Metabolomic assessment of exposure to near-highway ultrafine particles
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Abstract

Exposure to traffic-related air pollutants has been associated with increased risk of adverse cardiopulmonary outcomes and mortality; however, the biochemical pathways linking exposure to disease are not known. To delineate biological response mechanisms associated with exposure to near-highway ultrafine particles (UFP), we used untargeted high-resolution metabolomics to profile plasma from 59 participants enrolled in the Community Assessment of Freeway Exposure and Health (CAFEH) study. Metabolic variations associated with UFP exposure were assessed using a cross-sectional study design based upon low (mean 16,000 particles/cm³) and high (mean 24,000 particles/cm³) annual average UFP exposures. In comparing quantified metabolites, we identified five metabolites that were differentially expressed between low and high exposures, including arginine, aspartic acid, glutamine, cystine and methionine sulfoxide. Analysis of the metabolome identified 316 m/z features associated with UFP, which were consistent with increased lipid peroxidation, endogenous inhibitors of nitric oxide and vehicle exhaust exposure biomarkers. Network correlation analysis and metabolic pathway enrichment identified 38 pathways and included variations related to inflammation, endothelial function and mitochondrial bioenergetics. Taken together, these results suggest UFP exposure is associated with a complex
series of metabolic variations related to antioxidant pathways, in vivo generation of reactive oxygen species and processes critical to endothelial function.
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**INTRODUCTION**

Particulate air pollution is a key environmental risk factor for human health, with global disease burden estimates suggesting 3.1 million deaths in 2010 were attributable to ambient particulate exposure. A recent analysis of >60 million Medicare beneficiaries showed a 7.3% increase in all-cause mortality for every increase of 10 μg/m$^3$ in fine particle matter (PM$_{2.5}$, particulate matter with diameter ≤2.5 μm). Acute exposure to pollutants from traffic-related sources has been shown to be associated with changes in systemic inflammation, DNA methylation, gene expression and respiratory function; however, underlying toxicological mechanisms are not known.

The metabolome, which includes all low molecular weight (<2000 dalton) chemical species present in biological matrices, is a functional measure of the interaction between the genome, diet, environment and the biochemical processes required for life. Identifying the metabolic changes associated with environmental exposures can provide insight into the mechanisms underlying exposure-related diseases. Untargeted metabolomic techniques based upon ultra-high resolution mass spectrometry now make possible measurement of up to 20,000 chemical features, providing sufficient characterization for precision medicine and exposome research.

Limited study of the metabolomic effects of air pollution suggest metabolic response to is detectable on both short- and long-term exposure timescales; however, variations unique to acute and chronic exposure have not been established. In the study by Breitner, Schneider et al., PM$_{2.5}$ and ozone exposure were estimated based upon residential address (10-km grid) for participants in a cardiac catheterization cohort. Metabolomic measures included 61 metabolites, related to amino acid metabolism, fatty acid metabolism and total ketones, with only 10 used to assess association with PM$_{2.5}$ and ozone. The results suggested a delayed association with decreased arginine and glycine based upon previous day PM$_{2.5}$ levels. Other metabolomic characterization of the response to traffic-related pollution include a multi-platform assessment of lavage fluids following chamber exposures to biodiesel exhaust, 5-hr ambient pedestrian exposure and occupational exposure of office workers, traffic cops and rickshaw drivers in India. Only one study has examined the relationship between long-term PM$_{2.5}$ exposure and metabolic changes. Menni, Metrustry et al. showed significant metabolic variations associated with residential PM$_{2.5}$ exposure that included four amino acid-related metabolites, benzoate, glycerate and the antioxidant α-tocopherol, in a subset of the TwinsUK cohort. These metabolites were also linked to a decline in lung function within a larger cohort from this study, suggesting a protective role for α-tocopherol. While these studies provided insight into metabolic variations associated with air pollution
exposure, limitations included minimal metabolome coverage and lack of individualized exposure levels and primarily represented acute exposures only.

In the present study, we performed high-resolution metabolomics (HRM) of plasma collected from participants enrolled in the Community Assessment of Freeway Exposure and Health (CAFEH) study to assess metabolic variations associated with exposure to ultrafine particles (UFP, < 0.1 μm). We first evaluated central metabolic intermediates that were quantified using reference standardization, which was followed by a metabolome-wide association study (MWAS) to identify systemic variations in metabolism associated with UFP exposure. We then utilized the metabolic correlation structure and pathway enrichment for insight into the relationship between exposure, biological response and disease pathobiology.

