Environ Health Perspect

DOI: 10.1289/EHP11896

Note to readers with disabilities: *EHP* strives to ensure that all journal content is accessible to all readers. However, some figures and Supplemental Material published in *EHP* articles may not conform to <u>508 standards</u> due to the complexity of the information being presented. If you need assistance accessing journal content, please contact <u>ehp508@niehs.nih.gov</u>. Our staff will work with you to assess and meet your accessibility needs within 3 working days.

Supplemental Material

Association between Organophosphate Ester Exposure and Insulin Resistance with Glycometabolic Disorders among Older Chinese Adults 60–69 Years of Age: Evidence from the China BAPE Study

Enmin Ding, Fuchang Deng, Jianlong Fang, Tiantian Li, Minmin Hou, Juan Liu, Ke Miao, Wenyan Yan, Ke Fang, Wanying Shi, Yuanzheng Fu, Yuanyuan Liu, Haoran Dong, Li Dong, Changming Ding, Xiaohui Liu, Krystal J. Godri Pollitt, John S. Ji, Yali Shi, Yaqi Cai, Song Tang, and Xiaoming Shi

Table of Contents

Table S1. Variable information of 17 blood OPEs and 11 urine OPE metabolites.

Table S2. Descriptive statistics of the results from the daily time-activity surveys (for the three consecutive days prior to the physical examination) of participants for each of the five visits.

Table S3. Changes in the z-scores of glycometabolic markers with a quantile increase in the mixture concentration.

Table S4. Relative weight of each pollutant within four chemical mixtures.

Table S5. Proportions and overall averages of associated serum metabolite in each class for the key OPEs.

Table S6. Proportions and overall averages of the associated urine metabolite in each class for the key OPEs.

Table S7. Representative toxicological literature on the associations between OPEs and glycometabolic marker.

Table S8. Representative toxicological literature on the molecular mechanisms of OPEs.

Figure S1. Pairwise spearman correlations of the 28 OPE exposures.

Figure S2. Sensitivity analysis results of the associations between OPE exposures and glycometabolic markers.

Figure S3. Stratification analysis results of the associations between OPE exposures and glycometabolic markers by sex.

Figure S4. Common and specific biomolecular intermediators of individual OPEs.

References

Additional File- Excel Document

Supplemental Tables

Table S1. Variable information of 17 blood OPEs and 11 urine OPE metabolites.

No.	Family	Abbreviation	Full name	Detection	LOD	Median	IQR	SD	ICC	Transformation
				frequency (%)		(P25-P75)				
1	Blood	TPHP	Tri-phenyl phosphate	78	0.11	0.40 (0.14-1.70)	1.56	1.24	0.16	Log10
2	OPEs	EHDPP	2-Ethylhexyl di-phenyl phosphate	77	0.03	0.21 (0.04-0.40)	0.35	0.30	0.04	Power 1/3
3		TCIPP	Tri(1-chloro-2-propyl) phosphate	77	0.13	0.74 (0.19-1.36)	1.17	0.92	0.05	Power 1/3
4		TnBP	Tri-n-butyl phosphate	59	0.15	0.25 (0.07-0.62)	0.54	0.75	0.05	Log10
5		TCEP	Tri(2-chloroethyl) phosphate	56	0.22	0.30 (0.11-0.77)	0.66	0.56	0.03	Log10
6		TBP	Tributyl phosphate	55	0.20	0.49 (0.10-1.31)	1.21	1.51	0.04	Log10
7		TEP	Triethyl phosphate	54	0.06	0.14 (0.03-0.72)	0.69	1.29	0.04	Log10
8		TiBP	Tri-iso-butyl phosphate	51	0.22	0.23 (0.11-0.75)	0.64	0.89	0.03	Log10
9		TEHP	Tris(2-ethylhexyl) phosphate	51	0.09	0.09 (0.04-0.38)	0.34	0.50	0.06	Log10
10		BABP	Bisphenol-A bis(diphenyl phosphate)	47	0.004	0.002 (0.002-0.01)	0.01	0.01	0.02	Log10
11		TBOEP	Tri(2-butoxyethyl) phosphate	41	0.05	0.03 (0.03-0.20)	0.18	0.70	0.03	Log10
12		TDCPP	Tris(1,3-dichloro-2-propyl) phosphate	34	0.21	0.11 (0.11-0.32)	0.21	0.32	0.02	Log10
13		TMPP	Trimethylphenyl phosphate	33	0.02	0.01 (0.01-0.04)	0.03	0.03	0.04	Log10
14		RDP	Resorcinol bis(diphenyl phosphate)	21	0.02	0.01 (0.01-0.01)	0.00	0.06	0.02	Log10
15		TMP	Trimethyl phosphate	16	0.15	0.07 (0.07-0.07)	0.00	0.67	0.01	Log10
16		CDPP	Cresyl diphenyl phosphate	7	0.17	0.08 (0.08-0.08)	0.00	0.13	0.02	Log10
17		TPrP	Tripropyl phosphate	1	0.02	0.01 (0.01-0.01)	0.00	0.01	0.001	Log10
18	Urine	DPHP	Di-phenyl phosphate	79	0.04	0.11 (0.07-0.19)	0.11	0.46	0.02	Log10
19	OPE	DEHP	Di(2-ethylhexyl) phosphate	77	0.07	0.21 (0.09-0.41)	0.32	1.61	0.02	Log10
20	metabolite	BDCPP	Bis(1,3-dichloro-2-propyl) phosphate	76	0.05	0.16 (0.07-0.28)	0.20	0.31	0.02	Log10
21		DBP	Dibutyl phosphate	69	0.01	0.07 (0.03-0.18)	0.15	0.15	0.09	Log10
22		BMPP	Bis(2-methylphenyl phosphate)	65	0.004	0.02 (0.01-0.03)	0.02	0.03	0.18	Log10
23		BCIPP	Bis(1-chloro-2-propyl) phosphate	28	0.04	0.04 (0.03-0.08)	0.05	0.14	0.06	Log10

24	DPHP-OH	Hydroxyphenyl diphenyl phosphate	21	0.02	0.02 (0.01-0.04)	0.03	0.06	0.05	Log10
25	BCEP	Bis(2-chloroethyl) phosphate	20	0.63	0.52 (0.35-1.03)	0.69	2.08	0.11	Log10
26	BBOEP	Bis(2-butoxyethyl) phosphate	13	0.03	0.02 (0.02-0.05)	0.03	1.58	0.002	Log10
27	EHDPP-OH	Hydroxyphenyl 2-ethylhexyl-diphenyl	13	0.04	0.003 (0.002-0.01)	0.00	0.05	0.01	Log10
		phosphate							
28	BBOEHEP	Bis(2-butoxyethyl) hydroxyethyl	3	0.02	0.02 (0.01-0.03)	0.01	0.06	0.06	Log10
		phosphate							

Note: unit for LOD is $\mu g/L$; unit for blood OPEs is $\mu g/L$, and unit for urine OPE metabolites is $\mu g/g$ creatinine; LOD: limit of detection; IQR: interquartile range; SD: standard deviation; ICC: intra-class correlation coefficient.

