Screening the ToxCast Chemical Libraries for Binding to Transthyretin

Stephanie A. Eytcheson^{1,2}, Alexander D. Zosel^{2,3}, Jennifer H. Olker², Michael W. Hornung², Sigmund J. Degitz 2^*

¹Oak Ridge Institute for Science and Education Postdoctoral Fellow, Oak Ridge, TN, USA 20.5 . Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Research and Development, Center for Computational Toxicology and Exposure, Great Lakes Toxicology and Ecology Division, Duluth, MN, USA

³Oak Ridge Associated Universities Student Services Contractor, Oak Ridge, TN, USA

Disclaimer: *The views expressed in this paper are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views or policies of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. Mention of trade names or commercial products does not constitute endorsement or recommendation for use.*

*To whom correspondence should be addressed at U.S. EPA, Office of Research and Development, Center for Computational Toxicology and Exposure, Great Lakes Toxicology and Ecology Division, 6201 Congdon Blvd, Duluth, MN 55804 USA. E-mail: degitz.sigmund@epa.gov Tel: 218-529-5168

Conflict of Interest: The authors claim no conflicts of interest.

Abstract

 Transthyretin (TTR) is one of the serum binding proteins responsible for transport of thyroid hormones (TH) to target tissue and for maintaining the balance of available TH. Chemical binding to TTR and subsequent displacement of TH has been identified as an endpoint in screening chemicals for potential disruption of the thyroid system. To address the lack of data regarding chemicals binding to TTR, we optimized an *in vitro* assay utilizing the fluorescent probe 8-anilino-1-napthalenesulfonic acid (ANSA) and the human protein TTR to screen over 8 1,500 chemicals from the U.S. EPA's ToxCast ph1_v2, ph2, and e1k libraries utilizing a tiered approach. Testing of a single high concentration (target 100 µM) resulted in 888 chemicals with 20% or greater activity based on displacement of ANSA from TTR. Of these, 282 chemicals had activity of 85% or greater and were further tested in 12-point concentration-response with 12 target concentrations ranging from 0.015-100µM. An EC50 was obtained for 276 of these 301 chemicals. To date, this is the largest set of chemicals screened for binding to TTR. Utilization of this assay is a significant contribution towards expanding the suite of *in vitro* assays used to identify chemicals with the potential to disrupt thyroid hormone homeostasis. **Keywords:** thyroid, screening, endocrine disruption, transthyretin, NAMs, *in vitro* **Abbreviations:** TTR, transthyretin; NAMs, new approach methodologies; EDCs, endocrine disrupting compounds; TH, thyroid hormone

Introduction

 Thousands of chemicals are developed each year adding to the thousands of chemicals already in use (Naidu et al., 2021; van Dijk et al., 2021). It has been demonstrated that exposure to environmental contaminants can have adverse biological impacts; thus, it is necessary to characterize the risks of these chemicals (Lazofsky & Buckley, 2022; Tijani et al., 2016). As the number of chemicals grows each year, it becomes increasingly prohibitive to test them for effects *in vivo*. As such, regulatory agencies are turning to new approach methodologies (NAMs), including *in vitro* high throughput screening, to assess a chemical's potential to interact at a specific molecular target and to identify endocrine disrupting chemicals (EDCs) (Mondou et al., 2020; van der Zalm et al., 2022). The US Environmental Protection Agency's (US EPA) Endocrine Disruptor Screening Program has focused on identifying EDCs that interfere with the estrogen, androgen, and thyroid systems (USEPA, 2022). Much work has been done in validating *in vitro* assays to test chemical interactions at the estrogen and androgen receptors to prevent reproductive impacts (Browne et al., 2015; Judson et al., 2015; Kleinstreuer et al., 2017); however, progress in developing new methods for targets within the hypothalamus- pituitary-thyroid (HPT) axis has been slower due to complexity of the thyroid system and multiple targets for potential disruption (Noyes et al., 2019; USEPA, 2022). The HPT axis is tightly regulated due to its importance in growth, development, and metabolism (Boas et al., 2012; Nillni, 2010). There are several targets of potential interference along this HPT axis as well as in serum binding proteins and peripheral tissues (Boas et al., 2012; Boas et al., 2006; Tan & Zoeller, 2007; Zoeller et al., 2007). Further, a feedback system signaling when to turn on and off production of thyroid hormone (TH) is in place to maintain TH

 2007). In addition to TH, TTR can bind retinol binding protein, which in turn binds and transports retinol (Prapunpoj & Leelawatwattana, 2009). Chemical binding to TTR can displace TH from the protein resulting in lack of TH delivered to the target tissue and subsequent disruption of biological pathways dependent on TH activation (Cao et al., 2011). Competitive binding with TTR in cerebrospinal fluid has been shown *in vitro* to increase free T4 which may negatively regulate production of TH (Radovic et al., 2006). Alternatively, TH freed from TTR could be metabolized and excreted resulting in decreased TH levels in serum (Huang et al., 2023; Kim et al., 2018). Assays have been developed to assess chemical binding to TTR. These include a radiolabeled ligand displacement assay (Lans et al., 1993) and the fluorescence-based competitive binding assays using fluorescein isothiocyanate-T4 conjugate (FITC-T4) or 8-anilino- 1-naphthalenesulfonic acid ammonium salt (ANSA) (Cao et al., 2010; Montaño et al., 2012; Ren & Guo, 2012). The FITC and ANSA assays are currently being validated by the European Union Reference Laboratory for Alternatives to Animal testing (EURL ECVAM, tsar.jrc.ec.europa.eu/test-method/tm2019-08). 81 The objective of this work was to screen the ToxCast ph1 v2, ph2, and e1k libraries (Richard et al., 2016) in the TTR-ANSA assay using a tiered approach to: 1) identify chemicals

- with the potential to bind TTR, 2) determine an EC50 value for the chemicals that bind to TTR
- and displace ANSA based on 85% activity or greater in single concentration screening, and 3)
- evaluate the performance of the assay for use in large-scale screening.
- **Materials and Methods**
- *Overview*

 solubility limitations in DMSO (120 chemicals <20 mM, 22 chemicals >20 mM). Further, the concentration for 12 chemicals (oils and mixtures) was provided in mg/mL. Overall, 93.4% of chemicals were provided within 1 mM of the target concentration.

 In addition to test chemicals, DMSO, T4, and TTR were screened on each plate. DMSO, the solvent control, served as a negative control due to its inability to displace ANSA from TTR. T4 is a known ligand of TTR and served as a positive control. The final amount of DMSO in the DMSO and T4 controls was 0.5% to match the amount added in test chemical reactions. A protein-only control was included to correct fluorescence values. Source plates were received with column 1 and several random wells left empty for addition of reference controls. A T4 standard curve was added in column 1 using a 10 mM stock solution prepared in 0.4 N NaOH and diluted to final concentrations of 1.8, 0.81, 0.3645, 0.164, 0.0738, 0.0332. 0.0149, and 121 0.0067 µM. The maximum T4 concentration (1.8 µM) served as the positive control correlating with complete displacement of ANSA from TTR. T4 concentrations were selected based on assay optimization (see section below). Each replicate plate contained the T4 curve, additional high T4 and low T4 wells, DMSO, and TTR. Plate layouts for single concentration screening and concentration-response testing are in Supplemental Figure 1.

