



Green Chemistry Different Approach & Fundamental Goals

Dr. Sunil Chachere

HOD Chemistry Department
Dnyanesh Mahavidyalaya,
Navargaon Dist. Chandrapur

Introduction :

As noted by Anastas and Warner, most efforts at reducing risk to human health from chemicals have focused on reducing the probability and magnitude of exposures. That approach works, until it fails. Failure, unfortunately, is virtually inevitable, because of accidents and practices not part of the intended use of a product. There are a multitude of examples of unintended exposures including incidents like the accidental release of methyl isocyanate gas at Bhopal, BP's Deepwater Horizon oil spill, the recycling of electronic waste by children in China and India, and household dust in California containing flame retardance.

Green chemistry takes a different approach. One of its fundamental goals is to synthesize chemicals that are not hazardous for human health and the environment. To achieve this goal efficiently, chemists must be able to assess potential hazards of the chemicals that they develop.

We use the word 'hazard' deliberately. 'Hazard' is embedded in green chemistry as one of the two determining elements of risk. It is commonly accepted that risk is a function of inherent hazard and exposure. Green chemistry deals with risk by seeking to eliminate inherent hazard rather than by controlling exposure. Ideally this assessment would take place as early in the design process as feasible so that decisions can be made whether to pursue further development. If a hazard is identified, the chemist can opt either to cease development of that chemical or to manipulate the molecular structure to design against hazard.

In an ideal world, it would be possible to predict with confidence the potential toxicity of new molecules based on their structure and physical characteristics. Well-known weaknesses in these approaches, however (note for example the Structure Activity Relationship Paradigm discussed below), render this approach not just inadequate, but potentially misleading. In this endeavor, such potential for false positives and false negatives is unacceptable. Actual biological experiments are therefore necessary.

Because chemists typically are not trained in toxicology or other relevant fields, developing the means to achieve this goal requires collaboration between environmental health scientists and green chemists. This collaboration, systematically applied and constantly adjusted to reflect new scientific discoveries, would help lead to a new generation of inherently safer chemicals.

In this paper we explore how chemists can apply principles and tests from the environmental health sciences to identify potential endocrine disruptors. Specifically, we propose a five-tiered testing protocol, TiPED. We begin with computational approaches as the fastest and the least expensive assays. Subsequent tiers involve increasingly specialized

tests to determine the potential for endocrine disrupting characteristics of a chemical under development. Some of the assays are based on known mechanisms of action; some are designed to catch disruptions for which the mechanisms or receptors are as yet unknown. We present the overall structure of the protocol with assay examples that could be used in each tier.

We noted above that actual biological experiments are necessary for predicting toxicity. This is especially the case with endocrine disruption because of the complex signaling events that control endocrine activity within and between cells, tissues and organs. We discuss this issue in greater detail as we discuss the strengths and weaknesses of our different tiers.

We present the tiers in a logical sequence for a chemist designing a new chemical from the simplest approach (and least expensive) through the more complex (and often more expensive). We recognize, however, that different users will have different needs. A user can start anywhere in the system, not necessarily with Tier 1. An academic research chemist drawing a molecule *de novo* will have different issues and questions than an industrial chemist with a molecule already in hand; the former would be more likely to go through the protocol in a linear progression. The latter might use assays in a later tier to get a quick read on the likelihood of potential problems. Some users may want a straight "harm no likely harm" answer, abandoning failed molecules rather than developing them into products. Others, after getting a "harm" result, might pursue a series of increasingly specific assays to identify mechanisms of biological action so that they might redesign the product. To iterate, though presented here in a linear fashion for the sake of new chemical design, other users can enter the system where it best meets their needs.

To support the tiered assay system, we also identify a suite of principles that should be used to guide implementation (discussed after summary of TiPED). These principles focus both on general concerns about toxicity testing as well as unique characteristics of endocrine disrupting compounds (EDC) that makes their detection particularly challenging.

At this stage, TiPED is a scientific framework in progress. This paper presents the overall strategy, its scientific rationale and the principles that govern its design and implementation. The formal protocol itself will be presented on the TiPED website (www.TIPEDinfo.com). The website will undergo formal peer review and invite constant input from EDC specialists and chemists who use it.

