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PFAS Background

- Diverse group of compounds
- Used in carpeting, apparels, upholstery, food paper wrappings, and fire-fighting foams
- Persistent and bioaccumulative
- Long chain perfluorinated chemicals are well studied; their use is in decline
- Shorter and branched chain compounds increasing in production and use; less well studied
Widespread Contamination to PFAS in US Watersheds

Hu et al., ES&T letters 2016  81% assoc with manufacturing site
Ongoing PFAS NTP Studies

- PFOA Chronic bioassay: Male and female rats. Exposure included a perinatal (GD 6 – PND 21) and non-perinatal component to determine if early life exposure alters response.
  - Pathology tables expected to be posted early 2018 and NTP Technical Report peer reviewed in late 2018

- 28-day toxicity studies: Male and Female Rats
  - 7 PFASs evaluated: PFBS, PFHxS, PFOS, PFHxA, PFOA, PFNA, and PFDA
  - Tables expected to posted early 2018 and Toxicity Reports to follow

- Toxicokinetic studies in male and female rats:
  - Evaluated PFBS, PFHxS, PFOS, PFHxA, PFOA, PFDA, and 8:2 fluorotelomer

- Immunotoxicity assessment:
  - PFDA evaluation in female rats and mice (manuscript submitted)

- Published in vitro studies:
  - In vitro mitochondrial toxicity evaluation of 16 PFASs using rat liver: Wallace et al., Toxicology Letters 2013; 222(3)
  - In vitro assessment of immunotoxicity of 5 PFASs: Corsini et al., Toxicology and Applied Pharmacology 2012; 258(2)
  - In vitro assessment of immunotoxicity of PFOA and PFOS: Corsini et al., Toxicology and Applied Pharmacology 2011; 250(2)
  - In vitro neurotoxicity evaluation of 4 PFASs using PC12 cells: Slotkin et al., Environmental Health Perspectives 2008; 116(6)
PFOS and PFOA Alternatives of Interest

- Total number of PFAS >1500 chemicals.
  - Includes products, impurities and degradates.

- Significant Regulatory and Public Health Interest
  - USEPA: Several hundred of interest narrowing down to between 75-150.
  - FDA: Interested in PFAS used in packaging
  - DOD: Aqueous Fire Fighting Foams (AFFF).
  - ATSDR, CPSC, State public health agencies.
  - Federal Information Exchange on PFAS (Feb 2018)
    - National Science and Technology Council, Committee on Environment
    - EPA, DOD, NIH (co-chairs)
Challenges

- Nominations more complex.
  - Class nominations:
    - PFAS
    - Flame Retardants
    - Ionic Liquids
    - PAHs
- Expectations have changed
  - Impatience at pace of traditional NTP hazard assessment studies
  - Communication is now instantaneous (email, texts, etc.)
- Challenge for high throughput screening.
  - You can’t just turn on the robot and get the data.
Problem Formulation and Approach

- What are the types of biological activity and toxicological information that NTP can develop in a responsive timeframe on these classes of chemicals?
  - How can this information be used to make public health decisions?

- What are the appropriate tools to bring to this problem?

- How do we organize this information to provide useful products?

- How do we report this biological activity/toxicological information in a timely manner?
Screening and Testing Prioritization

Literature review: Chemicals Grouped by knowledge

In Silico: chemicals grouped by structure.

In vitro: chemicals will be grouped by structure and biology.

In vivo: prototype chemicals from in vitro groupings move on to in vivo studies.
PFAS Assessment is Based on Read Across

• Read Across
  – When the already available data of a data-rich substance (the source) is used for a data-poor substance (the target), which is considered similar enough to the source substance to use the same data as a basis for the safety assessment.

• Sufficient Similarity –
  – Use structure and in vitro data to group chemicals
  – NTP has developed statistical methods for Sufficient Similarity in our Gingko Biloba studies.

• Use the PFAS from the NTP 28 day studies as anchor chemicals for read across.

• Likely need to run other PFAS as anchors.
Staff team leads at NIEHS

- Literature Analyses – Andrew Rooney
- Chemistry – Suramya Waidyanatha
- In silico – Scott Auerbach
- In vitro – Sue Fenton
- In vivo – Chad Blystone
- Mixtures – Mike DeVito
- Reporting Plan – Mike DeVito
NTP Monograph on Immunotoxicity Associated with Exposure to Perfluorooctanoic Acid or Perfluorooctane Sulfonate

- The NTP concludes that PFOA and PFOS are presumed to be immune hazards to humans based on a high level of evidence that PFOA and PFOS suppressed the antibody response in animal studies and a moderate level of evidence from studies in humans.