Autofluorescence

 Reduction in fluorescence is used to determine displacement of ANSA from TTR; thus, autofluorescence of test chemicals is a potential interference of this assay. Specifically, one concern would be that autofluorescence of the chemical would mask any reduction in ANSA 130 fluorescence resulting in a false negative response. To address interference, 1 µL of each 131 chemical was added to 199 μ L of phosphate buffer, incubated for 2 hours at 4°C, and

fluorescence was measured using a BioTek Synergy Neo2 plate reader (Agilent, Santa Clara, CA)

with an excitation wavelength of 380 nm and an emission wavelength of 475 nm.

Binding assay optimization

 Several iterations of the binding assay were performed while optimizing this assay for use in our lab. Initial testing followed the parameters outlined by Montaño et al. (2012) with 137 reactions containing 0.5 µM TTR, 0.6 µM ANSA, and a T4 curve ranging from 100-1000 nM. Additionally, we assessed the difference in using clear vs black 96-well plates and flat vs round bottom plates in an effort to minimize background fluorescence. Black round-bottom plates (Corning 3356) were selected for use as assay plates. Further optimization included testing different concentrations and ratios of TTR and ANSA with the goal of reducing the amount of TTR in each reaction to ultimately lower the cost of the assay.

Assay conditions

144 Each 200 µL reaction contained 0.125 µM TTR, 1.2 µM ANSA, and 0.5% DMSO in 0.1 M phosphate buffer, pH 7.5. Four individual master mixes were prepared: a main master mix for test chemicals which contained all components except DMSO, the T4 and DMSO master mixes which contained all components, and a TTR master mix which did not contain ANSA (Supplemental Table 1). Master mixes were prepared in low light to prevent ANSA degredation. Each master mix was loaded into the appropriate wells of a 2 mL 96-well reservoir plate. Using a Biomek i5 liquid handler (Beckman Coulter, Indianapolis, IN), six 96-well black assay plates 151 were loaded with master mix. Subsequently, 2 μ L T4 and 1 μ L test chemical were added to the 152 assay plates using a 20 µL Rainin Liquidator 96-channel benchtop pipettor (Mettler Toledo, Columbus, OH). Reactions were mixed by pipetting using a 200 µL Rainin Liquidator, sealed

 with a polyolefin plate seal, and shaken on a Jitterbug microplate shaker (Boekel Scientific, Feasterville, PA) for 2 minutes at 1000 rpm. Assay plates were covered with foil and incubated 156 at 4°C for 2 hours. Following incubation, fluorescence was measured using a BioTek Synergy Neo2 plate reader (Agilent, Santa Clara, CA) using an excitation wavelength of 380 nm and an emission wavelength of 475 nm.

Chemical screening

 Chemical screening was performed using a tiered approach. The first tier was comprised of screening each chemical at a single concentration. The target concentration for single concentration screening was 100 µM with some variation based on solubility. Daughter plates were thawed before use and were used to load three individual assay plates (n=3 for each chemical, one well on each assay plate; see Supplemental figure 1A for plate layout). Additionally, a "T4 source plate" was prepared. The T4 source plate contained an adequate volume of each concentration of the T4 standard curve and the additional high and low T4 concentration wells. The T4 source plate was used to load individual assay plates using the Liquidator as described previously. Data were normalized to percent of control with the low concentration of T4 representing maximum fluorescence (no displacement of ANSA) and the highest concentration of T4 representing no fluorescence (100% ANSA displaced). In single concentration screening, chemicals were considered inactive if they displayed less than 20% activity compared to the high T4 concentration control.

 A subset of chemicals with the greatest activity moved forward to concentration- response testing. Specifically, the 282 chemicals with 85% or greater median displacement of ANSA were tested in 12-point concentration-response curves in an effort to establish EC50s for 176 these chemicals binding to TTR thereby displacing ANSA. The 85% activity level for moving chemicals forward for concentration-response testing differed from previous thyroid screening assays (*e.g.*, deiodinases used a 50% activity threshold). In this assay, a large proportion of chemicals showed activity >50%; thus, selecting 85% activity as the threshold for moving chemicals onto concentration-response testing provided better discrimination from a prioritization standpoint. For concentration-response testing, chemicals were taken from the original chemical source plate and aliquoted in a new 96-well polypropylene plate ("CR source plate") to prepare dilutions in DMSO. Chemicals were tested in 12-point curves with target concentrations of 0.015, 0.034, 0.076, 0.168, 0.374, 0.83, 1.845, 4.101, 9.113, 20.25, 45, and 185 100 μ M, one chemical per row with different concentrations in each column tested in three separate assay plates (n=3 for each chemical at each concentration, see Supplemental Figure 1B for plate layout).

Data Processing and Analysis

 Data were processed and analyzed in R [version 4.2.1,(R Core Team, 2022)] using an automated pipeline that normalized data, calculated plate diagnostics, and assigned assay- specific flags. Data were processed by: 1) adjusting relative fluorescence units (RFUs) by subtracting fluorescence in the TTR-only wells, and 2) normalizing test chemical responses to the concentration-response curve of the model chemical T4 fit to the Hill model with high concentration T4 (1.8 µM) representing 100% of ANSA displacement (0% of control) and low T4 (0.0067 µM) representing 0% ANSA displacement (100% of control). Results are reported as percent activity which was calculated as 100 minus the percent of control. Results for single

 concentration screening are reported as percent activity calculated from the median of the three replicates with range used to display variability.

 Concentration-response data were analyzed using the ToxCast Analysis Pipeline (tcpl) package version 3.0.1 (Filer, 2022) using the tcplLite option. In this analysis, percent activity was used as the response value and 20% activity as the threshold cutoff. This 20% cutoff was selected to have a consistent threshold across assays. The three replicates for each concentration of a chemical were included to fit dose-response curves based on the constant, constrained Hill, and constrained gain-loss model. The best model fit was identified based on the lowest Akaike Information Criterion (AIC) value. For chemicals that fit the Hill or gain-loss model, the EC20, EC50, and Hill slope were calculated from the model fit parameters. Results from concentration-response screening are displayed as displacement from the maximum response with chemical concentration (log10 scale) on the x-axis and percent of control on the y-axis.

