Disruption of the prostaglandin metabolome and characterization of the pharmaceutical exposome in fish exposed to wastewater treatment works effluent as revealed by nanoflow-nanospray mass spectrometry-based metabolomics

*Arthur David,† Anke Lange,‡ Alaa Abdul-Sada,† Charles R. Tyler,‡ and Elizabeth M. Hill†**

†School of Life Sciences. University of Sussex. Brighton. U.K. BN1 9QG.

‡ Biosciences, College of Life & Environmental Sciences. University of Exeter, Exeter. U.K EX4 4QD.

*To whom correspondence should be addressed:

Tel: +44 1273 678382

Fax: 44 1273 877586

email: E.M.Hill@sussex.ac.uk

18 **Abstract**.

19 Fish can be exposed to a complex mixture of chemical contaminants, including
20 pharmaceuticals, present in discharges of wastewater treatment works (WwTWs) effluents.
21 There is little information on the effects of effluent exposure on fish metabolism, especially
22 the small molecule signaling compounds which are the biological target of many
23 pharmaceuticals. We applied a newly developed sensitive nanoflow-nanospray mass
24 spectrometry non-targeted profiling technique to identify changes in the exposome and
25 metabolome of roach (*Rutilus rutilus*) exposed to a final WwTWs effluent for 15 days. Effluent
26 exposure resulted in widespread reduction (between 50% and 90%) in prostaglandin (PG)
27 profiles in fish tissues and plasma with disruptions also in tryptophan/ serotonin, bile acid and
28 lipid metabolism. Metabolite disruptions were not explained by altered expression of genes
29 associated with the PG or tryptophan metabolism. Of the 31 pharmaceutical metabolites that
30 were detected in the effluent exposome of fish, 6 were non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs
31 but with plasma concentrations too low to disrupt PG biosynthesis. PGs, bile acids and
32 tryptophan metabolites are important mediators regulating a diverse array of physiological
33 systems in fish and the identity of wastewater contaminants disrupting their metabolism
34 warrants further investigation on their exposure effects on fish health.

35

36 **1. Introduction**

37 Fish inhabiting lowland rivers are often exposed to reductions in water quality caused
38 by discharges of effluents from wastewater treatment works (WwTWs). Treated wastewaters
39 contain a wide range of biologically active man-made chemicals including pharmaceuticals,
40 personal care products and pesticides, which maybe incompletely removed during influent
41 treatment resulting in their temporally varying concentrations in the receiving waters.[1] Many
42 studies have reported the presence of numerous pharmaceuticals from different therapeutic
43 classes in final effluents and surface waters including non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs
44 (NSAIDs), selective serotonin reuptake inhibitors (SSRIs), antipsychotics, statins and fibrates,
45 beta blockers, and anticoagulants.[1-3] Pharmaceuticals are designed to interact with high
46 affinity with specific biological targets (e.g. receptors, enzymes) in humans and livestock (for
47 veterinary pharmaceuticals) and these targets can be evolutionary conserved and functional
48 in fish and other vertebrates,[4] which may lead to unwanted pharmacological effects in non-
49 target species. A challenge for the environmental community is to prioritize chemicals for risk
50 assessment and monitoring in order to improve the quality of surface and ground waters.

51 The read-across hypothesis assumes that internal drug concentrations in blood plasma
52 of wildlife which are similar to human therapeutic plasma concentrations (HtPC) may result
53 in expected 'therapeutic' effects in non-target organisms.[5] For example, exposure to some
54 anti-depressant SSRIs affect behavioural responses in fish at plasma concentrations similar to
55 the HtPC.[6,7] However, because fish populations can be exposed to complex mixtures of
56 biologically active chemicals,[8-10] identifying associations between exposure to their mixtures
57 and health outcomes is extremely difficult.[11] To date, most analytical methods monitoring
58 exposure of fish to effluents have used a targeted approach based on selection of key

59 contaminants and metabolite pathways and are thus limited in their assessments of the risk
60 of exposure to chemical mixtures.[e.g 8-.10] An untargeted analytical approach based on liquid
61 chromatography high resolution mass spectrometry (LC-MS) combined with chemometric
62 pattern recognition can identify chemical mixtures accumulating in fish (i.e., the exposome)
63 and simultaneously investigate for any associated disruption of metabolite profiles (the
64 metabolome). Using this approach, previous studies have demonstrated that exposure to
65 contaminants in wastewater effluents results in disruptions to lipid, steroid and bile acid
66 metabolism and uptake of a variety of household and personal care products in fish blood
67 plasma.[e.g 12-14] However, until now metabolite profiling methods have not been able to detect
68 trace levels of contaminants, endocrine or other signaling compounds present in tissues or
69 plasma extracts. Recently, we have demonstrated that the detection of less abundant
70 components in samples can be improved by using highly sensitive nanoflow/nanospray LC-
71 MS combined with appropriate sample preparation methods.[15-17] An additional advantage of
72 the method is that the chemical exposome, including pharmaceuticals, can also be profiled
73 alongside the metabolome in the same sample. Hence, an untargeted analytical approach,
74 based on nanoflow ultraperfomance liquid chromatography-nanoelectrospray ionization-
75 time-of-flight mass spectrometry (nUPLC-nESI-TOFMS) offers a very promising tool for
76 advancing ecotoxicological investigations in fish exposed to the complex mixtures of
77 contaminants present in WwTWs effluents.

78 The aim of this study was to investigate the effects of exposure to a final treated
79 wastewater effluent and the resultant uptake of a complex chemical exposome on the tissue
80 and plasma metabolome of fish. Extracts of blood plasma and tissues from effluent-exposed
81 and control fish were profiled using our newly developed nUPLC-nESI-TOFMS method in order

82 to reach unprecedented levels of sensitivity and enable the detection of signaling compounds
83 and contaminants present at very low concentrations. Our work revealed, for the first time,
84 widespread disruption of signaling metabolites including prostaglandins (PGs), in tissues of
85 effluent-exposed fish which could not be explained solely by the components of the
86 pharmaceutical exposome known to target PG biosynthesis. As PGs are important signaling
87 agents mediating a number of fish physiological processes, this study highlights the
88 importance of understanding the mixture effects of contaminants present in wastewaters on
89 fish health.

90 **2. Materials and Methods**

91 Sources of chemicals and standards are given in the Supporting Information.

92 2.1 Effluent characteristics

93 The WwTW chosen for this study received 95% influent from a domestic source
94 (population equivalent of 117,574) and 5% input from industrial wastewaters. The influent
95 was treated by fine screens, chemically assisted settlement, biological aerated flooded filter
96 processes and UV disinfection. During the exposure period, the pH of the effluent was 7.3,
97 concentrations of suspended solids 21 mg/l, biochemical oxygen demand 11 mg/l, chemical
98 oxygen demand 67 mg/l and total ammonia 29 mg/L (South West Water data).

