**QUEEN'S
UNIVERSITY
BELFAST**

A mixture of persistent organic pollutants relevant for human exposure inhibits the transactivation activity of the aryl hydrocarbon receptor in vitro

Doan, Q. T., Berntsen, H. F., Verhaegen, S., Ropstad, E., Connolly, L., Igout, A., Muller, M., & Scippo, M-L. (2019). A mixture of persistent organic pollutants relevant for human exposure inhibits the transactivation activity of the aryl hydrocarbon receptor in vitro. *Environmental Pollution*, [113098]. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envpol.2019.113098>

Published in:
Environmental Pollution

Document Version:
Peer reviewed version

Queen's University Belfast - Research Portal:
[Link to publication record in Queen's University Belfast Research Portal](#)

Publisher rights

Copyright 2019 Elsevier.

This manuscript is distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs License (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>), which permits distribution and reproduction for non-commercial purposes, provided the author and source are cited.

General rights

Copyright for the publications made accessible via the Queen's University Belfast Research Portal is retained by the author(s) and / or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing these publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

Take down policy

The Research Portal is Queen's institutional repository that provides access to Queen's research output. Every effort has been made to ensure that content in the Research Portal does not infringe any person's rights, or applicable UK laws. If you discover content in the Research Portal that you believe breaches copyright or violates any law, please contact openaccess@qub.ac.uk.

A mixture of persistent organic pollutants relevant for human exposure inhibits the transactivation activity of the aryl hydrocarbon receptor *in vitro*

Doan TQ¹, Berntsen HF^{2,3}, Verhaegen S², Ropstad E², Connolly L⁴, Igout A⁵, Muller M^{6*}, Scippo ML^{1*}

¹Laboratory of Food Analysis, FARA-Veterinary Public Health, University of Liège, Liège, Belgium, 4000;

²Department of Production Animal Clinical Sciences, Section of Experimental Biomedicine, NMBU - Faculty of Veterinary Medicine, Oslo, Norway, N-0033;

³Department of Administration, Lab Animal Unit, National Institute of Occupational Health P.O. Box 8149 Dep, Oslo, Norway, N-0033;

⁴Institute for Global Food Security, School of Biological Sciences, Queen's University Belfast, Northern Ireland, UK, BT7 1NN;

⁵Department of biomedical and preclinical sciences, Faculty of Medicine, University of Liège, Liège, Belgium, 4000;

⁶GIGA-R, Laboratory for Organogenesis and Regeneration, University of Liège, Liège, Belgium, 4000;

Corresponding author Scippo ML: mlscippo@uliege.be

*Muller M and Scippo ML equally contributed as the last authors.

Abstract: While humans are exposed to mixtures of persistent organic pollutants (POPs), their risk assessment is usually based on a chemical-by-chemical approach. To assess the health effects associated with mixed exposures, knowledge on mixture toxicity is required. Several POPs are potential ligands of the Aryl hydrocarbon receptor (AhR), which involves in xenobiotic metabolism and controls many biological pathways. This study assesses AhR agonistic and

antagonistic activities of 29 POPs individually and in mixtures by using Chemical-Activated Luciferase gene expression bioassays with 3 transgenic cell lines (rat hepatoma DR-H4IIE, human hepatoma DR-Hep G2 and human mammary gland carcinoma DR-T47-D). Among the 29 POPs, which were selected based on their abundance in Scandinavian human blood, only 4 exerted AhR agonistic activities, while 16 were AhR antagonists in DR-H4IIE, 5 in DR-Hep G2 and 7 in DR-T47-D when tested individually. The total POP mixture revealed to be AhR antagonistic. It antagonized EC₅₀ TCDD inducing AhR transactivation at a concentration of 125 and 250 and 500 fold blood levels in DR-H4IIE, DR-T47-D and DR-Hep G2, respectively, although each compound was present at these concentrations lower than their LOEC values. Such values could occur in real-life in food contamination incidents or in exposed populations. In DR-H4IIE, the antagonism of the total POP mixture was due to chlorinated compounds and, in particular, to PCB-118 and PCB-138 which caused 90% of the antagonistic activity in the POP mixture. The 16 active AhR antagonists acted additively. Their mixed effect was predicted successfully by concentration addition or generalized concentration addition models, rather than independent action, with only two-fold IC₅₀ underestimation. We also attained good predictions for the full dose-response curve of the antagonistic activity of the total POP mixture.

Keywords: Persistent Organic Pollutants; Aryl hydrocarbon Receptor; Antagonistic activity; Human relevant mixture; Generalized concentration addition model

Capsule:

A mixture of persistent organic pollutants relevant to human exposure antagonized the transcriptional activity of the Aryl hydrocarbon receptor *in vitro*, whose activity could be predicted.

1. Introduction

The aryl hydrocarbon receptor (AhR) was originally characterized as a xenobiotic mediator¹. It is often called the “dioxin receptor” as 2,3,7,8-tetrachlorodibenzo-p-dioxin (TCDD) and several dioxin-like (dl) compounds are AhR agonists. Adverse health effects associated with exposure to these AhR agonists are widely studied, including abnormal reproduction and development, impaired immune system, liver toxicity and cancers².

AhR physiological roles have recently gained more attention since AhR is activated by a wide range of structurally diverse endogenous and exogenous compounds³. Also, AhR-deficient rodents suffer from various physiological defects in the immune system⁴, liver⁵, kidney^{4,6}, cardiovascular system⁷, urinary bladder⁸, *etc.* Additionally, AhR homologs are preserved in animal evolution for 600 million years⁹, while invertebrate AhR homologues cannot bind dioxin¹⁰, indicating that dioxin detection was not the primary role of this protein. Increasing evidence supports important roles of AhR in normal development and homeostasis, while toxicity induced by AhR xenobiotic ligands could be due to perturbation of these normal processes¹¹.

Upon ligand binding, the AhR is translocated from cytosol into the nucleus where it joins its dimerization partner, aryl hydrocarbon receptor nuclear translocator (ARNT). This AhR/ARNT complex then binds to a DNA sequence called dioxin responsive element (DRE) to activate the expression of a battery of genes, including both phase I and phase II xenobiotic metabolism enzymes, of which *cyp1a1* is the best characterized. Hence, methods measuring *cyp1a1* gene expression are widely accepted for determining AhR activation¹², among which cell-based screening methods such as Chemical-Activated LUCiferase gene eXpression (CALUX) are the most common^{13–15}.

Many potential AhR ligands are persistent organic pollutants (POPs). POPs are resistant to degradation and widely distributed in the environment. They can be detected in almost every human sample, including fetuses and embryos¹⁶. They tend to bioaccumulate and biomagnify in living organisms, resulting in toxic health effects to both humans and wildlife¹⁷.

Presently, chemical risk assessment mainly relies on a chemical-by-chemical approach¹⁸. In real life, humans are exposed not to an individual POP, but to highly complex POP mixtures¹⁹. Understanding mixture toxicity is crucial to assess the potential adverse health effects associated with such real life exposure to mixtures of POPs²⁰. The mixture effects may be additive, synergistic, or antagonistic depending on whether they are equal, stronger, or weaker than the sum of the effects of individual components, respectively²¹. The concepts called "something from nothing" and "a lot from a little" were introduced to describe the mixture effect²² and proved in a study on fish when a significant effect was observed for a mixture combining individual compounds each at "no observed effect" concentrations²³.

Due to the various mixture forms and doses, models using the information of components to predict the combined effects are required. Three mathematical models have been developed for this purpose: i) the concentration addition (CA) model was designed for chemicals with similar mode of actions (MOAs)²⁴, but has also proven useful for mixtures with dissimilar compounds^{23,25,26}; ii) independent action (IA)²⁷, successful in several applications^{28,29}, applies for chemicals which act independently and have different MOAs; and iii) the generalized concentration addition (GCA)³⁰, a CA modified model, was developed for predicting the effects of mixtures containing partial agonists³⁰⁻³².

In an effort to fill the gap in the knowledge of mixture toxicology, a defined mixture of 29 POPs (total POP mixture) was constructed based on their prominence in blood and/or food and

breastmilk with the concentration being average blood values from recent Scandinavian studies^{33–35} published prior to 2012³⁶. To mimic the exposure of cells (in a tissue) to chemicals that are in the blood stream, reporter gene assays involving cancer cell lines from different tissues (liver and mammary gland) and species (rat and human) were used in this study to determine the AhR transcriptional activities of the selected 29 POPs, individually and in mixtures (the total POP mixture and six sub-mixtures³⁶). The aims were to (a) assess both AhR agonistic and antagonistic activities after exposing the cell lines to the 29 POPs and to the mixtures, (b) identify the main compound(s) responsible for the observed effects of the mixtures, and (c) predict the mixture activity by applying the three available models (IA, CA and GCA).

2. Materials and Methods

2.1. Chemicals and suppliers

The total POP and six sub-mixtures were designed and premade by the Norwegian University of Life Sciences, Oslo, Norway as described³⁶. The former consists of 29 POPs, where most of them are listed as POPs under the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants, belonging to three groups: six perfluorinated compounds (PFAAs), seven brominated compounds (BFRs), and 16 chlorinated compounds with seven polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs) and nine organochlorine pesticides (OCPs). The latter consist of either one single class of compounds (PFAA, Br and Cl) or two combined classes (Cl+Br, Cl+PFAA, Br+PFAA). This way of mixture preparation was to enable the study of the effect of adding or removing one chemical group on different endpoints. As the design of the mixtures was focused on compounds occurring at high concentrations, most dl-PCBs (with the exception of PCB-118) and polychlorinated dibenzodioxins/polychlorinated dibenzofurans (PCDD/PCDF) were deliberately excluded. These compounds were also omitted due to their high toxicity at low concentrations in several systems to allow the study of the effect of the non-dl and most prevalent compounds. The components included in the mixtures and their respective concentrations are given in Table S1.

Along with the mixture testing, 29 POPs from the total POP mixture were also examined individually. They were bought from Sigma Aldrich (Missouri, USA) except o-chlordane from Toronto Research Chemicals (North York, Canada) and PCB-118 from Dr Ehrenstorfer (Augsburg, Germany). All chemicals were dissolved in dimethylsulfoxide (DMSO) (Acros Organics, Molinons, France), except HCB in hexane (Merck, Massachusetts, USA).