Assay quality

 Quality control measures were calculated following methods previously described (Olker et al., 2019; Olker et al., 2021). Briefly, variability and separation between the positive control (1.8 µM T4) and solvent/negative control (DMSO) were evaluated with plate-wise Z' factors. The Z' factor is an indicator of assay quality, and values above 0.5 indicate good separation between positive and negative controls (Zhang et al., 1999). A Z' factor greater than or equal to 0.5 was used as a guideline for acceptable plate runs. Typically assay plates were rerun to replace data from plate runs where quality criteria were not met (*e.g.*, low Z' factor,

 poor control data). In one instance, a Z' factor less than 0.5 was not re-run because the two other replicates for that plate met the quality criteria.

 Data that fell outside of acceptable parameters for variability and fluorescence were flagged for manual review. Flags included high variability when the absolute difference between the mean and median of three replicate runs was greater than 10% and potential assay interference indicated by fluorescence outside of normal ranges. Individual wells with observed problems (*e.g.*, outliers, low volume in a well in one replicate) were excluded from analyses with only two replicates used.

Results

Assay Optimization, Performance, Quality Control

 Optimization of the TTR binding assay in our lab resulted in a fluorescence-based assay suitable for screening large chemical libraries for binding to the human TTR protein. To evaluate data quality, standard curves, Z' factor, and variability of the controls were evaluated for each assay plate and summarized across all plates. Quality control metrics were consistent over the duration of data collection in triplicate testing of 25 single concentration plates and 52 concentration-response plates. Standard curves for the positive control (T4) were consistent 234 with mean EC50 of 0.075 \pm 0.02 SD and mean Hill slope of -1.113 \pm 0.29 SD. Standard curves for all replicates had a Z' factor >0.5 except for one plate which failed acceptance criteria with a Z' factor of 0.302. The low Z' factor in this plate was attributable to unusually low fluorescence in a DMSO control well; however, the two other replicate plates had Z' factors >0.5, and this set of 238 plates was a repeat run with data similar to the initial assay run. Additionally, the mean Z'

 factor across all plates was 0.883± 0.06 SD and ranged from 0.542 to 0.98 when the one replicate plate was excluded.

Autofluorescence

 The assessment of chemical autofluorescence was done after screening all chemicals in the TTR assay to better understand an allowable threshold for chemical autofluorescence. For this analysis, the threshold for allowable chemical autofluorescence was set at 10% of maximum reaction fluorescence (*i.e.*, 10% of the average DMSO negative control fluorescence across all single concentration and concentration-response plates). The average maximum fluorescence in DMSO wells across all plates was 10263, so the threshold for chemical autofluorescence was 1026.3. Based on this threshold, 262 chemicals were determined to be autofluorescent (Figure 1). The 262 chemicals interfering with the assay are listed in Supplemental Table S2. Additionally, 39 chemicals (Supplemental Table S3) were flagged during data processing due to fluorescence being more than 20% greater than DMSO negative controls (*i.e.*, RFUs > DMSO+20%). Due to these exclusions, results from 1512 of the 1813 chemicals are reported herein.

Single Concentration Screening

 Data from single concentration screening are being used in the Tox24 challenge for independent researchers to develop methods to predict compounds' ability to bind TTR using only chemical structure data (https://ochem.eu/static/challenge.do) (Tetko, 2024). Thus, results from the blind and leaderboard sets are not included in this version of the manuscript but will be made publicly available at the conclusion of the challenge. In single concentration screening, 624 chemicals had <20% activity compared to the activity of high concentration T4 controls and

Concentration-response Testing

 Results from concentration-response testing confirmed single concentration screening results for 96% of the 282 chemicals tested. Results were considered consistent when the percent difference between median percent activity in single concentration screening and median percent activity at the maximum concentration tested in concentration-response was less than 25%. Two of the chemicals, *X* and tripropylene glycol monomethyl ether, were active 270 in single concentration screening and had less than 20% activity at the highest concentration tested in concentration-response. Different sets of source plates were used for single concentration and concentration-response testing; thus, it is possible that there was an error in 273 dosing in either of the assays. The remaining nine chemicals that were inconsistent ranged from 86-102% activity in single concentration screening and 32-73% activity at the maximum concentration tested in concentration-response. The Hill model was identified in the ToxCast pipeline as the best fit model for 230 of 282 chemicals, and the gain-loss model was the best fit model for 50 chemicals. EC50 values were 278 obtained for 276 of the chemicals screened in concentration-response (Supplemental Table 5, Supplemental Figure 2). For the 6 chemicals with no EC50 reported, two were inactive at all concentrations tested (*X* and tripropylene glycol monomethyl ether) and the constant model was the winning fit. The other four chemicals (citronellol, *X*,

 1,3,5,7−Tetramethyl−1,3,5,7−tetravinylcyclotetrasiloxane, and difenzoquat) did not reach 50% activity at the highest concentration tested in concentration-response.

 The 25 most potent chemicals, ranked by EC50, are listed in Table 2. Twenty-four of the chemicals had EC50 values less than or equal to the mean EC50 of T4 indicating that these chemicals are equally or more potent as T4 in binding to TTR. Example curves for selected chemicals are displayed in Figure 2. Complete displacement of ANSA from TTR was not achieved for the nine chemicals presented from the top twenty-five ranked inhibitors. These chemicals were more (Figures 2B-2I) or equally (C.I. disperse Black 6 dihydrochloride, Figure 2J) potent compared to T4 based on EC50. These chemicals could have been tested at even lower concentrations to achieve 100% of control (zero activity) and establish a full concentration-response curve.

Discussion

 Investigating chemical binding to TTR is important due to TTR's role in transporting thyroid hormone to target tissues as well as maintaining thyroid hormone homeostasis. It is commonly understood that displacement of T4 from TTR results in enhanced clearance and reduced serum TH concentrations (Brouwer et al., 1989; Morse et al., 1996; Yamauchi et al., 2003). While some research has been done to investigate chemical binding to serum transport proteins, this study presents the largest library of chemicals screened to date. Screening 1512 chemicals from the ToxCast chemical library through the TTR-ANSA binding assay presented herein resulted in identification of 888 active chemicals (20% activity or greater). Of these, 282 produced 85% activity or greater including 243 chemicals that, to our knowledge, have not previously been shown to bind TTR.