99 2.2 Fish exposure

100 A mixed-sex population of sexually mature roach [*Rutilus rutilus,* age 2+, length of 14.5
101 ± 1.3 cm and weight 45.4 ± 12.1 g (mean ± SEM)] was exposed to either a final treated WwTWs
102 effluent or clean water (control). Roach were exposed in triplicate tanks (20 fish per 200 L

103 tank) containing either dechlorinated water or 100% effluent for 15 days. The flow rate was
104 10 L/min and the tanks were continually aerated with an average temperature of 12 ºC ± 1
105 and a light dark cycle of 15h:9h. During the first 7 days of exposure, mortality occurred
106 amongst 8 out of 60 of effluent-exposed fish, while no mortalities occurred in the control
107 group. At the end of the experimental period, fish were terminated using an overdose of
108 phenoxyethanol according to UK Home Office regulations. Blood was collected from the
109 caudal vein using heparinized needles and samples were centrifuged (5 min, 10,000 RCF) and
110 the plasma supernatant collected. Gonads, kidney (posterior), gill and liver tissues were
111 dissected out and immediately snap frozen in liquid nitrogen. All samples were stored at −70
112 °C until analysis.

113 Wastewater effluent samples (2 x 2.5 litres) were collected in solvent washed, acid
114 rinsed amber glass bottles on days 0, 7, 15 of the exposure period. Samples were stored at 4
115 °C with the addition of acetic acid (1%) and methanol (5%) and were extracted within 12 h
116 after collection.

117 2.3 Sample preparation for nUHPLC-nESI-TOFMS profiling

118 Plasma samples were analyzed from up to 5 fish per replicate tank and in total 30
119 females and 25 males were analyzed (males were present in lower proportion than females
120 in the mixed sex population). Plasma samples (85-120 µL) were prepared as described in David
121 et al.[15] Previous studies have shown that this method, using phospolipid removal followed by
122 mixed-mode cation exchange plates, extracts non polar, cationic and anionic metabolites
123 (e.g., amino acids, neurotransmitters, bile acids, lipids, eicosanoids and steroids) as well as
124 contaminants such as pharmaceuticals from plasma samples. Briefly, methanol with 1%

125 formic acid (FA) was added to each sample to a final proportion of 80/20 methanol/plasma
126 (v/v). An internal standard (IS) mixture containing a mix of seven compounds (venlafaxine-d6,
127 propranolol-d7, carbamazepine-d10 and fluoxetine-d5 for the +ESI mode and prostaglandin
128 E2-d4, diclofenac-d4 and triclosan-C13 for the –ESI mode) was added to the plasma extracts.
129 The amount of IS added were adjusted to give a final concentration of 5 ng IS/120 µL of
130 plasma. Full details of plasma extraction using Phree and SPE plates are given in the
131 Supporting Information.

132 Testes (0.28-0.47 g), kidney (0.09-0.17 g), gill (0.28-0.47 g) and liver (0.09-0.20 g),
133 tissues were extracted in glass tubes (5 mL) using three volumes of methanol and a Microson
134 XL2000 ultrasonic probe (Misonix Farmingdale) (15W x 30s).[18] Before extraction, the mix of
135 seven IS was added to each tissue extract to give a final concentration of 5 ng IS to 0.4 g of
136 testes, to 0.15 g of kidney or gill and to 0.35 g of liver. After extraction, samples were,
137 centrifuged (13,000 RCF for 20 min) and supernatants collected. The samples were diluted to
138 20% water (HPLC grade) and extracted using the Phree and SPE plates (see Supporting
139 Information).

140 2.4 Extraction of wastewater samples for nUHPLC-nESI-TOFMS analysis of NSAIDs.

141 Final wastewater effluent samples (1 L) were spiked with the IS mix, and filtered
142 through glass wool and filter paper Whatman No1 (Whatman, Maidstone, UK). Samples were
143 extracted through an Oasis HLB (20 mL, 1 g) cartridge, which was pre-conditioned with 10 mL
144 of methanol and 10 mL HPLC water. The cartridge was washed with 20 mL of distilled water
145 and dried under vacuum. Analytes were eluted with 10 mL of methanol and 10 mL of ethyl

146 acetate. Extracts were dried and reconstituted in 1 mL of methanol and 300 mL of the extract
147 evaporated and purified using the Strata-X-C SPE protocol as described for tissue samples.

148 2.5 nUHPLC-nESI-TOFMS

149 The methods used for the nUHPLC-nESI-TOFMS profiling of small molecules have been
150 established in our laboratory.[15, 17] The nUHPLC-nESI-TOFMS injections were performed on a
151 Waters nanoAcquity UPLC linked to a Waters Xevo G2 TOFMS, equipped with a nESI source
152 (Waters, Manchester, U.K) (see Supporting Information for analytical details).

153 2.6. Quality control

154 For the metabolomics analysis, two work-up samples (i.e. extraction without sample)
155 per analytical batch were prepared to monitor for background contaminants. Quality control
156 (QC) samples comprising a composite sample of the control extracts (diluted two fold) were
157 prepared in order to monitor for nUHPLC-nESI-TOFMS repeatability and sensitivity during
158 analysis of a sample run. Each run commenced with the injection of the blank work-up
159 samples followed by injection of 3 QC samples to equilibrate the source. The samples were
160 injected randomly with QC samples analysed after every 6 samples. In total, 151 samples
161 (excluding QCs) were injected in both +ESI and -ESI MS modes.

162 2.7 Chemometric analyses

163 Mass spectra were collected in full scan mode (50 to 1000 m/z) and spectral peaks
164 were deconvoluted and aligned using TransOmics algorithm (Waters, Manchester, UK). Peak
165 picking was performed creating an aggregate dataset from all sample files in which the MS
166 features were binned into retention time (Rt) x m/z values. Datasets were exported to SIMCA