The 29 individual POPs and the mixtures were stored as stock solutions at -20°C. Working solutions were prepared from the stock solutions to reach the concentrations mentioned in Table S1. The highest tested concentration was 50 µM for all PCBs and PFAAs and 20 µM for BFRs except BDE-100, BDE-153, BDE-154 and BDE-209 (1 µM) due to stocks available. OCPs were tested at the maximum concentration of 100 µM for γ-HCH and dieldrin, or 80 µM for all the others. The concentrations for mixture exposure are presented as "fold blood levels", relative to the average contaminant levels found in human blood of the Scandinavian population. The total POP mixture and sub-mixtures were tested at concentrations between the estimated concentrations in human blood and maximum 3000 fold blood levels.

2.2. Determination of aryl hydrocarbon receptor agonistic and antagonistic activities

2.2.1. Cell-based assays

Rat and human dioxin responsive (DR) cell lines were used. Rat hepatoma DR-H4IIE cells were from BioDetection System (Amsterdam, The Netherlands) while both human cell lines (hepatoma DR-Hep G2 and mammary gland carcinoma DR-T47-D) were previously home-made (Liege, Belgium)³⁷. A vector containing an AhR-controlled luciferase reporter gene was stably integrated into these cells. The vector integrated into DR-H4IIE cells contained four native DREs (from the upstream promotor of the mouse *cyp1a1* gene), leading the MMTV (Mouse Mammary Tumour Virus) promoter³⁸, while both DR-T47-D and DR-Hep G2 cells were transfected with a vector

containing four synthetic DREs regulating the thymidine kinase promoter³⁷. The cells were routinely cultured in MEM α (Thermo Fisher Scientific, Massachusetts, USA) supplemented with 10% v/v fetal bovine serum (Greiner, Kremsmünster, Austria), 50 IU/mL penicillin and 50 μ g/mL streptomycin (Sigma Aldrich, Missouri, USA), and incubated in a H₂O saturated atmosphere containing 5% CO₂, at 37°C.

The methodology for the DR-CALUX (Dioxin Responsive Chemical-Activated LUCiferase gene eXpression) bioassays was described in detail elsewhere^{37,39}. Briefly, cells were first seeded in white clear-bottomed 96 well microplates (Greiner, Kremsmünster, Austria) and incubated for 24h to reach about 90% of confluence in the well. After 24-hour exposure, the cells were washed with phosphate buffered saline (Sigma Aldrich, Missouri, USA) and treated with lysis solution (containing Triton X100, Sigma Aldrich, Missouri, USA). Luciferin (Promega, Wisconsin, USA) and ATP (Roche Diagnostics, Rotkreuz, Switzerland) were then added to the cell lysate to produce luminescence, which was measured by using a luminometer (ORION II, Berthold Detection System, Pforzheim, Germany). The cells were exposed, in triplicates, to a dilution series of the tested compound/mixture in both agonistic and antagonistic tests. For the latter, the cells were co-exposed with a constant concentration of 15 pM, 150 pM and 650 pM TCDD corresponding to TCDD EC₅₀ in DR-H4IIE, DR-T47-D and DR-Hep G2 cells, respectively.

In order to verify whether AhR antagonists compete for the same, single site on the AhR with the agonist (TCDD), additional antagonistic tests were performed for selected compounds by co-exposing DR-H4IIE cells to different concentrations of the tested compounds and a constant saturating TCDD concentration (20 nM). Using the agonist (TCDD) at clearly saturating concentrations would make it impossible for a lower affinity antagonist to affect transcriptional activation at all.

All the exposure experiments were repeated at least three times independently. The final concentration of DMSO in the culture medium for the single POPs was 0.2% and 0.3% for agonistic and antagonistic tests, respectively, while they were 0.3% and 0.4% for the mixtures. For quality control, a TCDD reference curve was performed on each plate.

MTT cell viability and LDH cell cytotoxicity were performed along with visual inspection of cell morphology and attachment. The former was carried out in a replicate plate to the DR-CALUX assays. After 24-hour exposure, 25 μ L MTT dye solution (3-(4,5-dimethylthiazol-2-yl)-2,5-diphenyltetrazolium bromide, 5 mg/ml, Sigma Aldrich, Missouri, USA) was added into each well, followed by a 4-hour incubation at 37°C to form insoluble purple formazan. Then, 100 μ L isopropanol (Merck, Massachusetts, USA) was added into the plates to dissolve the formazan for two hours. The MTT formazan absorbance was read at 550/630 nm by a spectrophotometer (ELx800™ BioTek, Winooski, USA). Because the MTT data need to be interpreted with caution and are not necessarily related to cell death, we performed the LDH cell cytotoxicity as well. The Pierce™ LDH Cytotoxicity Assay Kit was purchased from Thermo Fisher Scientific (Massachusetts, USA) and operated according to the manufacturer's instructions (absorbance at 490/630 nm).

2.2.2. Calculations of EC₅₀, IC₅₀ and efficacy (RPC_{Max})

Final results were presented as relative responses, *i.e.* percentages of the cell response to the tested compound/mixture compared to the maximum response of the cells to TCDD on the same plate for agonistic activities, or to spike-in TCDD EC₅₀ for antagonistic activities. Dose-response curves were generated by Graphpad PRISM software, version 7 (San Diego, California, USA) by fitting a four-parameter non-linear regression for agonistic (Eq. 1) or antagonistic (Eq. 2) tests.

$$(1) Y_{agonistic} = B + \frac{x^H(T - B)}{x^H + EC_{50}^H}$$

$$(2) Y_{\text{antagonistic}} = B + \frac{T - B}{1 + \frac{x^H}{IC_{50}^H}}$$

where x is the concentration of a tested compound/mixture inducing the relative response $Y_{\text{agonistic}}$ or $Y_{\text{antagonistic}}$. EC_{50} and IC_{50} are the half maximal effective concentration for an agonist and antagonist, respectively⁴⁰. B = bottom, T = Top, H = Hillslope.

The lowest observed effect concentration (LOEC) is the lowest tested concentration at which a significant effect ($p < 0.05$) was observed. The maximum observed effect concentration (MOEC) is the lowest tested concentration causing the maximum effect ($p < 0.05$). ANOVA (Graphpad PRISM) was used to determine statistical significance. Prior to ANOVA, tests for homogeneity of variance and normal distribution (transformation if needed) were performed. When no full dose-response curve was achieved, MOEC was considered as the highest concentration of the test series. Efficacy was determined as RPC_{Max} (%), which is the maximum effect induced by the tested compound⁴⁰: AhR agonistic RPC_{Max} was the maximum relative response of the compound/mixture compared to the maximum TCDD response, while AhR antagonistic RPC_{Max} was the minimum relative response observed by the maximum inhibition of the test compound/mixture to the spike-in TCDD EC_{50} . The compound/mixture was accepted as active when its relative response was higher than the threshold level $RPC_{\text{Max}} \geq 10\%$ for AhR agonists and lower than $RPC_{\text{Max}} \leq 70\%$ for AhR antagonists⁴⁰.

2.2.3. Calculations of the predicted mixture antagonistic effects

Concentration addition (CA). CA model is based on a dilution principle, all the chemicals behave as they are simply the dilution of one another in the mixture. Hence, the effect contribution of one compound to the mixture effect can be totally or partially replaced by the effect of the other. It calculates the effect concentration ($IC_{\text{mix},j}$) of the mixture inducing a specific antagonistic effect j

(from 1% to 100%) by considering the concentration partition (p_i) of compound i and its respective effect concentration (IC_{ij}) inducing the same effect j (Eq. 3). Previously published formulae were adapted^{24,25,29}:

$$(3) IC_{mix,j} = \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{p_i}{IC_{ij}} \right)^{-1}$$

The concentration partition p_i can either consider or not the non-active (NA) compounds. Because nonactive compounds do not give IC_{ij} , n is the number of the active compounds.

For each compound i , IC_{ij} inducing the effect j is calculated using its $IC_{i,50}$ and hillslope (H_i) from their fitted curves using Eq. 4 (Graphpad PRISM):

$$(4) IC_{ij} = IC_{i,50} \left(\frac{j}{100 - j} \right)^{1/H_i}$$

Because the CA model allows only the calculation of $IC_{mix,j}$, to generate the full dose-response curves, we proposed several possible methods to calculate the hillslope and bottom (H_{mix} and B_{mix}) of the mixture response, while the top was set to 100% as no response.

- the Weighted Mean Hillslope and Bottom (WMHB) (Eq. 5a) considering p_i to weight the hillslope and bottom of the individual compounds:

$$(5a) H_{mix} = \left(\sum_{i=1}^n p_i H_i \right) \frac{100}{n} \text{ or } B_{mix} = \left(\sum_{i=1}^n p_i B_i \right) \frac{100}{n}$$

- the Averaged Hillslope and Bottom (AvBH) considering the average of the hillslope and bottom of the individual compounds (Eq. 5b):

$$(5b) H_{mix} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n H_i}{n} \text{ or } B_{mix} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n B_i}{n}$$

- the Formulated Hillslope and Bottom (FoBH) (Eq. 5c) using the formulae of the CA:

$$(5c) H_{mix} = \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{p_i}{H_i} \right)^{-1} \text{ or } B_{mix} = \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{p_i}{B_i} \right)^{-1}$$

Independent action (IA). This method assumes that the effect of each component is an independent event²⁷. Thus, the probability to exert a specific effect of the mixture is the joint probability of the effect of each compound applied independently. For calculating the relative response of the mixture, the data for individual compounds were converted into a probability.

An antagonistic effect induced by compound *i* is obtained by subtracting the measured relative response (R_{ik}) from 100% (100% being the relative response of TCDD EC₅₀) and then converted into a probability (scale 0-1, by dividing by 100). The relative response of the mixture (0%-100%) is calculated from the combination of individual probabilities of each compound using the adapted formula (Eq. 6)^{28,29}:

$$(6) R_{mix,k} = 1 - \left(1 - \prod_{i=1}^n \left(1 - \frac{100 - R_{ik}}{100} \right) \right)$$

At a specific concentration *k*, $R_{mix,k}$ is the relative response of the mixture; R_{ik} is the relative response of compound *i* at that concentration *k* of the mixture, *n* is the number of the active components.