Scientific understanding of endocrine disruption is advancing rapidly. New mechanisms of endocrine disruption, new targets for EDC action and new ways to measure the effects of EDCs are being reported regularly. Any effective testing protocol must evolve as new scientific discoveries are reported. The guiding principles behind this testing protocol, however, remain constant.

We choose to focus on endocrine disruption for three reasons. First, the body of evidence that has emerged from the past 20 years of research on this class of mechanisms has grown, indicating it is a serious public health issue. Second, it is clear that the current paradigm focused on exposure, instead of hazard, has failed to protect public health from endocrine disruption. Measurements by the US Centers for Disease Control and Prevention document widespread exposure to multiple EDCs at levels that current scientific research suggests may not be safe. Third, despite a 1996 Congressional mandate to develop toxicity assays for EDCs, the United States Environmental Protection Agency (US EPA) has made little progress in implementing the use of EDC assays in the regulatory process. With this focus in mind, we invited leading experts in endocrine disruption science to collaborate with leading green chemists to develop a testing protocol that could be used by chemists as a voluntary not

regulatory design tool (Table \$11). This allowed us to focus on scientific issues, rather than regulatory debates.

1. What is endocrine disruption ?

The endocrine system uses chemical signals to direct development and reproduction, regulate body function and metabolism, and influence behavior and immunity. In its broadest sense, endocrine disruption takes place when an agent alters hormone signaling or the response to hormone signaling, and in so doing alters some aspect of the organism under hormonal control. According to the Endocrine Society, the world's authoritative scientific association of clinical and basic endocrinologists, an endocrine-disrupting chemical (EDC) is an exogenous chemical, or mixture of chemicals, that can interfere with any aspect of hormonal action.

Endocrine disruption can be caused by diverse mechanisms. Hormones work by binding with protein receptors in the cell membrane, the cytoplasm or the nucleus. Binding initiates gene activity or physiological processes (depending upon the receptor, its location, hormone concentration, and the developmental state of the cell/tissue/organisms) that are part of and essential to normal organismal function. EDCs work by interfering with that signaling process. They are not necessarily structurally similar to hormones; many, but not all, are lipophilic.

Mechanisms of action include the EDC binds to the receptor and adds to the normal signal; the EDC binds to the receptor and blocks the normal signal, the EDC affects hormone synthesis (increasing or decreasing the amount of natural hormone that is available for signaling), the EDC alters hormone metabolism or hormone transport and storage within bodily time again, increasing or decreasing hormone amount and/or the EDC affects the levels of mature hormone receptor via disruption or modulation of gene expression, folding, or transport.

A central part of the phenomenon of endocrine disruption is receptor binding, which depends upon the molecular conformation of the hormone and its receptors. Molecular structure is a good, but imperfect predictor of whether binding will occur. Chemists can use information about structure both to predict potential (and described below) as well as to guide manipulation of a chemical's structure to avoid hazard.

A crucial aspect of hormone action is that it takes place at extremely low concentrations. For an estrogen, for example, typical physical levels of the biologically-active form of an estrogen are extremely low, in the range of 10-900 pg/ml (high parts per quadrillion to low parts per trillion). This is possible because of the specificity of hormone binding to its receptor, and is biologically necessary because of the large number of signaling molecules present at any one time. Specificity and sensitivity make it possible for an enormous number of signaling molecules to co-exist in circulation without disrupting each other's signaling. The specificity also evolved, presumably, to reduce or avoid disruption by exogenous compounds with which organisms have had evolutionary experience.

Within the past century, over 80,000 new chemicals have been synthesized and used in ways that have resulted in widespread human exposures. A subset of these chemicals are toxic; of these toxic chemicals are toxic due to endocrine disruption. A small number of these chemicals have been created explicitly to alter hormone signaling, e.g., the estrogenic drug diethylstilbestrol and many pesticides (see target species). Other chemicals have molecular structures that unintentionally bear sufficient resemblance to hormones such that they are capable of binding, with varying degrees of affinity to hormone receptors, or of merely acting at the molecular level with other molecules involved in hormonal activity. Often EDCs are much less potent than the endogenous hormones in binding with receptors. An increasing number of examples appearing in the peer-reviewed literature, however, show that in some signaling

pathways exogenous hormone-mimics can be equipotent and capable of provoking biological responses at picomolar (pM) levels or lower.

