

Regression Quantitative Structure-toxicity Relationship of Pesticides on Fishes

Bowen Yang1, Limin Dang2, Cong Chen3, Mingwang Li4*

¹College of Materials and Chemical Engineering, Hunan Institute of Engineering, Xiangtan, Hunan 411104, China
²College of Materials and Chemical Engineering, Hunan Institute of Engineering, Xiangtan, Hunan 411104, Chin *College of Materials and Chemical Engineering, Hunan Institute of Engineering, Xiangtan, Hunan 411104, China https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7625-1410 3*

³College of Materials and Chemical Engineering, Hunan Institute of Engineering, Xiangtan, Hunan 411104, China
⁴College of Materials and Chemical Engineering, Hunan Institute of Engineering, Xiangtan, Hunan 411104, Chin *College of Materials and Chemical Engineering, Hunan Institute of Engineering, Xiangtan, Hunan 411104, China*

** corresponding author's e-mail: l3055155812@163.com*

Abstract: Pesticide usage reaches several million metric tons annually worldwide, and the effects of pesticides on nontarget species, such as various fishes in aquatic environments, have resulted in serious concerns. Predicting pesticide aquatic toxicity to fish is of great significance. In this paper, 20 molecular descriptors were successfully used to develop a regression quantitative structure-activity/toxicity relationship (OSAR/OSTR) model for the toxicity logLC₅₀ of a large data set consisting of 1106 pesticides on fishes by using a general regression neural network (GRNN) algorithm. The optimal GRNN model produced correlation coefficients *R* of 0.8901 (*rms* = 0.6910) for the training set, 0.8531 $(rms = 0.7486)$ for the validation set, and 0.8802 $(rms = 0.6903)$ for the test set, which are satisfactory compared with other models in the literature, although a large data set of toxicity logLC50 was used in this work.

Keywords: Toxicity; pesticide; QSTR; general regression neural network

1. Introduction

Modern agricultural, residential, commercial and industrial settings are increasingly relying on the use of pesticides such as herbicides, insecticides, nematicides, and fungicides in protecting crops, plants and public health and in controlling overgrowth of insects, fungi, rodents, noxious weeds, etc. Nearly 2.7 million tons of pesticides are used in global agricultural production annually (Isah et al. 2020, Yu & Zeng 2022). The effects of pesticides on non-target species, such as man and aquatic organisms, have resulted in severe concerns (Mo et al. 2022).

Performing a pesticide risk assessment is essential to provide a precaution against environmental pollution. In determining the acute toxicity of pesticides, fish are usually used as laboratory animals. Unfortunately, the experimental tests for acute toxicity to fish are expensive and time-consuming (Yu 2020a, Yu 2021). A quantitative structure-activity/toxicity relationship (QSAR/QSTR) model, being a rapid, cost-effective and ethical alternative, can be used for predicting chemical toxicity (Sullivan et al. 2014, Mit et al. 2022, Masand et al. 2021, Fang et al. 2022), even for chemicals without being synthetized. This methodology is proposed by EU REACH Legislation, ICH M7 guideline, the US FDA and the US EPA to assess the environmental risks of a chemical (Cachot 2014, Schmidt et al. 2021). Some QSTR models have been reported on pesticide aquatic toxicity to fishes.

Toropov et al. (2020) introduced QSTR models for 311 acute toxicity data (pLC50) to Rainbow Trout with the index of ideal correlations. The models have coefficients of determination R^2 being 0.81-0.86 and root mean square (*rms*) errors of 0.55-0.65 for the validation set.

Pandey et al. (2020) considered QSAR modelling of 85 acute fish toxicity (pLC₅₀) of environmental transformation products of pesticides using ten simple 2D descriptors and partial least squares regression. The training and test sets have R^2 higher than 0.73 and mean absolute errors (MAE) lower than 0.57.