Generalized concentration addition (GCA). GCA (Eq. 7) assumes that the hillslope for each component is equal to 1 and considers also their RPC_{Max}^{31} . It was adapted for AhR antagonistic activity similarly to the IA model by assuming 100% as no effect:

$$(7) R_{mix,k} = 100 - \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{RPC_{Max,i} C_{ik}}{IC_{50i}}}{1 + \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{C_{ik}}{IC_{50i}}}$$

where $R_{mix,k}$ is the relative response of the mixture at a specific concentration *k*, C_{ik} is the concentration of compound *i* in the mixture at that specific mixture concentration *k*. $RPC_{Max,i}$ is the maximum effect of compound *i* and IC_{50i} is the IC_{50} of compound *i*.

3. Results

In DR-H4IIE cells, while α -chlordane caused cytotoxicity at the highest tested concentration of 80 μ M, *t*-nonachlor already did at 62.5 μ M in three cytotoxicity tests (data not shown). They were also cytotoxic for the DR-T47-D at lower concentrations of 30 and 30.5 μ M, respectively. These cytotoxic concentrations were excluded from the data analyses. None of the other compounds or mixtures induced cytotoxicity at any tested concentration.

3.1. Aryl hydrocarbon receptor activities of the 29 POPs

AhR – mediated agonistic activities. Only four out of the 29 tested POPs presented AhR agonistic activities ($RPC_{Max} \geq 10\%$). BDE-153, PCB-138, and PCB-118 were active in DR-H4IIE, while BDE-99 was active in DR-T47-D. BDE-99 and BDE-154 were able to trigger a weak agonistic activity ($5\% < RPC_{Max} < 10\%$) in DR-H4IIE, as well as γ -HCH in DR-T47-D (Table S2). No agonistic response was recorded in DR-Hep G2 cells for any of the 29 POPs.

AhR – mediated antagonistic activities. Sixteen out of the 29 individually tested POPs displayed AhR antagonisms. No antagonistic activities were observed for any of the PFAAs in all three cell lines. In contrast, in DR-H4IIE cells, AhR antagonistic responses were recorded for 16 POPs including all PCBs, most of the OCPs (except *p,p'*-DDE, α -HCH and β -HCH), and three out of the seven BRFs (BDE-47, BDE-99 and HCBd) (Table 1). PCB-118 and PCB-138 displayed a V-shaped dose-response curve, switching from antagonistic to agonist behavior at concentrations above 3.5 μ M and 27.5 μ M, respectively. Hence, their IC_{50} values were determined by only the antagonistic part of the curve. The dose-response curves obtained from DR-H4IIE cells co-exposed to TCDD EC_{50} and the 16 AhR antagonistic POPs are shown in Figure S1 (solid lines) with a detail in Table S3.

DR-Hep G2 cells were less responsive to the POPs than DR-H4IIE, with only five compounds exerting antagonistic activities, namely PCB-28, PCB-118, PCB-138, HCB and BDE-47 (Table 1). PCB-28 was the most potent compound, almost completely abolishing the activity of 650 pM TCDD in DR-Hep G2, displaying an RPC_{Max} of $7.2 \pm 3.6\%$ and an IC_{50} of $6.1 \pm 1.4 \mu M$. In DR-T47-D cells, seven out of the 29 POPs showed AhR antagonistic activities (PCB-28, PCB-118, PCB-138, HCB, α -chlordane, *t*-nonachlor and γ -HCH). The highest potencies were found for α -chlordane and *t*-nonachlor with RPC_{Max} of $7.4 \pm 12.5\%$ and $27.8 \pm 3.5\%$, respectively.

Evaluating competitive inhibition of 16 antagonists in DR-H4IIE. The AhR antagonistic activities were abolished for all compounds (except α -chlordane and *t*-nonachlor with RPC_{Max} of 56.6% and 56.8%, respectively) when co-exposing with excessive 20 nM TCDD, indicating they are possible AhR competitive antagonists (Figure S1, dashed lines).

3.2. Aryl hydrocarbon receptor activities of the POP mixtures

AhR – mediated agonistic activities. Exposure to the total POP mixture or to the six sub-mixtures described in Table S1 did not induce any significant ($RPC_{Max} \geq 10\%$) AhR agonistic response in any of the cell lines (data not shown), as it could be expected with the exclusion of dl-PCBs and PCDD/F.

AhR – mediated antagonistic activities. The total POP mixture triggered an AhR antagonistic response in all cell lines (Table 2, Figure 1A). At a concentration in the culture medium corresponding to the blood level, the total POP mixture did not interfere with the response of the cells to EC_{50} TCDD. In contrast, significant and dose-dependent antagonistic responses were already observed at concentrations of 125, 250 and 500 fold blood levels, respectively, for DR-H4IIE, DR-T47-D and DR-Hep G2, although the concentrations of all 29 compounds were below

their respective LOEC at these levels or even at 1000 fold blood levels (Table S1). In DR-H4IIE, the POP mixture displayed a significantly high AhR antagonistic efficacy of $52.5 \pm 2.1\%$ at 1000 fold blood levels and an $IC_{50} = 374 \pm 52$ fold blood levels, while in both human cell lines, a significant response was observed, but did not reach below 80%, making the calculation of an IC_{50} not possible.

In parallel, six complementary sub-mixtures (PFAA, Br, Cl, Cl+Br, Cl+PFAA, Br+PFAA) were also tested to study the possible interactions between these groups of compounds. Antagonism was seen for all Cl containing mixtures (the total POP, Cl, Cl+Br and Cl+PFAA mixtures) in DR-H4IIE and DR-Hep G2, while only the total POP and Cl+PFAA mixtures showed responses in DR-T47-D (Table 2).

In DR-H4IIE cells, the three Cl containing sub-mixtures and the total POP mixture gave more or less similar responses with $IC_{50} \cong 400$ to 500 fold blood levels and $RPC_{Max} \cong 50\%$. This indicates that the chlorinated compounds were responsible for the antagonism of all mixtures where they are present. Also, the antagonistic response curve of Cl+PFAA mixture overlapped that of the total POP mixture, which placed below those of the Cl and Cl+Br (Figure 1B). These observations suggest that the effect of the Cl mixture was somehow enhanced in the Cl+PFAA mixture, resulting in a dose-response curve overlapping that of the total POP mixture.

3.3. Predictions of the rat aryl hydrocarbon receptor antagonistic activities of the total POP mixture and Cl containing sub-mixtures

We evaluated the capacity of the three different mathematical models (concentration addition (CA), independent action (IA), and generalized concentration addition (GCA)) to predict the IC_{50} and dose-response curves of the total POP mixture in the most sensitive cell line, the DR-H4IIE.

Calculation of bottom and hillslope values. Because the 16 rat AhR antagonists contributed only 4.3% for the mass of the total POP mixture, along with considering all of the 29 POPs to calculating p_i , we also considered only the active compounds, subtracting the weight of the non-active compounds (sNA) as mentioned in section 2.2.3. WMBH method was unable to predict both bottom and hillslope values. AvBH and FoBH showed reasonable predicted values, especially AvBH and sNA FoBH for the total POP mixture and the three Cl containing sub-mixtures (Table S4).

Prediction of mixture effects of the three models. The results obtained after running the three models are shown in Figure 2. While the IA predicted a really strong response even at the lowest concentrations of the mixture, far out of the range of the measured curve, both the CA (CA-AvBH and CA-sNA FoBH) and GCA predictions resulted in calculated curves comparable to the measured curve. This refers that the 16 active compounds in the total POP mixture acted additively rather than independently.

The measured IC_{50} of the total POP mixture (374 ± 52 fold blood levels) was lower than the predicted value (784 fold blood levels for both the GCA and CA models), while the IA model predicted $IC_{50} = 2153$ fold blood levels. Thus, both CA and GCA models underestimated IC_{50} of the total POP mixture by about two folds, much less than one order of magnitude.

Concerning the calculated dose-response curves, the two additive models appeared to diverge: GCA produced a somewhat better prediction in the low concentration range, both CA (CA-AvBH and CA-sNA FoBH) closely followed the experimental curve and only diverged at concentrations higher than around 1000 fold blood levels (Figure 2). Similar predictions were also shown for the three active Cl, Cl+Br, Cl+PFAA sub-mixtures (Table S4, Figure S2).

Toxic units. Derived from CA model, toxic units (*i.e.* the ratio of the concentration partition of a compound to its IC_{50} ($p_i/IC_{50,i}$)) scales the concentrations of the mixture components to its toxicity, represented by the transcriptional activity of the Cyp1a1 promotor. Thus, it has been applied to identify the main driver(s) for mixture effects in CA model^{24,28,41}. Figure 3A clearly shows that PCB-138 and PCB-118 were the two main contributors for the AhR antagonism of the total POP mixture, constituting to 90% of the total combined activity. Since they were also partial agonists, it is likely that, in the presence of TCDD, they behaved mainly as antagonists especially at low concentrations. Following this prediction, a binary mixture of PCB-138 and PCB-118 was generated according to their concentration in the total POP mixture. The dose-response curve of this mixture followed that of the total POP mixture very closely, with an IC_{50} of 505 ± 67 fold blood levels (while $IC_{50} = 374 \pm 52$ fold blood levels for the total POP mixture) (Figure 3B).

4. Discussion

AhR transactivation activities of the 29 POPs and the mixtures. This study shows that a majority of the chemicals composing the realistic total POP mixture are actually AhR antagonists (16 in DR-H4IIE, five in DR-Hep G2 and seven in DR-T47-D cells). As expected, the total POP mixture and the Cl containing mixtures were also shown to be antagonistic. These activities were AhR-dependent, and seemed to act through competition for the TCDD binding site, except for *t*-nonachlor and α -chlordane.

In our study, we tested the AhR transcriptional activity of POPs and POP mixtures using a transcriptional reporter assay, which basically reports the canonical AhR-driven pathways via AhR-ARNT-DRE interactions. However, we observed that two of the compounds (α -chlordane and *t*-nonachlor) do not seem to exert their antagonistic effect through competitive binding to AhR.

Several possible non-canonical AhR-driven pathways could contribute to the observed results, such as crosstalk with other nuclear receptors, regulation of cell cycle and MAP kinase cascades, or novel AhR DNA-binding partners^{42,43}. Further studies of these mechanisms are required, but were outside of the scope of this paper.

