# Hepatobiliary Disposition of 15 Non-Therapeutic Chemicals in Sandwich-Culture Rat Hepatocytes using B-CLEAR<sup>®</sup> Technology

mg/kg BW/day

Potential

IVIVE

Potential

Exposure Rate

Hazard from in

vitro HTS with

<sup>1</sup>US EPA, Research Triangle Park, NC; <sup>2</sup>Qualyst Transporter Solutions, a BioIVT company, Durham, NC; and <sup>3</sup>Oak Ridge Institute for Science and Education, Oak Ridge, TN

### www.epa.gov

## Background: Two Problems with In Vitro-In Vivo Extrapolation

High throughput in vitro screening provides surrogate toxicity data for thousands of chemicals occurring in commerce and the environment without traditional toxicity testing data

In vitro-in vivo extrapolation (IVIVE) via high throughput toxicokinetics (HTTK) allows screening data to be placed in a risk prioritization context

#### In vitro TK tools underestimate toxicokinetic clearance (L/h/kg BW) when comparing with *in vivo* data

⁰ 🔚 Wambaugh et al. (201 Pharmaceutical:MSE = 2.44,  $R^2$  = 0.1 Other: MSE = 2.93,  $R^2 = 0.5$ 100 ...100 ...100 ...100 In vitro predicted clearance (mg/L/h)

HTTK currently calculates clearance based upon elimination (disappearance) observed in hepatocyte suspension over 4 hrs, and estimated passive glomerular filtration

Possible Reasons

- Hepatocytes in suspensior • Drug metabolism activity/cell viability rapidly lost
- Less accurate with low turnove
- Incubation time may miss slow clearance
- Extra-hepatic metabolism
- Active transport in kidney
- Biliary excretion

#### We typically do not know how a chemical partitions *in vitro*

We expect that the free and cellular concentrations of chemical *in vitro* will differ from the nominal (tested) concentration due to (at least) binding to plastic, lipids proteins, and gas exchange

Mathematical chemical partitioning models exist that predict *in vitro* distribution such as the Armitage et al. (2014) for neutral compounds, which was extended by Fischer et al. (2017) for ionized compounds

However, there is limited evaluation data for cellular partitioning for any chemical (six chemicals reviewed by Kramer et al. (2015)





## Methods



Standard Buffer Sequesters Bile

Ca2+-free Buffer Allows Bile to Mix with Media



- B-CLEAR<sup>®</sup> Technology utilizes tight junction modulation in sandwichcultured hepatocytes (SCH) to quantify biliary efflux of test article (Figure, left). The presence of calcium [Plus (+) Buffer] maintains the integrity of tight junctions and formation of the bile pockets. Biliary clearance of a compound requires uptake into the hepatocytes and excretion into the bile pockets. In the absence of calcium [Minus (-) Buffer], the tight junctions open and the contents of the bile pockets are released. The mass of the test article excreted into bile (e.g. bile accumulation) is the difference between the two conditions. Quantitation of test articles in cell lysates and dosing solutions was determined using LC-MS/MS equipped with an ESI interface.
- Biliary efflux was assessed for 15 compounds where HTTK has previously underestimated clearance
- All compounds assessed at two concentrations (10 and 30  $\mu$ M) and two time points (10 and 30 minutes) in rat SCH

**U.S. Environmental Protection Agency** Office of Research and Development

## J. F. Wambaugh<sup>1</sup>, J. P. Jackson<sup>2</sup>, K. R. Brouwer<sup>2</sup>, A. Herman<sup>2</sup>, G. S. Honda<sup>1,3</sup>, R. G. Pearce<sup>1,3</sup>, and R. S. Thomas<sup>1</sup>





#### **15 Test Chemicals**

Metabolism rate and fraction unbound in plasma (f<sub>up</sub>) measured *in vitro* by Wetmore *et al.* (2012, 2015) Wambaugh et al. (2015) TK triage predictor estimated error of in vivo clearance relative to HTTK estimated clearance Chemicals were selected such that they are likely to be underestimated by standard HTTK

Compound	logP	MW	Charge at pH 7.4	Metabolism	F <sub>up</sub>	Predicted Cellular Concentration vs. Nominal	Predict
Diclosulam	3.5	406.2	Neutral	Moderate	Low	>3.2x	>10x U
Diniconazole	4.3	326.2	Zwitterionic	Moderate	Low	>3.2x	>10x U
Ethametsulfuron methyl	1.6	410.4	Zwitterionic	Moderate	Low	NA	>10x U
Flumetsulam	1.5	325.3	Neutral	Moderate	Low	NA	>10x U
Fulvestrant	9.4	606.8	Neutral	Fast	Low	>100x	NA
Iodosulfuron-methyl-sodium	3.2	529.2	Anionic	Moderate	Low	>3.2x	>10x U
Mesotrione	1.5	339.3	Neutral	Slow	Moderate	NA	>10x U
Monobutyl phthalate	2.8	222.2	Anionic	Slow	Moderate	>3.2x	On the
Oxytetracycline dihydrate	-4.0	496.5	Neutral	None	Moderate	<100x	>10x U
Penoxsulam	3.0	483.4	Anionic	None	Low	>3.2x	>10x U
Perfluorooctanoic acid	5.1	414.1	Anionic	Moderate	Low	NA	Does N
Pyrithiobac-sodium	0.6	348.7	Anionic	None	Low	<3.2x	>10x U
Quinclorac	3.0	242.1	Neutral	None	Low	>3.2x	>10x U
Thidiazuron	1.9	220.3	Neutral	Moderate	Low	NA	>10x U
Triflumizole	1.4	345.7	Anionic	Moderate	Low	NA	>10x U