167 software (Umetrics, Crewe, UK) for multivariate analysis (principal component analysis, PCA)
168 in order to examine class separating differences between control and exposed groups. Data
169 sets were log transformed and pareto scaled, and models were developed using the database
170 of *n* (from 10 to 15) different fish per class. PCAs were performed in order to observe
171 clustering between treatments, and models were evaluated through an examination of
172 explained variation (R2X) and predictive ability (Q2X) parameters. In order to determine
173 which contaminants and metabolites influence discrimination between two classes, the
174 datasets were modelled using orthogonal partial least squares to latent structures (OPLS)
175 method which were assessed by the explained variation (R2Y) and predictive ability (Q2Y). Rt
176 x m/z signals pertaining to discriminatory contaminants or metabolites were detected using
177 an 'S' plot of the OPLS model. [e.g. 13, 18, 19] Signals associated with the presence of chemical
178 contaminants arising from effluent exposure were identified as only present in effluent-
179 exposed fish and not detected in any replicates from control fish or from work-up blank
180 samples. Signals corresponding to metabolite markers were either decreased in control fish
181 or increased in effluent-exposed fish but also present in control fish but not in work-up blanks.
182 The signal intensity of suspected metabolite markers of effluent exposure were normalized
183 to the area of the closest IS. Analysis, using the Kruskal-Wallis test, of replicate fish from each
184 of the triplicate tanks from the two exposure treatments revealed no significant intertank
185 variability for any metabolite marker. Hence, metabolites from fish from replicate tanks were
186 analyzed as one treatment for each exposure by non-parametric Mann-Whitney U-test (SPSS,
187 IBM) with a correction for a false discovery rate of 5%.[20]

188 The putative identities of contaminants and metabolites were determined from
189 screening the m/z of molecular ion using Metabosearch

190 (http://omics.georgetown.edu/metabosearch.html) which searched databases of the Human
191 Metabolome Database (http://www.hmdb.ca/), PubChem
192 (http://pubchem.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/), METLIN (http://metlin.scripps.edu/) and LipidMaps
193 (http://www.lipidmaps.org/). Chemical identity was confirmed from accurate mass, isotopic
194 fit and fragmentation data obtained from high energy collisional-induced dissociation and
195 from comparison in- house with standard compounds or with open source databases.

196 2.8 Targeted analysis of NSAIDs by nUHPLC-nESI-TOFMS

197 NSAIDs were quantified in the profiling datasets of tissues and plasma and also after
198 nUHPLC-nESI-TOFMS analysis of wastewater extracts (see Supporting Information for details)
199 Method detection and method quantification limits (MDLs, MQLs) are given in Tables S1 and
200 S5.

201 2.9 Gene expression analysis

202 Quantitative real-time RT-PCR (RT-QPCR) was performed on male and female gill, liver
203 and gonad tissue samples to quantify the expression profiles of transcripts encoding enzymes
204 for which related metabolites were found to change in the prostaglandin and serotonin
205 pathways. The targets were prostaglandin-endoperoxide synthase 1 (*ptgs1*), prostaglandin-
206 endoperoxide synthase 2b (*ptgs2b*), prostaglandin E synthase (*ptges*) and cytosolic
207 phospholipase A2 (*pla2g4*) in the prostaglandin pathway and monoamine oxidase (*mao*),
208 dopa decarboxylase (aromatic amino acid decarboxylase, *ddc*), aldehyde oxidase 1 (*aox1*),
209 tryptophan 2,3-dioxygenase a (*tdo2a*) and tryptophan 2,3-dioxygenase b (*tdo2b*) in the
210 serotonin pathway. Details on RNA analyses, primer sequences, sizes of PCR products and
211 PCR assay conditions are provided in Supporting Information and Table S2. Samples from 3

212 fish per tank were analysed and the Chauvenet's criterion[21] was applied to detect any outliers
213 in the transcript expression data. Identified outliers were removed from the data set prior to
214 statistical analyses. Data were analyzed using a t-test comparing transcript expression
215 between all control and exposed fish and results of all tests were accepted as significant at p
216 < 0.05 (IBM SPSS Statistics for Windows, Version 21.0.0).

217

218 **3. Results and Discussion**

219 3.1 nUHPLC-nESI-TOFMS profiling of roach plasma and tissues

220 Extracts of blood plasma from male and female roach exposed to either a treated
221 WwTWs effluent or to clean water were profiled by nUPLC-nESI-TOFMS in both +ESI and -ESI
222 modes. PCA modeling of the datasets revealed clear separation between control and effluent-
223 exposed roach of both sexes on the first component of the scores plots (-ESI mode Figure 1,
224 +ESI mode, Figure S1). In these plots, the QC samples clustered together indicating that the
225 profiling methods were highly repeatable with little analytical variability. The datasets were
226 further analyzed by OPLS modeling which revealed highly predictable models for control and
227 exposed datasets from either male or female roach (R2Y of >0.99 and Q2Y>0.69). No
228 separation according to sex was observed in effluent-exposed roach in either the PCA or OPLS
229 models indicating that the response (in terms of plasma chemical profiles) to effluent
230 exposure was similar in female and male fish. Therefore, female tissue samples (gills, liver
231 and the posterior kidney which contains both renal cells and macrophages) were analyzed as
232 they were available in greater numbers than males. Extracts of testes tissue from males were
233 also profiled because it is known that PGs play important roles in sexual differentiation[22] and

234 the association between exposure to WwTWs effluents and feminization of male fish has
235 been well documented.[e.g.23] The PCA of the datasets of all tissue extracts revealed a clear
236 separation between samples from control and exposed fish (Figure S2).

237 3.2 Metabolite markers of effluent exposure

238 From analysis of the 'S' loading plots of the OPLS models of the plasma datasets, it was
239 apparent that most of the chemicals driving the separation between control and effluent-
240 exposed fish were contaminants which were only detected in plasma of exposed fish (see
241 section 3.3 below). However, ten metabolite structures were identified as significant markers
242 of effluent exposure (Table 1). In agreement with a previous study,[14] exposure to WwTWs
243 effluent resulted in disrupted metabolism of plasma bile acids and lipids. After effluent
244 exposure, the plasma concentrations of two conjugated secondary bile acids were increased
245 by 5-12 fold (female and male fish) for taurodeoxycholic acid, and 39-56 fold for a
246 taurolithocholic acid-like structure. No changes in the levels of primary bile acids, such as
247 taurocholic acid and cyprinol sulfate, were detected. Little is known about the effect of
248 chemical exposures on disruption of bile acid profiles in fish or mammals, however secondary
249 bile acids are formed by the metabolism of gut microflora.[24,25] It is possible that the observed
250 increase in metabolism of secondary bile acids was a result of disruption of the community or
251 gene expression of resident gut bacteria as a result of exposure to chemical components in
252 the effluent. Increases in the lipid metabolite sphinganine (9- fold) and its potential precursor,
253 a palmitoyl serine type metabolite (177-227 fold), were also observed indicating disruption in
254 sphingolipid signaling.

