

# Supplementary Material (SM)

*Anal. Methods Environ. Chem. J.* 6 (3) (2023) 36-53



Research Article, Issue 3  
Analytical Methods in Environmental Chemistry Journal  
Journal home page: [www.amecj.com/ir](http://www.amecj.com/ir)



## Virtual chemical analysis and machine learning-based prediction of polyethylene terephthalate nanoplastics toxicity on aquatic organisms as influenced by particle size and properties

Christian Ebere Enyoh<sup>a,†</sup>, Chidi Edbert Duru<sup>b</sup>, Qingyue Wang<sup>a</sup>, and Senlin Lu<sup>c</sup>

<sup>a</sup>Graduate School of Science and Engineering, Saitama University, 255 Shimo-Okubo, Sakura-ku, Saitama City, Saitama 8570-338, Japan.

<sup>b</sup>Department of Chemistry, Faculty of Physical Sciences, Imo State University, PMB2000 Owerri, Nigeria.

<sup>c</sup>School of environmental and chemical engineering, Shanghai University, Shanghai 200444, China.

❖ Tables S1 and S2

❖ References from 41R-55R

# Supplementary Material (SM)

**Table S1. SVM training output for the Tc AChE**

Show	Method	Kernel Function	Cost	Gamma	# SV	Training RASE	Best
[ ]	Model 1	Radial Basis Function	3.3767 2	0.18732	5	0.13275	
[ ]	Model 2	Radial Basis Function	4.5194 8	0.23859	5	0.10908	
[ ]	Model 3	Radial Basis Function	3.1707 2	0.03026	4	0.76519	
[ ]	Model 4	Radial Basis Function	4.7571 6	0.01584	4	0.85201	
[ ]	Model 5	Radial Basis Function	3.9450 7	0.10586	5	0.26179	
[ ]	Model 6	Radial Basis Function	2.4432 9	0.14979	5	0.3744	
[ ]	Model 7	Radial Basis Function	0.1031 2	0.01009	4	1.0334	
[ ]	Model 8	Radial Basis Function	0.5804 3	0.09079	4	0.86356	
[ ]	Model 9	Radial Basis Function	2.0770 9	0.05255	5	0.70446	
[ ]	Model 10	Radial Basis Function	0.8845 4	0.33193	4	0.61806	
[ ]	Model 11	Radial Basis Function	1.3736 6	0.39858	4	0.39096	
[ ]	Model 12	Radial Basis Function	0.1917 3	0.47808	4	0.89397	
[ ]	Model 13	Radial Basis Function	1.7046 5	0.20981	5	0.44003	
[ ]	Model 14	Radial Basis Function	0.4048 7	0.24775	5	0.81678	
[ ]	Model 15	Radial Basis Function	2.2515 7	0.29769	5	0.1908	
[ ]	Model 16	Radial Basis Function	2.9508 3	0.43345	4	0.10288	
[x]	Model 17	Radial Basis Function	2.4924 7	0.49978	4	0.09741	Smallest RASE
[ ]	Model 18	Radial Basis Function	4.3755 1	0.46078	4	0.09894	
[ ]	Model 19	Radial Basis Function	4.9561 1	0.38486	5	0.10916	
[ ]	Model 20	Radial Basis Function	3.6773 1	0.36429	5	0.10918	

# Supplementary Material (SM)

**Table S2. SVM training output for the Zf CYP450**

Show	Method	Kernel Function	Cost	Gamma	#	Training	Best
					SV	RASE	
[ ]	Model 1	Radial Basis Function	3.34595	0.28001	5	0.12246	
[ ]	Model 2	Radial Basis Function	4.49687	0.23651	5	0.12248	
[ ]	Model 3	Radial Basis Function	2.79785	0.16683	5	0.33749	
[x]	Model 4	Radial Basis Function	3.71729	0.19253	4	0.11033	Smallest RASE
[ ]	Model 5	Radial Basis Function	4.02318	0.00538	4	1.18516	
[ ]	Model 6	Radial Basis Function	4.92471	0.12673	5	0.20215	
[ ]	Model 7	Radial Basis Function	0.64441	0.15186	5	0.96752	
[ ]	Model 8	Radial Basis Function	0.23326	0.25538	5	1.0937	
[ ]	Model 9	Radial Basis Function	1.23388	0.02136	4	1.165	
[ ]	Model 10	Radial Basis Function	0.02829	0.06238	4	1.2187	
[ ]	Model 11	Radial Basis Function	1.91165	0.09835	5	0.85228	
[ ]	Model 12	Radial Basis Function	3.05518	0.04884	5	0.92632	
[ ]	Model 13	Radial Basis Function	0.53571	0.48436	5	0.84824	
[ ]	Model 14	Radial Basis Function	1.39501	0.42868	5	0.33586	
[ ]	Model 15	Radial Basis Function	2.19444	0.2182	5	0.33487	
[ ]	Model 16	Radial Basis Function	1.04508	0.30485	5	0.64818	
[ ]	Model 17	Radial Basis Function	1.73037	0.3514	5	0.24177	
[ ]	Model 18	Radial Basis Function	3.85506	0.39807	5	0.12253	
[ ]	Model 19	Radial Basis Function	3.22307	0.49968	5	0.12247	
[ ]	Model 20	Radial Basis Function	4.74514	0.44231	5	0.1223	