METHODS

Study population

A subset of 59 participants from the CAFEH study was selected for HRM profiling. CAFEH is a community-based participatory research study of the relationship between traffic-related air pollution and health effects in individuals living near highway neighborhoods in the Boston area (MA, USA). Details of the study population and design can be found elsewhere. Briefly, recruitment occurred in near- (≤ 500 m from major highways) and far- (>1,000 m) highway areas. Participants were recruited based upon age (≥ 40 years) and a geographically-weighted, random selection process. Blood samples were collected by visiting a clinic during normal business hours from August 2009 to June 2010; the majority of samples were collected in winter, spring and fall. All participants provided informed consent and the study was approved by the Tufts University School of Medicine Institutional Review Board. For this metabolomics study, participant selection criteria included non-smokers and individuals with documented low (mean 33 16,000 particles/cm$^3$) or high (mean 24,000 particles/cm$^3$) UFP exposure and was restricted to non-Hispanic white residents of Somerville and Dorchester/South Boston.

Exposure assessment

The methodology for predicting individual time-activity adjusted (TAA) UFP exposure levels has been described previously. Hourly ambient particle number concentration (PNC), a proxy for UFP, was first estimated at fine spatial resolution (20 m) using predictive multivariable regression models. PNC measurements were obtained with a condensation particle counter (TSI Model 3775; particle size 4–3000 nm) in each study area by driving a mobile monitoring lab along fixed routes at various times of the day, on all days of the week and in all seasons (35–47 days per study area) over the course of one year. Individualized annual average PNC were obtained by adjusting hourly ambient PNC estimates to correct for time spent in different microenvironments over a year-long period. We first averaged the ambient PNC values predicted by the model for all hours of the year (n=8760h) to calculate a residential average ambient (RAA) PNC for each residence. To derive TAA-PNC, we used hourly questionnaire data for five micro-environments (inside...
home, outside home, at work, on highway, and other) and we accounted separately for PNC infiltration into the home. The time-activity information was used to assign time spent inside or outside home, at work/school, and at other locations for each hour of the day. Participants provided weekly window opening information from December to February (winter) and June to August (summer). Participants also reported air conditioner type and usage. We assigned the residential-PNC value to all hours spent inside the home, assuming 100% particle infiltration. This assumption was based upon previously published analyses of homes in our study population that showed a 0.95 median indoor-outdoor ratio.\textsuperscript{20} For those with work-based TRAP exposure, we approximated exposures by using the average hourly RAA-PNC of all participants residing ≤50m of a major highway for the hours they were at work. For participants without TRAP exposure at work, we approximated their work PNC exposures using the average hourly RAA-PNC of all participants residing in the urban background area. For time spent in all other micro-environments, we also assigned the hourly residential average of all participants residing in the urban background area based on the assumption that urban background was the most likely exposure for any microenvironment in the metropolitan area.

**High-resolution metabolomics**

HRM was completed using established methods by an analyst blinded to sample identity. Briefly, plasma samples were prepared and analyzed in batches of 20; each batch included duplicate analysis of pooled human plasma (QStd-3) for reference standardization. Prior to analysis, plasma aliquots were removed from storage at −80°C and thawed on ice. A 65 μL aliquot of plasma was then treated with 130 μL of LC-MS grade acetonitrile, equilibrated for 30 min on ice and centrifuged (16.1 ×g at 4°C) for 10 minutes to remove precipitated proteins. The supernatant was added to an autosampler vial and maintained at 4°C until analysis.