255 In our study, the use of more sensitive nanoflow/nanospray LC-MS profiling methods
256 resulted in detection of new metabolites in effluent-exposed fish that were associated with

257 other signaling pathways. These included a 5-11 fold increase in the plasma concentration of
258 tryptophan and a 2-fold decrease in its metabolite acetylserotonin, indicating effects on the
259 serotonin pathway (Table 1). 'S' plot analysis of OPLS models of metabolite profiles in tissues
260 revealed that concentrations of indolepyruvate, a metabolite of tryptophan, were increased
261 by 13 and 32-fold in female gills and male testes, respectively (Table S3), indicating that
262 tryptophan metabolism was also altered in these tissues as well as in blood plasma of effluent-
263 exposed roach. In order to explore the mechanisms responsible for these metabolite changes,
264 selected gene transcripts associated with tryptophan/serotonin metabolism were analyzed
265 by qRT-PCR in gills, liver and gonads of male and female fish (Figure S3). Tryptophan can be
266 metabolized by dioxygenases and a decrease in their expression would result in an increased
267 substrate for metabolism to acetyl serotonin or indolepyruvate.[26] However, the dioxygenase
268 (*tdo2a*) transcript was only significantly decreased in male and female liver from exposed fish
269 and was increased in male gills. Significant increases in the dopa decarboxylase transcript
270 levels (*ddc*) which metabolizes tryptophan to serotonin, and monamine oxidase expression
271 (*mao*) which further converts serotonin to hydroxyindole acetic acid,[27] were observed only in
272 female gills and for *ddc* also in female liver. Taken together, effluent exposure did not result
273 in a widespread alteration in the transcription of key genes that could explain the changes
274 involved in tryptophan metabolism in roach tissues.

275 Concentrations of a number of eicosanoid type metabolites were also altered in
276 plasma samples from effluent-exposed male and female fish. These included a 10-15-fold
277 reduction in prostaglandin F2α (PGF2α) levels, a 5-fold decrease in a tetranor PGE1-like
278 structure, and a 13-16- fold increase in an oxygenated C20 metabolite (dicarboxy leukotriene
279 B4-like) (Table 1). Examination of the 'S' plots from OPLS models of female gills, liver, kidney

280 and male testes revealed numerous signals, mainly corresponding to prostaglandin
281 structures, which were prevalent (depressed) markers of effluent exposure (Table S3). PGE2
282 and PGF2α levels were reduced by 52-90% in all the tissues analyzed, together with a mean
283 93% reduction observed for PGF2α in plasma (Figure 2). Reductions in levels of a further 7
284 different prostaglandin metabolites were detected in various body tissues (Table S3) and
285 further work is needed to determine their structural identity.

286 The widespread reduction of prostaglandin structures in tissues and in blood plasma
287 indicates a general inhibition of the prostaglandin metabolism in effluent-exposed fish.
288 Prostaglandins are formed from the action of prostaglandin endoperoxide synthases (PGTS),
289 also termed cyclooxygenase enzymes, on the C20 polyunsaturated fatty acid, arachidonic
290 acid, which in turn is released from membrane phospholipids by the action of cytosolic
291 phospholipase A2 (PLA2). At least two PTGS genes (*pgts* 1 and 2) are present in fish and qRT-
292 PCR analysis of gills, liver and gonads of male and female fish revealed that their expression
293 was not altered as a result of effluent exposure (Figure S3). Expression of *pla2g4*, associated
294 with substrate release by PLA2, was reduced in liver and gills of males but not in females or
295 in gonads of either sex. Likewise, *pgtes*, which encodes PGE synthase and conversion of the
296 PGH2 intermediate to PGE2, was reduced in liver and gills of males but not females, nor in
297 gonads of either sex. These data indicate that the widespread reduction of PG levels in the
298 various body tissues were not due to changes in expression of genes associated with their
299 biosynthesis, but rather may arise from direct inhibition of enzyme activity instead.

300 The functional role and the identities of the full complement of biologically active
301 prostaglandin structures has not been not fully determined in fish systems. However, PGE2
302 regulates ion transport in fish gills and kidney[28], macrophage differentiation in the posterior

303 kidney, and is an important inflammatory and blood clotting mediator produced by leucocytes
304 and thrombocytes.[29] PGF2α is can regulate reproductive behavior, synchronous spawning,
305 and ovulation in females.[30] PGs are also important signaling agents during cell development
306 and differentiation.[31] This indicates that widespread reduction of PG levels may have
307 deleterious effects affecting numerous endpoints in fish including development,
308 reproduction, the immune response and osmoregulation.

309 The role of other metabolites identified in our study has yet to be fully understood in
310 fish physiology. However, there remains the possibility that the roles of serotonin, bile acid
311 and PG metabolites maybe linked, or act in concert, to affect health in fish. For instance, a
312 follow-up study of brain tissue sampled from fish used in this study revealed significant
313 increases of serotonin concentrations in selected brain regions of the effluent-exposed fish
314 (A David, pers comm). Serotonin regulates aggression[32] and PGF2α mediates courtship in
315 male fish,[33] which indicates that further investigations on the effects of wastewater exposures
316 on disruption of fish behaviour are warranted. Similarly, serotonin and PG metabolites are
317 both signalling agents in the hypothalamus-pituitary-gonad axis of fish and regulate gonadal
318 development.[22,34] They are also both important modulators of the immune and inflammatory
319 response of vertebrates, [29, 35] and both regulate epithelial cell function in gills. [28,36] In
320 mammals, some secondary bile acids, including taurodeoxycholic acid, can act as anti-
321 secretory agents in the colon,[37] whereas both serotonin and prostaglandin metabolites
322 promote epithelial mucosal secretion and gastrointestinal protection[38,39] raising the question
323 as to whether interactions occur between these different metabolites affecting
324 gastrointestinal function in fish.

325

326 3.3 The link between the exposome and metabolome of effluent-exposed fish

327 Interrogation of the 'S' loading plots of signals unique to effluent-exposed fish
328 revealed the accumulation of a complex mixture of contaminants in blood plasma and tissues.
329 These contained 31 pharmaceuticals from 11 different classes including NSAIDs (naproxen,
330 mefenamic acid, diclofenac, ibuprofen, felbinac, celecoxib) and SSRIs (paroxetine, citalopram,
331 sertraline, fluoxetine, norfluoxetine, norsertraline and norcitalopram) (Figure 3 and Table S4).
332 In addition, a wide range of endocrine disrupters, personal care products, pesticides,
333 antibacterial and human dietary products were also detected in the plasma and tissues of
334 effluent-exposed but not control fish (Table S4).

