

Comment on “Toxicokinetics of bisphenol A, bisphenol S, and bisphenol F in a pregnancy sheep model”.

Flore Grandin^a, Véronique Gayrard^{a*}, Nicole Picard-Hagen^a, Pierre-Louis Toutain^b.

^aToxalim, INRA (Institut National de la Recherche Agronomique), Université de Toulouse, ENVT (Ecole Nationale Vétérinaire de Toulouse), EIP (Ecole d'Ingénieurs de Purpan), UPS (Université Paul Sabatier), Toulouse, France

^bThe Royal Veterinary College, University of London, London, United Kingdom

Corresponding author*: Véronique Gayrard, UMR1331 Toxalim, Ecole Nationale Vétérinaire de Toulouse, 23 chemin des Capelles, BP 87614, 31076 Toulouse cedex 3, France, Tel.: 33 (0) 33 5 61 19 39 18, E-mail: v.gayrard@envt.fr

1 **Comment on “Toxicokinetics of bisphenol A, bisphenol S, and bisphenol F in a**
2 **pregnancy sheep model”.**

3

4 Gingrich et al. (2019) report a comparative toxicokinetic (TK) study of Bisphenol A (BPA),
5 Bisphenol S (BPS) and Bisphenol F (BPF) in the pregnant ewe model after a single
6 subcutaneous administration of BPS or a mixture of BPA, BPS and BPF.

7

8 The topic is highly relevant. Unfortunately, many errors were noted in the calculation of TK
9 parameters. In the results reported, the disposition of aglycone is systematically confused
10 with that of the corresponding glucuronide, and the interpretation of computed or observed
11 data is therefore erroneous. This makes the paper misleading in a field that does not need
12 these kinds of error to fuel debates that are already heated and confusing. Inspection of
13 Table 2 immediately indicates that the computed clearances (CL) of 45.4 mL/h for BPA (but
14 actually BPA plus BPAG) or the clearance of 5.2 ml/h for BPS (but actually BPS and BPSG) are
15 impossible from a biological point of view. Indeed, this is clearly illustrated by the estimation
16 of Volume of Distribution (V_{ss}) from the product of Mean Residence Time (MRT) and
17 Clearance (CL) (Toutain and Bousquet-Melou, 2004). The computed MRTs of 8.3h for BPA
18 and 6.7h for BPS produce an estimated V_{ss} of 4.94 and 0.457 ml/kg for BPA and BPS,
19 respectively. However, these values are not plausible, given that the minimal possible V_{ss} for
20 any substance is the plasma volume (i.e. about 40mL/kg in sheep). This error in the
21 computation of plasma clearance is rooted in the flawed computation of the corresponding
22 AUC (0.81 and 7.5 mg*h/mL for BPA and BPS, respectively). The order of magnitude of these
23 AUCs can be readily obtained by dividing the maximal observed plasma concentration (C_{max}

24 of 66.7 and 643 ng/mL for BPA and BPS, respectively) by the slope of the terminal phase
25 (that is equal to $0.693/\text{half-life}$) (Toutain and Bousquet-Mélou, 2004). This leads to
26 computed AUCs of 0.000510 and 0.00343 mg*h/mL for BPA and BPS, respectively. These
27 roughly estimated AUCs are 1588 to 2185 fold lower than those reported in the present
28 article and we suspect that the authors, at the very least, made an error in handling their
29 concentration units. Using correctly computed AUCs would lead to estimates of total BPA
30 and BPS plasma clearance (actually CL/F , with F the bioavailability factor associated with the
31 subcutaneous administration) of about 980 and 146 mL/Kg/h. These values would be of the
32 same order of magnitude as the plasma clearance that we directly measured using an IV
33 administration of BPAG and BPSG in sheep (333 and 49 mL/kg/h) for BPAG and BPSG
34 (Gauderat et al., 2016; Grandin et al., 2018). The remaining difference is probably due in part
35 to incomplete bioavailability following the subcutaneous administration of BPA and BPS.

36

37 Moreover, the authors wrote in their “Toxicokinetic analysis” section that the TK parameters
38 were calculated using the plasma concentrations of total BPA, BPS, or BPF (i.e. unconjugated
39 and conjugated forms of bisphenols). Bisphenol metabolites and bisphenol aglycone are
40 distinct substances with their own physico-chemical properties and their own dispositions.
41 Therefore, total bisphenol concentrations cannot be considered for a meaningful TK analysis.
42 Given that the ratio of the bisphenol metabolite over bisphenol aglycone is about 100 for
43 BPA (Gauderat et al., 2016) and 10 for BPS (Grandin et al., 2018), the results published by
44 Gingrich et al. describe the disposition of the bisphenol metabolites i.e. BPAG and BPSG
45 rather than the disposition of bisphenol aglycone, at least for BPA and BPS. Hence the main
46 message conveyed by the present paper is not related to BPA and BPS but to their mainly
47 inactive metabolite.