 The data set was evaluated to determine whether any functional groups are enriched in the highly active (>85% activity) chemicals compared to the less active chemicals screened in this assay (Sushko et al., 2011; Vorberg & Tetko, 2014). SMILES were downloaded from the CompTox Chemicals Dashboard for the ph1_v2, ph2, and e1k library lists. Following the approach of Vorberg and Tetko (2014), SMILES were uploaded into the Online Chemical Modeling Environment (OCHEM). SMILES were recognized for 1504 individual chemicals. The chemicals were discretized by setting 85% activity as the threshold. There were 280 chemicals recognized as having "high" activity (>85%), and the remaining chemicals were categorized as "low" activity. The SetCompare Utility was then used to compare functional groups enriched among the highly active chemicals (Table 4). This analysis revealed that azo compounds and phenols are overrepresented in the highly active compounds with enrichment factors of 68 and 6.6, respectively. Interestingly, hydroxy compounds containing alcohols or phenols were grouped together and found to be enriched among the highly active compounds; however, this is largely due to enrichment of phenols (36.2% of high-actives vs 5.5% of low actives) since alcohols are enriched in the low-active group (enrichment factor 4.8). The top 25 most active chemicals (Table 2) were assessed for the presence of enriched functional groups. Most of the 25 most potent chemicals screened in this TTR assay are arenes, which were enriched by a factor of 1.7 in highly active chemicals, and many of them are phenols. Further, thirteen of the chemicals are halogen derivatives, which had an enrichment factor of 1.6. Three azo compounds are present among the list of 25 most potent TTR binders. Further investigation was done for the 25 most potent chemicals in this assay (lowest EC50s) to determine whether they have demonstrated thyroid activity in other *in vitro* or *in vivo* assays. Specifically, *in vitro* activity was assessed in thyroid assays with data available through the US EPA's CompTox Chemicals Dashboard (USEPA, 2021). The majority of the top 25 potent chemicals are active in multiple thyroid relevant assays. All of the chemicals except for 2,4,6- trichlorophenol were active in at least one other *in vitro* assay. Three chemicals (bromoxynil, chlorthal-dimethyl, and ammonium perfluorooctanoate) were active in only one other *in vitro* assay, which was the Tox21_TR_Luc_GH3_antagonist assay. Twenty-three of the twenty-five chemicals were active in the Tox21_TR_Luc_GH3_antagonist assay; however, eighteen of them were also active in the associated viability assay indicating potential cytotoxicity. It has been 334 reported that the Tox21 TR Luc GH3 antagonist assay is sensitive and identifies chemicals as active even if they are not direct thyroid receptor antagonists (Paul-Friedman et al., 2019). Chemical activity in the TTR binding assay and in other assays in which TH is the substrate (iodothyronine deiodinases) or ligand (thyroid receptor) makes sense due to TH being endogenous ligands for TTR. However, several chemicals are also active in the thyroid peroxidase (stimulated by thyroid-stimulating hormone) and iodotyrosine deiodinase (recycles iodide from mono- and diiodotyrosine) assays which are not regulated by TH, suggesting that these chemicals have non-specific interactions with multiple targets in the thyroid axis. To further clarify thyroid activity of these chemicals, a basic review of the literature was performed to identify *in vivo* thyroid activity. The review was performed by searching "(thyroid OR T4) AND (chemical name)" in Web of Science (search conducted July 24, 2023). As anticipated, there are many reports of *in vivo* thyroid activity for the thyroid hormone analogs Tetrac (ranked 1) and Triac (ranked 4). No *in vivo* studies were found for eighteen of the chemicals. Thyroid activity was demonstrated *in vivo* for the remaining five chemicals: ammonium perfluorooctanoate

(Butenhoff et al., 2012), 2,4,6-tribromophenol (Fu et al., 2020; Lee et al., 2016),

 diethylstilbestrol (Lin et al., 2023), apigenin (Panda & Kar, 2007), and dinoseb (Van den Berg et al., 1991).

 The EC50 values generated in this study were compared with those from previous 352 screening efforts using radiolabeled ligand $(1251-T4)$ as well as fluorescein isothiocyanate (FITC- T4) and 8-anilino-1-napthalene sulfonic acid (ANSA) assays (Table 4). There was a total of thirty- six chemicals overlapping between previous TTR screening assays and the ToxCast libraries. There are some chemicals (*e.g.*, amiodarone, benzoic acid, methimazole) with reported EC50s from previous ANSA screening assays greater than 24 µM which was corroborated by the ANSA assay reported herein by low percent activity in single concentration screening which precluded the chemicals from being screened in concentration-response. Similarly, several chemicals 359 screened in the 125 I-T4 assay had indeterminable EC50 values (2-perfluorohexyl ethanol, bisphenol A diglycidyl ether, hexanoic acid, and octanoic acid) which were not screened in concentration-response in this study due to low activity in single concentration screening. Interestingly, bisphenol A had 96% activity in single concentration screening but a relatively 363 high EC50 value of 8.63 μ M. The EC50 for bisphenol A was not determined in a previous ¹²⁵ 1-T4 assay suggesting this chemical does not have a particularly high affinity for TTR which agrees with the higher EC50 value determined in this study. In general, the ANSA-TTR assay conditions in this study appear to be more sensitive than other TTR binding assays with amiodarone in the FITC assay as the only exception. It has been reported that TTR is sensitive to changes in assay conditions (Chauhan et al., 2000; Marchesini et al., 2006); thus, the variety of methods and assay protocols used to investigate chemical binding to TTR hinder quantitative comparisons

 (Marchesini et al., 2006). However, the T4 EC50 values reported in this study are in the range of those reported in literature (Table 3).

 There are costs and benefits to each of the three screening methods previously used. The radio-labeled method uses the endogenous ligand of TTR to assess competition of chemicals for binding to the protein; however, the radiolabeled substrate can be expensive and hazardous, and the assay is not easy to adapt to a medium or high throughput format. ANSA is relatively inexpensive and non-toxic, but it is known to bind to many proteins by nonselective hydrophobic forces and cannot be used to specifically explore ligand binding sites (Ren & Guo, 2012). FITC may be more sensitive than ANSA due to the fluorescent probe being conjugated to the endogenous ligand; however, the FITC assay may be less sensitive than the radiolabeled ligand binding assay due to steric hindrance of the FITC moiety reducing the binding affinity of the probe (Ouyang et al., 2017).

 Based on assay performance metrics and the high Z' factors over the duration of screening, this ANSA fluorescence-based assay is suitable for high throughput screening of chemicals for binding to TTR; however, the large percentage (58.7%) of active chemicals may indicate that the assay may not be sufficiently specific for use in risk assessment. It is also possible that the TTR homotetrameric structure is not maintained *in vitro* and the reduction in fluorescence for the presumably active chemicals may be a result of protein degradation as opposed to chemical binding; however, this was previously tested in our lab with several per- and polyfluoroakyl substances and degradation of the protein structure was not observed. This supports the need for development of orthogonal high-throughput screening assays to confirm these chemicals are truly active. Overall, results from this assay, especially in conjunction with

414 **Tables**

415 **Table 1.** Summary of single point screening at an initial target concentration of 100 µM: percent 416 and number of chemicals in each library that produced less than 20% or greater than/equal to 417 20%, 50%, and 85% activity. **Actual % and # withheld until the end of the Tox24 Challenge*

418

	# chemicals	% with $\leq 20\%$	% with $\geq 20\%$	% with $\geq 50\%$	% with \geq 85%
Chemical library	tested ^a	activity (#)	activity $($ # $)$	activity (#)	activity (#)
ToxCast ph1 v2	262	$%$ (#)	$%$ (#)	$%$ (#)	$%$ (#)
ToxCast ph2	578	$%$ (#)	$%$ (#)	$%$ (#)	$%$ (#)
ToxCast e1k	672	$%$ (#)	$%$ (#)	$%$ (#)	$%$ (#)
Total	1512	$%$ (#)	$%$ (#)	$%$ (#)	$%$ (#)

⁴¹⁹

423 ^aChemical plates received from ToxCast included 1813 unique chemicals; however, 301 compounds had evidence 424 of interfering with the TTR assay and were excluded from all summaries and analyses.

