791 **Supplemental Figures**

792

794 SPARC for near-field, far-field, and pharmaceutical compounds, and the entire data set.

pharmaceutical near- and far-field environmental chemicals, sorted by the average number of

each atom type that is in pharmaceutical compounds.

800 **Table S1.** Number of predicted neutral chemicals per chemical class for ChemAxon p*Ka* plug-in.

801

802

Strope et al. **Draft Manuscript** Control of the Strope et al. **Draft Manuscript** Control of the Draft Manuscript

Appendix

 Several p*Ka* prediction programs exist (Liao and Nicklaus, 2009). Commercial predictors span a range of mechanisms to predict the protonation state of particular atoms, including linear 806 free energy relationships (LFER) that use a dictionary of chemical substructures (Lee et al., 2007), quantitative structure-property relationships (QSPR) (Jover et al., 2008; Palaz et al., 2012), and quantum chemical and *ab initio* methods (Bochevarov et al., 2013; Eckert and Klamt, 2006; Eckert et al., 2009; Klamt et al., 2010; Klamt et al., 2003; Vareková et al., 2011). Semi- empirical models calculate descriptors for each ionizable chemical functional group, after which p*Ka* values are predicted using machine learning or tree-based models (Jelfs et al., 2007; Xing et al., 2003). These semi-empirical models are limited by the number of chemicals used (Xing et al., 2003) and the usage of a proprietary, non-releasable training set (Jelfs et al., 2007). Empirical methods employ substructure databases and use LFER to predict p*Ka* values based on the prior assignments for the atomic groups stored in a database. As such, their prediction accuracy is limited to the substructures contained in their database. If additional training data are available, many of these tools can be recalibrated to apply to new chemical structures. Unfortunately, such data are not available for many environmental chemicals. The data limitations of these methods will improve with the addition of more p*Ka* data and could be aided 820 by efforts to contribute pK_a data that are currently underway (https://gist.github.com/egonw/5aa53abe480a8625fe81). Such is also the case with predictors using QSPR. These prediction methods have been developed using machine learning algorithms along with structural and chemical descriptors to make predictions of p*Ka* values (Fraczkiewicz et al., 2014; Szegezdi and Csizmadia, 2007; Szegezdi and Czismadia, 2004).

Strope et al. **Draft Manuscript**

834 2007).

835