335 Due to matrix interferences, the concentrations of SSRIs in the different sample types
336 could not be determined in this study and their quantitative analysis required further method
337 development. However, the concentrations of NSAIDs, which are potent inhibitors of PGTS
338 enzymes in vertebrate systems, were determined in effluent and fish samples. During the
339 exposure period, NSAIDs levels in the effluent were all below 0.5 µg/l, except for naproxen
340 which was present at a mean ± SD of 3.7 ± 2.3 µg/l (Tables 2 and S5). Studies to date indicate
341 that these concentrations of NSAIDs were too low to affect PG or PGTS gene expression levels
342 in fish.[40-42] In addition, NSAID concentrations in plasma and tissues of effluent-exposed fish
343 were determined and compared with reported human therapeutic plasma concentrations,
344 HtPC[43] (Table 2). NSAIDs were detected in plasma and most of the tissues analyzed, but with
345 the exception of naproxen and ibuprofen, their mean concentrations were < 1ng/ml plasma
346 or 1 ng/g tissue. Mean concentrations of naproxen and ibuprofen in the plasma were higher
347 than in the effluent indicating bioconcentration of these contaminants in the fish. The effluent
348 concentrations of naproxen were above the MQL, which allowed the determination of a
349 plasma bioconcentration factor of 4, similar to that already reported for this compound.[44]

350 However, the plasma concentrations of all NSAIDs were between 650 and 14,0000-fold below
351 the HtPC. As PG levels were significantly reduced in blood plasma and body tissues, this would
352 indicate that either NSAIDs and their mixtures were more potent in fish compared with
353 humans, or that other contaminants were present that inhibited PG biosynthesis in the fish.
354 Previous reports suggest that many other compounds can inhibit PGTS enzyme activity,
355 including pesticides and some of the endocrine disrupting chemicals detected in fish in this
356 study (Table S4).[45,46] Further work is needed to identify other PGTS inhibitors amongst the
357 diverse range of contaminants which bioconcentrate in fish exposed to WwTW effluents.

358 3.4 Implications of the work and future studies.

359 This study was conducted with undiluted effluent, which reflects the exposures of
360 aquatic animals, including fish, in some countries where there is little or no dilution of the
361 discharges into the receiving waters.[47] However, there was a mortality of 13% during effluent
362 exposure indicating that fish were subjected to high physiological stress. Further studies are
363 required to determine whether similar metabolite disruptions are observed with diluted
364 effluents that typify ambient waters.

365 Through the application of newly developed sensitive non-targeted chemical profiling
366 techniques, a novel finding emerging is the widespread reduction in PG metabolism in the
367 roach exposed to a final treated WwTWs effluent. This finding could not have been predicted
368 from an analysis of pharmaceuticals in the effluent which are designed to target PG
369 metabolism, and there is a need to identify the key causative contaminants disrupting PG
370 biosynthesis in WwTW effluents. Moreover, we highlight the need for further understanding
371 on the identity and function of the numerous PG metabolites that were detected in fish
372 tissues. Furthermore, PGs, serotonin and bile acid metabolites are components of key

373 signaling pathways which mediate gastrointestinal function, ion transport, immune and
374 reproductive processes in vertebrates, and disruption in their levels may potentially impact
375 on a range of health endpoints in contaminated fish.

376 Our study further emphasizes the importance of understanding mixture effects of
377 contaminants (including their metabolites) on the health of wildlife. Improvements in
378 discovery-based chemical profiling technologies are likely to increase coverage of the
379 exposome and metabolome, and advance our understanding of the link between exposure to
380 complex mixtures of contaminants and their impact on multiple metabolite pathways.
381 However, it will require a step change in knowledge to understand the link between
382 disruption of multiple interacting pathways and their consequent effects on wildlife or human
383 health. Without this knowledge, environmental policymakers may have to consider whether
384 regulation of chemical contaminants should be proactive and informed by changes in
385 molecular profiles with the *potential* for physiological disruption, rather than a reliance on
386 demonstrated health endpoints which may take many decades to investigate, particularly in
387 respect to exposure of chemical mixtures.

388 **Supporting Information**

389 Supporting information comprises further analytical details, PCA score plots of metabolomics
390 datasets and tables of identification of markers of effluent exposure. This material is available
391 free of charge via the Internet at http://pubs.acs.org.

392 **Acknowledgments**

393 This research was supported by a Marie Curie Intra European Fellowship within the European
394 Community Seventh Framework Programme (FP7/2007-2013, grant agreement number

395 302097). We gratefully acknowledge Jan Shears, Victoria Jennings, the fish team at Exeter
396 University and Andrew Chetwynd (Sussex) for help with the effluent exposure.
397

398 **References**

399

400 1. Li, W. C., Occurrence, sources, and fate of pharmaceuticals in aquatic environment and soil.
401 Environ. Pollut. 2014, 187, 193-201.
402 2. Kostich, M. S.; Batt, A. L.; Lazorchak, J. M., Concentrations of prioritized pharmaceuticals in
403 effluents from 50 large wastewater treatment plants in the US and implications for risk
404 estimation. *Environ. Pollut.* **2014,** *184*, 354-359.
405 3. der Beek, T. A.; Weber, F. A.; Bergmann, A.; Hickmann, S.; Ebert, I.; Hein, A.; Kuster, A.,
406 Pharmaceuticals in the environment-global occurences and perspectives. *Environ. Toxicol.*
407 *Chem.* **2016,** *35*, (4), 823-835.
408 4. Gunnarsson, L.; Jauhiainen, A.; Kristiansson, E.; Nerman, O.; Larsson, D. G. J., Evolutionary
409 conservation of human drug targets in organisms used for environmental risk assessments.
410 *Environ Sci Technol.* **2008,** *42*, (15), 5807-5813.
411 5. Rand-Weaver, M.; Margiotta-Casaluci, L.; Patel, A.; Panter, G. H.; Owen, S. F.; Sumpter, J.
412 P., The Read-Across Hypothesis and Environmental Risk Assessment of Pharmaceuticals.
413 *Environ Sci Technol.* **2013,** *47*, (20), 11384-11395.
414 6. Valenti, T. W.; Gould, G. G.; Berninger, J. P.; Connors, K. A.; Keele, N. B.; Prosser, K. N.;
415 Brooks, B. W., Human Therapeutic Plasma Levels of the Selective Serotonin Reuptake
416 Inhibitor (SSRI) Sertraline Decrease Serotonin Reuptake Transporter Binding and Shelter-
417 Seeking Behavior in Adult Male Fathead Minnows. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* **2012,** *46*, (4), 2427-
418 2435.
419 7. Margiotta-Casaluci, L.; Owen, S. F.; Cumming, R. I.; de Polo, A.; Winter, M. J.; Panter, G. H.;
420 Rand-Weaver, M.; Sumpter, J. P., Quantitative Cross-Species Extrapolation between Humans
421 and Fish: The Case of the Anti-Depressant Fluoxetine. *PLoS One.* **2014,** *9*, (10).
422 8. Ramirez, A. J.; Brain, R. A.; Usenko, S.; Mottaleb, M. A.; O'Donnell, J. G.; Stahl, L. L.; Wathen,
423 J. B.; Snyder, B. D.; Pitt, J. L.; Perez-Hurtado, P.; Dobbins, L. L.; Brooks, B. W.; Chambliss, C. K.,
424 Occurrence of pharmaceuticals and personal care products in fish: results of a national pilot
425 study in the United States. *Environ Toxicol Chem.* **2009,** *28*, (12), 2587-2597.
426 9. Meador, J. P.; Yeh, A.; Young, G.; Gallagher, E. P., Contaminants of emerging concern in a
427 large temperate estuary. *Environ Pollut.* **2016,** *213*, 254-267.
428 10. Tanoue, R.; Nomiyama, K.; Nakamura, H.; Kim, J. W.; Isobe, T.; Shinohara, R.; Kunisue, T.;
429 Tanabe, S., Uptake and Tissue Distribution of Pharmaceuticals and Personal Care Products in
430 Wild Fish from Treated-Wastewater-Impacted Streams. *Environ Sci Technol.* **2015,** *49*, (19),
431 11649-11658.
432 11. Hamilton, P. B.; Cowx, I. G.; Oleksiak, M. F.; Griffiths, A. M.; Grahn, M.; Stevens, J. R.;
433 Carvalho, G. R.; Nicol, E.; Tyler, C. R., Population-level consequences for wild fish exposed to
434 sublethal concentrations of chemicals – a critical review. *Fish Fish.* **2015**, *17*, (3), 545-566
435 12. Skelton, D. M.; Ekman, D. R.; Martinovic-Weigelt, D.; Ankley, G. T.; Villeneuve, D. L.; Teng,
436 Q.; Collette, T. W., Metabolomics for in situ environmental monitoring of surface waters
437 impacted by contaminants from both point and nonpoint sources. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* **2014,**
438 *48*, (4), 2395-2403.