425 426

427

428

429

430

431

432

433

434

435

436

437

⁴²⁰ Chemical names, CAS registry numbers, maximum tested concentrations, and median % activity produced can be 421 found in Supplementary Table S3. 422

Table 2. The top 25 ranked chemicals for binding to transthyretin (TTR) based on EC50.

**Chemicals from the blind and leaderboard sets withheld until the end of the Tox24 challenge.*

457 **Table 3.** Analysis of functional groups enriched in high and low TTR binding activity groups using

- 458 the SetCompare Utility of OCHEM.
- 459

460

461

462

463

464

465

466

467

468

469

470

471

- 473 **Table 4.** Comparison of EC50 values from literature and from this study. Assays include the TTR-
- 474 radiolabeled ligand binding assay (¹²⁵I-T4) as well as the fluorescein-5-isothiocyante (FITC-T4) and 8-
- 475 anilino-1-naphthalene sulfonic acid (ANSA) fluorescent binding assays. Percent activity from single point
- 476 screening in this study is also reported to explain why some chemicals do not have a reported EC50 (e.g.,
- 477 <85% activity in SC was not run in concentration response). **Chemicals from the blind and*

478 *leaderboard sets withheld until the end of the Tox24 challenge.*

480 *Chemicals that bind TTR in the literature are often referred to as "TTR inhibitors" because they

481 potentially inhibit TH from binding TTR. As such, results from TTR assays in found in the literature are

482 often reported as IC50s compared to EC50s reported in this study. For clarity, all the values will be

483 referred to as EC50s in this discussion.

484 ¹Cao 2010, ²Chauhan 2000, ³Degitz in review, ⁴Hamers 2006, ⁵Hamers 2020, ⁶Hill 2017 ⁷Lans 1993,

485 $8 Leusch 2018, ⁹Meerts 2000, ¹⁰Montaño 2012, ¹¹Ouyang 2017, ¹²Radovic 2006, ¹³Ren and Guo 2012,

486 14 Ren 2016, ¹⁵Weiss 2009, ¹⁶Xi 2020, ¹⁷Xin 2018, ¹⁸ Yang 2019. †May be different formulation from what

487 was screened in this study; no CAS was provided in the reference literature for comparison. These

488 chemicals in the ToxCast libraries were provided as potassium salt.

489

491

492

493

494

495

Figures and Figure Legends

Figure 1. Fluorescence of chemicals from the ToxCast phase 1 v2, phase 2, and e1k libraries at a target concentration of 100 uM. Chemicals are ordered from low to high according to the average relative fluorescence units (RFUs) of three replicate plates. The dashed line denotes 10% of the maximum fluorescence value from DMSO wells across all plates, which was the maximum chemical autofluorescence set for this study. Chemicals above the dashed line (i.e., those with RFUs >1026) were excluded from further analysis. There were 68 additional chemicals not depicted on the plot due to RFUs ranging from 10,200 to "overflow" (≥100,000).

 Figure 3. Concentration-response curves for binding to transthyretin by T4 at eight concentrations of the model ligand T4 (A) and selected chemicals at twelve concentrations with three replicates at each concentration (black circles). Examples include nine of the top twenty-517 five ranked inhibitors (B-J) selected from Table 2 and two chemicals with ~90% activity in single concentration screening (K-L) to represent a variety across types of compounds and inhibition curves.

