Experience & Needs from industry

Feedback from L'Oreal R&I

Workshop on Use of QSAR Toolbox November 24th, 2011

L'ORÉAL



- Introduction & General feedback on the OECD Toolbox
- Case-studies highlighting several issues
 - Coverage of databases & Profilers
 - Quality /Quantity (presence/absence) of information
 - Documentation of profilers & inventories
 - Multiple databases: human vs environmental safety
 - Multiple profilers : Info available to the end-user
 - Dealing with skin and liver metabolites
 - Risk of abusing of the tool
- Concluding remarks
- Acknowledgements

Content



- L'Oreal has been following the development of the OECD Toolbox since 2007 as part of its global efforts to develop/implement alternative methods to animal testing
 - Input via both the sharing of expertise and regular feedback provided when new versions were released
 - Interest expressed in-house by different teams which are either using the Toolbox or interested in following its development as potential future end-users :
 - Developers of predictive computational approaches
 - Chemists
 - Eco(toxicologists)
 - Teams in charge of the REACh dossiers



Introduction



General feedback

- OECD Toolbox Project: provides a public software co-developed by major stakeholders involved in the development of computational approaches to fill data gaps for regulatory use
 - ECHA
 - OECD Member States
 - Academics, institutions, experts
 - Industry
 - Etc.
- High level of complexity inherent to the process of read-across
 - Consideration of Physchem properties, chemical reactivity, metabolism, toxicology, etc.

Multiple expertise required to use the tool adequately. Adequate training is essential.





Coverage of Databases

- Some of the questions raised by chemists & safety assessors at L'Oreal regarding the ~ 50.000 chemicals present in the Toolbox & their associated safety data:
 - What % of toxicological data being in the public domain is in the Toolbox?
 - What public databases are not included in the current version of the Toolbox ? Because of non authorization from institutions in charge of certain DBs, or because some data cannot at present be easily linked to adverse effects (eg HTS data)
 - Are there on-going DBs retrieval?
 - What is covered in terms of industrial use? agrochemicals (pesticides, etc), cosmetics, food ingredients, drugs, detergents, etc
 - What do we know is missing? Eg some chemicals used for a specific industrial application?
 - What % of the CAS registry is prsent in th toolbox?
 - How many chemicals have at least 1 data for human health endpoints? For Environmental endpoints?

Need for more infos/statistics on inventories/DBs included in the Toolbox



Coverage of Databases

 After selection of chemicals from DBs targeting human health endpoints, export of data was launched:



Eg DB REPDOSE Fraunhofer (615 chemicals): "All copyright from the RepDose DB are owned in full by the Fraunhofer-Gesellschaft. Permission is granted to download or print material published from the RepDose DB for personal use only. This includes use of data for categorisation of chemicals via the read across or category approach. Its use for any other purpose, and in particular its commercial use or distribution, are strictly forbidden in the absence of prior written approval. "

L'ORÉAL

Which data/quantity of data is downloadable?



Coverage of profilers

- Interest in adding to the Toolbox other profilers
 - Eg groups of flavourings defined by EFSA (interest also in adding to the Toolbox safety data on chemicals that have been assessed as food additives and food flavourings by EFSA)
 - Boundaries of these categories (more than 30) have to be defined

About EFSA	News & events	Topics A-Z	Publications	Panels & units	Cooperation	Applications helpde	sl Calls & consultation
Home > Publica	itions > EFSA Journ	al > Flavouring (Group Evaluation 7,	Revision 3			🖨 Print
EFSA Journal		EFSA	JOUR	NAL D	Sea	arch EFSA Journal	
Latest Issue						Search	Advanced Search
All Issues							
About the Jou	irnal	Flavouring Group Evaluation 7, Revision 3 (FGE.07Rev3): Saturated and					
Supporting pul	ng publications unsaturated alip			secondary alc	ohols, keton	es and esters of	secondary
Corporate pub	lications	alcohols and saturated linear or branched-chain carboxylic acids from chemical group 5					



Presence/Absence of information

- Read-across exercise on CAS 107-98-2
 - **PGME: Propylene Glycol Monomethyl Ether**
- Mutagenicity/Skin sensitization data from public sources are mentioned for the 3 analogs of PGME cited in Vink et al. (data captured from ECETOC and OECD reports)