	1 st	2^{nd}	3 rd	4 th	5 th			
Characteristics	(N=66)	(N=74)	(N=71)	(N=71)	(N=71)			
Extra Diet in last 72h	Number of subjects (% subject population)							
Fruit	27 (40.9)	38 (51.4)	35 (49.3)	34 (47.9)	39 (54.9)			
Milk	3 (4.5)	4 (5.4)	5 (7.0)	4 (5.6)	4 (5.6)			
Rice	5 (7.6)	13 (17.6)	7 (9.9)	11 (15.5)	10 (14.1)			
Nuts	4 (6.1)	10 (13.5)	16 (22.5)	21 (29.6)	18 (25.4)			
Eggs	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	2 (2.8)	1 (1.4)			
Seafood	2 (3.0)	5 (6.8)	3 (4.2)	2 (2.8)	1 (1.4)			
Meat	3 (4.5)	2 (2.7)	3 (4.2)	2 (2.8)	3 (4.2)			
Vegetables	2 (3.0)	4 (5.4)	7 (9.9)	10 (14.1)	5 (7.0)			
Bean products	0 (0)	2 (2.7)	0 (0)	1 (1.4)	1 (1.4)			

Table S2. Descriptive statistics of the results from the daily time-activity surveys (for the three consecutive days prior to the physical examination) of participants for each of the five visits.

concentration.						
Glycometabolic	Quantile	Line	Low limit of	Up limit of	Low limit of	Up limit of
markers	midpoint	predication	line predication	linpred	simulation	simulation
FPG	0.13	0.77	0.72	0.82	0.74	0.79
FPG	0.38	0.82	0.79	0.84	0.79	0.84
FPG	0.63	0.86	0.86	0.86	0.81	0.91
FPG	0.88	0.91	0.89	0.94	0.84	0.98
GSP	0.13	2.49	2.44	2.54	2.47	2.51
GSP	0.38	2.53	2.51	2.55	2.50	2.55
GSP	0.63	2.57	2.57	2.57	2.52	2.61
GSP	0.88	2.61	2.58	2.63	2.53	2.68
FINS	0.13	0.44	0.37	0.51	0.36	0.51
FINS	0.38	0.49	0.46	0.53	0.46	0.53
FINS	0.63	0.55	0.55	0.55	0.51	0.59
FINS	0.88	0.61	0.57	0.64	0.54	0.68
HOMA-IR	0.13	-0.13	-0.30	0.04	-0.24	-0.01
HOMA-IR	0.38	-0.01	-0.09	0.07	-0.09	0.07
HOMA-IR	0.63	0.11	0.11	0.11	-0.04	0.25
HOMA-IR	0.88	0.23	0.14	0.31	-0.01	0.44

Table S3. Changes in the z-scores of glycometabolic markers with a quantile increase in the mixture concentration.

Note: see also Figure 3B.

	F	PG		(GSP		F	FINS		HO	MA-IR
Pollutant	Negative	Posivive									
	weight	weight									
TPHP	-	0.14	TPHP	-	0.19	TPHP	-	- 0.44	TPHP	-	0.17
TMPP	-	0.54	TMPP	-	0.46	DPHP	-	0.13	TnBP	-	0.06
EHDPP	1.00	-	EHDPP-OH	0.03	-	DBP	-	0.43	TMPP	-	0.20
DPHP	-	0.01	EHDPP	0.97	-				TiBP	-	0.29
DBP	-	0.24	DPHP	-	0.02				TBP	0.24	-
BCEP	-	0.07	DBP	-	0.26				EHDPP	0.57	-
			BCEP	-	0.07				DPHP	-	0.06
									DBP	-	0.23
									BCEP	0.18	_

Table S4. Relative weight of each pollutant within four chemical mixtures.

Note: see also Figure 3C.

					Serum Metabolite				
Dollutont			Cofeetens and				Partially		
Ponutant	Amino Acid	Carbohydrate	Cofactors and	Energy	Lipid	Nucleotide	Characterized	Peptide	Xenobiotics
			vitamins				Molecules		
TMPP	12.38% 4.76%	0.00% 22.73%	21.05% 2.63%	20.00% 10.00%	3.96% 18.18%	20.51% 20.51%	8.33% 0.00%	43.18% 31.82%	6.54% 3.27%
TPHP	13.33% 14.29%	4.55% 36.36%	23.68% 15.79%	30.00% 20.00%	7.93% 26.34%	20.51% 23.08%	33.33% 8.33%	47.73% 29.55%	4.58% 7.19%
TiBP	1.43% 3.33%	9.09% 9.09%	5.26% 0.00%	10.00% 0.00%	0.70% 2.80%	0.00% 5.13%	0.00% 0.00%	9.09% 22.73%	1.31% 3.92%
DBP	2.38% 6.19%	0.00% 9.09%	5.26% 13.16%	0.00% 20.00%	2.56% 5.59%	0.00% 7.69%	8.33% 8.33%	2.27% 4.55%	11.76% 7.19%
DPHP	0.95% 1.43%	0.00% 0.00%	5.26% 5.26%	0.00% 0.00%	3.03% 0.93%	0.00% 5.13%	0.00% 0.00%	0.00% 2.27%	1.96% 0.00%
Total	30.47% 30.00%	13.64% 77.27%	60.51% 36.84%	60.00% 50.00%	18.18% 53.84%	40.12% 61.54%	49.33% 16.66%	102.25% 90.92%	26.15% 21.57%
Average	6.10% 6.00%	2.73% 15.45%	12.11% 7.37%	12.00% 10.00%	3.64% 10.77%	8.21% 12.31%	10.00% 3.33%	20.45% 18.18%	5.23% 4.31%

Table S5. Proportions and overall averages of associated serum metabolite in each class for the key OPEs.

Note: red (left) and blue (right) colors represent positive and negative associations, respectively; see also Figure 4F.

	Urine Metabolite												
Pollutant		Carrhabarduata	Cofactors and	E	Clabal		Other	Other secondary					
	Amino Acid	Carbonydrate	Vitamins	Energy	Global	Стріа	Nucleonde	Other	metabolites				
TMPP	0.00% 0.42%	0.00% 0.00%	0.00% 0.00%	0.00% 0.00%	0.00% 0.00%	0.00% 0.00%	0.00% 1.69%	0.00% 0.00%	0.00% 0.00%				
TPHP	1.26% 3.77%	5.48% 5.48%	7.50% 2.50%	0.00% 20.00%	3.45% 0.00%	0.00% 6.52%	0.00% 11.86%	2.03% 5.41%	0.00% 10.00%				
TiBP	0.84% 0.00%	0.00% 0.00%	5.00% 0.00%	0.00% 0.00%	0.00% 0.00%	0.00% 0.00%	0.00% 0.00%	0.00% 0.00%	0.00% 0.00%				
DBP	12.97% 21.34%	26.03% 24.66%	15.00% 22.50%	20.00% 0.00%	0.00% 31.03%	6.52% 23.91%	10.17% 42.37%	9.01% 17.79%	40.00% 0.00%				
DPHP	10.88% 17.99%	19.18% 17.81%	10.00% 27.50%	0.00% 0.00%	10.34% 27.59%	4.35% 21.74%	6.78% 28.81%	10.14% 12.39%	10.00% 0.00%				
Total	25.95% 43.52%	50.69% 47.95%	37.50% 52.50%	20.00% 20.00%	13.79% 58.62%	10.87% 52.17%	16.95% 84.73%	21.18% 35.59%	50.00% 10.00%				
Average	5.19% 8.70%	10.14% 9.59%	7.50% 10.50%	4.00% 4.00%	2.76% 11.72%	2.17% 10.43%	3.39% 16.95%	4.23% 7.12%	10.00% 2.00%				

Table S6. Proportions and overall averages of the associated urine metabolite in each class for the key OPEs.

