	$\frac{6.7 \times 10^{-6} ^{(a)}}{(4.4 \times 10^{-6} - 9.5 \times 10^{-6})}$	0.91	3.4×10^{-5} $(1.1 \times 10^{-5} - 1.0 \times 10^{-4})$	$5.9 \times 10^{-4} {}^{(c)} \\ (3.6 \times 10^{-4} - 9.8 \times 10^{-4})$	0.058*	
ZELHa	$M1_A_{ZELH\alpha}$	$\frac{8.2 \times 10^{-7}}{(6.5 \times 10^{-7} - 1.6 \times 10^{-6})}$	2.0×10^{-6} (1.0 ×10^{-6} - 3.0 ×10^{-6})	0.41	-	-	-	
	$M1_I_{ZELH\alpha}$	-	-	-	2.7×10^{-6} (1.9×10 ⁻⁶ - 3.6×10 ⁻⁶)	3.1×10^{-6} (1.2 × 10 ⁻⁶ - 1.2 × 10 ⁻⁵)	0.87	
	M1_A+I_{ZELHa}	$> 4 \times 10^{-5 (c)}$	2.1×10^{-4} (1.3 ×10 ⁻⁴ - 3.2 ×10 ⁻⁴)	n.a.	$\begin{array}{c} 4.2 \times 10^{-6} \\ (1.9 \times 10^{-6} - 9.5 \times 10^{-6}) \end{array}$	5.7 ×10 ⁻⁶ (2.4 ×10 ⁻⁶ - 2.3 ×10 ⁻⁵)	0.74	
	M1	$> 10^{-5 (c)}$	3.0×10^{-4} (1.8 ×10 ⁻⁴ - 4.6 ×10 ⁻⁴)	n.a.	$\begin{array}{c} 4.2 \times 10^{-6} \\ (2.0 \times 10^{-6} - 8.7 \times 10^{-6}) \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 4.4 \times 10^{-6} \\ (1.7 \times 10^{-6} - 1.7 \times 10^{-5}) \end{array}$	0.95	
ZELHβ2	M1_A _{ZELHβ2}	$\frac{8.6 \times 10^{-8}}{(3.7 \times 10^{-8} - 1.8 \times 10^{-7})}$	$\frac{1.2 \times 10^{-7}}{(5.5 \times^{-8} - 2.4 \times 10^{-7})}$	0.71	-	-	-	
	$M1_I_{ZELH\beta2}$	-	-	-	$\begin{array}{c} 2.9 \times 10^{-6} \\ (2.0 \times 10^{-6} - 4.0 \times 10^{-6}) \end{array}$	3.5×10^{-6} (2.1 × 10 ⁻⁶ - 5.1 × 10 ⁻⁶)	0.83	
	$M1_A \!+\! I_{ZELH\beta2}$	$> 2 \times 10^{-5 (c)}$	1.3×10^{-5} (5.8 ×10 ⁻⁶ - 2.5 ×10 ⁻⁵)	n.a.	4.4 ×10 ⁻⁶ (3.0 ×10 ⁻⁶ - 6.3 ×10 ⁻⁶)	6.4 ×10 ⁻⁶ (4.0 ×10 ⁻⁶ - 9.0 ×10 ⁻⁶)	0.69	
	M1	$> 3 \times 10^{-5 (c)}$	$\frac{1.8 \times 10^{-5}}{(8.1 \times 10^{-6} - 3.5 \times 10^{-5})}$	n.a.	3.7×10^{-6} (2.1 × 10 ⁻⁶ - 6.3 × 10 ⁻⁶)	5.0 ×10 ⁻⁶ (3.0 ×10 ⁻⁶ - 7.1 ×10 ⁻⁶)	0.74	

Table 4: Observed and predicted ER activation and inhibition for mixture M2 and its subgroups. All concentrations are in M. (-) not tested as none of the individual compounds showed activity below its cytotoxic concentration range. (n.a.): the calculation is not applicable. Star indicates statistical significance (p<0.05). ^(a) re-calculated from Altenburger et al., 2018; ^(b) maximal induction measured below 20%.