Presence/Absence of information

The Muta/Skin sensitization data on analogs of PGME are missing in the Toolbox

	ŕ	(Target)	2	3	4
Structure		он сн _а	сна сна	CH ₂ CH ₂	and a state of the
CAS Number		107-98-2	1569-02-4	1569-01-3	5131-66-8
— Chemical Name		2-propylene glycol I-methoxy-2-propanol 2-propanol, 1-meth I-methoxypropan-2-ol I-methoxy-2-hydro I-methoxy-2-hydro	1-ethoxy-2-propanol 2-propylene glycol (1-ethoxypropan-2-ol 2-propanol, 1-ethoxy-	propylene glycol n 1-propoxypropan-2-ol 2-propanol, 1-propoxy- 1-propoxy-2-propanol	1-butoxy-2-propanol propylene glycol m 2-propanol, 1-butoxy- 1-butoxypropan-2-ol
L—Structural Formula	1	000(0)(0)	C(C)(O)COCC	000000000000000000000000000000000000000	000000000000000000000000000000000000000
⊞Physical Chemical Properties (4/10)		M: 119 °C, -95 °C,	M: 131 °C	M: 150 °C, -80 °C,	M: 172 °C
⊞Environmental Fate and Transport	(2/5)	M: 9.20E-7 atm-m3			M: 3.76E-11 cm3/
⊞Ecotoxicological Information (3/5)		VI: 5 parts per milli	M: 5 parts per million		M: 5 parts per million
무Human Health Hazards					
-Acute Toxicity					
–⊞Carcinogenicity					
-⊞Developmental Toxicity / Teratogenicity					
–⊞Genetic Toxicity					
-Immunotoxicity					
–⊞Irritation / Corrosion	(3/3)	M: 0.09		M: 1.25	M: 1.12
Neurotoxicity					
-⊞Repeated Dose Toxicity	(4/108)	M: 309 mg/kg/day,	M [.] 97 7 mg/kg/day	M: 111 mg/kg/day	M: 400 mg/kg/day
–⊞ Sensitisation	.(1/1)	M: Negative			

Information on physico-chemical and toxicological properties of



the selected source substances was obtained from publicly available review documents, i.e. for PGEE and PGPE, a dataset from ECE-TOC (ECETOC, 2005), and for PGME and PnB the SIDS Initial Assessment Report on Propylene Glycol Ethers was used (OECD) 2003).



Quality of information (1)

- Read-across applied to PGME for the AMES test
 - Categorization: No DNA binding >> OECD HPV « Propylene glycol ethers » _
 - 3/28 analogs have a data (AMES test)





Quality of information (2)

Info Gathered from the Data Gap filling window on « CAS # *0-13-1 »



Info. Gathered in the INPUT window > « CAS # *0-13-1 »

🥘 s	earc	h by CAS #					
	CAS	# 0131 V Search			C	✓ OK X Cancel	
	Select	All Clear All Invert Selection Selected 2 of 2					
Sele	cted	CA5/2D	Names	CAS/Name	2D/Name	CAS/2D	
1 Ye	1. es	С{P-}(C)(O)COCC{P-}(C)O CAS: 131				1: N/A 1: Genotoxicity OASIS	
2 Ye	2. es	C[=0][c1c[S[=0][=0]0{}.[Na]{+}]cc[S[=0][=0]0{ CAS: 131	1: benzoyloxybenzene disulpha	1: N/A 1: Skin Sensitisation	1: N/A 1: Skin Sensitisation	1: N/A 1: Skin Sensitisation	



- ---- High Quality
- ---- Low Quality
- … ✔ Low Quality, Conflict
- ---- Moderate Quality, Conflict
- ---• N/A 🤈
- ···· 🖌 (Vides)

Understanding of what is not OK for such CAS numbers is not straight forward

L'ORÉAL

Quality of information (3)

 Searching analogs of a phthalate derivative (CAS 131-17-9) by structure similarity (Tanimoto @ 95%): retrieving « CAS 110-69-0 » whith the same structure assigned and a wrong chemical name/CAS given (cf oxime)



This CAS is in red meaning a concern with the quality of the information provided: is there a possibility to exclude such chemicals from the read-across?