Our results concerning single compound testing are in general consistent with previously published studies, where available. For agonistic activity, PCB-118 displayed highest $RPC_{Max} = 61.3\%$ at $50\text{ }\mu\text{M}$, with $EC_{50} = 25 \pm 13\text{ }\mu\text{M}$ similar to previously finding ($9.3 \pm 2.5\text{ }\mu\text{M}$)⁴⁴. $EC_{50} = 4 \pm 0.8\text{ }\mu\text{M}$ of BDE-99 was lower than previous report ($EC_{50} > 15\text{ }\mu\text{M}$)⁴⁵. For PCB-138, we observed an agonistic effect with a high $EC_{50} = 28 \pm 6.4\text{ }\mu\text{M}$, which was not reported before⁴⁴ (Table S2).

For antagonistic activities, in this study, IC_{50} of PCB-28 and PCB-138 were 6.8 ± 1.7 and $0.6 \pm 0.07\text{ }\mu\text{M}$ (Table 1), close to previous estimates of $9.0 \pm 2.9\text{ }\mu\text{M}$ and $1.4 \pm 0.1\text{ }\mu\text{M}$, respectively⁴⁴. BDE-47 activity ($IC_{50} = 3.1 \pm 0.5\text{ }\mu\text{M}$) was similar to those previously reported ($2.7 \pm 0.7\text{ }\mu\text{M}$)⁴⁵ and ($3.7 \pm 0.8\text{ }\mu\text{M}$)⁴⁴. However, the $IC_{50} = 5.2 \pm 1.9\text{ }\mu\text{M}$ for BDE-99 found in this study was lower than that previously reported ($13 \pm 0\text{ }\mu\text{M}$)⁴⁵. This study reports for the first-time data for the AhR transcriptional activity of the 29 POPs in both human mammary gland carcinoma DR-T47-D and hepatoma DR-Hep G2 cells.

Differences between IC_{50} or EC_{50} values of this study and those from previous findings^{44,45} may result from differences in the experimental design and the regression methods (*i.e.* the number of concentration points, availability of a maximum effect if a full curve is generated, extrapolation if the maximum effect is not reached, and the regression function used with either four or three parameters). Our study not only confirms and consolidates previous findings^{44,45}, but it also contributes new data including full dose-response curves with four parameter fit (see Table S3)

which can be used for further data treatment or calculation of the joint effect of any mixture made from these 29 POPs for the rat DR-H4IIE cells.

We observed species and tissue differences in the AhR transcriptional activities of the individual POPs and of the mixtures. In general, the rat DR-H4IIE cells were more sensitive than the two human cells towards the effects on AhR transactivation when exposed to individual POPs or POP mixtures. Several considerations may explain this result. Interspecies differences in AhR structure will obviously shape the sensitivity. Rats are 1000 folds more sensitive to TCDD than guinea pigs⁴⁶. Mouse AhR has a higher affinity than human AhR due to the different position of the important amino acid Valine (V381 in humans corresponding to V375 in mice)⁴⁷. Human AhR has shown a higher relative affinity for certain structurally compounds *i.e.* endogenous ligands or polyphenols⁴⁸. Moreover, the difference in genetic modification (origins of the integrated promotor and DREs) of the rat DR-H4IIE compared to the two human cell lines could also play a role for the specific responses. Differences in regulatory processes downstream of AhR binding may be responsible, such as differential binding to transcriptional coactivators⁴⁹. Finally, in the antagonistic tests, the POPs have to compete with increasing TCDD concentration (15 pM, 150 pM and 650 pM, respectively for DR-H4IIE, DR-T47-D and DR-Hep G2), which could lead to the lower sensitivity to detect an antagonistic activity of the POPs in the two human cells compared to the rat cells.

Mixtures relevant for human exposure antagonize AhR activation. The most striking result of this study is that the total mixture of 29 POPs, derived from concentrations found in the blood of a Scandinavian population, and sub-mixtures thereof were found to exert only antagonistic effects on AhR. This observation is consistent with our results obtained from testing each compound alone, revealing a majority of antagonistic compounds. AhR antagonism of POPs has been observed in several screening studies^{44,45} and mixture studies^{50,51}. However, while the AhR agonistic activity of POPs has been studied for decades, the antagonistic counterpart has not yet

received much attention, especially regarding its physiological consequences on an organism's health.

This finding challenges the method of using toxic equivalency factors (TEFs) and toxic equivalent quantities (TEQ) for risk assessments of mixtures of AhR ligands. The World Health Organization assigned TEFs for PCDDs/PCDFs/dl-PCBs, expressed as relative effect potencies compared to the most toxic form TCDD. Regarding their additive mechanism, TEFs are also used to estimate TEQ for a mixture of compounds by adding up the TEF fraction and the concentration of each compound within the mixture⁵². However, PCB mixtures alone or in combination with PCDDs/PCDFs (usually TCDD) have shown additive but also non-additive responses^{53,54}. Also, several environmentally abundant biphenyls antagonize the *cyp1a1* induction by TCDD¹², while some dl-mono-ortho-substituted PCBs revealed both agonistic and antagonistic properties^{55,56}. In many environmental samples, the ratio between PCBs and AhR agonists is above 1000, indicating that antagonisms, resulting from interactions between AhR agonists and PCBs⁵⁷, are not irrelevant. Therefore, the antagonistic effect of these compounds should be also considered to calculate the effect of mixtures. Since they are more abundant in real-life mixtures, their antagonisms may undermine or even abolish the overall dioxin potency of the environmental mixtures¹².

Our finding also raises the issue of the biological significance of a predominantly AhR antagonistic mixture in the blood of a human population. We found antagonistic activities at levels of 125 fold blood levels in rat liver cells or 250 or 500 folds in human mammary gland and liver cells, levels that may realistically be reached after an accident or in exposed populations.

It is important to note that in the total POP mixture used here³⁶, no dioxins and dl-compounds were included. That allows us to study the antagonism of the human-exposure relevant POP mixtures by isolating them from the dioxin and dl-compounds. But the roles of the dioxin and dl-

compounds in human exposure should have also been considered. Therefore, we attempted to estimate the effect of the total POP mixture in a real-life situation. According to Kvaalem *et al.*⁵⁸, the median of dl-compounds in Norwegian human blood was 33.1 pg TEQ/g lipid, which is equal to 0.6 pM in blood assuming that blood contains 0.6% fat and 1 ml blood = 1 g. Thus, the respective LOECs (for the POP mixture AhR antagonistic activity) in DR-H4IIE, DR-T47-D and DR-Hep G2 of 125, 250, and 500 fold human blood level correspond to 75 pM, 150 pM and 300 pM of dl-compounds, respectively. This concentration is close to the TCDD EC₅₀ (15 pM TCDD in DR-H4IIE, 150 pM in DR-T47-D and 650 pM in DR-Hep G2 cells) used in our antagonistic assays. Therefore, it is likely that the total POP mixture would antagonize the activity of these dl-compounds in the Scandinavian population.

Furthermore, the question arises whether an overall AhR antagonistic exposure would actually cause health problems by interfering with the normal AhR function. Increasing evidence suggests that endogenous AhR ligands exist^{59,60}, complemented by dietary phytochemical-derived AhR agonists/antagonists^{61,62}. AhR induced functions are essential for a variety of normal physiological functions. In mammary tissue, AhR likely plays a physiological role in coordinating development, differentiation, cell growth, and signaling of hormones^{63–67}. Knock out mice or mice with low affinity AhR variants display impaired survival, growth, fertility, liver function and innate and adaptive immunity⁶⁸. It is thus conceivable that the presence of highly stable POPs may interfere with the essential function of AhR controlled by mostly short-lived endogenous and dietary ligands, and thus impair cellular AhR mediated processes. The risk caused by AhR antagonism as the major effect of POPs could well exceed that due to their agonistic effect, however the health effect associated to AhR antagonism is unclear and deserves further investigation.

Predictions of mixture effects. Risk assessment for mixture exposure is crucial to protect the health of both humans and wildlife. The individual chemical approach underestimates the mixture

exposure and decreases the accuracy of risk assessment^{22,23,69}. In addition, the risk of exposure to multiple chemicals at doses below their threshold, which is the most common case in real-life, should not be underestimated or assumed as no-effect.

In this study, the best prediction results were obtained using the CA (concentration addition) and GCA (generalized concentration addition) models. They performed well in predicting $IC_{mix,50} = 784$ fold blood levels within two folds from the measured value (374 fold blood levels). This is considered as well accepted in predicting the combined effect of complex mixtures *i.e.* the total POP mixture with its components present at low concentration (lower than their LOECs at 1000 fold blood levels) and belonging to different compound groups.

CA is often chosen as the default model⁷⁰ for predicting mixture activities, first for mixtures with similar compounds²⁴ then expended to dissimilar compounds^{23,25,26}. Previous studies have shown the capability of the CA model to predict the mixture effect using the information of individual chemicals obtained *in vitro*^{25,41,71,72}, *ex vivo*⁷³ or *in vivo*^{23,25}. *In vitro* research has mainly focused on an equimolar mixture with less than ten components and at high exposure concentrations. Birkhøj *et al.*²⁵ successfully applied the CA model to predict the antiandrogenic effect of a mixture of five commonly used pesticides at 10 μ M each. In contrast, the CA model was unable to predict the effect on thyroid hormone function and AhR transactivation of another mixture of five different pesticides at the maximum concentration of 50 μ M each, due to the presence of an inhibitory compound⁷¹. Other studies focused on more complex mixtures with multiple components at lower doses, typically below their threshold doses, or on human or environmentally relevant exposure scenarios. Two complex mixtures of 17 estrogenic chemicals were screened for estrogenic activities, reporter-gene (ERLUX) and cell proliferation (ESCREEN) endpoints⁴¹. This represents

one of the most comprehensive studies on the effects of mixtures where they were able to predict the effects of the two mixtures.

GCA, on the other hand, has been recently developed and proven useful specifically for calculating mixtures containing partial agonists^{30–32}, but has not been applied before to calculate the activity of AhR antagonists. It allows to consider theoretically the fact that some agonists never reach the full activity of TCDD, or that some antagonists present partial agonistic activities.