Most early research on EDCs focused on the effects of disruption of sexual reproduction interactions with the estrogen and androgen nuclear receptors. Evidence gathered over the past decade now shows that the mechanisms and endpoints vulnerable to endocrine disruption are much broader than originally understood. Indeed, EDCs are now known to affect metabolism, diabetes, obesity, liver function, bone function, immune function, learning and behavior via a variety of receptor systems and signaling pathways. In addition, the actions of EDCs on reproduction are now known to go far beyond nuclear sex steroid hormone receptors. In principle, there is virtually no endocrine signaling system or hormone pathway immune to disruption (Fig. 1)

Fig. 1 The endocrine system is comprised of the hypothalamus, pituitary, adrenal gland, parathyroid gland, thyroid, pancreas, and gonads. Other organs such as the liver, heart, and adipose tissue have secondary endocrine functions and may also be targeted by EDCs. Endocrine glands secrete hormones, which circulate throughout the body via the blood, and may bind to its specific receptors. For instance, progesterone is related to the androgen receptor (AR) and is distributed throughout the body and brain.

The majority of research on EDCs has examined the consequences of their interactions with such hormone receptors (NRs), especially estrogen receptors alpha and beta (ER α , ER β), the androgen receptor (AR), among others. NRs are a superfamily of transcription factors, proteins that can bind to DNA and influence the expression of nearby genes. NRs play central roles in development, physiology and disease. In humans, there are some 40 identified NRs. Many others remain orphans meaning that their endogenous ligands have not yet been identified. When activated, NRs undergo conformational changes that allow recruitment of co-regulatory molecules and the chromatin modifying machinery of the cell. The ultimate action of NRs is to influence the transcriptional machinery of target genes. NRs also interact with other intracellular signaling pathways. Examining how chemicals bind to these receptors can provide important information concerning their endocrine disrupting potential. There are *in vitro* assays, some of which can be performed as part of high throughput, screening systems that can confirm chemical binding to the majority of NRs. The strengths and weaknesses of *in vitro* tools in predicting hazard will be discussed below in the section on Tier 2

Endocrine disruption also takes place outside the cell nucleus. Many natural steroid hormones bind to cell membrane-bound receptors, which in turn partner with a variety of well-known signaling cascade proteins. Recent evidence demonstrates that EDCs may exert hormonal effects in these non-nuclear hormone receptors as well. Rather than acting as transcription factors, membrane hormone receptors act in intracellular signaling molecules to affect phosphorylation and calcium flux within a cell. Disruption of this pathway is another way by which EDCs may alter endogenous hormone actions.

Thus, EDCs can act via multiple pathways and receptor-based mechanisms (Fig. 2). At higher doses they may also exert receptor-independent actions via more traditional mechanisms of toxicology. Their effects are species, time and cell-specific, and are influenced by metabolism.

2. Testing for endocrine disruption

The complex biology of endocrine disruption means that no single area or single approach can be used to identify chemicals with EDC characteristics. Instead, a combination of approaches is necessary, including computational methods as well as both *in vitro* and *in vivo* testing. Compared to current practice, a carefully composed battery of assays can

dramatically reduce the likelihood that a newly developed chemical will later be found to be an EDC

In vivo methods can test for many types of EDC activity. Actual endocrine disruption, however, involves perturbing the action of one or more hormones within a whole organism. Today's in vitro and computer models do not incorporate the complexity that this involves. For this reason, in vivo assays will also be necessary.

Two additional characteristics of the endocrine system must inform a strategy to detect potential EDCs. First, like endogenous hormones, EDCs may display non-monotonic dose-response curves. This means that effects observed at low dose levels may be completely unpredictable, and indeed the opposite, of effects observed at high levels. Multiple mechanisms underlie the non-monotonicity of endocrine systems. Thus it is critical to assess chemicals over a wide concentration range in vivo and wide dose range in vivo to determine whether they have EDC characteristics.

Second, the effects of an exposure to EDC vary with the life stage in which it is experienced (Fig. 3). Thus, the consequences of exposure during periods of development (fetal, childhood and adolescence, including puberty) can vary among periods and may also yield very different effects compared to exposure in adulthood. While adult exposure to EDCs can certainly be an important factor in adverse health outcomes, early times in development are likely to be more sensitive to endocrine disruption.