48

49 Other surprising results are the urinary concentrations. It is claimed that 9h after bisphenol
50 administration, the *peak maternal urine concentrations for BPA and BPS* were 1300 and 3870
51 ng/ml, respectively. Again, this is very unlikely as the daily urine output in sheep is similar to
52 that of humans (i.e. 1.5L for sheep of 76.3Kg BW). If, as a worst-case scenario, we consider
53 that these so-called maximal urine concentrations are similar to the average urine
54 concentration, the total amounts of BPA/BPAG and BPS/BPSG that are eliminated by urine
55 over 24h are no more than 2 and 6 mg in total, i.e. about 5 and 16% of the administered
56 dose of 36.7 mg, for BPA/BPAG and BPS/BPSG, respectively. This is at variance with the
57 literature reports that most of the BPA/BPAG is eliminated in urine over 24 h (Gauderat et
58 al., 2016). The discrepancy of the authors' result may be due to the low bioavailability of the
59 two tested compounds or, more likely, to the fact that most of the dose had already been
60 eliminated during the first hours following subcutaneous administration and was simply
61 missed by the sampling design because the first urine sampling at 9h post-administration
62 was too late.

63

64 The interpretation of the results is also questionable. For instance, the authors suggest that
65 a first-pass effect may reduce the terminal half-life of a substance or compare MRTs (as
66 computed for an extravascular route with a mixture of the aglycone and its conjugate) with a
67 half-life, as obtained after an IV administration. The authors may not have realized that MRT
68 are additives, not half-lives, and that what they actually measured were not the genuine
69 MRTs of the different substances under investigation (only possible by an IV administration)
70 but an overall MRT that includes a Mean Absorption time (MAT) plus a Mean Time of

71 conjugation of bisphenol aglycone into the bisphenol metabolite. This misunderstanding
72 makes any comparison with the results obtained for Bisphenols by IV route meaningless.

73

74 Finally, the authors indicate in their conclusion that “this is the first report on the
75 toxicokinetic of either BPS and BPF in a pregnancy model”. This statement is, to our
76 knowledge, correct for BPF but, for BPS, the first toxicokinetic parameters were published in
77 Environment International and have been available since August 2018 (Grandin et al., 2018).

78

79 *The authors declare they have no competing financial interests.*

80

81 Flore Grandin^a, Véronique Gayrard^{a*}, Nicole Picard-Hagen^a, Pierre-Louis Toutain^b.

82

83 ^a Toxalim, INRA (Institut National de la Recherche Agronomique), Université de Toulouse,
84 ENVT (Ecole Nationale Vétérinaire de Toulouse), EIP (Ecole d’Ingénieurs de Purpan), UPS
85 (Université Paul Sabatier), Toulouse, France

86 ^b The Royal Veterinary College, University of London, London, United Kingdom

87

88 **Corresponding author***: Véronique Gayrard, UMR1331 Toxalim, Ecole Nationale Vétérinaire
89 de Toulouse, 23 chemin des Capelles, BP 87614, 31076 Toulouse cedex 3, France, Tel.: 33 (0)
90 33 5 61 19 39 18, E-mail: v.gayrard@envt.fr

91

92 **References**

93 Gauderat, G., Picard-Hagen, N., Toutain, P.-L., Corbel, T., Viguié, C., Puel, S., Lacroix, M.Z.,
94 Mindeguia, P., Bousquet-Melou, A., Gayrard, V., 2016. Bisphenol A glucuronide
95 deconjugation is a determining factor of fetal exposure to bisphenol A. Environment
96 International 86, 52–59. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envint.2015.10.006>

97 Gingrich, J., Pu, Y., Ehrhardt, R., Karthikraj, R., Kannan, K., Veiga-Lopez, A., 2019.
98 Toxicokinetics of bisphenol A, bisphenol S, and bisphenol F in a pregnancy sheep
99 model. *Chemosphere* 220, 185–194.
100 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chemosphere.2018.12.109>

101 Grandin, F.C., Lacroix, M.Z., Gayraud, V., Gauderat, G., Mila, H., Toutain, P.-L., Picard-Hagen,
102 N., 2018. Bisphenol S instead of Bisphenol A: Toxicokinetic investigations in the ovine
103 materno-feto-placental unit. *Environment International* 120, 584–592.
104 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envint.2018.08.019>

105 Toutain, P.L., Bousquet-Melou, A., 2004. Volumes of distribution. *Journal of Veterinary*
106 *Pharmacology and Therapeutics* 27, 441–453. [https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2885.2004.00602.x)
107 [2885.2004.00602.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2885.2004.00602.x)

108 Toutain, P.L., Bousquet-Mélou, A., 2004. Plasma terminal half-life. *Journal of Veterinary*
109 *Pharmacology and Therapeutics* 27, 427–439. [https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2885.2004.00600.x)
110 [2885.2004.00600.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2885.2004.00600.x)
111