#### oounds (any time, any concentration) demonstrated Bil

Compound	logP	MW	Charge at pH 7.4	Metabolism	F <sub>up</sub>	Time (min)	Conc. (µM)
Flumetsulam	1.5	325.3	Neutral	Moderate	Low	10	30
Iodosulfuron-methyl-sodium	3.2	529.2	Anionic	Moderate	Low	30	30
Mesotrione	1.5	339.3	Neutral	Slow	Moderate	30	30
Oxytetracycline dihydrate	-4.0	496.5	Neutral	None	Moderate	30	30

These chemicals span a range of hydrophobicity (logP) and have no obvious distinctions from other chemicals

#### in vitro Disposition: Intracellular Concentration (ICC) Varied By Chemical

We compared the ratio  $(k_p)$  of the measured ICC to nominal concentration (either 10 or 30  $\mu$ M)

Median ICC was 1.4x higher than nominal, low of 0.05x, max of 35x, with 95% of values within 0.13x to 28x)



ICC is predicted by the Armitage et al. (2014) model

Model tends to overestimate accumulation

liary Clea	arance: C	Only four comp bile accumulation				
	Compound		logP	MW		
	Flumetsulam		1.5	325.3		
	Iodosulfuron-methy	yl-sodium	3.2	529.2		
	Mesotrione		1.5	339.3		
	Oxytetracycline dih	ydrate	-4.0	496.5		

Chemical

Diclosulam
Diniconazole Ethametsulfuron-methyl Flumetsulam Fulvestrant Iodosulfuron-methyl-sodium • •• Mesotrione Monobutyl phthalate Oxytetracycline dihydrate Penoxsulam
 PFOA \*\*\*\*\* Pyrithiobac-sodium Quinclorac
Thidiazuron
Triflumizole In vitro measured k<sub>n</sub>

John Wambaugh I orcid.org/0000-0002-4024-534X I wambaugh.john@epa.gov I 919-541-764

## **Conclusion and Future Direction**

- Biliary efflux (BEI) results of < 20% for all compounds evaluated suggested biliary excretion of all compounds studied was low or slow. Although no biliary efflux is sometimes observed in rat SCH, a compound with high accumulation potential may still be extensively excreted into the bile a result of a slow excretion process.
- Biliary clearance does not seem to explain underestimation of clearance by HTTK in general, pointing to a potential role for extra-hepatic metabolism.
- The results indicate the importance of accounting for hepatic accumulation
  - Ratio of ICC to nominal concentration for four compounds (Diniconazole, Ethametsulfuronmethyl, Fulvestrant, Triflumizole) was greater than ten times
  - Ratio of ICC to nominal concentration less than ten times for only PFOA, and only at 30 minutes and  $30 \,\mu\text{M}$  (0.05x nominal)
- Accumulation of three chemicals (Diclosulam, Quinclorac, and Monobutyl phthalate) was significantly over-predicted by the Armitage et al. (2014) partitioning model
- SCH (rat) data suggested these compounds have low accumulation potential resulting from either low hepatic uptake potential or a possible role for efflux transporters (basolateral/canalicular) reducing accumulation potential
- Difference between cellular concentration and nominal concentrations exist, but there was no pronounced bias (median cellular concentration was 1.4x higher than nominal).

#### **Recommendations for future testing of non-therapeutic chemicals in B-CLEAR**<sup>®</sup> :

- Longer incubation time may allow for greater accumulation of compounds with slow, but non-zero biliary clearance
- The maximum tested concentration was 30 μM testing at higher chemical concentrations should make compound in bile easier to detect, but higher concentrations may cause cytotoxicity
- Current techniques rely on liquid chromatography mass spectrometry, could eventually expand chemical space using gas chromatography

## References

Armitage, James M., et al. "Application of mass balance models and the chemical activity concept to facilitate the use of in vitro toxicity data for risk assessment." Environmental science & technology 48.16 (2014): 9770-9779.

Fischer, Fabian C., et al. "Modeling exposure in the Tox21 in vitro bioassays." Chemical research in toxicology 30.5 (2017): 1197-1208. Kramer, Nynke I., et al. "Biokinetics in repeated-dosing in vitro drug toxicity studies." Toxicology in Vitro 30.1 (2015): 217-224. Wambaugh, John F., et al. "Toxicokinetic triage for environmental chemicals." Toxicological Sciences 147.1 (2015): 55-67. Wambaugh, John F., et al. "Evaluating In Vitro-In Vivo Extrapolation" accepted at Toxicological Sciences,. Wetmore, Barbara A., et al. "Integration of dosimetry, exposure and high-throughput screening data in chemical toxicity assessment." Toxicological Sciences (2012): kfr254. Wetmore, Barbara A., et al. "Incorporating High-Throughput Exposure Predictions with Dosimetry-Adjusted In Vitro Bioactivity to Inform Chemical Toxicity Testing." Toxicological Sciences 148.1 (2015): 121-136.

This poster does not necessarily reflect EPA policy. Mention of trade names or commercial products does not constitute endorsement or recommendation for use.

Clearance Erroi derestimated derestimated derestimated derestimated derestimated derestimated derestimated derestimated ot Reach Steady Stat

nderestimated

derestimated

derestimated nderestimated



## 3361/P143 Society of Toxicology Annual Meeting San Antonio, TX March 11-15, 2018