L'ORÉAL



Quality of information (4)

- This structure is not referenced in the Toolbox
 - Its CAS is 78418-01-6
 - Wrong information for « chemical name »





Quality of information (5)

GPMT assay not clearly indicated for CAS 84-66-2 (diethylphthalate)

					1 (Target)							
About	Structure					2						
🧕 Data poi	nts											
	Endpoint	Value	Original value	Organ	Type of method	Title	Test method / Data source	Institution and country	Year	Reference source	QA (CAS-2D)	Database name
	Skin sensitisation	Negative (Skin sensitisation II (ECETOC))	Negative (Skin sensitisation II (ECETOC))	Skin	in vivo	References Greif N, 1967. Cutaneous safety of fragrance material as measured by the maximization test. Amer. Perfum. Cosmet. 82, 54. Klecak G, Geleick H and Frey JR, 1977. Screening of fragrance materials for allergenicity in the guinea-pig. 1 Comparis	GPMT	?	01.08.1999	TR77 Skin and Respiratory Sensitisers - Reference Chemicals Data Bank.pdf	High Quality	Skin Sensitisation ECETOC
	Skin sensitisation	Negative (Skin	Negative (Skin	Skin	in vivo		LLNA	LMC,BUL	2002	Unilever	High Quality	Skin



Documentation of profilers

ER Binding Profiler

🧕 Estrogen Receptor Binding (General	Mechanistic) - Profiling Scheme Browser	
() Advanced		
Estrogen Beceptor Binding Category definitions	Profile Description	
 Moderate binder, NH2 group Moderate binder, OH grooup Non binder, impaired OH or NH2 group Non binder, MW>500 Non binder, non cyclic structure Non binder, without OH or NH2 group Strong binder, NH2 group Strong binder, OH group Very strong binder, OH group Weak binder, NH2 group Weak binder, OH group 	Non-ER binder due to high molecular weight. Estrogen receptor (ER) binding is a molecular initiating event much like protein binding (1) that may lead to a series of adverse outcomes, which are typically linked to reproductive and development hazards. It is an endpoint where several comprehensive databases exist, which has lead to the development of several approaches for using (Q) SARs to predict ER-binding and possible subsequent endocrine disruption (2). Popular among these are the "four phase" assessment that includes Comparative Molecular Field Analysis (CoMFA) (3) and the Common Reactivity Pattern Approach (COREPA) (4). Since the RE-binding is a receptor mediated event, particular organic functional groups, size and shape are critical to binding potency. A schematic representation of an ER binding pocket with its three sites of interaction (A, B, O) is shown in Figure 1.	General in on ER Bind Should b moved to the « Ab section. Add a sente explaining the ER pro- of the Tool
A lot of information not easy to understand for an end-user not familiar with	E 333 A R 394	on structu motifs & N ranges?
 the FDA NCCT « four phase » approach the ERBA OASIS database (transparent for end-users knowing OASI software – Need for a Ref or weblink) 	Chemicals that are too large cannot bind to the receptor regardless of structure or shape. While chemicals with a Molecular Weight of greater that 1000 are reported to be too large to bind to the receptor (2, 3) a review of the ER-binding database(ERBA OASIS) within the Toolbox reveals that no chemical with a molecular weight greater that 500 has been shown to bind to the ER receptor (Figure 2).	To add: •Reference/w for the OASI •Species (Rat Trout? Huma •Receptor sul (Erα? Erβ?) Helsinki - Nov 24, 2011

ntro ling: be out » ence that filer lbox olely ıral MW

vebling IS DB t? an?) btype 15



Documentation of Inventories

Cannot find any information on the COSING inventory



- Add a « Help » functionality with searches by keywords (to complement the info available on the OECD Toolbox website)?
 - Cf need to retrieve information as quickly as possible

L'ORÉAL



 Very important to have multiple DB but would be easier to use if DB targeting human-health safety were separated from DB targeting environmental safety



Complex for end-users not familiar with « OASIS » tools or with the latest evolutions of the Cramer classification

Multiple profilers (1)

Profiling methods		
Select All Unselect All Invert About		
····· Predefined		
- V Database Affiliation		
- V Inventory Affiliation		
OECD HPV Chemical Categories		
Substance Type		
US-EPA New Chemical Categories		
General Mechanistic		
- V DNA binding by OASIS		41 Cat
		115 Cat
- Protein binding by OASIS		67 Cat
	J	122 Cat
Superfragments		20 No. additional explanation available
Toxic hazard classification by Cramer (original)		39 Nodes to the and user to know whether to
Toxic hazard classification by Cramer (with extension)		44 Nodes to the end-user to know whether to
Endpoint Specific		use Cramer with extensions or not
Acute aquatic toxicity classification by Verhaar		
Acute aquatic toxicity MOA by OASIS		
Aquatic toxicity classification by ECOSAR		
Bioaccumulation – metabolism alerts		
Bioaccumulation – metabolism half-lives		
Biodegradation fragments (BioWIN MITI)		
Eye irritation/corrosion Exclusion rules by BfR		
Eye irritation/corrosion Inclusion rules by BfR		
Micronucleus alerts by Benigni/Bossa		
Mutagenicity/Carcinogenicity alerts by Benigni/Bossa		S Ringeissen – Workshon FCHA – Helsinki - Nov 24 2011 18



Too complex for end-users to have 4 different profilers built on organic functional groups ?