439 13. Alvarez-Munoz, D.; Al-Salhi, R.; Abdul-Sada, A.; Gonzalez-Mazo, E.; Hill, E. M., Global
440 metabolite profiling reveals transformation pathways and novel metabolomic responses in
441 Solea senegalensis after exposure to a non-ionic surfactant. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* **2014,** *48*,
442 (9), 5203-5210.
443 14. Al-Salhi, R.; Abdul-Sada, A.; Lange, A.; Tyler, C. R.; Hill, E. M., The xenometabolome and
444 novel contaminant markers in fish exposed to a wastewater treatment works effluent.
445 *Environ Sci Technol.* **2012,** *46*, (16), 9080-9088.
446 15. David, A.; Abdul-Sada, A.; Lange, A.; Tyler, C. R.; Hill, E. M., A new approach for plasma
447 (xeno)metabolomics based on solid-phase extraction and nanoflow liquid chromatography-
448 nanoelectrospray ionisation mass spectrometry. *J Chromatog.r A.* **2014,** *1365*, 72-85.
449 16. Chetwynd, A. J.; Abdul-Sada, A.; Hill, E. M., Solid-phase extraction and nanoflow liquid
450 chromatography-nanoelectrospray ionization mass spectrometry for improved global urine
451 metabolomics. *Anal. Chem*. **2015,** *87*, (2), 1158-1165.
452 17. Chetwynd, A. J.; David, A.; Hill, E. M.; Abdul-Sada, A., Evaluation of analytical performance
453 and reliability of direct nanoLC-nanoESI-high resolution mass spectrometry for profiling the
454 (xeno)metabolome. *J Mass Spectrom.* **2014,** *49*, (10), 1063-1069.
455 18. Flores-Valverde, A. M.; Hill, E. M., Methodology for profiling the steroid metabolome in
456 animal tissues using ultraperformance liquid chromatography-electrospray-time-of-flight
457 mass spectrometry. *Anal. Chem.* **2008,** *80*, (22), 8771-8779.
458 19. Wiklund, S.; Johansson, E.; Sjostrom, L.; Mellerowicz, E. J.; Edlund, U.; Shockcor, J. P.;
459 Gottfries, J.; Moritz, T.; Trygg, J., Visualization of GC/TOF-MS-based metabolomics data for
460 identification of biochemically interesting compounds using OPLS class models. *Anal. Chem.*
461 **2008,** *80*, (1), 115-122.
462 20. Benjamini, Y.; Hochberg, Y., Controlling the False Discovery Rate - a Practical and Powerful
463 Approach to Multiple Testing. *J Roy Stat Soc B Met.* **1995,** *57*, (1), 289-300.
464 21. Chauvenet, W., Methods of least squares. **1863,** *Reprinted (1960) 5th edition. Dover,*
465 *NY.*, 469-566.
466 22. Pradhan, A.; Olsson, P. E., Juvenile Ovary to Testis Transition in Zebrafish Involves
467 Inhibition of Ptges. *Biol. Reprod.* **2014,** *91*, (2), 15.
468 23. Lange, A.; Paull, G. C.; Hamilton, P. B.; Iguchi, T.; Tyler, C. R., Implications of persistent
469 exposure to treated wastewater effluent for breeding in wild roach (Rutilus rutilus)
470 populations. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* **2011,** *45*, (4), 1673-1679.
471 24. Reyes, H., Phylogenetic diversity of bile acids. *Revista Medica De Chile* **1994,** *122*, (8), 944-
472 950.
473 25. Ridlon, J. M.; Kang, D. J.; Hylemon, P. B., Bile salt biotransformations by human intestinal
474 bacteria. *Journal of Lipid Research* **2006,** *47*, (2), 241-259.
475 26. Cortes, J.; Alvarez, C.; Santana, P.; Torres, E.; Mercado, L., Indoleamine 2,3-dioxygenase:
476 First evidence of expression in rainbow trout (Oncorhynchus mykiss). *Dev. Comp. Immunol.*
477 **2016,** *65*, 73-78.
478 27. Sainio, E. L.; Pulkki, K.; Young, S. N., L-tryptophan: Biochemical, nutritional and
479 pharmacological aspects. *Amino Acids* **1996,** *10*, (1), 21-47.
480 28. Avella, M.; Part, P.; Ehrenfeld, J., Regulation of Cl- secretion in seawater fish
481 (Dicentrarchus labrax) gill respiratory cells in primary culture. *J. Physiol.-London.* **1999,** *516*,
482 (2), 353-363.
483 29. Gomez-Abellan, V.; Sepulcre, M. P., The role of prostaglandins in the regulation of fish
484 immunity. *Mol. Immunol.* **2016,** *69*, 139-145.