Adverse effects during periods of developmental transition are likely to occur at concentrations of the chemical that are far below levels that would be considered harmful in the adult. These vulnerable life stages, including fetal, childhood, and perinatal development, are of particular concern because it is during these stages that the individual is changing physiologically and morphologically. These periods of transition are marked by massive changes in the endocrine environment as the new phenotype (or body plan) is being developed.

This heightened sensitivity during developmental transitions results from multiple factors. Most important, the organizational activities of hormones (formation of organs, brain organization, etc.) are not reversible, whereas the activational activities (regulation of reproduction, immune system modulation, etc.) prevail in adulthood and are reversible. Second, the protective mechanisms available to the adult such as DNA repair mechanisms, a competent immune system, detoxifying enzymes, liver metabolism/excretion, and the blood/brain barrier are not fully functional in the fetus or newborn. Third, the developing organism has an increased metabolic rate as compared to an adult or aged and this, in some cases, may result in increased or reduced toxicity.

Lastly, any strategy designed to test for EDC activity must examine organisms during different developmental stages because the suite of endogenous hormones present during development vary from one stage to another. A developing organism may be at a stage when it would not normally be exposed to a certain hormone and thus, exogenous exposure to an EDC that acts upon that hormone's receptor or signaling system will activate a pathway that should not be active at that life stage. Therefore, prenatal exposure to environmental factors can modify normal cellular and tissue development and function through developmental programming, such that the individual may have a higher risk of reproductive pathologies and metabolic and hormonal disorders later in life.

Principles guiding protocol development and use

Several principles have framed the development of TIPED and will continue to guide its development in the future. Table 1 summarizes the overarching principles guiding our design of the EDC testing protocol. We briefly elaborate on each of the principles below.

Overarching principles :

The first principal comes from green chemistry. Green chemists design against hazard.⁵⁷ The earlier in the design process that hazard can be discovered, the more likely it is that downstream problems will be minimized, if not avoided entirely. This can have material benefits for the chemist and his/her company.

The second principle, on current scientific understanding, contrasts our protocol with standardized approaches used in regulatory toxicology. As noted above, the standardized assays upon which traditional toxicological approaches are based are often decades old. They rarely reflect the quality and modernity of assay tools used in scientific research funded by the National Institutes of Health, including the National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences. The old approaches are insensitive and largely incapable of dealing with EDCs. Ignoring current science would result in chemists producing yet another generation of hazardous chemicals.

That said, the assays we recommend have been chosen because multiple laboratories have successfully used them. They can require specialized knowledge and skills, but are not so

Table 1 Overarching principles guiding design of TiPED

- Chemical hazard must be considered at all stages of molecular design and synthesis.
- Assays used should reflect current scientific understanding, and the protocol should be reviewed regularly to incorporate new scientific discoveries and tools.
- The assays within each tier should span a comprehensive range of EDC mechanisms of action.
- While *in silico* and *in vitro* assays offer less costly starting points, *in vivo* assays are necessary to conclude that a chemical is unlikely to have EDC activity.

arcane that only a single, or small number of, laboratories, would be capable of implementing them. The second half of the principle acknowledges the fast pace of scientific discoveries in the field of endocrine disruption. New modes of action requiring new assays will certainly be discovered. Incorporating this evolving knowledge into the protocol is essential.

The third principle, a comprehensive range of EDC mechanisms, reflects the need to look for more than one or two EDC modes of action. This is because single chemicals can act through multiple mechanisms. The absence of action through one mechanism cannot be taken as evidence of no action through another mechanism. A case in point is BPA. It is an estrogen via both genomic and non-genomic pathways, an anti androgen, a thyroid hormone antagonist, and a peroxisome proliferator-activated receptor (PPAR) agonist.

The fourth principle acknowledges that the current state of *in silico* and *in vitro* assays do not sufficiently incorporate the complexity of an endocrine system functioning in a living organism, and especially that of a developing organism..

Evaluating EDC assays :

In all likelihood, the chemist him/herself will not be performing the assays, but instead will be working in partnership with environmental health scientists or with a contract laboratory. Because this is not the chemist's field, yet their research is dependent upon the test findings, it is important for the chemist to have some ability to gauge the quality and reliability of the work being done. This is especially the case for EDCs because of the complexity of the science.