-
-

Figure 3

References

- Boas, M., Feldt-Rasmussen, U., & Main, K. M. (2012). Thyroid effects of endocrine disrupting chemicals. *Mol Cell Endocrinol, 355*(2), 240-248. doi:10.1016/j.mce.2011.09.005
- Boas, M., Feldt-Rasmussen, U., Skakkebaek, N. E., & Main, K. M. (2006). Environmental chemicals and thyroid function. *Eur J Endocrinol, 154*(5), 599-611. doi:10.1530/eje.1.02128
- Brouwer, A., Reijnders, P. J. H., & Koeman, J. H. (1989). Polychlorinated biphenyl (PCB)-contaminated 586 fish induces vitamin A and thyroid hormone deficiency in the common seal (Phoca vitulina). *Aquatic Toxicology, 15*(1), 99-106. doi:Doi 10.1016/0166-445x(89)90008-8
- Browne, P., Judson, R. S., Casey, W. M., Kleinstreuer, N. C., & Thomas, R. S. (2015). Screening Chemicals for Estrogen Receptor Bioactivity Using a Computational Model. *Environ Sci Technol, 49*(14), 8804-8814. doi:10.1021/acs.est.5b02641
- Butenhoff, J. L., Bjork, J. A., Chang, S. C., Ehresman, D. J., Parker, G. A., Das, K., . . . Wallace, K. B. (2012). Toxicological evaluation of ammonium perfluorobutyrate in rats: twenty-eight-day and ninety-day oral gavage studies. *Reprod Toxicol, 33*(4), 513-530. doi:10.1016/j.reprotox.2011.08.004
- Cao, J., Guo, L. H., Wan, B., & Wei, Y. (2011). In vitro fluorescence displacement investigation of thyroxine transport disruption by bisphenol A. *J Environ Sci (China), 23*(2), 315-321. doi:10.1016/s1001-0742(10)60408-1
- Cao, J., Lin, Y., Guo, L. H., Zhang, A. Q., Wei, Y., & Yang, Y. (2010). Structure-based investigation on the binding interaction of hydroxylated polybrominated diphenyl ethers with thyroxine transport proteins. *Toxicology, 277*(1-3), 20-28. doi:10.1016/j.tox.2010.08.012
- Chauhan, K. R., Kodavanti, P. R., & McKinney, J. D. (2000). Assessing the role of ortho-substitution on polychlorinated biphenyl binding to transthyretin, a thyroxine transport protein. *Toxicol Appl Pharmacol, 162*(1), 10-21. doi:10.1006/taap.1999.8826
- Costa-e-Sousa, R. H., & Hollenberg, A. N. (2012). Minireview: The neural regulation of the hypothalamic-pituitary-thyroid axis. *Endocrinology, 153*(9), 4128-4135. doi:10.1210/en.2012-1467
- Degitz, S. J., Olker, J. H., Denny, J. S., Degoey, P. P., Hartig, P. C., Cardon, M. C., . . . Hornung, M. W. (2023). In vitro screening of per- and polyfluorinated substances (PFAS) for interference with seven thyroid hormone system targets across nine assays. *Toxicol In Vitro, 95*, 105762. doi:10.1016/j.tiv.2023.105762
- ECVAM, E. TSAR-Tracking System for Alternative methods towards Regulatory acceptance. Retrieved from https://tsar.jrc.ec.europa.eu/index.php/
- Filer, D. (2022). _tcpl: ToxCast Data Analysis Pipeline_ (Version R package version 3.0.1). Retrieved from https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=tcpl
- Freitas, J., Cano, P., Craig-Veit, C., Goodson, M. L., Furlow, J. D., & Murk, A. J. (2011). Detection of thyroid hormone receptor disruptors by a novel stable in vitro reporter gene assay. *Toxicol In Vitro, 25*(1), 257-266. doi:10.1016/j.tiv.2010.08.013
- Fu, J., Guo, Y., Wang, M., Yang, L., Han, J., Lee, J. S., & Zhou, B. (2020). Bioconcentration of 2,4,6- tribromophenol (TBP) and thyroid endocrine disruption in zebrafish larvae. *Ecotoxicol Environ Saf, 206*, 111207. doi:10.1016/j.ecoenv.2020.111207
- Hallinger, D. R., Murr, A. S., Buckalew, A. R., Simmons, S. O., Stoker, T. E., & Laws, S. C. (2017). Development of a screening approach to detect thyroid disrupting chemicals that inhibit the human sodium iodide symporter (NIS). *Toxicol In Vitro, 40*, 66-78. doi:10.1016/j.tiv.2016.12.006
- Hoermann, R., Midgley, J. E., Larisch, R., & Dietrich, J. W. (2015). Homeostatic Control of the Thyroid- Pituitary Axis: Perspectives for Diagnosis and Treatment. *Front Endocrinol (Lausanne), 6*, 177. doi:10.3389/fendo.2015.00177
- Hornung, M. W., Korte, J. J., Olker, J. H., Denny, J. S., Knutsen, C., Hartig, P. C., . . . Degitz, S. J. (2018). Screening the ToxCast Phase 1 Chemical Library for Inhibition of Deiodinase Type 1 Activity. *Toxicol Sci, 162*(2), 570-581. doi:10.1093/toxsci/kfx279
- Huang, K., Zhou, W., Fu, J., Zhang, Q., Teng, Y., Gu, L., . . . Jiang, G. (2023). Linking Transthyretin-Binding Chemicals and Free Thyroid Hormones: In Vitro to In Vivo Extrapolation Based on a Competitive Binding Model. *Environ Sci Technol, 57*(25), 9130-9139. doi:10.1021/acs.est.3c01094
- Judson, R. S., Magpantay, F. M., Chickarmane, V., Haskell, C., Tania, N., Taylor, J., . . . Thomas, R. S. (2015). Integrated Model of Chemical Perturbations of a Biological Pathway Using 18 In Vitro High-Throughput Screening Assays for the Estrogen Receptor. *Toxicol Sci, 148*(1), 137-154. doi:10.1093/toxsci/kfv168
- Kim, M. J., Moon, S., Oh, B. C., Jung, D., Ji, K., Choi, K., & Park, Y. J. (2018). Association between perfluoroalkyl substances exposure and thyroid function in adults: A meta-analysis. *PLoS One, 13*(5), e0197244. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0197244
- Kleinstreuer, N. C., Ceger, P., Watt, E. D., Martin, M., Houck, K., Browne, P., . . . Judson, R. (2017). Development and Validation of a Computational Model for Androgen Receptor Activity. *Chem Res Toxicol, 30*(4), 946-964. doi:10.1021/acs.chemrestox.6b00347
- Knudsen, T. B., Houck, K. A., Sipes, N. S., Singh, A. V., Judson, R. S., Martin, M. T., . . . Kavlock, R. J. (2011). Activity profiles of 309 ToxCast chemicals evaluated across 292 biochemical targets. *Toxicology, 282*(1-2), 1-15. doi:10.1016/j.tox.2010.12.010
- Lans, M. C., Klasson-Wehler, E., Willemsen, M., Meussen, E., Safe, S., & Bouwer, A. (1993). Structure- Dependent, Competetive interactin of hydroxy-polychlorobiphenyls, -dibenzo-p-dioxins, and - dibenzofurans with human transthyretin. *Chem. Biol. Interactions, 88*, 7-21.
- Lazofsky, A., & Buckley, B. (2022). Recent Trends in Multiclass Analysis of Emerging Endocrine Disrupting Contaminants (EDCs) in Drinking Water. *Molecules, 27*(24). doi:10.3390/molecules27248835
- Lee, D., Ahn, C., Hong, E. J., An, B. S., Hyun, S. H., Choi, K. C., & Jeung, E. B. (2016). 2,4,6-Tribromophenol Interferes with the Thyroid Hormone System by Regulating Thyroid Hormones and the Responsible Genes in Mice. *Int J Environ Res Public Health, 13*(7). doi:10.3390/ijerph13070697
- Lin, X., Wang, Y., Yang, X., Watson, P., Yang, F., & Liu, H. (2023). Endocrine disrupting effect and reproductive toxicity of the separate exposure and co-exposure of nano-polystyrene and diethylstilbestrol to zebrafish. *Sci Total Environ, 865*, 161100.
- doi:10.1016/j.scitotenv.2022.161100
- Magalhaes, J., Eira, J., & Liz, M. A. (2021). The role of transthyretin in cell biology: impact on human pathophysiology. *Cell Mol Life Sci, 78*(17-18), 6105-6117. doi:10.1007/s00018-021-03899-3
- Marchesini, G. R., Meulenberg, E., Haasnoot, W., Mizuguchi, M., & Irth, H. (2006). Biosensor recognition of thyroid-disrupting chemicals using transport proteins. *Anal Chem, 78*(4), 1107-1114. doi:10.1021/ac051399i
- Martin, M. T., Dix, D. J., Judson, R. S., Kavlock, R. J., Reif, D. M., Richard, A. M., . . . Houck, K. A. (2010). Impact of environmental chemicals on key transcription regulators and correlation to toxicity end points within EPA's ToxCast program. *Chem Res Toxicol, 23*(3), 578-590. doi:10.1021/tx900325g
- Mayasich, S. A., Korte, J. J., Denny, J. S., Hartig, P. C., Olker, J. H., DeGoey, P., . . . Hornung, M. W. (2021). Xenopus laevis and human type 3 iodothyronine deiodinase enzyme cross-species sensitivity to inhibition by ToxCast chemicals. *Toxicol In Vitro, 73*, 105141. doi:10.1016/j.tiv.2021.105141
- Meerts, I. A. T. M., Assink, Y., Cenijn, P. H., van den Berg, J. H. J., Weijers, B. M., Bergman, A., . . . Brouwer, A. (2002). Placental Transfer of a Hydroxylated Polychlorinated Biphenyl and Effects on Fetal and Maternal Thyroid Hormone Homeostasis in the Rat. *Toxicological Sciences, 68*, 361- 371.