Note: red (left) and blue (right) colors represent positive and negative associations, respectively; see also Figure 4G.

Pollutant	No	Туре	Subject	Outcome	Main Results	Journal	Year
TPHP	1	In vivo	Pubertal mice	Adiponectin; HOMA-IR	We observed that the insulin-sensitizing hormone (adiponectin) was inhibited in female	J Hazard	2020 ²
					serum while stimulated in males after oral administration of TPhP. Correspondingly, we	Mater	
					found a high index of HOMA-IR in females.		
	2	In vivo	Adult male mice	Blood biochemistry; Gene	Results showed that TPHP exposure led to increased body weight, liver weight, fat mass,	Environ Pollut	2019 ³
				expression; Gut microbiota	hepatic steatosis, impaired glucose homeostasis, and insulin resistance, and mRNA levels		
				compositions; Metabolic functions	of genes involved in lipid metabolism, especially lipogenesis and lipid accumulation, were		
					significantly altered by TPHP treatment.		
	3	In vivo	Earthworm	Metabolome	Acute TPHP exposure caused significant perturbations of the endogenous metabolome in	Sci Rep	20184
					earthworms, featuring fluctuations in amino acids, glucose, inosine and phospholipids.		
	4	In vivo	Rats	Type 2 diabetes mellitus	Perinatal TPhP exposure accelerated T2DM onset in males and increased plasma non-	Reproductive	2017^{5}
					esterified- fasting fatty acids.	Toxicology	
	5	In vivo	Zebrafish	Hepatic histopathological;	These results suggest that triphenyl phosphate exposure markedly disturbs hepatic	Sci Rep	20166
				metabolomic and transcriptomic	carbohydrate and lipid metabolism in zebrafish. Moreover, DNA replication, the cell		
				responses	cycle, and non-homologous end-joining and base excision repair were strongly affected,		
					thus indicating that triphenyl phosphate hinders the DNA damage repair system in		
					zebrafish liver cells.		
	6	In vivo	C57Bl/6 mice	Insulin-like growth factor	A significant decrease in transcript levels of Igf1 and Irs2 was detected in maternal livers,	Birth Defects	20187
					whereas a significant increase in transcript levels of all genes measured was detected in	Res	
					fetal liver. A significant decrease in Igf1 protein levels was detected in maternal liver,		
					however the increase in Igf1 protein levels in fetal livers was not found to be statistically		
					significant.		
	7	In vivo	Adult mice	Metabolomics	Both TPP and DPP had no negative effect on uterine weight, glucose tolerance, and	Environ Pollut	2018^{8}
					estradiol. 1H-NMR-based metabolomics revealed a sex-specific metabolic disturbance of		
					TPP.		
	8 In vivo Female mice Expression of genes glucose		Expression of genes glucose	In the mediobasal hypothalamus, OPFR increased Pdyn, Tac2, Esr1, and Pparg in PND 14	Reprod	20209	
				metabolism and xenobiotic	females. In the liver, OPFR increased Pparg and suppressed Insr, G6pc, and Fasn in PND	Toxicol	
				metabolism	14 males and increased Esr1, Foxo1, Dgat2, Fasn, and Cyb2b10 in PND 14 females.		
	9	In vivo	Wild-type	Glucose homeostasis; metabolism	OPFR exposure interacted with HFD to increase fasting glucose in females and alter	J Appl	202110
			C57Bl/6J dams		glucose and insulin tolerance in male offspring.	Toxicol	

 Table S7. Representative toxicological literature on the associations between OPEs and glycometabolic marker.

10	In vivo	Adult mice	Metabolism			Despite no marked effect of OPFRs on glucose or insulin tolerance, OPFR treatment	J Toxicol	202011
						altered circulating insulin and leptin in females and ghrelin in males.	Environ	
							Health A	
11	In vivo	adult wild-type	Glucose and i	insulin tolerar	nce	FR increased fasting glucose levels in males, and BDE-47 augmented glucose clearance	Toxicol Sci	201812
		(WT) and ER α				in females. In males, OPFR increased ghrelin but decreased leptin and insulin independent		
		KO mice				of body weight.		
12	In vivo	Mice	Glucose and i	insulin tolerar	nce	Interestingly, female PPARyKO mice, but not males, experienced many novel OPFR	J Toxicol	202213
						effects not noted in WT mice, including decreased fat mass, altered feeding behavior and	Environ	
						efficiency, improved insulin sensitivity, elevated plasma ghrelin and hypothalamic	Health A	
						expression of its receptor.		
13	In vivo	Adult mice	Food intake	patterns, glu	cose and	Male $\text{ER}\alpha\text{KO}$ mice fed LFD experienced decreased feeding efficiency and altered insulin	J Toxicol	202214
			insulin tolerar	nce		tolerance, whereas their female counterparts displayed less fat mass and circulating ghrelin	Environ	
						when exposed to OPFRs.	Health A	
14	In vitro	3T3-L1 cells	Resistin; lepti	in		Triphenyl phosphate (TPhP), tricresyl phosphate (TCP), TDCPP, TBP and TBEP	Environ Pollut	202215
						enhanced glucose uptake at both basal and insulin-stimulated status.		
15	In vitro	Hep G2 cell	Metabolic dis	turbances		We found that when HepG2 cells were exposed to TMPP, TPHP and TDBPP, the main	Sci Total	201916
						metabolic sub-network disturbances focused on metabolism linked with oxidative stress,	Environ	
						osmotic pressure equilibrium, and glucocorticoid and mineralocorticoid receptor		
						antagonist activities.		
16	In vitro	3T3-L1 cells	Glucose uptal	ke		This study suggests that TPhP increases adipogenic differentiation, glucose uptake, and	Toxicol In	201717
						lipolysis in 3T3-L1 cells through endocrine and noradrenergic mechanisms.	Vitro	
17	In vitro	RAW264.7	Lipidomic	analysis;	insulin	Correspondingly, exposure to 10 and 20 μM TPHP induced endoplasmic reticulum (ER)	Environ Pollut	202018
		murine	resistance			stress and inflammatory responses, which have been linked to metabolic dysfunction such		
		macrophage				as insulin resistance and hypertriglyceridemia.		
		cells						
18	In vitro	3T3-L1 cells	Insulin-stimu	lated		DPhP increased the insulin-stimulated 2-NBDG uptake only at 100 μ M DPhP.	Toxicol In	201717
							Vitro	