The difference between CA and GCA models resides in the predicted dose-response curve of the mixture and in the maximum predicted activity of the total POP mixture (Figure 2). GCA predicting the mixture response, allows to generate the full dose-response curve of the mixture using only the data from testing the individual compounds (*i.e.* RPC_{Max} , concentration and IC_{50}). The reason why this predicted curve diverged from the experimental curve at higher concentrations could result from the assumption that the hillslopes of all components, and so of the POP mixture, are equal to 1, which is clearly not the case (Table S3). However, GCA predicted the bottom (RPC_{Max} = 52%) very close to the observed value for the total POP mixture (52.5%) thanks to its consideration of the RPC_{Max} .

On the other hand, CA provides a prediction of $IC_{mix,j}$ without the full dose-response curve. Therefore, we calculated the hillslope and the bottom values for the mixture response based on its components by formulating several possibilities. The dose-response curve generated by CA with averaged bottom hillslope (CA-AvBH) resulted in the best fit with reasonable hillslope and bottom values (1.7 and 21%) compared to 1.3 and 52.5%, respectively of the measured POP mixture curve. Subtracted non-activated compounds and formulated bottom hillslope (sNA FoBH) predicted an overlapped curve with the observed up to 1000 fold blood levels because of its closer H_{mix} = 1.5, but overestimated the extension of antagonism at higher concentration, leading to the prediction of B_{mix} = 0% for the total POP mixture. B_{mix} is important when predicting the activity of

a mixture for risk assessment. Therefore, CA-AvBH rather than CA-sNA FoBH was chosen as a more suitable prediction in our case. The CA model also provides a good prediction of $IC_{mix,50}$ for the response of the DR-H4IIE cells to the active sub-mixtures as to the total POP mixture, and reasonable predicted dose-response curves (Table S4, Figure S2).

Finally, IA (independent action) was designed specifically for mixtures of compounds with clearly different MOAs to combine probabilities of action of individual compounds. Previous studies showed that IA outperformed CA²³ or was comparable to CA with equal²⁹ or not more than five-fold differences^{28,74} in predicting the combined effects for chemicals having different MOAs. The bad performance of IA to predict either IC_{mix} or the dose-response curve clearly results from the mixture studied here, where we showed that most components act through the same MOAs. At low doses, accumulation of the individual, low probabilities derived for a high number of individual compounds presumably resulted in the dramatic overestimation of the antagonistic effect.

5. Conclusions

We tested the AhR agonistic and antagonistic activities of 29 POPs shown to contaminate human blood, both in individual and mixture forms. AhR transactivation activities in three reporter cell lines exposed to the 29 POPs and the mixtures were different due to the species and tissue-specific responses. The predominant individual activities of the POPs were AhR antagonism, as shown for 16 compounds out of 29 in rat DR-H4IIE cells, and for seven and five compounds in human DR-T47-D and DR-Hep G2, respectively. The total POP mixture already induced a significant AhR antagonistic activity at concentrations of 125, 250, and 500 fold human blood levels, respectively in DR-H4IIE, DR-T47-D and DR-Hep G2, although each individual compound was present at concentrations lower than its LOEC at these levels. Such blood levels of POPs could realistically occur in food or environmental contamination incidents or in highly exposed sub-populations. Chlorinated compounds, among which PCB-118 and PCB-138 contributed 90%

to the activity of the total POP mixture, were the drivers for AhR antagonism in DR-H4IIE cells. Finally, CA and GCA proved to be good tools to predict the mixed effect of the total POP mixture with only two-fold underestimated IC_{50} and acceptable dose response curves. Hence, the compounds acted additively in the mixtures. Although limitations remain to fully describe the effects of realistic mixtures due to biological complexity, the predictions obtained using CA and GCA seem suitable for establishing general regulatory guidelines for mixture toxicity assessments. In addition, the data generated in this study for individual compounds will be useful to predict the effect of other complex mixtures constituted by these compounds.

Conflict of interest: The authors declare that there is no conflict of interest.

Acknowledgements: This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation program under the Marie Skłodowska-Curie grant agreement No. 722634. Muller M. is "Maître de Recherche" at the "Fonds National de la Recherche Scientifique".

References

1. Hankinson O. The Aryl Hydrocarbon Receptor Complex. *Annu Rev Pharmacol Toxicol.* 1995;35(1):307-340. doi:10.1146/annurev.pa.35.040195.001515
2. WHO. Consultation on assessment of the health risk of dioxins; re-evaluation of the tolerable daily intake (TDI): Executive Summary. *Food Addit Contam.* 2000;17(4):223-240. doi:10.1080/713810655
3. Denison MS, Nagy SR. Activation of the aryl hydrocarbon receptor by structurally diverse exogenous and endogenous chemicals. *Annu Rev Pharmacol Toxicol.* 2003;43(1):309-334. doi:10.1146/annurev.pharmtox.43.100901.135828
4. Harrill JA, Layko D, Nyska A, et al. Aryl hydrocarbon receptor knockout rats are insensitive to the pathological effects of repeated oral exposure to 2,3,7,8-tetrachlorodibenzo-p-dioxin. *J Appl Toxicol.* 2015;36(6):802-814. doi:10.1002/jat.3211
5. Gonzalez FJ, Fernandez-Salguero P. The Aryl Hydrocarbon Receptor. Studies Using the AHR-Null Mice. *Drug Metab Dispos.* 1998;26(12):1194-1198.
6. Harrill JA, Hukkanen RR, Lawson M, et al. Knockout of the aryl hydrocarbon receptor results in distinct hepatic and renal phenotypes in rats and mice. *Toxicol Appl Pharmacol.* 2013;272(2):503-518. doi:10.1016/j.taap.2013.06.024
7. Lahvis GP, Lindell SL, Thomas RS, et al. Portosystemic shunting and persistent fetal vascular structures in aryl hydrocarbon receptor-deficient mice. *Proc Natl Acad Sci.* 2000;97:10442-10447. doi:10.1073/pnas.190256997
8. Butler R, Inzunza J, Suzuki H, Fujii-Kuriyama Y, Warner M, Gustafsson JA. Uric acid stones in the urinary bladder of aryl hydrocarbon receptor (AhR) knockout mice. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A.* 2012;109(4):1122-1126. doi:10.1073/pnas.1120581109
9. Hahn ME, Karchner SI, Merson RR. Diversity as opportunity: Insights from 600 million years of AHR evolution. *Curr Opin Toxicol.* 2017;2:58-71. doi:10.1016/j.cotox.2017.02.003

- 611 10. Butler RA, Kelley ML, Powell WH, Hahn ME, Van Beneden RJ. An aryl hydrocarbon
612 receptor (AHR) homologue from the soft-shell clam, *Mya arenaria*: Evidence that
613 invertebrate AHR homologues lack 2,3,7,8-tetrachlorodibenzo-p-dioxin and β -
614 naphthoflavone binding. *Gene*. 2001;278(1-2):223-234. doi:10.1016/S0378-
615 1119(01)00724-7
- 616 11. Marlowe JL, Puga A. Aryl hydrocarbon receptor, cell cycle regulation, toxicity, and
617 tumorigenesis. *J Cell Biochem*. 2005;96(6):1174-1184. doi:10.1002/jcb.20656
- 618 12. Wall RJ, Fernandes A, Rose M, Bell DR, Mellor IR. Characterisation of chlorinated,
619 brominated and mixed halogenated dioxins, furans and biphenyls as potent and as partial
620 agonists of the Aryl hydrocarbon receptor. *Environ Int*. 2015;76:49-56.
621 doi:10.1016/j.envint.2014.12.002
- 622 13. Murk A, Legler J, Denison M, Giesy J, van de Guchte C, Brouwer A. Chemical-activated
623 luciferase gene expression (CALUX): a novel in vitro bioassay for Ah receptor active
624 compounds in sediments and pore water. *Fundam Appl Toxicol*. 1996;33(1):149-160.
- 625 14. Scippo ML, Eppe G, De Pauw E, Maghuin-Rogister G. DR-CALUX® screening of food
626 samples: Evaluation of the quantitative approach to measure dioxin, furans and dioxin-
627 like PCBs. *Talanta*. 2004;63(5):1193-1202. doi:10.1016/j.talanta.2004.05.037
- 628 15. Goeyens L, Hoogenboom R, Eppe G, et al. Discrepancies between Bio-analytical and
629 Chemo-analytical results have a non-negligible message. *Organohalogen Compd*.
630 2010;72:964-967.
- 631 16. Vizcaino E, Grimalt JO, Fernández-Somoano A, Tardon A. Transport of persistent
632 organic pollutants across the human placenta. *Environ Int*. 2014;65:107-115.
633 doi:10.1016/j.envint.2014.01.004
- 634 17. Stockholm Convention. *Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants*. Vol 9.;
635 1997.
- 636 18. Bopp SK, Barouki R, Brack W, et al. Current EU research activities on combined

637 exposure to multiple chemicals. *Environ Int.* 2018;120:544-562.
638 doi:10.1016/j.envint.2018.07.037

639 19. Kortenkamp A. Ten years of mixing cocktails: A review of combination effects of
640 endocrine-disrupting chemicals. *Environ Health Perspect.* 2007;115(Suppl 1):98-105.
641 doi:10.1289/ehp.9357

642 20. EC COM. *Communication from the Commission on Combination Effects of Chemicals*
643 *(Chemical Mixtures).*; 2012.

644 21. Berenbaum MC. What is synergy? *Pharmacol Rev.* 1985;41(2):93–141.

645 22. Kortenkamp A, Backhaus T, Faust M. *State of the Art Report on Mixture Toxicity. Report*
646 *to the Commission of the European Union (Directorate General for the Environmen).;*
647 2009.

648 23. Thrupp TJ, Runnalls TJ, Scholze M, Kugathas S, Kortenkamp A, Sumpter JP. The
649 consequences of exposure to mixtures of chemicals: Something from ‘nothing’ and ‘a lot
650 from a little’ when fish are exposed to steroid hormones. *Sci Total Environ.* 2018;619-
651 620:1482-1492. doi:10.1016/j.scitotenv.2017.11.081

652 24. Loewe S, Muischnek H. Combined effects I Announcement-Implements to the problem.
653 *Naunyn Schmiedebergs Arch Exp Pathol Pharmacol.* 1926;114:313-326.