# Supplementary Material (SM)

## References

- [41R] M. L. Connolly, Analytical molecular surface calculation, *J. Appl. Crystallogra.*, 16 (1983) 548–558. <https://doi.org/10.1107/s0021889883010985>
- [42R] M.A.H. Alzuhairi, B.I. Khalil, R.S. Hadi, Nano ZnO catalyst for chemical recycling of polyethylene terephthalate (PET), *Eng. Technol. J.*, 35, 8 (2017) 831-837. <https://doi.org/10.30684/etj.35.8A.7>
- [43R] C.E. Enyoh, Q. Wang, P.E. Ovuoraye, Response surface methodology for modeling the adsorptive uptake of phenol from aqueous solution using adsorbent polyethylene terephthalate microplastics, *Chem. Eng. J. Adv.*, 12 (2022) 100370. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ceja.2022.100370>.
- [44R] D. Cortés-Arriagada, Elucidating the co-transport of bisphenol A with polyethylene terephthalate (PET) nanoplastics: A theoretical study of the adsorption mechanism, *Environ. Pollut.*, 270 (2021) 116192. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envpol.2020.116192>
- [45R] M. Miloloža, K. Bule, V. Prevaric, M. Cvetnic, Assessment of the influence of size and concentration on the ecotoxicity of microplastics to microalgae *scenedesmus* sp., bacterium *pseudomonas putida* and Yeast *Saccharomyces cerevisiae*, *Polymers*, 14 (2022) 1246. <https://doi.org/10.3390/polym14061246>
- [46R] G.D. Christian, *Analytical Chemistry*, 6th edn., Wiley, NewYork, p. 128, 2003. [https://archive.org/details/analyticalchemis00chri\\_0](https://archive.org/details/analyticalchemis00chri_0)
- [47R] C.E. Enyoh, B.O. Isiuku, 2, 4, 6-trichlorophenol (TCP) removal from aqueous solution using *canna indica* l: Kinetic isotherm and thermodynamic studies, *Chem. Ecol.*, 37 (2020) 64-82. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02757540.2020.1821673>.
- [48R] Eurachem, *The fitness for purpose of analytical method: a laboratory guide to method validation and related topics*, 1998. <https://www.eurac.hem.org/guide.s/pdf/valid.pdf>.

## Supplementary Material (SM)

[49R] C. Xie, Y. Ma, P. Zhang, J. Zhang, Elucidating the origin of the toxicity of nano-CeO<sub>2</sub> to *Chlorella pyrenoidosa*: the role of specific surface area and chemical composition, *Environ. Sci.: Nano*, 8 (2021) 1701–1712. <https://doi.org/doi:10.1039/d0en01177k>

[50R] D. Lison, C. Lardot, F. Huaux, G. Zanetti, B. Fubini, Influence of particle surface area on the toxicity of insoluble manganese dioxide dusts, *Arch. Toxicol.*, 71 (1997) 725–729. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s002040050453>

[51R] O. Schmid, T. Stoeger, Surface area is the biologically most effective dose metric for acute nanoparticle toxicity in the lung, *J. Aerosol Sci*, 99 (2016) 133–143. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jaerosci.2015.12.00>

[52R] T. Chai, R. R. Draxler Root mean square error (RMSE) or mean absolute error (MAE)? arguments against avoiding RMSE in the literature, *Geosci. Model Dev.*, 7 (2014) 1247–1250. <https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-7-1247-2014>

[53R] H. Timothy, Root mean square error (RMSE) or mean absolute error (MAE): when to use them or not, *Geosci. Model Develop.*, 15 (2022) 5481–5487. <https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-15-5481-2022>

[54R] C. Sammut, G.I. Webb, Mean Absolute Error. In: *Encyclopedia of Machine Learning*. Springer, Boston, MA, 2011. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-0-387-30164-8\\_525](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-0-387-30164-8_525)

[55R] R.A. Naqvi, M. Arsalan, G. Batchuluun, H.S. Yoon, K.R. Park, Deep learning-based gaze detection system for automobile drivers using a NIR camera sensor, *Sensors*, 18 (2018) 456. <https://doi.org/10.3390/s18020456>

---