DPHP

Pollutant	Pathway	No	Туре	Subject	Outcome	Main results	Journal	Year
TPHP	Oxidative Stress	1	In vivo	Labeo rohita	reactive oxygen species (ROS)	The reactive oxygen species (ROS) production and lipid peroxidation (LPO)	Chem Res	202119
				fingerlings	production; lipid peroxidation	rates were significantly higher in tissues (brain, liver, and kidney) of TPhP-	Toxicol	
					(LPO) rates	treated groups. Interestingly, superoxide dismutase (SOD) and catalase		
						(CAT) activities were remarkably decreased in tissues following TPhP		
						exposure.		
		2	In vivo	Zebrafish	ROS generation; Lipid	The hepatic glucose production (except short-term TPhP treatment up to 48	Neurotoxicol	2020^{20}
					peroxidation (LPO);	h), aspartate transaminase, alanine transaminase, lactate dehydrogenase,	Teratol	
					Superoxide dismutase (SOD)	reactive oxygen species generation, lipid peroxide, and catalase activities		
					activity; Catalase (CAT)	were found to be increased in TPhP exposed groups when compared to		
					activity; Glutathione-S-	control groups (normal and solvent control groups). Our study reveals that		
					transferase (GST) activity;	TPhP can potentially cause antioxidants imbalance, alterations in		
					Antioxidant activities	enzymological and biochemical profiles, and morphological anomalies in		
						hepatic tissues of zebrafish.		
		3	In vitro	Murine	anti-oxidant enzyme	Concentrations of TPHP and TDCIPP of 50 μ M were cytotoxic to BMDCs.	Chemosphere	2017 ²¹
				dendritic cells	hemeoxigenase-1	At these cytotoxic concentrations, TPHP exposure induced an activated		
						phenotype in steady state DCs, while HDM exposed DCs acquired a		
						tolerogenic phenotype. The cytotoxic concentrations induced the anti-		
						oxidant enzyme hemeoxigenase-1, which is a marker for oxidative stress.		
		4	In vitro	HepaRG cells	biomarkers of the oxidative	Potential biomarkers belonging to different TPs were found for APAP and	Toxicol In	2015 ²²
					stress TP	TPHP. For APAP, the biomarkers were related to a decrease in unsaturated	Vitro	
						phospholipids, and for TPHP to an accumulation of phosphoglycerolipids		
						and increase of palmitoyl lysophosphatidylcholine.		
		5	In vitro	Non-small cell	reactive oxygen species (ROS)	OPFRs and BFRs could cause the reduction of cell viability of A549 cell in	Chemosphere	201923
				lung cancer	production	both dose- and time-dependent manner after exposure for 24 and 48 h.		
				A549 cell		Simultaneously, excessive generation of reactive oxygen species (ROS),		
						mitochondrial membrane potential (MMP) dysfunction.		
		6	In vitro	Hep G2 cell	metabolic disturbances;	When HepG2 cells were exposed to TMPP, TPHP and TDBPP, the main	Sci Total	201916
				line		metabolic sub-network disturbances focused on metabolism linked with	Environ	
						oxidative stress, osmotic pressure equilibrium, and glucocorticoid and		

 Table S8. Representative toxicological literature on the molecular mechanisms of OPEs.

				mineralocorticoid receptor antagonist activities.		
7	In vitro	H4IIE cells	oxidative stress responses	Cells treated with TCEP and TPP showed opposite trends between cyp1a1	Toxicol Appl	201924
			(gpx1, gr, gsta2, cat)	mRNA and enzymatic activities. Furthermore, exposure to TCEP increased	Pharmacol	
				gst and cat especially at the highest concentration tested, whereas TPP		
				produced significant changes only for gr and cat at the highest concentration.		
8	In vitro	TM3 cells	superoxide dismutase (SOD),	3 β -hydroxysteroid dehydrogenase (3 β -HSD) and 17 β -hydroxysteroid	Reprod	2015 ²⁵
			catalase (CAT), glutathione	dehydrogenase (17 β -HSD) were dramatically reduced by TPP and TCEP	Toxicol	
			peroxidase (GPX) and	treatments, especially with the high dosage for 24 h. TPP and TCEP		
			glutathione S-transferase	treatments for 24 h caused significant decreases in T levels in the medium.		
			(GST) activities	Furthermore, co-treatments of hCG with TPP or TCEP could inhibit hCG-		
				induced changes in the expression of P450scc, P450-17 α and 17 $\beta\text{-HSD}$ and		
				T levels. TPP and TCEP could induce oxidative stress and endocrine		
				disruption in TM3 cells.		
9	In vitro	Human	multi-omic (transcriptomic,	Transcriptomic analysis revealed that TPP exposure markedly affected cell	Ecotoxicol	202026
		normal liver	proteomic, and metabolomic)	apoptosis, oncogene activation, REDOX homeostasis, DNA damage and	Environ Saf	
		cell (L02)		repair. Additionally, proteomic analysis found that the related proteins		
				associated with apoptosis, oxidative stress, metabolism and membrane		
				structure were affected.		
10	In vitro	MA-10 mouse	superoxide production	All of the OPFRs significantly increased (10 μ M, 1.7-4.4-fold) superoxide	Toxicol Sci	201627
		Leydig tumor		production whereas BDE-47 had no significant effect. Basal progesterone		
		cells		production was significantly increased (10 $\mu M,$ 1.5 to 3-fold) by 2-		
				ethylhexyl diphenyl phosphate, isodecyl diphenyl phosphate, isopropylated		
				triphenyl phosphate, tert-butylphenyl diphenyl phosphate, and tricresyl		
				phosphate, while BDE-47, triphenyl phosphate and tri-o-cresyl phosphate		
				had no effect.		
11	In vitro	HepG2	cell viability; reactive oxygen	All these four OPFRs could inhibit cell viability, overproduce ROS level,	J Environ Sci	2016 ²⁸
		hepatoma	species (ROS) level	induce DNA lesions and increase the LDH leakage.	Health A Tox	
		cells, A549			Hazard Subst	
		lung cancer			Environ Eng	
		cells and				
		Caco-2 colon				