485 30. Goncalves, D.; Costa, S. S.; Teles, M. C.; Silva, H.; Ingles, M.; Oliveira, R. F., Oestradiol and
486 prostaglandin F2 alpha regulate sexual displays in females of a sex-role reversed fish. *Proc. R.*
487 *Soc. B-Biol. Sci.* **2014,** *281*, (1778), 1-9.
488 31. Cha, Y. I.; Solnica-Krezel, L.; DuBois, R. N., Fishing for prostanoids: Deciphering the
489 developmental functions of cyclooxygenase-derived prostaglandins. *Dev. Biol.* **2006,** *289*, (2),
490 263-272.
491 32. Winberg, S.; Thornqvist, P. O., Role of brain serotonin in modulating fish behavior. *Curr.*
492 *Zool.* **2016,** *62*, (3), 317-323.
493 33. Yabuki, Y.; Koide, T.; Miyasaka, N.; Wakisaka, N.; Masuda, M.; Ohkura, M.; Nakai, J.; Tsuge,
494 K.; Tsuchiya, S.; Sugimoto, Y.; Yoshihara, Y., Olfactory receptor for prostaglandin F-2 alpha
495 mediates male fish courtship behavior. *Nat. Neurosci.* **2016,** *19*, (7), 897-904.
496 34. Prasad, P.; Ogawa, S.; Parhar, I. S., Role of serotonin in fish reproduction. *Front. Neurosci.*
497 **2015,** *9*, 1-9.
498 35. Shajib, M. S.; Khan, W. I., The role of serotonin and its receptors in activation of immune
499 responses and inflammation. *Acta Physiol.* **2015,** *213*, (3), 561-574.
500 36. Shakarchi, K.; Zachar, P. C.; Jonz, M. G., Serotonergic and cholinergic elements of the
501 hypoxic ventilatory response in developing zebrafish. *J. Exp. Biol.* **2013,** *216*, (5), 869-880.
502 37. Keating, N.; Mroz, M. S.; Scharl, M. M.; Marsh, C.; Ferguson, G.; Hofmann, A. F.; Keely, S.
503 J., Physiological concentrations of bile acids down-regulate agonist induced secretion in
504 colonic epithelial cells. *J. Cell. Mol. Med.* **2009,** *13*, (8B), 2293-2303.
505 38. Fidalgo, S.; Ivanov, D. K.; Wood, S. H., Serotonin: from top to bottom. *Biogerontology* **2013,**
506 *14*, (1), 21-45.
507 39. Dey, I.; Lejeune, M.; Chadee, K., Prostaglandin E-2 receptor distribution and function in
508 the gastrointestinal tract. *Br. J. Pharmacol.* **2006,** *149*, (6), 611-623.
509 40. Bhandari, K.; Venables, B., Ibuprofen bioconcentration and prostaglandin E2 levels in
510 the bluntnose minnow Pimephales notatus. *Comp. Biochem. Physiol. C-Toxicol. Pharmacol*
511 **2011,** *153*, (2), 251-257.
512 41. Morthorst, J. E.; Lister, A.; Bjerregaard, P.; Van der Kraak, G., Ibuprofen reduces zebrafish
513 PGE(2) levels but steroid hormone levels and reproductive parameters are not affected.
514 *Comp. Biochem. Physiol. C-Toxicol. Pharmacol.* **2013,** *157*, (2), 251-257.
515 42. Mehinto, A. C.; Hill, E. M.; Tyler, C. R., Uptake and Biological Effects of Environmentally
516 Relevant Concentrations of the Nonsteroidal Anti-inflammatory Pharmaceutical Diclofenac in
517 Rainbow Trout (Oncorhynchus mykiss). *Environ. Sci. Technol.* **2010,** *44*, (6), 2176-2182.
518 43. Schulz, M.; Iwersen-Bergmann, S.; Andresen, H.; Schmoldt, A., Therapeutic and toxic blood
519 concentrations of nearly 1,000 drugs and other xenobiotics. *Crit Care.* **2012,** *16*, (4), R136.
520 44. Brown, J. N.; Paxeus, N.; Forlin, L.; Larsson, D. G. J., Variations in bioconcentration of
521 human pharmaceuticals from sewage effluents into fish blood plasma. *Environ. Toxicol.*
522 *Pharmacol.* **2007,** *24*, (3), 267-274.
523 45. Kugathas, S.; Audouze, K.; Ermler, S.; Orton, F.; Rosivatz, E.; Scholze, M.; Kortenkamp, A.,
524 Effects of Common Pesticides on Prostaglandin D2 (PGD2) Inhibition in SC5 Mouse Sertoli
525 Cells, Evidence of Binding at the COX-2 Active Site, and Implications for Endocrine Disruption.
526 *Environ. Health Perspect.* **2016,** *124*, (4), 452-459.
527 46. Kristensen, D. M.; Skalkam, M. L.; Audouze, K.; Lesne, L.; Desdoits-Lethimonier, C.;
528 Frederiksen, H.; Brunak, S.; Skakkebaek, N. E.; Jegou, B.; Hansen, J. B.; Junker, S.; Leffers, H.,
529 Many Putative Endocrine Disruptors Inhibit Prostaglandin Synthesis. *Environ. Health Perspect.*
530 **2011,** *119*, (4), 534-541.

531 47. Keller, V. D. J.; Williams, R. J.; Lofthouse, C.; Johnson, A. C., Worldwide estimation of river
532 concentrations of any chemical originating from sewage treatment plants using dilution
533 factors. *Environ. Toxicol. Chem.* **2014,** *33*, (2), 447-452.

534

535

Table 1. The effect of exposure to wastewater effluent on blood plasma metabolite profiles of roach.

Retention time	Observed molecular ion	Molecular ion species	Δ ppm	Formula of ion	Fragment ions	Kegg no	Identity	Fold change	p value	Fold change	P value
Metabolites decreased in plasma								**Female**		**Male**	
6.19	219.1136	M+H	0.9	C12H15N2O2	160.0766	C00978	acetylserotonin [a]	1.6	0.014	2.7	$2.8x10^{-4}$
13.61	353.2326	M-H	-0.6	C20H33O5	309.2058	C00639	PGF2α [a]	10.6	$3.7x10^{-5}$	14.7	$2.6x10^{-4}$
14.20	297.1702	M-H	0	C16H25O5	nd	-	tetranor PGE1 like	5.2	$4.0x10^{-6}$	4.8	$8.5x10^{-5}$
Metabolites increased in plasma											
15.80	383.2068	M-H	-0.5	C20H31O7	nd	-	dicarboxy LTB4 like	16.6	$6.1 x 10^{-6}$	13.3	$8.1 x 10^{-5}$
14.74	498.2889	M-H	0	C26H44NO6S	nd	C05122	taurodeoxycholic acid [a]	5.1	$1.3x10^{-4}$	12.1	$1.2x10^{-4}$
19.29	482.2939	M-H	-0.2	C26H44NO5S	nd	C02592	taurolithocholic acid like	39.3	$2.0x10^{-6}$	56.0	$2.6x10^{-5}$
6.01	205.0979	M+H	0.1	C11H13N2O2	188.0713, 146.0606	C00078	tryptophan [a]	5.0	$4x10^{-3}$	10.7	$4.0x10^{-4}$
4.27	204.0662	M+H	0.5	C11H10NO3	158.0605, 130.0658	C00331	Indolepyruvate[a]	22.9	2.1x10-5	77.6	$5.6x10^{-5}$
15.59	302.3060	M+H	0.3	C18H40NO2	284.2952	C00836	sphinganine	9.1	$6.4 x 10^{-5}$	9.4	$5.2 x 10^{-5}$
25.19	352.2828	M+Na	0	C19H39NO3Na	312.2898		palmitoyl serine like	227	$4.5x10^{-5}$	177	$3.0x10^{-4}$