Importance of using the skin metabolism simulator

- Ethylene diamine (CAS 107-15-3)
 - Use of the skin metabolism simulator
 - 6 metabolites proposed for the target -> the dialdehyde glioxal is among predicted metabolites (cf Schiff base formation leading to skin sensitization)



Primary amines undergoing oxidative deamination to aldehydes > Need infos on parent chemicals producing - via biotic metabolism - aldehydes (causing SS via Shiff Base formation) (currently missing in the simulator documentation)

Inherent complexity when dealing with metabolites (1)

Dipropyl- (CAS 131-16-8) versus Diallylphthalate (CAS 131-17-9)



S. Wu et al. / Regulatory Toxicology and Pharmacology 56 (2010) 67-81

- Use of the liver metabolism simulator (cf no metabolites retrieved when using « observed liver metabolism »)
 - 12 metabolites proposed for diallylphthalate-> it becomes rapidly difficult to handle the multiple compounds (parent & metabolites) in the software





Inherent complexity when dealing with metabolites (2)

	1 (Target)	2		
Structure				
Liver metabolism simulator	12 metabolites	4 metabolites		
— Database Affiliation	12 x (N/A)	4 x (N/A)		
-Inventory Affiliation	12 x (N/A)	4 x (N/A)		
OECD HPV Chemical Categories	12 x (N/A)	4 x (N/A) 4 x Discrete chemical		
-Substance Type	12 x Discrete chemical			
— US-EPA New Chemical Categories	 2 x (N/A) 1 x Acrylates/Methacrylates (Acute to 2 x Aldehydes (Acute toxicity) 2 x Anionic Surfactants 2 x Epoxides 5 x Esters (Acute toxicity) 	1 x Aldehydes (Acute toxicity) 1 x Anionic Surfactants 1 x Esters (Acute toxicity) 1 x Neutral Organics		
— DNA binding by OASIS	1 x Alpha, beta unsaturated aldehydes 2 x Epoxides, Aziridines 9 x No binding	D>x Aldehydes 3 x No binding		
	 x Alpha, beta- unsaturated aldehydes x Epoxides x MA: Direct Acting Epoxides and r x MA: Direct Acting Schiff Base For x MA: Polarised Alkenes_Michael a x Mechanistic Domain: Michael addi x Mechanistic Domain: Schiff base x Mechanistic Domain: SN2 x Mono aldehydes 	 MA: Direct Acting Schiff Base F 1 x Mechanistic Domain: Schiff base 1 x Mono aldehydes 3 x No Binding 		

ĽORÉAL



Risk of abusing of the tool (1)

CAS 84-66-2 (diethylphthalate) : Read-across for Skin Sensitization

- Profiling:
 - Rq: No category « Phthalates » available
 - No Protein-binding category
 - ECOSAR, US EPA : category « Esters »
 - Organic Functional groups (nested): « Arene, carboxylic acid ester »
 - 51/1353 analogs have a skin sensitization data
 - Sub-categorization with « chemical elements » >> 23/306 analogs have a SS data
 - » Dimethyl & Dipropylphthalate are missing since no SS data available
 - » Dibutylphthalate is Neg in LLNA





Risk of abusing of the tool (2)

- CAS 84-66-2 (diethylphthalate) : Read-across for Skin Sensitization
 - Further sub-categorization done with a focus on analogs of the category « No protein binding »
 - Only 1/5 neighbours is a phthalate (Dibutylphthalate in blue below), other neighbours are dior tri-carboxylates (meta or para substitutions, not ortho as it is for phthalates)



L'ORÉAL

In the end: Read-across is conclusive? Inconclusive?



Conclusion on the OECD Toolbox

- A powerful tool made publicly available
- More development/refinement would make it more user-friendly and increase confidence in the data obtained
 - include a reliability index to read-across outcomes?
- Training is key to ensure as much as possible a proper use
- Appropriate use requires multiple expertise



- A special thanks to my colleagues for their feedback on the Toolbox, in particular:
 - J Clouzeau, S Morand (Safety assessors)
 - L Colombe (Ecotoxicologist)

Thanks for your attention!