			cancer cells					
	12	In vivo	Male mice	Endocrine	disruption;	Hepatic malondialdehyde (MDA) contents increased significantly in both	Environ	2015 ²⁹
				Oxidative stress		TPP treated groups, while the contents of glutathione (GSH) decreased	Toxicol	
						significantly in 300 mg/kg TPP and both TCEP treated groups. In addition,	Pharmacol	
						the hepatic activities of antioxidant enzymes including glutathione		
						peroxidase (GPX), catalase (CAT) and glutathione S-transferase (GST) as		
						well as their related gene expression were affected by TPP or TECP		
						exposure.		
	13	In vitro	A549 cells	Intracellular ROS	and miSOD	The results of the intracellular ROS analysis showed that alkyl-PFRs could	Chemosphere	202030
				analysis		cause excessive production of ROS in the nucleus, indicating that PFRs can		
						induce oxidative stress. TEHP and DNBP, which contain longer alkyl chains		
						than the other alkyl-PFRs, induced severe oxidative damage.		
	14	Human	Pregnant	Oxidative stress b	iomarkers of	Thyroid disrupting effects of OPE exposure on mothers and fetuses during	Environ Int	202131
			women	MDA and 8-Ohd	3	pregnancy and the potential influence mediated by the oxidative stresses of		
						DNA damage and lipid peroxidation.		
Apoptosis	15	In vitro	JEG-3 cells	Lipid metabolism		Although PPAR γ and its target CCAAT/enhancer binding proteins	Chemosphere	202132
						(C/EBP α) was decreased, the TG content and gene expression of SREBP1,		
						ACC, and CD36 decreased when TPP was co-exposed to the $\ensuremath{\text{PPAR}\gamma}$		
						antagonist GW9662. TPP also induced inflammatory responses,		
						endoplasmic reticulum stress (ERS), and cell apoptosis.		
	16	In vivo	Weaned male	Metabolomic; tran	nscriptomic	RNA-seq data indicated that neuronal transcription processes and cell	Chemosphere	202033
			mice			apoptosis pathway (forkhead box (FOXO), and mitogen-activated protein		
			(C57/BL6)			kinase (MAPK) signaling pathways) were significantly affected by TPP		
						exposure.		
	17	In vitro	Human	Transcriptomic;	proteomic;	TPP could induce human normal liver cell (L02) apoptosis, injury cell	Ecotoxicol	2020^{26}
			normal liver	metabolomic		ultrastructure and elevate the levels of reactive oxygen species (ROS).	Environ Saf	
			cell (L02)			Transcriptomic analysis revealed that TPP exposure markedly affected cell		
						apoptosis, oncogene activation, REDOX homeostasis, DNA damage and		
						repair. Additionally, proteomic analysis found that the related proteins		
						associated with apoptosis, oxidative stress, metabolism and membrane		
						structure were affected.		

	18	In vivo	Pregnant mice	the protein levels related to	Western blot analysis verified that the protein levels related to ERS stress	Environ Pollut	2022 ³⁴	
				apoptosis	and apoptosis were significantly increased.			
	19	In vitro	Hepatocyte	mitochondrial injury;	Docking view showed that TPP could interact with helix αJ to affect the	Ecotoxicol	202135	
				apoptosis inducing factor	activation of PARP1 as a molecular initial event. In vitro assays suggested	Environ Saf.		
				(AIF) release; reactive oxygen	some biochemical events downstream of PARP1 activation, such as			
				species (ROS) production;	mitochondrial injury, apoptosis inducing factor (AIF) release, reactive			
				DNA damage; mitochondrial	oxygen species (ROS) production, and DNA damage. Moreover, the			
				PARP1 dependent pathway	apoptosis was alleviated when cells were pretreated with PJ34 hydrochloride			
					(PARP1 inhibitor), suggesting the mitochondrial PARP1 dependent pathway			
					played a pivotal role in L02 cells apoptosis.			
Inflammasome	20	In vitro	Murine BV-2	NLRP3 inflammasome	TBBPA showed indications of possible secondary triggering activity while	Chemosphere	202036	
			microglia cells	activation	no changes were seen with TPP.			
Glucocorticoid	21	In vitro	Hep G2 cell	glucocorticoid,	When HepG2 cells were exposed to TMPP, TPHP and TDBPP, the main	Sci Total	201916	
			line	mineralocorticoid receptor	metabolic sub-network disturbances focused on metabolism linked with	Environ		
				antagonist activities	oxidative stress, osmotic pres sure equilibrium, and glucocorticoid and			
					mineralocorticoid receptor antagonist activities.			
	22	In vitro	CHO cells	CYP17,CYP21, CYP11B1	TMPP, TPHP and TDBPP exhibited both GR and MR antagonistic	Environ Sci	201737	
				expression	activities.	Technol		
	23	In vitro	CHO-K1 cells	glucocorticoid receptor (GR)	Hydroxylated TPHP-metabolites also showed ER antagonistic activity at	Toxicol Lett	201638	
			and simian	antagonistic activities	higher concentrations and exhibited pregnane X receptor (PXR) agonistic			
			kidney COS-7		activity as well as androgen receptor (AR) and glucocorticoid receptor (GR)			
			cells		antagonistic activities at similar levels to those of TPHP.			
	24	In vitro	CHO-K1 cell	glucocorticoid receptor (GR)	TBP, tris(2-ethylhexyl) phosphate (TEHP), TDCPP, TPhP and TCP showed	Toxicology	201339	
				antagonistic activity	GR antagonistic activity.			

Supplemental Figures

Figure S1. Pairwise spearman correlations of the 28 OPE exposures.