With this in mind, we offer a set of principles that chemists can use to select and evaluate EDC assays (Table 2). Each principle is briefly elaborated upon below.

The first principle is designed to select assays that have proven reliable among different laboratories, to have well defined performance standards and to avoid assays that test for poorly defined endpoints and hence are open to arbitrary and variable interpretation.

The second principle should guide experimental design. Negative controls are essential to establish an effect. Positive controls are needed to demonstrate that the experimental system is appropriately sensitive and free of contamination or other confounding variables. The positive control must be used at an appropriate concentration or dose to demonstrate the sensitivity of the assay in terms of being capable to detect effects of low doses of EDCs. Prior use of insensitive strains of rodents in EDC tests without positive controls has led to significant confusion in the

Table 2 General principles for selection and evaluation of EDC assays for Green Chemists

- Each assay should be reliable, relevant, meet performance standards and use well-defined endpoints.
- Experimental design should employ concurrent negative and positive controls and blanks to confirm that the experimental system is free from contamination and that it is appropriately sensitive.
- A dynamic testing range should be established, and testing should be carried out over the full range, including high and low doses.
- Some in vivo tests should be structured to reveal the consequences of developmental exposures on health and function later in life, through all life stages.
- Some in vivo tests should not assume knowledge of the mechanism/ pathway of action.

peer-reviewed literature. Controls must be run concurrently because of the potential for temporal variation in unintended contamination (e.g., changes in composition of rodent chow from batch to batch or inadvertent contamination of lab).

The third principle acknowledges a fundamental feature of endocrine disruption, that high dose effects do not necessarily predict low dose effects, i.e., non-monotonicity in the dose response curve.

The fourth principle addresses another key feature of endocrine disruption, that developmental exposures can lead to effects that are initially subtle, for example changes in epigenetic programming, but ultimately highly adverse, e.g., cancer in adulthood.

The fifth principle is designed to widen the reach of the assays beyond currently known mechanisms of endocrine disruption. We have identified several in vivo versions of high-throughput screening that do not assume the mechanism of EDC action but instead look broadly at developmental disorders following early life exposure in fish and amphibians.

Evaluating laboratories :

As with the choice and evaluation of specific assays, assessment of laboratory practice performance and capabilities in experimental environmental health science is outside the expertise of most chemists. In Table 3 we list six important criteria that should be addressed explicitly in the choice of collaborators/contract laboratories.

The first criterion specifies that the laboratory must demonstrate it can replicate the appropriate performance of the assay(s) as carried out by other laboratories and that it is capable of repeatedly performing the assay successfully.

The second criterion specifies that the laboratory must be willing to share all relevant information about the laboratory and its methods and practices, as well as all relevant data on assay performance.

The third criterion focuses on animal husbandry practices by the laboratory. Poor animal husbandry is not only unethical, it introduces additional variability in the experiments that can mask effects, making it more difficult to confirm or reject EDC activity. The laboratory should share information about its husbandry practices and benchmark those against industry standards.

The fourth criterion stipulates that power analyses should be performed in preparation for the full assay. Power analysis is a statistical tool that provides guidance, based on preliminary data, on the sample size necessary to find a statistically significant result given the magnitude of the effect and the variance inherent in the data. Use of power analysis is especially important in

Table 3 Criteria to guide evaluation of laboratories

A lab must:

- Demonstrate intra- and inter-laboratory repeatability.
- Demonstrate transparency in reporting.
- Utilize effective, safe husbandry practices; high mortality/morbidity rates in controls are unacceptable.
- Employ power analysis of preliminary results to design methods.
- Utilize standard protocols and solutions/reagents/cultures/etc., where they are available.
- Undergo external review and audit on regular basis comparable to NSF/NIH external reviews.

in so studies to ensure the sample size is large enough to detect an effect but not so large that an excessive number of animals are used.

The fifth criterion addresses replicability and reliability. Standard protocols, well established in the peer-reviewed literature, should be followed in carrying out the assays and variations in assay performance must be avoided. Use of standard solutions/reagents/cultures/etc., will help avoid inadvertent contamination and unexpected biological variability.

The sixth criterion external review and audit will provide the chemist overall assurance of the laboratory's quality.