Sample extracts were analyzed using liquid chromatography (LC) and Fourier transform high-resolution mass spectrometry (Dionex Ultimate 3000, Q-Exactive HF, Thermo Scientific). For each sample, 10 μL aliquots were analyzed in triplicate using hydrophilic interaction liquid chromatography (HILIC) with electrospray ionization (ESI) source operated in positive mode and reverse phase chromatography (RPC) with ESI operated in negative mode. This use of complementary chromatography phases and ionization polarity has been shown to improve detection of endogenous and exogenous chemicals.\textsuperscript{22} Analyte separation was accomplished by HILIC using a 2.1 mm x 100 mm x 2.6 μm Accucore HILIC column (Thermo Scientific) and an eluent gradient (A= 2% formic acid, B= water, C= acetonitrile) consisting of an initial 1.5 min period of 10% A, 10% B, 80% C, followed by linear increase to 10% A, 80% B, 10% C at 6 min and then held for an additional 4 min, resulting in a total runtime of 10 min per injection. Reverse phase separation was by 2.1 mm x 100 mm x 2.6 μm Accucore C\textsubscript{18} column (Thermo Scientific) using an eluent gradient consisting of an initial 2 min period of 0.5% A, 94.5% B, 5% C, followed by a linear increase to 0.5% A, 4.5% B, 95% C at 6 min and held for the remaining 4 min. For both methods, mobile phase flow rate was held at 0.35 mL/min for the first 1.5 min, increased to 0.5 mL/min and held for the final 4 min.
The high-resolution mass spectrometer was operated in full scan mode at 120,000 resolution and mass-to-charge ratio (m/z) range 85–1275. Probe temperature, capillary temperature, sweep gas and S-Lens RF levels were maintained at 200°C, 300°C, 1 arbitrary units (AU), and 45 AU, respectively, for both polarities. Positive tune settings for sheath gas, auxiliary gas, sweep gas and spray voltage setting were 45 AU, 25 AU and 3.5 kV, respectively; negative settings were 30 AU, 5 AU and −3.0 kV. Raw data files were extracted and aligned using apLCMS with modifications by xMSanalyzer. Uniquely detected ions consisted of accurate mass m/z, retention time and ion abundance, referred to as m/z features. Prior to data analysis, m/z features were batch corrected using ComBat and filtered to remove those with coefficient of variation (CV) ≥75% or greater than 20% non-detected values in both groups.

Reference standardization

To determine concentrations of metabolites critical to metabolic homeostasis and clinical health markers, 79 metabolites previously confirmed by comparison to authentic reference standards were quantified by reference standardization. Using this approach, metabolite concentrations were first determined in Q-Std3 by methods of addition or comparison to NIST standard reference material 1950 (Metabolites in Frozen Human Plasma), providing a reference standard for each analyte. Plasma concentrations were calculated using single point calibration by multiplying the analyte response factor (calculated as the ratio between the known concentration of the compound being quantified and ion intensity in Q-Std3 or NIST 1950) and metabolite intensity detected in each study sample. Metabolite concentrations were compared to previously reported values in the human metabolome database (HMDB) and data from the National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey. Association with UFP exposure was tested using the Student’s T test with p < 0.05 and Cohen’s d.

Metabolome-wide association study of UFP exposure

Following reference standardization, we applied a multivariate MWAS framework to identify m/z features associated with UFP exposure. Partial least squares discriminant analysis (PLS-DA) was used for selection of exposure-associated features based upon low and high exposure classification. PLS components 1 through 3 were evaluated; the first two components were identified as the optimal number of latent components using the plsGénomics package. Percent variability described by the first two components and R²/Q² values support these components as optimal for the final model. The addition of the third component resulted in R²>>Q², which suggests overfitting. MixOmics was used to build the final PLS-DA model and select discriminatory features based on variable importance for projection (VIP) score ≥2.0. Model accuracy was evaluated by R²/Q² for PLS components 1 and 2, 10-fold cross-validation accuracy and random data predictive accuracy, which was calculated using the R package, xMSpanda (https://github.com/kuppal2/xmsPANDA).

Metabolite annotation

The m/z features were annotated using a three step process with final identification level based upon Schymanski, Jeon et al First, detected m/z and retention time were compared
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to a database of approximately 150 metabolites with adduct mass and retention time confirmed by authentic reference standards (Level 1). Level 2 matches were not considered since MS/MS data were not collected for the majority of detected signals. Features not identified by comparison to the reference list were then annotated using HMDB in conjunction with xMSannotator, which uses a scoring system based upon correlation modularity clustering combined with isotopic, adduct and mass defect grouping to improve annotation of high-resolution mass spectrometry data (Level 3). The remaining m/z features were then matched using m/z alone and common adducts (Level 4) for positive and negative ESI using HMDB and METLIN; m/z values providing no matches in either of the databases were considered non-identifiable chemical signals (Level 5). Non-identifiable signals are often present in untargeted HRM studies and can include uncharacterized environmental exposures or unknown metabolic intermediates.

All metabolite matching was completed using 10 parts-per-million (ppm) accuracy.

**Metabolome correlation and pathway enrichment**

To identify systemic effects associated with UFP exposure, we combined a network-based metabolome-wide correlation analysis of PLS-DA discriminatory metabolites with metabolic pathway enrichment. Pearson correlation and corresponding p between m/z features in the raw data and PLS-DA selected features were calculated pairwise using the R package MetabNet. The m/z features with Pearson $|r| \geq 0.6$ and Benjamini-Hochberg FDR ≤ 5% were selected for visualization in Cytoscape and metabolic pathway enrichment using Mummichog.