	TMP TEP G	TBP TDBP	TibP	TEHP TBOEP	TPHP	EHDPP	TMPP	BABP	RDP	TCEP	TCIPP	TDCPP	DPHP	BDCPP	DBP	BCIPP	BCEP	BMPP	BBOEP	DEHP	BBOEHEP	DPHP-OH	ЕНДРР-ОН	
TMP	1 -0.03 0.4	05 0.14 0.1	5 0.14	-0.04-0.12	0.07	-0.01 <mark>0.0</mark>	4 0.02	0.06	-0.06	0.06	0	0.02	-0.05	-0.05	0.07	-0.07	0.02	-0.1	0	-0.06	-0.02	0	-0.01	- 1
TEP	-0.03 <mark>1</mark> -0	.03-0.04-0.0	02-0.05	-0.2 <mark>0.22</mark>	0.01	-0.11 0.0	6 0.04	-0.01	0.05	0.1	0.09	0.15	0.04	-0.04	0.09	-0.07	-0.01	0.05	0.05	-0.1	0.03	0.04	0.01	
TPrP	0.05 -0.03	1 0.05 0.0	8 0.06	-0.03-0.04	-0.02	0.04 -0.0	02-0.06	6 0.03	-0.05	0.12	0.05	-0.06	-0.02	0.05	-0.05	-0.03	0	-0.04	0.01	-0.02	0.03 -	0.01	0.05	- 08
TBP	0.14 -0.04 0.	05 1 0.9	1 0.78	0.14 -0.08	0.11	0.22 0.0	0.18	0	0.01	0.17	0.14	-0.1	-0.02	-0.04	0	0.01	-0.02	-0.03	-0.02	0.08	-0.04	0.02 ·	-0.03	0.0
TnBP	0.15 -0.02 0.	08 0.91 1	0.55	0.14 -0.12	0.2	0.23 0.0	3 0.18	-0.02	-0.01	0.12	0.13	-0.08	-0.03	-0.06	0	-0.01	-0.03	-0.02	-0.01	0.1	-0.03	0.01 ·	-0.02	
TiBP	0.14 -0.05 0.4	06 0.78 0.5	5 1	0.05 -0.03	8 0.03	0.06 -0.0	05 0.1	0.02	0.02	0.19	0.15	-0.11	0.01	0.01	0.03	0.08	0	0	-0.05	-0.01	-0.03-	·0.03·	-0.04	- 0.6
TEHP	-0.04 -0.2 -0	.03 0.14 0.1	4 0.05	1 0.03	0.04	0.31 -0.0	02 0.14	-0.01	-0.01	0.12	-0.02	-0.08	-0.11	0.01	-0.15	0.04	-0.16	-0.03	-0.09	-0.02	-0.11-	·0.04	-0.08	
TBOEP	-0.12 <mark>0.22</mark> -0	.04-0.08-0.1	2-0.03	0.03 1	-0.08	-0.05-0.0	08 0.08	-0.15	-0.08	0.11	0.05	-0.06	0.05	0.07	-0.15	0.09	-0.03	-0.01	-0.05	-0.03	-0.05-	-0.07	-0.06	
TPHP	0.07 0.01 -0	.02 0.11 0.2	0.03	0.04 -0.08	1	-0.17 -0.	1 0.16	-0.15	-0.04	0	-0.04	-0.02	0.03	-0.01	0.08	0.06	0.13	80.0	0.09	0.15	0.12 -	·0.04	0.15	- 0.4
EHDPP	-0.01-0.11 0.	04 0.22 0.2	3 0.06	0.31 -0.05	5-0.17	1 0.0	6 0.06	0.17	0.02	0.08	0.23	-0.07	-0.11	0.03	-0.24	-0.01	-0.14	-0.04	-0.04	0.01	-0.08	0.14	-0.09	
CDPP	0.04 0.06 -0	.02 0.01 0.0	3 -0.05	-0.02-0.08	8 -0.1	0.06 1	-0.07	0.02	0.15	-0.12	0.02	0.04	-0.04	-0.11	-0.06	-0.13	-0.15	-0.02	-0.16	-0.05	-0.14-	·0.08·	-0.15	
TMPP	0.02 0.04 -0	.06 0.18 0.1	8 0.1	0.14 0.08	0.16	0.06 -0.0	07 1	-0.06	-0.07	0.08	0	0.02 -	-0.03	-0.04	0.06	0.08	0.12	0.03	0.16	0.13	0.15	0.16	0.12	- 0.2
BABP	0.06 -0.01 0.	03 0 -0.0	2 0.02	-0.01-0.15	5-0.15	0.17 0.0	2 -0.06	1	0.01	0.07	0.06	0.15	0.05	-0.09	0.12	-0.03	-0.02	0.05	0.07	-0.12	-0.01	0.07 ·	-0.02	
RDP	-0.06 <mark>0.05</mark> -0	.05 0.01 -0.0	01 0.02	-0.01-0.08	8-0.04	0.02 0.1	<mark>5</mark> -0.07	0.01	1 -	-0.04	0.02	-0.03	0.05	0.03	-0.03	-0.01	0.02	0.07	0.05	0.01	0.05	0.06	0.06	
TCEP	0.06 0.1 0.	12 0.17 0.1	2 0.19	0.12 0.11	0	0.08 -0.1	12 0.08	0.07	-0.04	1	0.28	0.05	-0.02	0.1	0.07	0	0.02	0.02	0.06	-0.05	0.07	0.04	0.07	- 0
TCIPP	0 0.09 0.	05 0.14 0.1	3 0.15	-0.02 0.05	-0.04	0.23 0.0	2 0	0.06	0.02	0.28	1	-0.01	0.03	0.08	0.06	0.01	-0.04	0.12	-0.01	-0.06	-0.01	0.06	-0.03	
TDCPP	0.02 0.15 -0	.06 -0.1 -0.0	8-0.11	-0.08-0.06	6-0.02	-0.07 <mark>0.0</mark>	4 0.02	0.15	-0.03	0.05	-0.01	1	0.04	-0.14	0.16	-0.07	0.06	0.05	0.02	-0.03	0.04	0.02	0.01	
DPHP	-0.05 0.04 -0	.02-0.02-0.0	3 0.01	-0.11 0.05	0.03	-0.11-0.0	04-0.03	3 0.05	0.05 -	-0.02	0.03	0.04	1	0.28	0.47	0.27	0.34	0.41	0.25	0.09	0.23	0.18	0.24	0.2
BDCPP	-0.05-0.04 0.	<mark>05</mark> -0.04-0.0	6 0.01	0.01 0.07	-0.01	0.03 -0.	11-0.04	1-0.09	0.03	0.1	0.08	-0.14	0.28		0.28	0.44	0.34	0.29	0.34	0.18	0.38	0.32	0.37	
DBP	0.07 0.09 -0	.05 0 0	0.03	-0.15-0.15	80.08	-0.24-0.0	D6 0.06	0.12	-0.03	0.07	0.06	0.16	0.47	0.28	1	0.28	0.46	0.39	0.43	0.14	0.44	0.31	0.41	04
BCIPP	-0.07-0.07-0	.03 0.01 -0.0	01 0.08	0.04 0.09	0.06	-0.01-0.	13 0.08	-0.03	-0.01	0	0.01	-0.07	0.27	0.44	0.28	1	0.48	0.33	0.45	0.28	0.48	0.46	0.47	0.1
BCEP	0.02 -0.01	0 -0.02-0.0	03 0	-0.16-0.03	0.13	-0.14-0.1	15 0.12	-0.02	0.02	0.02	-0.04	0.06	0.34	0.34	0.46	0.48	1	0.32	0.64	0.38	0.72	0.48	0.58	
BMPP	-0.1 0.05 -0	.04-0.03-0.0	02 0	-0.03-0.01	0.08	-0.04-0.0	02 0.03	0.05	0.07	0.02	0.12	0.05	0.41	0.29	0.39	0.33	0.32	1	0.24	0.02	0.24	0.25	0.23	0.6
BBOEP	0 0.05 0.4	01 -0.02-0.0	01-0.05	-0.09-0.05	0.09	-0.04-0.	16 0.16	0.07	0.05	0.06	-0.01	0.02	0.25	0.34	0.43	0.45	0.64	0.24	1	0.42	0.87	0.63	0.69	
DEHP	-0.06 -0.1 -0	.02 0.08 0.1	-0.01	-0.02-0.03	0.15	0.01 -0.0	05 0.13	-0.12	0.01 -	-0.05	-0.06	-0.03	0.09	0.18	0.14	0.28	0.38	0.02	0.42	1	0.47	0.31	0.43	
BBOEHEP	-0.02 0.03 0.4	03 -0.04-0.0	03-0.03	-0.11-0.05	0.12	-0.08-0.	14 0.15	-0.01	0.05	0.07	-0.01	0.04	0.23	0.38	0.44	0.48	0.72	0.24	0.87	0.47		0.63	0.79	0.8
DPHP-OH	0 0.04 -0	.01 0.02 0.0	1 -0.03	-0.04-0.07	-0.04	0.14 -0.0	08 0.16	0.07	0.06	0.04	0.06	0.02	0.18	0.32	0.31	0.46	0.48	0.25	0.63	0.31	0.63	1	0.54	
EHDPP-OH	-0.01 0.01 0.4	<mark>05</mark> -0.03-0.0	02-0.04	-0.08-0.06	0.15	-0.09-0.	15 0.12	-0.02	0.06	0.07	-0.03	0.01	0.24	0.37	0.41	0.47	0.58	0.23	0.69	0.43	0.79	0.54	1	
																								└ _1

Figure S2. Sensitivity analysis results of the associations between OPE exposures and glycometabolic markers.