Using TiPED with known EDCs verification of methodology :

When we first started the process of developing this tiered approach to screening new chemicals, we identified several known EDCs (chemicals or classes of chemicals) that work through different mechanisms and are known to have widely different effects on exposed cells, animals or humans. Using these examples, we identified a repertoire of assays that we expected would be sufficient to detect known endocrine disrupting activities. To continue this thought-exercise, we then identified published studies that determined whether the

TIPED assays described above (or similar ones) have been used successfully with these six known EDC's (Table 891)

Clearly, some of these EDCs would be identified by several computational assays in Tier 1. BPA and phthalates, for example, have been tested with both QSAR and molecular docking assays, and both of these methods indicate that these chemicals bind to nuclear hormone receptors. Other EDC's, such as perchlorate and atrazine, would likely "pass" the first tier. Testing BPA further with TIPED, it would also be identified as an EDC in Tiers 2, 3, 4 and 5. Thus, a chemical like BPA, with mechanisms that span several NRs, would be easily identified by this tiered screening protocol. In contrast, perchlorate and atrazine might make it to Tiers 3 or 4 before they are identified as EDCs. Yet the proposed assays are clearly robust enough that these chemicals would not make it to market, providing supportive evidence that the TIPED screens will be sufficient to identify putative EDC,

Currently we intend to place EDC test protocol in the public domain. The institutional home for it is still to be determined, but it will likely be either an academic or government institution. Whenever it is located the "home" for TIPED will be a place where detailed protocols for assays will be found along with lists of available online databases and tools. In addition there will be trained personnel to answer questions and provide general guidance and referral to labs that can contract to do specific assays. The design and creation of the protocol has been overseen by a Scientific Advisory Committee comprised of experts from both chemistry and biology (Table SIT). Future management of the protocol will also require oversight and regular reexamination of the assays in light of scientific advancement.

The latter point is critically important in order to avoid submitting future chemical innovation to insensitive safety tests (or worse, giving approval to chemicals that future scientists learn to be EDCs), the assays and tiers of the protocol must be reviewed and updated on a regular basis. The continuing role of the Scientific Advisory Committee will be essential to this process and will keep the protocol on the leading edge of EDC science.

Summary and conclusions :

TIPED provides tools that can guide the development of inherently safer materials by avoiding chemicals likely to disrupt the endocrine system. Using the assays in the protocol early in the design process to detect potential EDCs, chemists can choose not to pursue development of a candidate chemical that has EDC characteristics. Alternatively, they can use mechanistic data from the assays to guide redesign of the chemical, with the goal of retaining desired material characteristics but avoiding action through identified EDC mechanisms.

In an effort to prevent novel EDCs from being produced in appreciable quantities, we focused solely on scientific issues to provide chemists with a set of guiding principles and tools that will enable them to stem production of chemicals with EDC potential. The goal of this ground-up approach, termed TIPED, is to identify hazards early in the design process using a systematic series of assays that build upon one another. We wish to emphasize that this tiered protocol was not designed as a one-size-fits-all tool. Depending upon their unique situation, a chemist may have good reason to start at any point within the protocol, not necessarily with Tier 1.

A positive test at any step in the process is an indication of potential endocrine disruptor activity and thus provides the chemist an opportunity to modify the chemical under development. The endocrine disruption screening assays comprised in each tier are based on the best and most up-to-date science collectively. TIPED is designed to cover all known aspects of endocrine disruption.

Beyond serving as a tool for chemists, this paper highlights the need for a transformation in the field of toxicology, advancing this science from an exclusively reactive, analytical one

to include a significantly preemptive arm. For new chemicals, and perhaps old ones as well, toxicology, at least as it is associated with commercial chemicals, has to become much more a collaborative undertaking between the chemist and scientists who can evaluate toxicity in real time both theoretically and experimentally. It is our hope that collaborative efforts such as these, which lie at the interface of endocrine disruption and green chemistry, will help lead to a new generation of inherently safer chemicals

Acknowledgements :

We are grateful to the following scientists who participated in a two day retreat at Cavallo Point, California to help us develop and refine our thinking on this investigation: Paul Anastas, Evan Beach, Amy Cannon, Chad Ellis, Julie Haack, Andreas Kortenkamp, CJ. Li, Nicolas Oles, Sarah Vogel, Adelina Voutchkova and Wim Thielemans. The work was supported by grants from NIEHS (grant no. IRI3ES016981-01), the Cedar Tree Foundation, the Johnson Family Foundation, the Kendeda Fund, the Marisla Foundation, the John Merck Fund, and the Passport Foundation. We thank Julie Jones for outstanding logistical and organizing efforts without which this collaboration