Jia et al. (2020) proposed a linear QSAR model for aquatic toxicity (pLC_{50}) of 311 pesticides on Rainbow Trout with molecular weight and 27 norm indices. The model has a coefficient of determination R^2 higher than 0.80 for the training set (249 samples) and test set (62 samples).

Galimberti et al. (2020) established linear QSAR models for small pesticide toxicity Log(EC50) data sets for *Pimephales promelas* and *Oncorhynchus mykiss*. The two models have 12 samples and three descriptors, yielding R^2 of 0.96 and MAE higher than 0.20. However, for linear QSARs, the ratios of the numbers of samples to descriptors are generally greater than 5.

The QSAR models mentioned above focus on a particular fish species and have relatively small data sets of pesticide toxicity to fishes. Thus, these models possess some limitations in application. Li et al. (2017) and Yu & Zeng (2022) reported classification models for large data sets of pesticide toxicity to various fish species. These classification models have a larger applicability domain in predicting the toxic categories of pesticides.

In predicting the physicochemical properties of compounds, QSAR models based on regression analysis are more accurate than classification models, although developing regression models is more difficult than building classification models. This work aims to establish a regression QSAR model for a large data set, including 1106 pesticide toxicity to fishes, by using a general regression neural network (GRNN) algorithm.

2. Materials and Methods

2.1. Data set

Table S1 in Supplementary Material shows 1106 toxicity data (96 *h*, LC50) of organic pesticides on fish species, including *Oncorhynchus mykiss*, *Lepomis macrochirus*, *Pimephales promelas*, *Brachydanio rerio*, *Cyprinodon*, *Cyprinus carpio*, etc., which were reported in the literature (Li et al. 2017, Yu & Zeng 2022). The toxicity data (96 *h*, logLC₅₀) lie from −4.4559 to 4.7324 mg/L. For pesticides of approximately equal molecular weight, a smaller $log LC_{50}$ value suggests the corresponding pesticide molecule possesses higher toxicity to fish. The total data set (1106 organic pesticides) was randomly divided into three sets at the ratio of 70%:15%:15%, which were, respectively, used as the training set (Nos. 1-774 in Table S1 in Supplementary Material), the validation set (Nos. 775-940 in Table S1) and the test set (Nos. 941-1106 in Table S1). QSAR models of $log LC_{50}$ were established with the training set by tuning the model parameters with the validation set. Subsequently, the models were assessed with the test set (Golmohammadi & Safdari 2010).

2.2. Descriptors derivation

The molecular structures were constructed with KingDraw (http://kingdraw.cn/en/index.html) and then optimized with the AM1 method in Gaussian 09 (Revision A.02). Subsequently, these molecules were used as input files for Dragon 6.0 (Talete srl, 2012) to obtain molecular descriptors. After removing those descriptors being a constant or approximately equaling to a constant or whose partial correlation coefficients > 0.90 , 773 descriptors were retained for descriptor selection in the next steps (Yu 2023).

2.3. GRNN principle

GRNN can successfully deal with classification and regression prediction by introducing the nonparametric strategy based on Parzen window (Yu 2020a). As is shown in Fig. 1, it consists of four layers: input layer, pattern layer, summation layer and output layer. For the input layer, the number of neurons equals to the dimension of the input vector in the training set. For the pattern layer, the number of neurons equals the number of samples. A transfer function of the *i*th neuron is used to correlate its output with the input variable *X* and the learning sample *Xi*, by calculating their Euclid distance:

$$
p_i = \exp[-(X - X_i)^T (X - X_i)] / 2\sigma^2] \qquad i = 1, 2, \cdots, n
$$
 (1)

where σ is the SPREAD parameter of the Gaussian function and needs to be adjusted by users.