		ER	activation (EC20)		ER inhibition (IC20)			
		Observed	Predicted	Ratio	Observed	Predicted	Ratio	
Cell line	Mixture (name)	Mean (95% CI)	Mean (95% CI)	obs/pred	Mean (95% CI)	Mean (95% CI)	obs/pred	
MELN	$M2_A_{MELN}$	$\frac{1.6 \times 10^{-7}}{(8.2 \times 10^{-8} - 2.9 \times 10^{-7})}$	$\begin{array}{c} 6.4 \times 10^{-8} \\ (4.0 \times 10^{-8} - 9.5 \times 10^{-8}) \end{array}$	2.5	-	-	-	
	M2	$\frac{1.5 \times 10^{-7 (a)}}{(6.8 \times 10^{-8} - 2.8 \times 10^{-7})}$	$\begin{array}{c} 2.08 \times 10^{-7 \text{ (a)}} \\ (1.3 \times 10^{-7} - 3.3 \times 10^{-7}) \end{array}$	0.72	-	-	-	
ZELHa	$M2_{ZELH\alpha}$	1.1×10^{-6} (7.4 ×10 ⁻⁷ - 1.7 ×10 ⁻⁶)	2.0×10^{-6} (1.2 ×10 ⁻⁶ - 3.1 ×10 ⁻⁶)	0.55	-	-	-	
	$M2_I_{ZELH\alpha}$	-	-	-	6.7 ×10 ⁻⁶ (2.9 ×10 ⁻⁶ - 1.3 ×10 ⁻⁵)	$ \begin{array}{c} 6.1 \times 10^{-6} \\ (2.2 \times 10^{-6} - 1.1 \times 10^{-5}) \end{array} $	1.1	
	$M2_A + I_{ZELH\alpha}$	1.5×10^{-6} (7.8 ×10 ⁻⁷ - 2.8 ×10 ⁻⁶)	4.9 ×10 ⁻⁶ (3.0 ×10 ⁻⁶ - 7.5 ×10 ⁻⁶)	0.31*	7.6 ×10 ⁻⁶ (5.3 ×10 ⁻⁶ - 1.0 ×10 ⁻⁵)	$\frac{1.0 \times 10^{-5}}{(3.7 \times 10^{-6} - 1.7 \times 10^{-5})}$	0.76	
	M2	$> 1.5 \times 10^{-7}$ ^(b)	$\begin{array}{c} 6.6 \times 10^{-6} \\ (4.0 \times 10^{-6} - 1.0 \times 10^{-5}) \end{array}$	n.a.	$\frac{8.3 \times 10^{-6}}{(6.0 \times 10^{-6} - 1.1 \times 10^{-5})}$	$\frac{1.4 \times 10^{-5}}{(5.3 \times 10^{-6} - 2.4 \times 10^{-5})}$	0.59	
ZELHβ2	$M2_{ZELH\beta2}$	$\frac{1.1 \times 10^{-7}}{(3.3 \times 10^{-8} - 3.2 \times 10^{-7})}$	1.5×10^{-7} (7.0 ×10 ⁻⁸ - 3.0 ×10 ⁻⁷)	0.73	-	-	-	
	$M2_I_{ZELH\beta2}$	-	-	-	7.5 ×10 ⁻⁶ (5.3 ×10 ⁻⁶ - 1.0 ×10 ⁻⁵)	6.6×10^{-6} (1.7 ×10 ⁻⁶ - 8.2 ×10 ⁻⁶)	1.1	
	$M2_A+I_{ZELH\beta2}$	1.2×10^{-6} (2.9 ×10 ⁻⁷ - 4.5 ×10 ⁻⁶)	3.7×10^{-7} (1.7 ×10 ⁻⁷ - 7.3 ×10 ⁻⁷)	3.2	7.7 ×10 ⁻⁶ (2.1 ×10 ⁻⁶ - 1.8 ×10 ⁻⁵)	6.8×10^{-6} (1.8 × 10 ⁻⁶ - 8.6 × 10 ⁻⁶)	1.1	
	M2	$\frac{1.8 \times 10^{-6}}{(3.2 \times 10^{-7} - 6.6 \times 10^{-6})}$	5.0 ×10 ⁻⁷ (2.3 ×10 ⁻⁷ - 9.8 ×10 ⁻⁷)	3.6	$\begin{array}{c} 4.1 \times 10^{-6} \\ (3.2 \times 10^{-6} - 5.1 \times 10^{-6}) \end{array}$	9.2×10^{-6} (2.4 × 10 ⁻⁶ - 1.2 × 10 ⁻⁵)	0.44	

Figure 1: Experimental approach selected to study the combined effects of ER activating and inhibiting chemicals within the 12-component mixtures M1 and M2. Subgroups of activators and inhibitors were designed with the chemicals predicted to contribute to the 12-component mixture responses at M1 and M2 mixture ratios.



Figure 2: Predicted and measured effects of multi-component mixtures based on M1 concentration ratios. Data represent the mean (+/- SD) of a minimum of 3 independent experiments done in triplicates and pooled together. The green line represents CA prediction for ER activation and the orange line ER inhibition, and their respective dotted line represent the 95% CI belt. Cytotoxic concentrations (measured by MTT) were removed.



Figure 3: Predicted and measured effects of multi-component mixtures based on M2 concentration ratios. Data represent the mean (+/- SD) of a minimum of 3 independent experiments done in triplicates and pooled together. The green line represents CA prediction for ER activation and the orange line ER inhibition, inhibition, and their respective dotted line represent the 95% CI belt. Cytotoxic concentrations (measured by MTT) were removed.



SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION

Combined effects of environmental xeno-estrogens within multi-component mixtures: comparison of *in vitro* human- and zebrafish-based estrogenicity bioassays

Hélène Serra^{1,2}, Martin Scholze³, Rolf Altenburger⁴, Wibke Busch⁴, Hélène Budzinski², François Brion¹, Selim Aït-Aïssa^{1,*}

¹Institut National de l'Environnement Industriel et des risques (INERIS), Unité Ecotoxicologie *in vitro* et *in vivo*, UMR-I 02 SEBIO, 60550 Verneuil-en-Halatte, France
 ² UMR-CNRS EPOC/LPTC, Université de Bordeaux, Talence, France
 ³Brunel University London, Uxbridge, United Kingdom
 ⁴UFZ– Helmholtz Centre for Environmental Research, Leipzig, Germany

*Corresponding author. Email: selim.ait-aissa@ineris.fr

Content:

Table SI 1: Composition of the 12 compound mixtures M1 and M2 and the highest substance concentration tested *in vitro*.

Table SI 2: Composition of mixtures of ER activator (M1_A), ER inhibitors (M1_I) or combined ER activators and inhibitors (M1_A+I) tested in MELN, ZELH α , ZELH β 2 and ZELH cells.

Table SI 3: Composition of mixtures of ER activator (M2_A), ER inhibitors (M2_I) or combined ER activators and inhibitors (M2_A+I) tested in MELN, ZELH α , ZELH β 2 and ZELH cells.

Table SI 4: Estrogenic activity of the M1 and M2 expressed in estradiol equivalent.

Figure SI 1: Response of the 12 chemicals on ER activation in MELN, ZELHα and ZELHβ2 cells.

Figure SI 2: Response of the 12 chemicals on E2-induced ER inhibition in MELN, ZELH α , ZELH β 2 and ZELH cells.

Figure SI 3: Cyprodinil response in MELN, ZELHα, ZELHβ2 and ZELH cells.

Figure SI 4: Predicted and observed effects of inhibiting chemicals on ZELH cells.

	M1		M2		
	Concentration (M)	proportion ¹⁾	Concentration (M)	proportion ¹⁾	
Benzo(a)pyrene	6E-08	0.05%	9.47E-09	0.06%	
Benzo(b)fluorantene	1E-07	0.08%	9.51E-09	0.06%	
Bisphenol A	7E-07	0.58%	4.17E-06	27.70%	
Chlorophene	9E-06	7.50%	6.40E-06	42.51%	
Cyprodinil	1E-06	0.83%	1.87E-07	1.24%	
Diazinon	6E-09	0.00%	1.96E-08	0.13%	
Diclofenac	3E-05	24.99%	2.90E-06	19.26%	
Diuron	6E-07	0.50%	2.08E-07	1.38%	
Genistein	1E-07	0.08%	4.47E-07	2.97%	
Propiconazole	6E-05	49.97%	8.48E-08	0.56%	
Triphenylphosphate	1.5E-05	12.49%	2.32E-07	1.54%	
Triclosan	3.5E-06	2.92%	3.89E-07	2.58%	
Mixture	1.2E-04	100%	1.51E-5	100%	

Table SI 1: Composition of the 12 compound mixtures M1 and M2 and the highest substance

 concentration tested *in vitro*.

¹⁾ mixture composition according to Altenburger et al., (2018)

Table SI 2: Composition of mixtures of ER activator (M1_A), ER inhibitors (M1_I) or combined ER activators and inhibitors (M1_A+I) tested in MELN, ZELH α , ZELH β 2 and ZELH cells. The mixture composition is based on their relative proportion in the 12-compound mixture M1 (Table SI 1).

		MELN	[Z	ZELH		
Type of mixture	Activators	Inhibitors	Inhibitors + activators	Activators	Inhibitors	Inhibitors + activators	Inhibitors
Mixture name	M1_A _{MELN}	$M1_{MELN}$	$M1_A{+}I_{MELN}$	M1_A _{ZELHα} , M1_A _{ZELHβ2}	$\begin{array}{l} M1_I_{ZELH\alpha},\\ M1_I_{ZELH\beta2} \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{l} M1_I+A_{ZELHa},\\ M1_I+A_{ZELH\beta2} \end{array}$	$M1_I_{ZELH}$
Genistein	1%	-	1%	13%	-	0.2%	-
Bisphenol A	4%	-	4%	87%	-	0.8%	-
Triphenylphosphate	95%	-	89%	-	18%	17.7%	20%
Cyprodinil	-	100%	6%	-	-	-	1%
Diclofenac	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Chlorophene	-	-	-	-	11%	10.6%	-
Propiconazole	-	-	-	-	71%	70.8%	79%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Table SI 3: Composition of mixtures of ER activator (M2_A), ER inhibitors (M2_I) or combined ER activators and inhibitors (M2_A+I) tested in MELN, ZELH α , ZELH β 2 and ZELH cells. The mixture composition is based on their relative proportion in the 12-compound mixture M2 (Table SI 1).