Reference :

1. L. N. Vandenberg, et al., Hormones and endocrine-disrupting chemicals: low-dose effects and non-monotonic dose responses, *Endocr. Rev.*, 2012, 33(3), 1-78. 3
2. R. T. Zoeller, et al., Endocrine-disrupting chemicals and public health protection: a statement of principles from the endocrine society, *Endocrinology*, 2012, 25, 25.
3. W. V. Welshons, et al., Large effects from small exposures. 1. Mechanisms for endocrine-disrupting chemicals with estrogenic activity, *Environ. Health Perspect.*, 2003, 111(8), 994-1006.
4. P. Alonso-Magdalena, et al., Bisphenol-A acts as a potent estrogen via non-classical estrogen triggered pathways, *Mol. Cell. Endocrinol.*, 2012, 55(2), 201-207.
5. J. P. Myers, R. T. Zoeller and F. S. vom Saal, A clash of old and new scientific concepts in toxicity, with important implications for public health, *Environ. Health Perspect.*, 2009, 117(11), 1652-1655.
6. R. R. Newbold, E. Padilla-Banks and W. N. Jefferson, Adverse effects of the model environmental estrogen diethylstilbestrol are transmitted to subsequent generations, *Endocrinology*, 2006, 147(6 Suppl), S11-S17.
7. R. R. Newbold, et al., Developmental exposure to endocrine disruptors and the obesity epidemic, *Reprod. Toxicol.*, 2007, 23(3), 290-296.
8. A. M. Voutchkova, T. G. Osimitz and P. T. Anastas, Toward a comprehensive molecular design framework for reduced hazard, *Chem. Rev.*, 2010, 110(10), 5845-5882.
- 9.
10. D. P. Williams and D. J. Naisbitt, Toxicophores: groups and metabolic routes associated with increased safety risk, *Curr Opin. Drug Discovery Dev.*, 2002, 5(1), 104-115.

11. G. Bottegoni, et al., Four-dimensional docking: a fast and accurate account of discrete receptor flexibility in ligand docking. *J. Med. Chem.*. 2009, 52(2), 397-406.
12. C. Hansch and T. Fujita, Rho-sigma-pi analysis. A method for the correlation of biological activity and chemical structure, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.*. 1964, 86, 1616-1626.
13. E. Papa, S. Kovarich and P. Gramatica, QSAR modeling and prediction of the endocrine-disrupting potencies of brominated flame retardants, *Chem. Res. Toxicol.*, 2010, 23(5), 946-954.
14. L. M. Shi, et al., QSAR models using a large diverse set of estrogens, *J. Chem. Inf. Comput. Sci.*, 2001, 41(1), 186-195.
15. J. H. van Drie, in *Computational Medicinal Chemistry for Drug Discovery*, ed. P. Bultinck, et al., CRC Press, New York, USA, 2005.
16. W. Yang, et al., Insights into the structural and conformational requirements of polybrominated diphenyl ethers and metabolites as potential estrogens based on molecular docking, *Chemosphere*, 2011, 84(3), 328

SUPPLEMENTARY REFERENCES :

McDonough, William, and Michael Braungart, *Cradle to Cradle: Remaking The Way We Make Things*, North Point Press, 2002.

1. Lancaster, M. *Green Chemistry: An Introductory Text*; The Royal Society of Chemistry:2002.
2. Manahan, S.E. *Green Chemistry and the Ten Commandments of Sustainability*: ChemChar Research Inc. 2005

RECOMMENDED READING BOOKS :

1.J. Clark, D. Macquarrie. "Handbook of Green chemistry and Technology". Blackwell Science. 2002.

WEB LINKS FOR REFERENCE

1. <https://www.rse.org/journals-books-databases/about-journals/green-chemistry/>
2. <https://www.acs.org/content/acs/en/greenchemistry/research-innovation.html>

E-BOOKS (subject to copyrights laws)

1. <https://bookboon.com/en/fundamentals-of-green-chemistry-ebook>