(A) Forest plot of the LMM results between OPE exposures and glycometabolic markers (FPG, GSP, FINS, and HOMA-IR) adjusting for age, sex, BMI, education level, financial income, blood cotinine concentration, other diets (3 days), and month of sample collection. (B) Forest plot of the LMM results between OPE exposures and glycometabolic markers (FPG, GSP, FINS, and HOMA-IR) adjusting for age, sex, BMI, education level, financial income, blood cotinine concentration, other diets (3 days), and cups of tea consumption (3 days). (C) Forest plot of the LMM results between OPEs exposures and glycometabolic markers (FPG, GSP, FINS, and HOMA-IR) adjusting for age, sex, BMI, education level, financial income, blood cotinine concentration, other diets (3 days), and cups of tea consumption (3 days). (C) Forest plot of the LMM results between OPEs exposures and glycometabolic markers (FPG, GSP, FINS, and HOMA-IR) adjusting for age, sex, BMI, education level, financial income, blood cotinine concentration, other diets (3 days), and frequency of alcohol consumption (3 days). The FDR adjusted *P*-values of each predictor are given as * FDR < 0.05.

Note: see also Excel Table S4.



Figure S3. Stratification analysis results of the associations between OPE exposures and glycometabolic markers by sex.



Note: see also Excel Table S5.

Figure S4. Common and specific biomolecular intermediators of individual OPEs.

(A) Upset plot of common and specific biomolecular intermediators of each OPE for metabolome. (B) Upset plot of common and specific biomolecular intermediators of each OPE for transcriptome.



References

- 1 Wilmanski, T. *et al.* Blood metabolome predicts gut microbiome α -diversity in humans. *Nature biotechnology* **37**, 1217-1228, doi:10.1038/s41587-019-0233-9 (2019).
- 2 Wang, C. *et al.* Triphenyl phosphate causes a sexually dimorphic metabolism dysfunction associated with disordered adiponectin receptors in pubertal mice. *Journal of hazardous materials* **388**, 121732, doi:10.1016/j.jhazmat.2019.121732 (2020).
- Wang, D. *et al.* Effects of triphenyl phosphate exposure during fetal development on obesity and metabolic dysfunctions in adult mice: Impaired lipid metabolism and intestinal dysbiosis. *Environmental pollution (Barking, Essex : 1987)* **246**, 630-638, doi:10.1016/j.envpol.2018.12.053 (2019).
- Wang, L., Huang, X., Laserna, A. K. C. & Li, S. F. Y. Untargeted metabolomics reveals transformation pathways and metabolic response of the earthworm Perionyx excavatus after exposure to triphenyl phosphate. *Scientific reports* **8**, 16440, doi:10.1038/s41598-018-34814-9 (2018).
- 5 Green, A. J. *et al.* Perinatal triphenyl phosphate exposure accelerates type 2 diabetes onset and increases adipose accumulation in UCD-type 2 diabetes mellitus rats. *Reproductive toxicology (Elmsford, N.Y.)* **68**, 119-129, doi:10.1016/j.reprotox.2016.07.009 (2017).
- 6 Du, Z. *et al.* TPhP exposure disturbs carbohydrate metabolism, lipid metabolism, and the DNA damage repair system in zebrafish liver. *Scientific reports* **6**, 21827, doi:10.1038/srep21827 (2016).
- Philbrook, N. A., Restivo, V. E., Belanger, C. L. & Winn, L. M. Gestational triphenyl phosphate exposure in C57Bl/6 mice perturbs expression of insulin-like growth factor signaling genes in maternal and fetal liver. *Birth defects research* **110**, 483-494, doi:10.1002/bdr2.1185 (2018).
- 8 Wang, D. *et al.* Neonatal triphenyl phosphate and its metabolite diphenyl phosphate exposure induce sex- and dosedependent metabolic disruptions in adult mice. *Environmental pollution (Barking, Essex : 1987)* **237**, 10-17, doi:10.1016/j.envpol.2018.01.047 (2018).
- 9 Adams, S. *et al.* Sex- and age-dependent effects of maternal organophosphate flame-retardant exposure on neonatal hypothalamic and hepatic gene expression. *Reproductive toxicology (Elmsford, N.Y.)* **94**, 65-74, doi:10.1016/j.reprotox.2020.04.001 (2020).
- 10 Walley, S. N. *et al.* Maternal organophosphate flame-retardant exposure alters offspring energy and glucose homeostasis in a sexually dimorphic manner in mice. *Journal of applied toxicology : JAT* **41**, 572-586, doi:10.1002/jat.4066 (2021).
- 11 Vail, G. M. *et al.* The interactions of diet-induced obesity and organophosphate flame retardant exposure on energy homeostasis in adult male and female mice. *Journal of toxicology and environmental health. Part A* **83**, 438-455, doi:10.1080/15287394.2020.1777235 (2020).
- 12 Krumm, E. A. *et al.* Organophosphate Flame-Retardants Alter Adult Mouse Homeostasis and Gene Expression in a Sex-Dependent Manner Potentially Through Interactions With ERα. *Toxicological sciences : an official journal of the Society of Toxicology* **162**, 212-224, doi:10.1093/toxsci/kfx238 (2018).
- 13 Vail, G. M. *et al.* Implications of peroxisome proliferator-activated receptor gamma (PPARY) with the intersection of organophosphate flame retardants and diet-induced obesity in adult mice. *Journal of toxicology and environmental health*. *Part A* **85**, 381-396, doi:10.1080/15287394.2021.2023716 (2022).
- 14 Vail, G. M. *et al.* Implications of estrogen receptor alpha (ERa) with the intersection of organophosphate flame retardants and diet-induced obesity in adult mice. *Journal of toxicology and environmental health. Part A* **85**, 397-413, doi:10.1080/15287394.2022.2026849 (2022).
- 15 Liu, Y. *et al.* Remodeling on adipocytic physiology of organophosphorus esters in mature adipocytes. *Environmental pollution (Barking, Essex : 1987)* **305**, 119287, doi:10.1016/j.envpol.2022.119287 (2022).
- 16 Gu, J., Su, F., Hong, P., Zhang, Q. & Zhao, M. (1)H NMR-based metabolomic analysis of nine organophosphate flame retardants metabolic disturbance in Hep G2 cell line. *The Science of the total environment* 665, 162-170, doi:10.1016/j.scitotenv.2019.02.055 (2019).
- 17 Cano-Sancho, G., Smith, A. & La Merrill, M. A. Triphenyl phosphate enhances adipogenic differentiation, glucose uptake

and lipolysis via endocrine and noradrenergic mechanisms. *Toxicology in vitro : an international journal published in association with BIBRA* **40**, 280-288, doi:10.1016/j.tiv.2017.01.021 (2017).