In the summation layer, two types of neurons are used in summation. One is the denominator node S_A , and the other is the numerator node *SNj*. The former is based on an arithmetic sum for the output from the neurons in the pattern layer by setting the connection weights of 1:

$$
S_A = \sum_i^n P_i \tag{2}
$$

The latter is used for weighted summation with the connection weight *yij* associating the *i*th neuron in the pattern layer with the *j*th neuron in the summation layer:

$$
S_{Nj} = \sum_{i=1}^{n} y_{ij} P_i \quad j = 1, 2, \cdots, k
$$
\n⁽³⁾

In the output layer, the prediction results can be obtained with:

$$
y_j = S_{Nj}/S_A \quad j = 1, 2, \cdots, k \tag{4}
$$

Fig. 1. Network structure of GRNN algorithm

3. Results and Discussion

3.1. Descriptors and toxicity mechanism

Stepwise multiple regression (MLR) analysis in SPSS 19.0 was carried out for 1106 logLC₅₀ of pesticides on fish and 773 molecular descriptors mentioned above. In total, 28 descriptors entered an MLR model when the increment of determination coefficient $(\Delta R^2) \ge 0.04$ was set as the criterion for adding new descriptors. Then, MLR analysis was performed for the 28 descriptors and 774 $log LC_{50}$ in the training set with the same criterion in introducing new descriptors. In the end, 20 molecular descriptors were obtained and taken as the optimal descriptor subset for developing QSAR models for $log LC_{50}$ of pesticides on fishes. The physical meaning and toxicity mechanism of descriptors are listed in Table 1, their values are shown in Table S1 in Supplementary Material, and the characteristics of molecular descriptors obtained from the total set are shown in Table 2.

Table 1. cont.

Table 1. cont.

3.2. GRNN model

The 20 molecular descriptors in the optimal descriptor subset were used as independent variables, and the toxicity logLC₅₀ was used as the dependent variable to develop GRNN models from 774 pesticides in the training set by applying MATLAB R2014a. The spread parameter *σ* varying in the range of 0.01-0.15 with the step of 0.01 resulted in *rms* errors for the validation set, which are depicted in Fig. 2. As is shown, the optimal GRNN model with the SPREAD parameter *σ* being 0.11 has the minimum *rms* error of 0.7486 (log units). Then, $166 \log LC_{50}$ of pesticides on fishes in the test set were adopted to assess the optimal GRNN model $(\sigma = 0.11)$. The calculated logLC₅₀ values are listed in Table S1 in the Supplemental file and shown in Fig. 3.

Fig. 2. Relationship between spread parameters and rms errors in the validation set

Fig. 3. Relationship between experimental versus calculated logLC₅₀ with GRNN model

The optimal GRNN model (σ = 0.11) yielded coefficients of determination R^2 = 0.7922 and *rms* = 0.6910 log units for the training set (774 samples), $R^2 = 0.7278$ and $rms = 0.7486$ log units for the validation set (166 samples), $R^2 = 0.7748$ and $rms = 0.6903$ log units for the test set (166 samples). Although the GRNN model dealt with a large dataset of pesticide toxicity $log LC_{50}$ to fishes, it is comparable to the latest similar models from the literature that have the number of samples and R^2 for the training sets being $n = 13$ and $R^2 = 0.839$ (Önlü & Saçan 2017), $n = 94$ and $R^2 = 0.79$ (Toropov et al. 2017), $n = 66$ and $R^2 = 0.80$ (Khan et al. 2019) $n = 249$ and $R^2 = 0.80$ (Jia et al. 2020) and $n = 233$ and $R^2 = 0.67$ (Toropov et al. 2020).

In addition, the optimal GRNN model produced $R^2 = 0.7798$ and $rms = 0.6998$ log units for the total set of 1106 pesticides. It is superior to the MLR model based on the same data sets and descriptor set, which has $R^2 = 0.5103$ and *rms* = 1.0286 log units for the total dataset. Therefore, the 20 molecular descriptors used in the GRNN model are nonlinear with $log LC_{50}$, which indicates that applying the GRNN algorithm to develop QSTRs is reasonable.