	MELN		ZELHa			ZELHβ2		ZELH
Туре	Activators	Activators	Inhibitors	Inhibitors + activators	Activators	Inhibitors	Inhibitors + activators	Inhibitors
Name	M2_A _{MELN}	$M2_A_{ZELH\alpha}$	$M2_I_{ZELH\alpha}$	$M2_I + A_{ZELH\alpha}$	$M2_{ZELH\beta2}$	$M2_I_{ZELH\beta2}$	$M2_I + A_{ZELH\beta2}$	$M2_I_{\text{ZELH}}$
Genistein	10%	10%		4.0%	10%		4.0%	
Bisphenol A	90%	90%		37.2%	90%	38.6%	37.2%	
Triphenylphosphate			3.5%	2.0%		2.1%	2.1%	77%
Chlorophene			96.4%	56.6%		59.3%	57.1%	
Propiconazole								23%
Benzo(a)pyrene			0.14%	0.08%				
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Table SI 4: Estrogenic activity of the M1 and M2 expressed in estradiol-equivalents

(E2-Eq). E2-Eq (expressed in μ M) were calculated for the 12-component mixtures on the basis of their predicted and observed EC20s (reported in Tables 3 and 4) in relation to the EC20 of E2 (in Table 2). The E2-Eq (observed) is the ratio between the EC20(E2) and the measured EC20(mixture), and E2-Eq(predicted) is the ratio between the EC20(E2) and the CA predicted EC20(mixture). n.a.: not applicable (no estrogenic activity measured).

M1 E2-Eq	M2 E2-Eq		
Observed Predicted Observed/Predicted	Observed	Predicted	Observed/Predicted
(μM) (μM) (%)	(µM)	(µM)	(%)
MELN 0.56 0.51 110	22.7	16.3	139
ZELH α n.a. 0.43 n.a.	n.a.	19.7	n.a.
ZELHβ2 n.a. 0.33 n.a.	3.33	12	28

Figure SI 1: Response of the 12 chemicals on ER activation in MELN, ZELH α and ZELH β 2 cells. Data represent each replicate and their mean (red dash) of at least 2 independent experiments done in triplicates. Chemicals were tested in the 10 nM - 30 μ M range, except for genistein (from 1 nM). 17 β -estradiol (E2) was used as positive control. The horizontal dotted line at 20% figures the threshold of effect.











Figure SI 2: Response of the 12 chemicals on E2-induced ER inhibition in MELN, ZELH α , ZELH β 2 and ZELH cells. Data represent each replicate and the mean (red dash) of at least 2 independent experiments done in triplicates. Chemicals were tested in the 10 nM - 30 μ M range. MELN and ZELH β 2 cells were co-exposed with 0.1 nM E2, and ZELH α and ZELH cells with 1 nM E2. Cell viability (MTT) was measured for at least one experiment and is represented in green full circles (mean +/- SD) on the right Y axis. The horizontal dotted line at 80% figures the threshold of effect (IC20). Hydroxy-tamoxifen (OH-TAM) was used as positive control.









Figure SI 3: Cyprodinil response in MELN, ZELH α , ZELH β 2 and ZELH cells. The response was measured with cyprodinil alone (ER, luciferase induction relative to DMSO control) or in presence of E2 (antiER, luciferase induction relative to E2 positive control). Data represent the mean (+/- SD) of a minimum of 2 independent experiments done in triplicates and pooled together.



Figure SI 4: Predicted and observed effects of inhibiting chemicals on ZELH cells. Results of subgroup mixtures M1_I_{ZELH} (A), M2_I_{ZELH} (B), and 12-component mixtures M1 (B) and M2 (D). Mixture effects were predicted according to CA model (orange line, 95% CI belt). Luciferase (LUC) activity was measured in absence (black circles) or in presence of E2 (co-exposure with E2 at 1 nM, grey open circles). The data (mean +/- SD) originate from at least 2 independent experiments done in triplicates and pooled together. Cytotoxic concentrations (measured by MTT) were removed.



Highlights:

- 12-chemical mixtures including xenoestrogens were tested in ER-reporter gene assays
- Human and zebrafish cells had distinct estrogenic response to the mixtures
- Several ER inhibitors were identified but in zebrafish cells only
- Inhibitors decreased the ER response in zebrafish cells compared with expected CA
- Non-estrogenic chemicals influenced ER mixture response in a cell-specific manner