654 25. Birkhøj M, Nellemann C, Jarfelt K, et al. The combined antiandrogenic effects of five
655 commonly used pesticides. *Toxicol Appl Pharmacol.* 2004;201(1):10-20.
656 doi:10.1016/j.taap.2004.04.016

657 26. Orton F, Ermler S, Kugathas S, Rosivatz E, Scholze M, Kortenkamp A. Mixture effects at
658 very low doses with combinations of anti-androgenic pesticides, antioxidants, industrial
659 pollutant and chemicals used in personal care products. *Toxicol Appl Pharmacol.*
660 2014;278(3):201-208. doi:10.1016/j.taap.2013.09.008

661 27. Bliss CI. The Toxicity of Poisons Applied Jointly. *Ann Appl Biol.* 1939;26(3):585-615.
662 doi:10.1111/j.1744-7348.1939.tb06990.x

- 663 28. Backhaus T, Arrhenius Å, Blanck H. Toxicity of a mixture of dissimilarly acting substances
664 to natural algal communities: predictive power and limitations of independent action and
665 concentration addition. *Environ Sci Technol*. 2004;38(23):6363-6370.
666 doi:org/10.1021/es0497678
- 667 29. Payne J, Rajapakse N, Wilkins M, Kortenkamp A. Prediction and assessment of the
668 effects of mixtures of four xenoestrogens. *Environ Health Perspect*. 2000;108(10):983-
669 987. doi:10.1289/ehp.00108983
- 670 30. Howard GJ, Webster TF. Generalized concentration addition: a method for examining
671 mixtures containing partial agonists. *J Theor Biol*. 2009;259(3):469-477.
672 doi:10.1016/j.jtbi.2009.03.030
- 673 31. Howard GJ, Schlezinger JJ, Hahn ME, Webster TF. Generalized Concentration Addition
674 Predicts Joint Effects of Aryl Hydrocarbon Receptor Agonists with Partial Agonists and
675 Competitive Antagonists. *Env Heal Perspect*. 2010;118(5):666-672.
676 doi:10.1289/ehp.0901312
- 677 32. Brinkmann M, Hecker M, Giesy JP, et al. Generalized concentration addition accurately
678 predicts estrogenic potentials of mixtures and environmental samples containing partial
679 agonists. *Toxicol Vitro*. 2018;46(June 2017):294-303. doi:10.1016/j.tiv.2017.10.022
- 680 33. Småstuen L, Salihovic S, Ericson I, et al. Levels in food and beverages and daily intake
681 of perfluorinated compounds in Norway. 2010;80:1137-1143.
682 doi:10.1016/j.chemosphere.2010.06.023
- 683 34. Knutsen HK, Kvalem HE, Thomsen C, et al. Dietary exposure to brominated flame
684 retardants correlates with male blood levels in a selected group of Norwegians with a
685 wide range of seafood consumption. *Mol Nutr Food Res*. 2008;52(2):217-227.
686 doi:10.1002/mnfr.200700096
- 687 35. Polder A, Thomsen C, Lindström G, Løken KB, Skaare JU. Levels and temporal trends of
688 chlorinated pesticides, polychlorinated biphenyls and brominated flame retardants in

- individual human breast milk samples from Northern and Southern Norway.
Chemosphere. 2008;73(1):14-23. doi:10.1016/j.chemosphere.2008.06.002
36. Berntsen HF, Berg V, Thomsen C, Ropstad E, Zimmer KE. The design of an environmentally relevant mixture of persistent organic pollutants for use in in vivo and in vitro studies. *J Toxicol Environ Heal Part A*. 2017;24(3):1002-1016.
doi:10.1080/15287394.2017.1354439
37. Van der Heiden E, Bechoux N, Muller M, et al. Food flavonoid aryl hydrocarbon receptor-mediated agonistic/antagonistic/synergic activities in human and rat reporter gene assays. *Anal Chim Acta*. 2009;637(1-2):337-345. doi:10.1016/j.aca.2008.09.054
38. Garrison PM, Tullis K, Aarts JMMJG, Brouwer A, Giesy JP, Denison MS. Species-Specific Recombinant Cell Lines as Bioassay Systems for the Detection of 2,3,7,8-Tetrachlorodibenzo- p -dioxin-like Chemicals. *Toxicol Sci*. 1996;30(2):194-203.
doi:10.1093/toxsci/30.2.194
39. Scippo M, Rybertt MS, Focant J, et al. Evaluation of the DR-CALUX screening of food and feed, according to regulation levels including DL-PCB. *Organohalogen Compd*. 2005;67:1397-1402.
40. OECD. Test No. 455: Performance-Based Test Guideline for Stably Transfected Transactivation In Vitro Assays to Detect Estrogen Receptor Agonists and Antagonists. 2016. doi:10.1787/20745788
41. Evans RM, Scholze M, Kortenkamp A. Additive mixture effects of estrogenic chemicals in human cell-based assays can be influenced by inclusion of chemicals with differing effect profiles. *PLoS One*. 2012;7(8). doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0043606
42. Wright EJ, Pereira De Castro K, Joshi AD, Elferink CJ. Canonical and non-canonical aryl hydrocarbon receptor signaling pathways. *Curr Opin Toxicol*. 2017;2:87-92.
doi:10.1016/j.cotox.2017.01.001
43. Jaeger C, Tischkau SA. Role of Aryl Hydrocarbon Receptor in Circadian Clock Disruption

715 and Metabolic Dysfunction. 2016;(Dim):133-141. doi:10.4137/EHI.S38343.TYPE

716 44. Brenerová P, Hamers T, Kamstra JH, et al. Pure non-dioxin-like PCB congeners
 717 suppress induction of AhR-dependent endpoints in rat liver cells. *Environ Sci Pollut Res*.
 718 2016;23(3):2099-2107. doi:10.1007/s11356-015-4819-6

719 45. Hamers T, Kamstra JH, Sonneveld E, et al. In vitro profiling of the endocrine-disrupting
 720 potency of brominated flame retardants. *Toxicol Sci*. 2006;92(1):157-173.
 721 doi:10.1093/toxsci/kfj187

722 46. Hulme EC, Trevethick MA. Ligand binding assays at equilibrium: Validation and
 723 interpretation. *Br J Pharmacol*. 2010;161(6):1219-1237. doi:10.1111/j.1476-
 724 5381.2009.00604.x

725 47. Ramadoss P, Perdew GH. Use of 2-Azido-3-[125 I] iodo-7,8-dibromodibenzo-p-dioxin as
 726 a Probe to Determine the Relative Ligand Affinity of Human versus Mouse Aryl
 727 Hydrocarbon Receptor in Cultured Cells. *Mol Pharmacol*. 2004;66(1):129-136.
 728 doi:10.1124/mol.66.1.129

729 48. Flaveny CA, Murray IA, Chiaro CR, Perdew GH. Ligand Selectivity and Gene Regulation
 730 by the Human Aryl Hydrocarbon Receptor in Transgenic Mice. 2009;75(6):1412-1420.
 731 doi:10.1124/mol.109.054825.

732 49. Flaveny C, Reen RK, Kusnadi A, Perdew GH. The mouse and human Ah receptor differ
 733 in recognition of LXXLL motifs. *Arch Biochem Biophys*. 2008;471(2):215-223.
 734 doi:10.1016/j.abb.2008.01.014

735 50. Harper N, Connor K, Steinberg M, Safe S. Immunosuppressive activity of polychlorinated
 736 biphenyl mixtures and congeners: nonadditive (antagonistic) interactions. *Fundam Appl*
 737 *Toxicol*. 1995;27(1):131-139.

738 51. Long M, Deutch B, Bonefeld-Jorgensen EC. AhR transcriptional activity in serum of Inuits
 739 across Greenlandic districts. *Environ Heal A Glob Access Sci Source*. 2007;6(32).
 740 doi:10.1186/1476-069X-6-32

- 741 52. Van den Berg M, Birnbaum LS, Denison M, et al. The 2005 World Health Organization
742 reevaluation of human and mammalian toxic equivalency factors for dioxins and dioxin-
743 like compounds. *Toxicol Sci.* 2006;93(2):223-241. doi:10.1093/toxsci/kfl055
- 744 53. Safe SH. Development validation and problems with the toxic equivalency factor
745 approach for risk assessment of dioxins and related compounds. *J Anim Sci.*
746 1998;76(1):134-141. doi:10.2527/1998.761134x
- 747 54. Safe S. Limitations of the toxic equivalency factor approach for risk assessment of TCDD
748 and related compounds. *Teratog Carcinog Mutagen.* 1997;17(4-5):285-304.
749 doi:10.1002/(SICI)1520-6866(1997)17:4/5<285::AID-TCM11>3.0.CO;2-B
- 750 55. Clemons JH, Myers CR, Lee LEJ, Dixon DG, Bols NC. Induction of cytochrome P4501A
751 by binary mixtures of polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs) and 2,3,7,8-tetrachlorodibenzo-p-
752 dioxin (TCDD) in liver cell lines from rat and trout. *Aquat Toxicol.* 1998;43(2-3):179-194.
753 doi:10.1016/0166-445X(93)90030-5
- 754 56. Hestermann E V., Stegeman JJ, Hahn ME. Relative contributions of affinity and intrinsic
755 efficacy to aryl hydrocarbon receptor ligand potency. *Toxicol Appl Pharmacol.*
756 2000;168(2):160-172. doi:10.1006/taap.2000.9026
- 757 57. Fiedler H. *The Handbook of Environmental Chemistry. Persistent Organic Pollutants.* Vol
758 3. Springer, Berlin; 2003.
- 759 58. Kvalem HE, Knutsen HK, Thomsen C, et al. Role of dietary patterns for dioxin and PCB
760 exposure. *Mol Nutr Food Res.* 2009;53(11):1438-1451. doi:10.1002/mnfr.200800462
- 761 59. Rannug A, Rannug U, Rosenkranz H, et al. Certain photooxidized derivatives of
762 tryptophan bind with very high affinity to the Ah receptor and are likely to be endogenous
763 signal substances. *J Biol Chem.* 1987;262(32):15-427.
- 764 60. Rannug A, Rannug U. The tryptophan derivative 6-formylindolo [3,2-b] carbazole, FICZ, a
765 dynamic mediator of endogenous aryl hydrocarbon receptor signaling, balances cell
766 growth and differentiation. *Crit Rev Toxicol.* 2018;48(7):555-574.