- 18 Hu, W. *et al.* Triphenyl phosphate modulated saturation of phospholipids: Induction of endoplasmic reticulum stress and inflammation. *Environmental pollution (Barking, Essex : 1987)* **263**, 114474, doi:10.1016/j.envpol.2020.114474 (2020).
- 19 Umamaheswari, S., Karthika, P., Suvenitha, K., Kadirvelu, K. & Ramesh, M. Dose-Dependent Molecular Responses of Labeo rohita to Triphenyl Phosphate. *Chemical research in toxicology* 34, 2500-2511, doi:10.1021/acs.chemrestox.1c00281 (2021).
- 20 Ramesh, M. *et al.* Organophosphorus flame retardant induced hepatotoxicity and brain AChE inhibition on zebrafish (Danio rerio). *Neurotoxicology and teratology* **82**, 106919, doi:10.1016/j.ntt.2020.106919 (2020).
- 21 Canbaz, D., Logiantara, A., van Ree, R. & van Rijt, L. S. Immunotoxicity of organophosphate flame retardants TPHP and TDCIPP on murine dendritic cells in vitro. *Chemosphere* **177**, 56-64, doi:10.1016/j.chemosphere.2017.02.149 (2017).
- 22 Van den Eede, N. *et al.* Metabolomics analysis of the toxicity pathways of triphenyl phosphate in HepaRG cells and comparison to oxidative stress mechanisms caused by acetaminophen. *Toxicology in vitro : an international journal published in association with BIBRA* **29**, 2045-2054, doi:10.1016/j.tiv.2015.08.012 (2015).
- Yu, X. *et al.* OPFRs and BFRs induced A549 cell apoptosis by caspase-dependent mitochondrial pathway. *Chemosphere* 221, 693-702, doi:10.1016/j.chemosphere.2019.01.074 (2019).
- 24 Mennillo, E., Cappelli, F. & Arukwe, A. Biotransformation and oxidative stress responses in rat hepatic cell-line (H4IIE) exposed to organophosphate esters (OPEs). *Toxicology and applied pharmacology* **371**, 84-94, doi:10.1016/j.taap.2019.04.004 (2019).
- 25 Chen, G. *et al.* TPP and TCEP induce oxidative stress and alter steroidogenesis in TM3 Leydig cells. *Reproductive toxicology (Elmsford, N.Y.)* **57**, 100-110, doi:10.1016/j.reprotox.2015.05.011 (2015).
- 26 Wang, X., Li, F., Liu, J., Ji, C. & Wu, H. Transcriptomic, proteomic and metabolomic profiling unravel the mechanisms of hepatotoxicity pathway induced by triphenyl phosphate (TPP). *Ecotoxicology and environmental safety* 205, 111126, doi:10.1016/j.ecoenv.2020.111126 (2020).
- 27 Schang, G., Robaire, B. & Hales, B. F. Organophosphate Flame Retardants Act as Endocrine-Disrupting Chemicals in MA-10 Mouse Tumor Leydig Cells. *Toxicological sciences : an official journal of the Society of Toxicology* **150**, 499-509, doi:10.1093/toxsci/kfw012 (2016).
- An, J. et al. The cytotoxicity of organophosphate flame retardants on HepG2, A549 and Caco-2 cells. Journal of environmental science and health. Part A, Toxic/hazardous substances & environmental engineering **51**, 980-9888, doi:10.1080/10934529.2016.1191819 (2016).
- 29 Chen, G., Jin, Y., Wu, Y., Liu, L. & Fu, Z. Exposure of male mice to two kinds of organophosphate flame retardants (OPFRs) induced oxidative stress and endocrine disruption. *Environmental toxicology and pharmacology* 40, 310-318, doi:10.1016/j.etap.2015.06.021 (2015).
- 30 Yuan, S. *et al.* In vitro oxidative stress, mitochondrial impairment and G1 phase cell cycle arrest induced by alkylphosphorus-containing flame retardants. *Chemosphere* **248**, 126026, doi:10.1016/j.chemosphere.2020.126026 (2020).
- 31 Yao, Y. *et al.* Exposure to organophosphate ester flame retardants and plasticizers during pregnancy: Thyroid endocrine disruption and mediation role of oxidative stress. *Environment international* 146, 106215, doi:10.1016/j.envint.2020.106215 (2021).
- Wang, Y. *et al.* Triphenyl phosphate disturbs the lipidome and induces endoplasmic reticulum stress and apoptosis in JEG-3 cells. *Chemosphere* **275**, 129978, doi:10.1016/j.chemosphere.2021.129978 (2021).
- 33 Liu, X. *et al.* Triphenyl phosphate permeates the blood brain barrier and induces neurotoxicity in mouse brain. *Chemosphere* **252**, 126470, doi:10.1016/j.chemosphere.2020.126470 (2020).
- 34 Hong, J. *et al.* Prenatal exposure to triphenyl phosphate activated PPARγ in placental trophoblasts and impaired pregnancy outcomes. *Environmental pollution (Barking, Essex : 1987)* **301**, 119039, doi:10.1016/j.envpol.2022.119039 (2022).
- 35 Wang, X. *et al.* New insights into the mechanism of hepatocyte apoptosis induced by typical organophosphate ester: An integrated in vitro and in silico approach. *Ecotoxicology and environmental safety* **219**, 112342, doi:10.1016/j.ecoenv.2021.112342 (2021).

- 36 Bowen, C. *et al.* Mitochondrial-related effects of pentabromophenol, tetrabromobisphenol A, and triphenyl phosphate on murine BV-2 microglia cells. *Chemosphere* **255**, 126919, doi:10.1016/j.chemosphere.2020.126919 (2020).
- 37 Zhang, Q., Wang, J., Zhu, J., Liu, J. & Zhao, M. Potential Glucocorticoid and Mineralocorticoid Effects of Nine Organophosphate Flame Retardants. *Environmental science & technology* **51**, 5803-5810, doi:10.1021/acs.est.7b01237 (2017).
- 38 Kojima, H., Takeuchi, S., Van den Eede, N. & Covaci, A. Effects of primary metabolites of organophosphate flame retardants on transcriptional activity via human nuclear receptors. *Toxicology letters* 245, 31-39, doi:10.1016/j.toxlet.2016.01.004 (2016).
- 39 Kojima, H. *et al.* In vitro endocrine disruption potential of organophosphate flame retardants via human nuclear receptors. *Toxicology* **314**, 76-83, doi:10.1016/j.tox.2013.09.004 (2013).