- Mondou, M., Hickey, G. M., Rahman, H. T., Maguire, S., Pain, G., Crump, D., . . . Basu, N. (2020). Factors Affecting the Perception of New Approach Methodologies (NAMs) in the Ecotoxicology Community. *Integr Environ Assess Manag, 16*(2), 269-281. doi:10.1002/ieam.4244
- Montaño, M., Cocco, E., Guignard, C., Marsh, G., Hoffmann, L., Bergman, A., . . . Murk, A. J. (2012). New approaches to assess the transthyretin binding capacity of bioactivated thyroid hormone disruptors. *Toxicol Sci, 130*(1), 94-105. doi:10.1093/toxsci/kfs228
- Morse, D. C., Klasson Wehler, E., Wesseling, W., Koeman, J. H., & Brouwer, A. (1996). Alterations in Rat Brain Thyroid Hormone Status Following Pre- and Postnatal Exposure to Polychlorinated Biphenyls (Aroclor 1254). *Toxicology and Applied Pharmacology, 136*(2), 269-279. doi:10.1006/taap.1996.0034
- Murk, A. J., Rijntjes, E., Blaauboer, B. J., Clewell, R., Crofton, K. M., Dingemans, M. M., . . . Gutleb, A. C. (2013). Mechanism-based testing strategy using in vitro approaches for identification of thyroid hormone disrupting chemicals. *Toxicol In Vitro, 27*(4), 1320-1346. doi:10.1016/j.tiv.2013.02.012
- Naidu, R., Biswas, B., Willett, I. R., Cribb, J., Kumar Singh, B., Paul Nathanail, C., . . . Aitken, R. J. (2021). Chemical pollution: A growing peril and potential catastrophic risk to humanity. *Environ Int, 156*, 106616. doi:10.1016/j.envint.2021.106616
- Nillni, E. A. (2010). Regulation of the hypothalamic thyrotropin releasing hormone (TRH) neuron by neuronal and peripheral inputs. *Front Neuroendocrinol, 31*(2), 134-156. doi:10.1016/j.yfrne.2010.01.001
- Noyes, P. D., Friedman, K. P., Browne, P., Haselman, J. T., Gilbert, M. E., Hornung, M. W., . . . Degitz, S. J. (2019). Evaluating Chemicals for Thyroid Disruption: Opportunities and Challenges with in Vitro Testing and Adverse Outcome Pathway Approaches. *Environ Health Perspect, 127*(9), 95001. doi:10.1289/EHP5297
- Olker, J. H., Korte, J. J., Denny, J. S., Hartig, P. C., Cardon, M. C., Knutsen, C. N., . . . Hornung, M. W. (2019). Screening the ToxCast Phase 1, Phase 2, and e1k Chemical Libraries for Inhibitors of Iodothyronine Deiodinases. *Toxicol Sci, 168*(2), 430-442. doi:10.1093/toxsci/kfy302
- Olker, J. H., Korte, J. J., Denny, J. S., Haselman, J. T., Hartig, P. C., Cardon, M. C., . . . Degitz, S. J. (2021). In vitro screening for chemical inhibition of the iodide recycling enzyme, iodotyrosine deiodinase. *Toxicol In Vitro, 71*, 105073. doi:10.1016/j.tiv.2020.105073
- Ouyang, X., Froment, J., Leonards, P. E. G., Christensen, G., Tollefsen, K. E., de Boer, J., . . . Lamoree, M. H. (2017). Miniaturization of a transthyretin binding assay using a fluorescent probe for high throughput screening of thyroid hormone disruption in environmental samples. *Chemosphere, 171*, 722-728. doi:10.1016/j.chemosphere.2016.12.119
- Panda, S., & Kar, A. (2007). Apigenin (4',5,7-trihydroxyflavone) regulates hyperglycaemia, thyroid dysfunction and lipid peroxidation in alloxan-induced diabetic mice. *J Pharm Pharmacol, 59*(11), 1543-1548. doi:10.1211/jpp.59.11.0012
- Paul-Friedman, K., Martin, M., Crofton, K. M., Hsu, C. W., Sakamuru, S., Zhao, J., . . . Houck, K. A. (2019). Limited Chemical Structural Diversity Found to Modulate Thyroid Hormone Receptor in the Tox21 Chemical Library. *Environ Health Perspect, 127*(9), 97009. doi:10.1289/EHP5314
- Paul Friedman, K., Papineni, S., Marty, M. S., Yi, K. D., Goetz, A. K., Rasoulpour, R. J., . . . Peffer, R. C. (2016). A predictive data-driven framework for endocrine prioritization: a triazole fungicide case study. *Crit Rev Toxicol, 46*(9), 785-833. doi:10.1080/10408444.2016.1193722
- Paul, K. B., Hedge, J. M., Rotroff, D. M., Hornung, M. W., Crofton, K. M., & Simmons, S. O. (2014). Development of a thyroperoxidase inhibition assay for high-throughput screening. *Chem Res Toxicol, 27*(3), 387-399. doi:10.1021/tx400310w
- Prapunpoj, P., & Leelawatwattana, L. (2009). Evolutionary changes to transthyretin: structure-function relationships. *FEBS J, 276*(19), 5330-5341. doi:10.1111/j.1742-4658.2009.07243.x
- Rabah, S. A., Gowan, I. L., Pagnin, M., Osman, N., & Richardson, S. J. (2019). Thyroid Hormone Distributor Proteins During Development in Vertebrates. *Front Endocrinol (Lausanne), 10*, 506. doi:10.3389/fendo.2019.00506
- Radovic, B., Mentrup, B., & Kohrle, J. (2006). Genistein and other soya isoflavones are potent ligands for transthyretin in serum and cerebrospinal fluid. *Br J Nutr, 95*(6), 1171-1176. doi:10.1079/bjn20061779
- Ren, X. M., & Guo, L. H. (2012). Assessment of the binding of hydroxylated polybrominated diphenyl ethers to thyroid hormone transport proteins using a site-specific fluorescence probe. *Environ Sci Technol, 46*(8), 4633-4640. doi:10.1021/es2046074
- Renko, K., Hoefig, C. S., Dupuy, C., Harder, L., Schwiebert, C., Kohrle, J., & Schomburg, L. (2016). A Nonradioactive DEHAL Assay for Testing Substrates, Inhibitors, and Monitoring Endogenous Activity. *Endocrinology, 157*(12), 4516-4525. doi:10.1210/en.2016-1549
- Renko, K., Hoefig, C. S., Hiller, F., Schomburg, L., & Kohrle, J. (2012). Identification of iopanoic acid as substrate of type 1 deiodinase by a novel nonradioactive iodide-release assay. *Endocrinology, 153*(5), 2506-2513. doi:10.1210/en.2011-1863
- Renko, K., Schache, S., Hoefig, C. S., Welsink, T., Schwiebert, C., Braun, D., . . . Schomburg, L. (2015). An Improved Nonradioactive Screening Method Identifies Genistein and Xanthohumol as Potent Inhibitors of Iodothyronine Deiodinases. *Thyroid, 25*(8), 962-968. doi:10.1089/thy.2015.0058
- Richard, A. M., Judson, R. S., Houck, K. A., Grulke, C. M., Volarath, P., Thillainadarajah, I., . . . Thomas, R. S. (2016). ToxCast Chemical Landscape: Paving the Road to 21st Century Toxicology. *Chem Res Toxicol, 29*(8), 1225-1251. doi:10.1021/acs.chemrestox.6b00135
- Richardson, S. J. (2002). The evolution of transthyretin synthesis in vertebrate liver, in primitive eukaryotes and in bacteria. *Clin Chem Lab Med, 40*(12), 1191-1199. doi:10.1515/CCLM.2002.209
- Richardson, S. J. (2007). Cell and molecular biology of transthyretin and thyroid hormones. *International Review of Cytology - a Survey of Cell Biology, Vol 258, 258*, 137-193. doi:10.1016/S0074- 7696(07)58003-4
- Romanov, S., Medvedev, A., Gambarian, M., Poltoratskaya, N., Moeser, M., Medvedeva, L., . . . Makarov, S. (2008). Homogeneous reporter system enables quantitative functional assessment of multiple transcription factors. *Nat Methods, 5*(3), 253-260. doi:10.1038/nmeth.1186
- Schreiber, G. (2002). The evolutionary and integrative roles of transthyretin in thyroid hormone homeostasis. *J Endocrinol, 175*(1), 61-73. doi:10.1677/joe.0.1750061
- Sushko, I., Novotarskyi, S., Korner, R., Pandey, A. K., Rupp, M., Teetz, W., . . . Tetko, I. V. (2011). Online chemical modeling environment (OCHEM): web platform for data storage, model development and publishing of chemical information. *J Comput Aided Mol Des, 25*(6), 533-554. doi:10.1007/s10822-011-9440-2
- Tan, S. W., & Zoeller, R. T. (2007). Integrating basic research on thyroid hormone action into screening and testing programs for thyroid disruptors. *Crit Rev Toxicol, 37*(1-2), 5-10. doi:10.1080/10408440601123396
- Team, R. C. (2022). R: A language and environment for statistical computing. Vienna, Austria: R Foundation for Statistical Computing. Retrieved from https://www.R-project.org/
- Tetko, I. V. (2024). Tox24 Challenge. *Chemical Research in Toxicology*. doi:10.1021/acs.chemrestox.4c00192
- Tijani, J., Fatoaba, O., OO, B., & Petrick, L. (2016). Pharmaceuticals, endocrine disruptors, personal care products, nanomaterials and perfluorinated pollutants: a review. *Environ Chem Lett, 14*, 27-49. doi:10.1007/s10311-015-0537-z