- https://ntp.niehs.nih.gov/go/749926
NIEHS/DNTP PFS In Vivo Studies

- Autoimmunity and PFAS in mice
- GenX developmental toxicity study in mice
- GenX in vivo pharmacokinetic studies
- GenX has been found in high concentrations in the Cape Fear River near Wilmington NC.
In Silico Predictions
### NTP and EPA Collaborative Effort

**Proposed in vitro assays for toxicological characterization of the EPA’s 75 PFAS Chemical Library**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Endpoint of Interest</th>
<th>NTP</th>
<th>EPA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hepatotoxicity</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developmental Toxicity</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immunotoxicity</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitochondrial Toxicity</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developmental Neurotoxicity</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hepatic Clearance</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plasma Protein Binding</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enterohepatic Recirculation</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Vitro Disposition</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Proposed Exploratory *in vitro* assays for toxicological characterization at NTP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Endpoint of Interest</th>
<th>Assay</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hepatotoxicity</td>
<td>Metabolomics in HepaRG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immunotoxicity</td>
<td>NTP Immunotoxicity Contract</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placental Model</td>
<td>Using JEG cells</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mammary gland model</td>
<td>MCF-7 cell milk protein production</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renal Transport</td>
<td>Renal proximal tubule permeability assay in rats and humans</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**In Vitro To In Vivo Extrapolation: IVIVE**

Steady state in vitro-in vivo extrapolation assumption:

**blood::tissue partitioning ≈ cells::medium partitioning**

---

**Graphs:**

- **Left Graph:**
  - Steady-state Concentration (μM) vs. Daily Dose (mg/kg/day)
  - Prediction: Slope = $C_{ss}$ for 1 mg/kg/d
  - Equation: $C_{ss} = \frac{\text{oral dose}}{(\text{GFR} \times F_{in}) \times \left( Q + \frac{F_{in} \times C_{in}}{Q + F_{in} \times C_{L}} \right)}$
  - Source: Wetmore et al. (2012)

- **Right Graph:**
  - Oral Equivalent Daily Dose vs. Steady-state Concentration (μM) = *in vitro* AC50
  - Prediction: Slope = mg/kg/d per $C_{ss}$

**Notes:**
- Swap the axes (this is the “reverse” part of reverse dosimetry)
- Can divide bioactive concentration by $C_{ss}$ for a 1 mg/kg/day dose to get oral equivalent dose

---

*Slide from John Wambaugh*
In vivo studies

• Based on in vitro groupings, potency, IVIVE, environmental and human exposure.
  - 5-day rat hepatic transcriptomic assay
  - 28 day toxicity studies
  - Other in vivo studies possible for a limited number of PFAS
Products from REACT

- In vitro characterization and read-across grouping of PFAS chemicals
- Estimates of oral equivalent dose to attain Cmax or Css equivalent to *in vitro* Points of Departure.
- In vivo studies on limited numbers of chemicals that provide sufficient anchors for read-across.
REACT Approach: Note of Caution

- Not every tool will work for every class of chemicals!
  - 5 day adult transcriptomic study may not predict the point of departures for developmental effects
  - Need to understand when a tool is useful and when it is not
  - We need to adapt to the problem
• Are the effects of PFAS mixtures dose additive?
  – NTP will evaluate dose addition using laboratory-prepared mixtures. Initial mixtures will be based on water sample analyses from Mark Strynar (ORD/USEPA).

• Can the toxicity of commercial mixtures of Aqueous Fire-Fighting Foam for MIL Specs (AFFF), be estimated based on the PFAS content?
  – NTP will evaluate the AFFF mixtures and prepare PFAS mixtures at the same mixing ratios as in the formulation.
  – Compare and contrast the effects of the AFFF mixture to that of the PFAS mixtures
Summary

- Published a systematic review on PFOA immunotoxicity.
- A number of in vivo studies are at various stages of development.
  - Publications from NTP Laboratory on PFOA.
  - Carcinogenicity and toxicity studies of PFOA.
  - 28-day toxicity studies in rats on 8 PFAS.
- Developing an approach that provides a rapid response to a large class of chemicals and mixtures.
- Integrated approach that will incorporate data and information from:
  - In silico models.
  - In vitro models.
  - In vivo models.
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