Assessing the GRNN model with the test set resulted in an external correlation coefficient $q_{ext}^2 = 0.7659 > 0.5$; a slope *k′* (=1.1021) of regression with fix intercept at 0, lying in the range of 0.85-1.15; determination coefficients $R'_{0}^{2} = 0.7740$ and $R_{0}^{2} = 0.7706$, close to the determination coefficient ($R^{2} = 0.7748$) of the test set. Therefore, the development of the GRNN model was successful (Golmohammadi & Safdari 2010).

The optimal GRNN model was further checked with the bias level in prediction errors. There is a systematic error in prediction for a QSAR model if it has any one or more of the following five conditions (Roy, et al. 2017, Yu 2021):

(1) NPE/NNE $>$ 5 or NNE/NPE $>$ 5;

(2) ABS(MPE/MNE)> 2 or ABS(MNE/MPE)> 2;

(3) MAE – ABS(AE) < $0.5 \times \text{MAE}$;

(4) $R^2(i^{\text{th}} \text{ vs } (i-1)^{\text{th}} \text{ residuals}) > 0.5$ for residuals sorted on Y_{obs};

(5) R^2 (Y vs residuals) > 0.5.

where NPE is the number of positive errors, NNE is the number of negative errors, ABS(x) expresses the absolute value, AE is the average error, MPE is the mean positive error, and MNE is the mean negative error.

Then the following formulas were obtained: $NPE/NNE = 94/72 < 5$; $ABS(MPE/MNE) = 0.5315/0.4918 < 2$; $MAE - ABS(AE) = 0.5143 - 0.0877 = 0.4266 > 0.5 \times 0.5143 = 0.2572$; $R^2(i^{\text{th}} \text{ vs } (i-1)^{\text{th}} \text{ residuals}) = 0.1691 < 0.5$ for residuals sorted on Y_{obs} ; $R^2(Y \text{ vs } \text{residuals}) = 0.3602 < 0.5$. Obviously, the calculation results do not meet any of the above conditions. Thus, the optimal RF model has no systematic error in predictions.

3.3. Applicability domain

Figure 4 shows the Williams plot of the standardized residuals vs. leverages calculated with SPSS 19.0. The prediction points in the domain with absolutes values of standard residual less than 3 and leverages h less than the warning leverage h^{*} are considered reliable (Yu 2020b). In this paper, the warning leverage is $h^* = 0.0814 = 3 \times (20+1)/774 = 3 \times (p+1)/n$, here *p* and *n* are, respectively, the numbers of descriptors and

samples. As shown in Fig. 4, there are 13 samples (Nos. 113, 122, 142, 337, 404, 419, 494, 505, 756, 940, 951, 954 and 1103 in Table S1) with absolute values of standard residuals >3 and leverages *h* less than 0.0814, which suggest that the larger standard residuals may result from the experimental errors for toxicity (pLC50). In addition, there are 32 samples (e.g. Nos. 2 and 4 in Table S1) possessing smaller standard residuals (<3) and higher leverages *h* (> 0.0814), indicating their toxicity (pLC50) can be accurately predicted. However, they have dissimilar structures with other pesticide molecules in the training set.

Fig. 4. Williams plot with a warning leverage of 0.0814

4. Conclusions

Although many factors affect pesticide toxicity on fishes, the optimal GRNN model (σ = 0.11) based on 20 molecular descriptors was successfully developed for toxicity $log LC_{50}$ of a large data set including 1106 pesticides. The training set (774 pesticides), validation set (166 pesticides) and test set (166 pesticides) yielded correlation coefficients *R* of 0.8901, 0.8531 and 0.8802, respectively. Compared with other QSTR models of toxicity logLC₅₀ on fishes reported in the literature, the optimal GRNN model in this work is accurate. However, a large data set of toxicity $log LC_{50}$ was used for the model.