**RESULTS**

**Study population**

Demographics of the 59 CAFEH participants selected for HRM profiling are provided in Table 1. Age, sex, BMI, treatment for diabetes and statin use were comparable for the two exposures while education level differed ($p=0.007$). As expected, UFP levels were significantly different ($p<0.0001$). Since assignment to the low- and high-exposure group was based upon personal time- and activity-adjusted UFP exposure, individuals from both neighborhoods were present in the two exposure groups. However, there was a significant difference ($p<0.0001$) between residence location, with the majority of low-exposed individuals resided in Dorchester and South Boston, while high-exposed individuals lived in Somerville. Residence Euclidean distance to the nearest highway also differed between the two groups ($p=0.02$), although the majority of individuals from both exposure categories lived within 100–500m of the nearest highway.

**High-resolution metabolomics**

HRM profiling detected 8,554 unique m/z features with mean replicate CV of 23% using HILIC chromatography with positive ESI and 6,337 unique m/z features with mean replicate CV of 19% using RPC with negative ESI mode. Previous comparison of these analytical modes has shown the use of two ionization methods provides complementary detection of metabolites with limited overlap since different functional groups preferentially form adducts in either positive or negative ionization mode. To confirm the measures from the
two analytical modes were independent, we calculated the pairwise Pearson correlation coefficient between all HILIC and RPC m/z features used in the untargeted analysis (Supplementary Figure 1). Pearson correlation coefficient for 95% of the m/z features ranged between −0.27 and 0.37; less than 1% exhibited |r| ≥ 0.9. Thus, due to different adducts, retention characteristics, ionization efficiency and limited correlation between intensities for the two modes, each dataset was tested for association with UFP independently. Prior to untargeted comparison of low and high exposure, m/z features detected in less than 80% of individuals in both groups were removed, resulting in 5,367 and 3,781 remaining for HILIC and RPC, respectively.

Reference standardization

To evaluate the metabolic effects of year-long UFP exposure, we first used a reference standardization approach to measure levels of central metabolic intermediates and test for differences between the low- and high-exposure groups. Quantitative data on the association of metabolites critical to metabolic homeostasis and clinical health markers provide an important reference for how UFP exposure influence metabolic health. Thus, we provide measured concentrations for all 79 metabolites and concentration ranges reported in the Human Metabolome Database\textsuperscript{7} in Tables 2 and 3, regardless of whether they reached the significance threshold. The results for amino acids, related metabolites and clinical health markers are provided in Table 2. The amino acids arginine, aspartic acid, cystine and glutamine, and the amino acid metabolite methionine sulfoxide differed at p< 0.05. None of the clinical health markers showed statistically significant differences at p< 0.05; however, the effect size measure (Cohen’s |d| > 0.3) suggests possible variations in creatinine and histamine levels for the high exposure group.

Reference standardization results for metabolites related to fatty acid metabolism, lipids, the tricarboxylic acid (TCA) cycle, nucleotides and co-factor metabolism are provided in Table 3. None of the measured metabolites were different between the low- and high-exposure groups at p< 0.05. While not meeting the significance threshold of p< 0.05, the observed differences suggest positive associations with linolenic acid and niacin in the high-exposure group, while carnitine, acetyl-carnitine, myristic acid, palmitic acid, DHA, hypoxanthine, succinic acid, malic acid and citric acid were elevated in the low-exposure group.

Metabolome-wide association study of UFP exposure

To identify additional metabolic changes associated with UFP exposure, we applied PLS-DA to select discriminatory m/z features within the complete HRM dataset. Results from HILIC with positive ESI identified 178 m/z features. The resulting model exhibited good classification accuracy (Figure 1A), with R\textsuperscript{2}/Q\textsuperscript{2} values of 0.67/0.67 and 0.77/0.34 for PLS components 1 and 2 respectively. Support vector machine (SVM), 10-fold cross-validation balanced accuracy rate was 98.75% with mean permuted accuracy of 45.6%. Metabolite annotation identified 103 m/z features matching 136 unique chemicals. This included seven confirmed metabolites (Level 1); 42 metabolites identified based upon adduct and isotopic pairing (Level 3), and 85 based upon matching alone (Level 4). The remaining 70 detected m/z features provided no matches (Level 5). Because of the large number of identified metabolites meeting the PLS-DA threshold, the identified metabolites consistent with risk
factors for cardiopulmonary disease and environmental chemical exposure biomarkers for polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAH) and nicotine exposure are provided in Table 4; the full results are listed in Supplementary Table 1. Since education level differed between the low- and high-exposed groups, we performed a second untargeted MWAS using education level as the outcome variable. Using the same VIP threshold, 64 m/z features were identified and did not include any of the 178 m/z features discriminating low- from high-UFP exposure.