doi:10.1080/10408444.2018.1493086

61. Powell JB, Ghotbaddini M. Cancer-promoting and Inhibiting Effects of Dietary Compounds: Role of the Aryl Hydrocarbon Receptor (AhR). *Biochem Pharmacol.* 2014;3(1):1-21. doi:10.4172/2167-0501.1000131

62. Jin UH, Park H, Li X, et al. Structure-Dependent Modulation of Aryl Hydrocarbon Receptor-Mediated Activities by Flavonoids. *Toxicol Sci.* 2018;164(1):205-217. doi:10.1093/toxsci/kfy075

63. Hubbard TD, Murray IA, Nichols RG, et al. Dietary Broccoli Impacts Microbial Community Structure and Attenuates Chemically Induced Colitis in Mice in an Ah receptor dependent manner. *J Funct Foods.* 2018;37:685-698. doi:10.1016/j.jff.2017.08.038.Dietary

64. Quintana FJ, Basso AS, Iglesias AH, et al. Control of Treg and TH17 cell differentiation by the aryl hydrocarbon receptor. *Nature.* 2008;453(7191):65-71. doi:10.1038/nature06880

65. Roman AC, Carvajal-Gonzalez JM, Merino JM, Mulero-Navarro S, Fernández-Salguero PM. The aryl hydrocarbon receptor in the crossroad of signalling networks with therapeutic value. *Pharmacol Ther.* 2018;185(xxxx):50-63. doi:10.1016/j.pharmthera.2017.12.003

66. Casado FL. The Aryl Hydrocarbon Receptor Relays Metabolic Signals to Promote Cellular Regeneration. *Stem Cells Int.* 2016;2016(1):1-9. doi:10.1155/2016/4389802

67. Hushka LJ, Williams JS, Greenlee WF. Characterization of 2,3,7,8-Tetrachlorodibenzofuran-Dependent Suppression and AH Receptor Pathway Gene Expression in the Developing Mouse Mammary Gland. *Toxicol Appl Pharmacol.* 1998;152(1):200-210. doi:10.1006/TAAP.1998.8508

68. Larigot L, Juricek L, Dairou J, Coumoul X. AhR signaling pathways and regulatory functions. *Biochim Open.* 2018;7:1-9. doi:10.1016/j.biopen.2018.05.001

69. Silva E, Rajapakse N, Kortenkamp A. Something from “nothing” - Eight weak estrogenic

chemicals combined at concentrations below NOECs produce significant mixture effects.

Environ Sci Technol. 2002;36(8):1751-1756. doi:10.1021/es0101227

70. Hardy A, Benford D, Halldorsson T, et al. Draft guidance on harmonised methodologies for human health, animal health and ecological risk assessment of combined exposure to multiple chemicals. EFSA Scientific Committee. *EFSA J* 201X. 2018:1-81.

doi:10.2903/j.efsa.201X.XXXX

71. Ghisari M, Long M, Tabbo A, Bonefeld-Jørgensen EC. Effects of currently used pesticides and their mixtures on the function of thyroid hormone and aryl hydrocarbon receptor in cell culture. *Toxicol Appl Pharmacol.* 2015;284(3):292-303.

doi:10.1016/j.taap.2015.02.004

72. Liu L, Liu S-S, Yu M, Zhang J, Chen F. Concentration addition prediction for a multiple-component mixture containing no effect chemicals. *Anal Methods.* 2015;7(23):9912-9917.

doi:10.1039/C5AY01784J

73. Gaudriault P, Mazaud-Guittot S, Lavoué V, et al. Endocrine Disruption in Human Fetal Testis Explants by Individual and Combined Exposures to Selected Pharmaceuticals, Pesticides, and Environmental Pollutants. *Environ Health Perspect.* 2017;125(8):087004.

doi:10.1289/EHP1014

74. Faust M, Altenburger R, Backhaus T, et al. Joint algal toxicity of 16 dissimilarly acting chemicals is predictable by the concept of independent action. *Aquat Toxicol.*

2003;63(1):43-63. doi:10.1016/S0166-445X(02)00133-9

Figure Captions

Figure 1: (A) Dose-response curves obtained from DR-H4IIE, DR-T47-D and DR-HepG2 cells co-exposed to 15 pM, 150 pM and 650 pM TCDD, respectively, and the total POP mixture. (B) Dose-response curves obtained from DR-H4IIE cells co-exposed to 15 pM TCDD, and the total POP mixture, or the Cl, Cl+Br and Cl+PFAA sub-mixtures (Mean $\pm$ SD, n = 3, 0.4% DMSO).

Figure 2: Measured and predicted dose-response curves obtained from rat DR-H4IIE cells co-exposed to 15 pM TCDD and the total POP mixture, and from three prediction models. CA = Concentration addition, IA = Independent action, GCA = Generalized concentration addition, AvBH = averaged hillslope and bottom, and sNA FoBH = subtracted nonactive compounds, formulated hillslope and bottom. Green dashed lines represent the 95% confidence interval of the measured response.

Figure 3: (A) Distribution of toxic units of the 16 active AhR antagonists. (B) Dose-response curves obtained from rat DR-H4IIE cells co-exposed to 15 pM TCDD and the total POP mixture or a binary mixture consisting of PCB-138 and PCB-118 (Mean $\pm$ SD, n = 3, 0.4% DMSO).

(A)

(B)

Figure 1.

Figure 2.

Figure 3.

840 **Table Captions**

841 **Table 1:** AhR antagonistic responses (LOEC, MOEC, IC₅₀ and RPC_{Max}) of 16 POPs in DR-H4IIE,
842 DR-Hep G2 and DR-T47-D cell lines (n = 3, 0.3% DMSO).

843
844 **Table 2:** AhR antagonistic responses (LOEC, MOEC, IC₅₀ and RPC_{Max}) of the total POP mixture
845 and Cl containing sub-mixtures (Cl, Cl+Br, Cl+PFAA) in DR-H4IIE, DR-T47-D and DR-Hep G2
846 cells (n = 3, 0.4% DMSO).

847

Table 1.

Compounds	DR-H4IIE				DR-Hep G2				DR-T47-D			
	LOEC (μ M)	MOEC (μ M)	IC ₅₀ $\pm$ SE (μ M)	RPC _{Max} (%)	LOEC (μ M)	MOEC (μ M)	IC ₅₀ $\pm$ SE (μ M)	RPC _{Max} (%)	LOEC (μ M)	MOEC (μ M)	IC ₅₀ $\pm$ SE (μ M)	RPC _{Max} (%)
PCB-28	2.5	25	6.8 $\pm$ 1.7	36.6 $\pm$ 4.3	2.5	25	6.1 $\pm$ 1.4	7.2 $\pm$ 3.6	3.5	25	11.4 $\pm$ 1.5	48.3 $\pm$ 5.9
PCB-52	2.5	50*	7.3 $\pm$ 1.2	17.1 $\pm$ 5.5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
PCB-101	12.5	50*	17.9 $\pm$ 3.8	54.3 $\pm$ 3.6	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
PCB-118	0.5	2.5	0.3 $\pm$ 0.05	67 $\pm$ 4.7	12.5	25	9 $\pm$ 2.7	38.3 $\pm$ 16.5	12.5	27.5	13.6 $\pm$ 2.4	49.2 $\pm$ 4.9
PCB-138	0.5	2.5	0.6 $\pm$ 0.07	42.8 $\pm$ 2.8	3.5	25	ND	50.2 $\pm$ 9.5	12.5	50*	ND	42.6 $\pm$ 2.5
PCB-153	0.01	50*	18.5 $\pm$ 2.8	16.7 $\pm$ 4.6	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
PCB-180	1	50*	7.4 $\pm$ 3.3	16 $\pm$ 1.4	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
HCB	0.075	37.5	17.9 $\pm$ 11.6	42 $\pm$ 8.7	3.75	37.5	4.5 $\pm$ 2.3	39.4 $\pm$ 12.7	0.075	30	16.4 $\pm$ 2.1	51.7 $\pm$ 6.7
α -Chlordane	0.4	50*	28.3 $\pm$ 3.3	15 $\pm$ 1.1	-	-	-	-	10	30	20.2 $\pm$ 2.1	7.4 $\pm$ 12.5
<i>o</i> -chlordane	20	40*	26.5 $\pm$ 19.4	26.3 $\pm$ 1.5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<i>t</i> -nonachlor	25	50*	34.3 $\pm$ 1.8	34.2 $\pm$ 8.1	-	-	-	-	25	25	16.8 $\pm$ 2	27.8 $\pm$ 3.5
γ -HCH	0.5	50	27.5 $\pm$ 2.7	40.7 $\pm$ 3.5	-	-	-	-	50	75	61.2 $\pm$ 2.9	65.4 $\pm$ 13.7
Dieldrin	6.25	50	22.4 $\pm$ 11.4	59.6 $\pm$ 1.9	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
BDE-47	0.25	20*	3.1 $\pm$ 0.5	17.9 $\pm$ 2.7	1.25	12.5	ND	55.3 $\pm$ 7.2	-	-	-	-
BDE-99	0.25	10	5.2 $\pm$ 1.9	36.3 $\pm$ 1.5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
HBCD	0.25	15	35.8 $\pm$ 63.9**	58.1 $\pm$ 3.1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

849 LOEC: lowest observed effect concentration ($p < 0.05$); MOEC: maximum observed effect concentration ($p < 0.05$); IC₅₀: the concentration inducing half of the
850 maximum inhibition response; SE: Standard Error; RPC_{Max} : observed efficacy expressed as a percentage of the cell response exposed to 15 pM, 650 pM and 150
851 pM TCDD, respectively for DR-H4IIE, DR-Hep G2 and DR-T47-D, corresponding to the MOEC; ND: Not Determined. * Corresponds to the highest tested
852 concentration. ** IC₅₀ estimated beyond tested concentrations. -: no response.

853

Table 2.