Acknowledgements

The authors wish to express their sincere thanks to Professor Xinliang Yu at Hunan Institute of Engineering for his guidance.

Declarations

Conflict of interest: The authors declare no competing interests.

Data Availability Statement

The data that support the findings of this study are available in the supplementary material of this article. Table S1 being molecular descriptors and $log LC_{50}$ values.

Author contributions

B.W., C.C. and M.L: data curation, software.

L.D.: conceptualization, methodology, writing – original draft, writing – review & editing.

Ethical Approval Bowen Yang declares that he has not received any research grants or honoraria from any commercial companies.

Limin Dang declares that she has not received any research grants or honoraria from any commercial companies. Cong Chen declares that she has not received any research grants or honoraria from any commercial companies. Mingwang Li declares that he has not received any research grants or honoraria from any commercial companies.

Human and Animal Rights

This article does not contain any studies with human or animal subjects.

References

- Cachot, J. (2014). Assessment of pollution in the Bizerte lagoon (Tunisia) by the combined use of chemical and biochemical markers in mussels, Mytilus gallo-provincialis. *Marine Pollution Bulletin*, *84*, 379-390. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpolbul.2014.05.002
- DeLorenzo, M.E., Scott, G.I., Ross, P.E. (2001). Toxicity of pesticides to aquatic microorganisms: a review. *Environmental Toxicology and Chemistry*, *20*, 84-98. https://doi.org/10.1002/etc.5620200108
- Fang, Z., Yu, X., Zeng, Q. (2022). Random forest algorithm-based accurate prediction of chemical toxicity to *Tetrahymena pyriformis*. *Toxicology*, *480*, 153325. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tox.2022.153325
- Galimberti, F., Moretto, A., Papa, E. (2020). Application of chemometric methods and QSAR models to support pesticide risk assessment starting from ecotoxicological datasets. *Water Research*, *174*, 115583. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.watres.2020.115583
- Golmohammadi, H., Safdari, M. (2010). Quantitative structure–property relationship prediction of gas-to-chloroform partition coefficient using artificial neural network. *Microchemical Journal*, *95*(2), 140-151. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.microc.2009.10.019
- Jia, Q., Liu, T., Yan, F., Wang, Q. (2020). Norm index–based QSAR model for acute toxicity of pesticides toward *rainbow trout*. *Environmental Toxicology and Chemistry*, *39*(2), 352-358. https://doi.org/10.1002/etc.4621
- Isah, H.M., Sawyerr, H.O., Raimi, M.O., Bashir, B.G., Haladu, S., Odipe, O.E. (2020). Assessment of Commonly Used Pesticides and Frequency of Self-Reported Symptoms on Farmers Health in Kura, Kano State, Nigeria. *Journal of Education and Learning Management*, *1*(1), 31-54. http//dx.doi.org/10.46410/jelm.2020.1.1.05
- Li, F., Fan, D., Wang, H., Yang, H., Li, W., Tang, Y., Liu, G. (2017). In silico prediction of pesticide aquatic toxicity with chemical category approaches. *Toxicology Research*, *6*, 831. https://doi.org/10.1039/c7tx00144d
- Khan, K., Khan, P.M., Lavado, G., Valsecchi, C., Pasqualini, J., Baderna, D., Marzo, M., Lombardo, A., Roy, K., Benfenati, E. (2019). QSAR modeling of Daphnia magna and fish toxicities of biocides using 2D descriptors. *Chemosphere*, *229*, 8-17. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chemosphere.2019.04.204
- Masand, V.H., Zaki, M.E.A., Al-Hussain, S.A., Ghorbal, A.B., Akasapu, S., Lewaa, I., Ghosh, A., Jawarkar, R.D. (2021). Identification of concealed structural alerts using QSTR modeling for *Pseudokirchneriella subcapitata*. *Aquatic Toxicology*, *239*, 105962. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aquatox.2021.105962