[a] metabolite identity confirmed by a pure standard. Other metabolite structures determined from comparison of CID fragments with MS databases. Δ ppm difference between observed and calculated molecular ion. nd= not detected. Metabolites disrupted by effluent exposure were determined from P values calculated using Mann Whitney test and after correction for a false discovery rate of 5%. n=10 and n=13 for control and exposed males; n=13 and n=16 for control and exposed females.

Table 2. Concentrations of nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drugs in effluent, blood plasma and tissues of effluent-exposed roach and human therapeutic plasma concentrations (HtPC).

		Effluent[a] ng/ml (n=6)	plasma ♀ ng/ml (n=16)	plasma ♂ ng/ml (n=13)	gills ng/g (n=10)	kidney ng/g (n=12)	liver ng/g (n=12)	testes ng/g (n=12)	HtPC [b] ng/ml
Naproxen	Range	2.0 - 7.7	5.2 - 27	6.7 - 22	3.3 - 6.9	3.5 - 16	12 - 351	<0.11[d] - 1.9	20000 - 50000
	Mean±SD	3.7 ± 2.3	13 ± 6.2	14 ± 4.6	5.1 ± 1.2	8.2 ± 3.8	75 ± 91	0.93 ± 0.48	
Felbinac	Range	<0.25[c]	0.36 - 1.1	<0.19[d]- 0.84	0.19-0.23	0.58 - 0.97	3.5 - 8.7	0.056 - 0.11	400 - 1000
	Mean±SD	<0.25[c]	0.65 ± 0.15	0.57 ± 0.27	0.21 ± 0.01	0.77 ± 0.1	5.7 ± 1.6	0.091 ± 0.013	
Diclofenac	Range	0.22 - 0.38	<0.30[d] - 1.9	<0.1 - 0.82	0.35 -1.0	<0.24[d]- 0.35	<0.21[d] - 0.31	<0.03[c] - 0.32	500 - 3000
	Mean±SD	0.35 ± 0.10	0.43 ± 0.45	0.39 ± 0.27	0.58 ± 0.21	0.13 ± 0.10	0.21 ± 0.09	0.09 ± 0.09	
Ibuprofen	Range	<0.01[c]	<7.5[d] - 13	<7.5[d] - 14	<2.0 [c] - <6.0[d]	<2.0 - <6.0[d]	<1.7[c] - <5.1[d]	<0.75[c] -< 2.3[d]	15000 - 30000
	Mean±SD	<0.01[c]	5.2 ± 3.7	5.8 ± 4.3	<2.0 [c]	<2.0 [c]	<1.7[c]	<0.75[c]	
Celecoxib	Range	0.013 – 0.018	0.30 - 0.32	0.29 - 0.31	0.23 - 0.25	0.35 - 0.37	0.36 - 0.41	<0.019[c] - 0.094	360 - 800
	Mean±SD	0.015 ± 0.002	0.31 ± 0.01	0.30 ± 0.01	0.24 ± 0.01	0.36 ± 0.003	0.38 ± 0.01	0.091 ± 0.001	
Mefenamic	Range	0.08 – 0.15	<0.94[d] - 1.2	<0.94[d] - 1.3	<0.25 [c] - 0.75[d]	0.94 - 1.0	1.0 - 1.7	<0.094[c] - <0.28[d]	2000 - 10000
acid	Mean±SD	0.10 ± 0.03	0.70 ± 0.40	0.79 ± 0.42	<0.25[c]	0.98 ± 0.03	1.2 ± 0.18	<0.09[c]	

[a]Effluent samples measured at 0, 7, and 15 days of exposure. Plasma and tissue samples analysed at the end of the 15 day exposure period. [b]HtPC from Shultz et al.[43] [c] = MDL value, [d] = MQL value. SD= standard deviation. For the mean calculations, all concentrations that were over the limits of detection (≥MDL) but below the limits of quantification (<MQL) were assigned the value considered as the MDL in each case. Concentrations below the MDL were considered to be zero. Gills, kidney and liver samples were from females only. NSAID levels in control fish were below the MDL values given in Table S1.

Figure captions.

Figure 1. Principal component analysis scores plot of the chemical profiles in plasma of roach (male and female) exposed either to a final treated WwTWs effluent or clean water.
Extracts were profiled in -ESI mode by nUPLC-nESI-TOFMS. Quality control (QC) samples were used to monitor the analytical performance of the MS platform. % R2X values are given on the respective components. MC= male control, FC=female, control, FE=female effluent, ME= male effluent.

Figure 2. Effect of effluent exposure on PGE2 and PGF2α concentrations in fish tissues and blood plasma
PGE2 and PGF2α concentrations were measured from the mean (± standard deviation) relative abundance compared to the internal standard. The % reduction in PG concentrations in the effluent-exposed group were determined from the mean values in the control fish which had been normalised to 100% for each tissue type. **$p<0.01$;***$p<0.001$;****$p<0.0001$. n=10 and n=13 for control and exposed male plasma; n=13 and n=16 for control and exposed female plasma; n=12 and n=12 for control and exposed testes; n=10 and n=12 for control and exposed kidney; n=14 and n=12 for control and exposed liver; n=11 and n=10 for control and exposed gills, respectively. PGE2 was not detected in any plasma sample, MDL; method detection limit.

Figure 3. Number and classes of pharmaceuticals detected in the blood plasma and tissues of roach exposed to a WwTW effluent.
NSAIDs, non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs. SSRIs, selective serotonin reuptake inhibitors. In total, 31 pharmaceuticals were detected across the different tissues and the identities of 26 were confirmed by pure standards (see Table S4). No pharmaceuticals were detected in samples from control fish.



Figure 1.





Figure 2.



Figure 3.