Titus, S., Neumann, S., Zheng, W., Southall, N., Michael, S., Klumpp, C., . . . Austin, C. P. (2008). Quantitative high-throughput screening using a live-cell cAMP assay identifies small-molecule agonists of the TSH receptor. *J Biomol Screen, 13*(2), 120-127. doi:10.1177/1087057107313786

- Tomar, D., Khan, T., Singh, R. R., Mishra, S., Gupta, S., Surolia, A., & Salunke, D. M. (2012). Crystallographic study of novel transthyretin ligands exhibiting negative-cooperativity between two thyroxine binding sites. *PLoS One, 7*(9), e43522. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0043522
- USEPA. (2021). *ToxCast Database (invitroDB)*.
- USEPA. (2022). *Availability of New Approach Methodologies (NAMs) in the Endocrine Disruptor Screening Program (EDSP)*. (EPA-HQ-OPP-2021-0756-0002).
- Van den Berg, K. J., van Raaij, J. A. G. M., Bragt, P. C., & Notten, W. R. F. (1991). Interactions of halogenated industrial chemicals with transthyretin and effects on thyroid hormone levels in vivo. *Archives of Toxicology*(65), 15-19.
- van der Zalm, A. J., Barroso, J., Browne, P., Casey, W., Gordon, J., Henry, T. R., . . . Clippinger, A. J. (2022). A framework for establishing scientific confidence in new approach methodologies. *Arch Toxicol, 96*(11), 2865-2879. doi:10.1007/s00204-022-03365-4
- van Dijk, J., Gustavsson, M., Dekker, S. C., & van Wezel, A. P. (2021). Towards 'one substance one assessment': An analysis of EU chemical registration and aquatic risk assessment frameworks. *J Environ Manage, 280*, 111692. doi:10.1016/j.jenvman.2020.111692
- Vorberg, S., & Tetko, I. V. (2014). Modeling the Biodegradability of Chemical Compounds Using the Online CHEmical Modeling Environment (OCHEM). *Mol Inform, 33*(1), 73-85. doi:10.1002/minf.201300030
- Wang, H., Tang, Y., & Lei, M. (2007). Models for binding cooperativities of inhibitors with transthyretin. *Arch Biochem Biophys, 466*(1), 85-97. doi:10.1016/j.abb.2007.07.010
- Wang, J., Hallinger, D. R., Murr, A. S., Buckalew, A. R., Simmons, S. O., Laws, S. C., & Stoker, T. E. (2018). High-Throughput Screening and Quantitative Chemical Ranking for Sodium-Iodide Symporter Inhibitors in ToxCast Phase I Chemical Library. *Environ Sci Technol, 52*(9), 5417-5426. doi:10.1021/acs.est.7b06145
- Yamauchi, K., Ishihara, A., Fukazawa, H., & Terao, Y. (2003). Competitive interactions of chlorinated phenol compounds with 3,3′,5-triiodothyronine binding to transthyretin: detection of possible thyroid-disrupting chemicals in environmental waste water. *Toxicology and Applied Pharmacology, 187*(2), 110-117. doi:10.1016/s0041-008x(02)00045-5
- Zhang, J. H., Chung, T. D., & Oldenburg, K. R. (1999). A Simple Statistical Parameter for Use in Evaluation and Validation of High Throughput Screening Assays. *J Biomol Screen, 4*(2), 67-73. doi:10.1177/108705719900400206
- Zoeller, R. T., Tan, S. W., & Tyl, R. W. (2007). General background on the hypothalamic-pituitary-thyroid (HPT) axis. *Crit Rev Toxicol, 37*(1-2), 11-53. doi:10.1080/10408440601123446