- Mit, C., Bado-Nilles, A., Daniele, G., Giroud, B., Vulliet, E., Beaudouin, R. (2022). The toxicokinetics of bisphenol A and its metabolites in fish elucidated by a PBTK model. *Aquatic Toxicology*, *247*, 106174. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aquatox.2022.106174
- Mo, L.-Y., Yuan, B.-K., Zhu, J., Qin, L.-T., Dai, J.-F. (2022). QSAR Models for Predicting Additive and Synergistic Toxicities of Binary Pesticide Mixtures on Scenedesmus Obliquus. *Chinese Journal Structural Chemistry*, *41*(3), 2203166-2203177. https://doi.org/10.14102/j.cnki.0254-5861.2011-3306
- Schmidt, S., Schindler, M., Faber, D., Hager, J. (2021). Fish early life stage toxicity prediction from acute daphnid toxicity and quantum chemistry. *SAR and QSAR in Environmental Research*, *32*(2), 151-174. https://doi.org/10.1080/1062936X.2021.1874514
- Sullivan, K.M., Manuppello, J.R., Willett, C.E. (2014). Building on a solid foundation: SAR and QSAR as a fundamental strategy to reduce animal testing. *SAR and QSAR in Environmental Research*, *25*, 357-365. https://doi.org/10.1080/1062936X.2014.907203
- Önlü, S., Saçan, M.T. (2017). An in silico approach to cytotoxicity of pharmaceuticals and personal care products on the rainbow trout liver cell line RTL-W1. *Environmental Toxicology and Chemistry*, *36*(5), 1162-1169. https://doi.org/10.1002/etc.3663
- Pandey, S.K., Ojha, P.K., Roy, K. (2020). Exploring QSAR models for assessment of acute fish toxicity of environmental transformation products of pesticides (ETPPs). *Chemosphere*, *252*, 126508. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chemosphere.2020.126508
- Roy, K., Ambure, P., Aher, R.B. (2017). How important is to detect systematic error in predictions and understand statistical applicability domain of QSAR models?. *Chemometrics and Intelligent Laboratory Systems*, *162*, 44-54. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.chemolab.2017.01.010
- Talete srl (2012). DRAGON (software for molecular descriptor calculation) Version 6.0. http://www.talete.mi.it/
- Toropov, A.A., Toropova, A.P., Marzo, M., Dorne, J.L., Georgiadis, N., Benfenati, E. (2017). QSAR models for predicting acute toxicity of pesticides in rainbow trout using the CORAL software and EFSA's OpenFoodTox database. *Environmental Toxicology and Pharmacology*, *53*, 158-163. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.etap.2017.05.011
- Toropov, A.A., Toropova, A.P., Benfenati, E. (2020). QSAR model for pesticides toxicity to Rainbow Trout based on "ideal correlations". *Aquatic Toxicology*, *227*, 105589. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aquatox.2020.105589
- Yu, X. (2020a). Prediction of chemical toxicity to *Tetrahymena pyriformis* with four descriptor models. *Ecotoxicology and Environmental Safety*, *190*, 110146. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecoenv.2019.110146
- Yu, X. (2020b). Quantitative structure-toxicity relationships of organic chemicals against *Pseudokirchneriella subcapitata*. *Aquatic Toxicology*, *224*, 105496. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aquatox.2020.105496
- Yu, X. (2021). Support vector machine-based model for toxicity of organic compounds against fish. *Regulatory Toxicology and Pharmacology*, *123*, 104942. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.yrtph.2021.104942
- Yu, X., Zeng, Q. (2022). Random forest algorithm-based classification model of pesticide aquatic toxicity to fishes. *Aquatic Toxicology*, *251*, 106265. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aquatox.2022.106265
- Yu, X. (2023). Global classification models for predicting acute toxicity of chemicals towards Daphnia magna. *Environmental Research*, *238*, 117239. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envres.2023.117239