Mixtures	DR-H4IIE				DR-Hep G2				DR-T47-D			
	LOEC (x bl)	MOEC (x bl)	IC ₅₀ ± SE (x bl)	RPC _{Max} (%)	LOEC (x bl)	MOEC (x bl)	IC ₅₀ ± SE (x bl)	RPC _{Max} (%)	LOEC (x bl)	MOEC (x bl)	IC ₅₀ ± SE (x bl)	RPC _{Max} (%)
POP	125	1000	374 ± 52	52.5 ± 2.1	500	1000	ND	80.1 ± 5.8	250	1000	ND	86.6 ± 2.2
Cl	250	1000	562 ± 54	53 ± 0.9	250	2000	ND	59 ± 1.6	-	-	-	-
Cl+Br	125	2000	468 ± 38	64.6 ± 1.7	500	1000	534 ± 253	76.1 ± 3.9	-	-	-	-
Cl+PFAA	75	2000	461 ± 78	41 ± 1.3	500	500	243 ± 104	77 ± 3.8	500	500	ND	77 ± 3.8

854 LOEC: lowest observed effect concentration ($p < 0.05$); MOEC: maximum observed effect concentration ($p < 0.05$); IC₅₀: the concentration inducing half of the
855 maximum inhibition response; SE: Standard Error; RPC_{Max} : relative response at MOEC expressed in % of the response of TCDD EC₅₀ 15 pM, 650 pM and 150 pM
856 TCDD (respectively for DR-H4IIE, DR-Hep G2 and DR-T47-D) corresponding to the MOEC; x bl: fold blood levels; ND: Not Determined. -: no response.

Table S1: Composition of the total POP mixture and the six sub-mixtures (PFAA, Br, Cl, Cl+Br, Cl+PFAA, Br+PFAA). The minimum and maximum tested concentrations of each compound in individual compound testing and the concentrations of each compound corresponding to 1000 fold blood levels in the mixture testing are also given.

Compounds	Individual compound testing: tested concentration (µM)		Mixture testing: individual concentrations in the mixture corresponding to 1000 fold blood levels (µM)						
	Minimum	Maximum	Total POP	PFAA	Br	Cl	Cl+Br	Cl+PFAA	Br+PFAA
PCB-28	0.01	50	0.031			0.031	0.031	0.031	
PCB-52	0.01	50	0.021			0.024	0.021	0.021	
PCB-101	0.01	50	0.025			0.025	0.021	0.025	
PCB-118	0.01	50	0.14			0.13	0.12	0.13	
PCB-138	0.01	50	0.43			0.45	0.39	0.42	
PCB-153	0.01	50	0.70			0.73	0.63	0.67	
PCB-180	0.01	50	0.34			0.38	0.33	0.35	
<i>p,p'</i> -DDE	0.5	50	1.066			1.088	0.95	1.006	
HCB	0.075	60	0.23			0.24	0.21	0.22	
α -chlordane	0.4	80	0.024			0.029	0.032	0.032	
<i>o</i> -chlordane	0.4	40	0.34			0.034	0.029	0.029	
<i>t</i> -nonachlor	0.5	50	0.099			0.099	0.101	0.101	
α -HCH	0.5	50	0.017			0.017	0.017	0.017	
β -HCH	0.5	50	0.076			0.076	0.069	0.069	
γ -HCH	0.5	100	0.017			0.021	0.017	0.017	
Dieldrin	0.5	100	0.055			0.063	0.060	0.058	
BDE-47	0.025	20	0.019		0.012		0.016		0.014
BDE-99	0.025	20	0.0071		0.0053		0.007		0.0071
BDE-100	0.0025	1	0.0035		0.0035		0.004		0.0035
BDE-153	0.0025	1	0.0016		0.0016		0.002		0.0016
BDE-154	0.0025	1	0.0031		0.0031		0.003		0.0016
BDE-209	0.0025	1	0.0094		0.0104		0.009		0.0094
HBCD	0.025	20	0.055		0.055		0.033		0.065
PFHxS	0.5	50	7.809	6.71				7.41	6.91
PFOS	0.5	50	41.52	18.19				40.83	16.37
PFOA	0.5	50	4.209	7.24				4.42	6.69
PFNA	0.5	50	1.092	1.76				1.036	1.74
PFDA	0.5	50	0.38	0.72				0.44	0.66
PFUnDA	0.5	50	0.34	0.32				0.17	0.28
Summary concentration (µM)			59.048	34.94	0.091	3.43	3.101	57.51	32.75

POPs: persistent organic pollutants. PFAA: perfluorinated compounds. Br: brominated compounds. Cl: chlorinated compounds.

PCB: polychlorinated biphenyl. DDE: dichlorodiphenyldichloroethane. HCB: hexachlorobenzene. HCH: hexachlorocyclohexane.

BDE: brominated diphenyl ether. HBCD: hexabromocyclododecane. PFHxS: perfluorohexanesulfonic acid. PFOS:

perfluorooctanesulfonic acid. PFOA: perfluorooctanoic acid. PFNA: perfluorononanoic acid. PFDA: perfluorodecanoic acid.

PFUnDA: perfluoroundecanoic acid.

Table S2: EC₅₀, RPC_{Max} and relative potency for AhR agonistic compounds in DR-H4IIE and DR-T47-D cells (n = 3, 0.2% DMSO).

Cell lines	DR-H4IIE					DR-T47-D	
Compounds	BDE-99	BDE-153	BDE-154	PCB-118	PCB-138	BDE-99	γ-HCH
EC ₅₀ ± SE (μM)	4 ± 0.8	ND	ND	25 ± 13	28 ± 6.4	1.9 ± 1.8	> 50
RPC _{Max} (%)	7.3	15.2	8.9	61.3	28.2	11	6
Relative potency	0.0000038	-	-	0.00006	0.000054	0.000013	0.000033

EC₅₀: concentration inducing half of the maximum response, extrapolated; RPC_{Max}: observed efficacy of the maximum tested concentration expressed in % of the maximum response of TCDD; Relative potency: ratio between the EC₅₀ of TCDD and the EC₅₀ of the tested compound, with TCDD EC₅₀ = 15 pM in DR-H4IIE and 150 pM in DR-T47D; SE: Standard Error; ND: not determined

Table S3: Four parameters obtained in the dose-response curves (Graphpad PRISM) of the 16 active AhR antagonists in the rat DR-H4IIE cells (n = 3, 0.2% DMSO, Mean ± SD).

Parameters	BDE-47	BDE-99	HBCD	PCB-28	PCB-53	PCB-101	PCB-118	PCB-138
Bottom (%)	0.2 ± 7.05	16.9 ± 12.4	0	20.3 ± 7.4	8.2 ± 5.5	47.2 ± 7.4	67.2 ± 1.4	43.1 ± 1.5
Top (%)	100.7 ± 2.6	93.1 ± 3.3	80.7 ± 1.4	104.2 ± 1.8	107.6 ± 1.2	99.5 ± 1.3	104.2 ± 1.8	92.9 ± 2.1
HillSlope	0.9 ± 0.1	0.9 ± 0.2	1.3 ± 0.5	1.1 ± 0.2	1.1 ± 0.1	1.5 ± 0.3	2.2 ± 0.5	2.4 ± 0.6
IC ₅₀ (μM)	3.1 ± 0.5	5.2 ± 1.9	35.8 ± 63.9	6.8 ± 1.7	7.3 ± 1.2	17.9 ± 3.8	0.3 ± 0.05	0.6 ± 0.07
Parameters	PCB-153	PCB-180	HCB	α-Chlordane	o-chlordane	t-nonachlor	γ-HCH	Dieldrine
Bottom (%)	0	5.1 ± 14.7	33.01 ± 13.4	0	0	25.8 ± 5.8	23.2 ± 4.6	45.6 ± 11.5
Top (%)	89.9 ± 1.1	102.9 ± 3.2	74.6 ± 2.6	89.1 ± 1.2	101.4 ± 4.8	89 ± 1.0	94.4 ± 1.6	96.7 ± 3.3
HillSlope	1.4 ± 0.2	0.9 ± 0.2	1.1 ± 0.5	2.4 ± 0.4	2.2 ± 1.5	4.98 ± 0.9	1.8 ± 0.3	0.8 ± 0.3
IC ₅₀ (μM)	18.5 ± 2.8	7.4 ± 3.3	17.9 ± 11.6	28.3 ± 3.3	26.5 ± 19.4	34.3 ± 1.8	27.5 ± 2.7	22.4 ± 11.4

Table S4: Measured and predicted bottom, hillslope and IC₅₀ of the CA models with several methods for the total POP mixture and Cl, Cl+Br, Cl+PFAA sub-mixtures.

Methods	Measured	WMBH	AvBH	FoBH	sNA WMBH	sNA FoBH
Total POP mixture						
Bottom (%)	52.5	5	21	0	100	0
Hillslope	1.3	0.5	1.7	34.2	-10.9	1.5
IC ₅₀ (x bl)	374	784	784	784	784	784
Cl sub-mixture						
Bottom (%)	53	83	25	0	100	0
Hillslope	2.1	6.9	1.8	2.1	-10.6	1.4
IC ₅₀ (x bl)	500	786	786	786	786	786
Cl+Br mixture						
Bottom (%)	64.6	83	21	0	100	0
Hillslope	2.1	7	1.7	2.1	-10.6	1.4
IC ₅₀ (x bl)	500	875	875	875	875	875
Cl+PFAA mixture						
Bottom (%)	41	5	25	0	100	0
Hillslope	1.4	0.4	1.8	38.6	-10.7	1.4
IC ₅₀ (x bl)	576	840	840	840	840	840

WMBH = weighted mean, AvBH = averaged, formulated hillslope and bottom (FoBH), sNA = subtracted nonactive compounds. x bl: fold blood levels.

Figure S1: Dose-response curves obtained from DR-H4IIE cells co-exposed to 15 pM TCDD (solid lines) or 20 nM TCDD (dashed lines) and PCBs (A1 and A2), OCPs (B1 and B2) and BRFs (C) (Mean $\pm$ SD, n = 3, 0.3% DMSO).

Figures S2: Predicted full dose-response curves of the concentration addition models with several methods to calculate the bottom and hill-slope for the total POP mixture (A) and CI (B), CI+Br (C), CI+PFAA (D) sub-mixtures. WMBH = weighted mean, AvBH = averaged, formulated hillslope and bottom, sNA = subtracted nonactive compounds.

(C)

(D)