Comparison of m/z features from RPC with negative ESI also showed metabolic associations with UFP exposure. PLS-DA identified 138 m/z features discriminating between low- and high-exposure. The selected features provided good classification accuracy (Figure 2A), with $R^2/Q^2$ of 0.73/0.72 and 0.83/0.38 for PLS components 1 and 2, respectively. The 10-fold cross-validation balanced accuracy rate was 98.75% with mean permuted accuracy of 55.2%. Annotation resulted in 74 m/z features matching 83 unique metabolites. This included four confirmed metabolites, five metabolites meeting Level 3 identification criteria, and 74 matches based upon Level 4. The remaining 64 m/z features provided no matches (Level 5). Metabolites identified by RPC with negative ESI included amino acids, endothelial function related metabolites, co-factors and environmental chemicals arising from exposure to PAHs and nicotine; only identified metabolites related to cardiopulmonary disease risk factors and environmental chemical exposure biomarkers are provided in Table 5; the complete annotation results for RPC with negative ionization are listed in Supplementary Table 2. A second MWAS using education level as the outcome variable identified 152 m/z at VIP ≥ 2.0, six of which were also identified in the UFP analysis. These m/z features included a match to bromomethane, PS(16:018:0), dihydroorotic acid, hydroxyfluoroprednisolone butyrate, fucose and one unidentifiable m/z signal (m/z= 217.8614).

**Metabolite correlation and pathway enrichment**

Following identification of PLS-DA selected m/z features, a metabolome-wide Pearson correlation analysis was completed by testing for additional associations within the raw data. Combined with pathway enrichment in Mummichog, this approach improves detection of metabolic changes associated with exposure while reducing false positives due to the use of a random sampling permutation approach for annotation and pathway mapping. The correlation networks for HILIC with positive ESI and RPC with negative ESI are provided in Figures 1B and 2B, respectively. For HILIC, an additional 928 m/z features were correlated with the PLS-DA results. Pathway enrichment showed exposure-associated alterations in 34 different metabolic pathways that had 5 or more annotated metabolites within the correlation network (Figure 1C). These included pathways related to amino acids, oxidative stress, nucleotide metabolism, cofactors, xenobiotics and fatty acid metabolism.

A similar correlation network was obtained for RPC, which included an additional 721 m/z features. Pathway enrichment results are shown in Figure 2C. Sixteen pathways were identified as associated with UFP exposure, including amino acid pathways, microbiome-related metabolites, fatty acid metabolism, cofactors, nucleotide metabolism and the TCA cycle.
DISCUSSION

Although long-term exposure to air pollution has been associated with cardiopulmonary diseases, the underlying mechanisms and mode of action are unknown. In this study, we applied HRM to identify metabolic changes associated with year-long averaged personal UFP exposure. Initial characterization of amino acids, clinical markers, lipid/fatty acid metabolites, co-factors and cellular respiration was completed to assess exposure-associated changes to key metabolic intermediates. This analysis was followed by identification of global metabolomic differences between the two groups at the metabolite and pathway level.

By providing absolute concentrations of metabolites, the use of reference standardization allows evaluation of physiological levels of central human metabolites and comparison to expected ranges. In this study, concentrations of 79 metabolites were determined. Compared to HMDB, 26 were outside reported ranges, including 17 that were lower than previously reported concentrations. While this population was differentiated into low- and high-exposure groups, as a whole the CAFEH cohort may carry a higher burden of UFP exposure due to residential proximity to highways within an urban area. Thus, exposure history could contribute to the differences between metabolite concentrations measured in CAFEH participants and those listed in HMDB.

Comparison of the metabolite levels between the low and high-exposure groups identified five metabolites significantly different at p < 0.05. Elevated methionine sulfoxide (MetSO) and cystine (CySS) are consistent with increased oxidative stress. In humans, the major extracellular thiol/disulfide redox couple is cysteine and its disulfide form, CySS. Increased oxidation of this couple and subsequent shift towards a more positive redox potential has been shown to result in activation of pro-inflammatory cytokines, regulate early events in atherosclerosis and is associated with cardiovascular disease and endothelial function. MetSO is the oxidation product of methionine with reactive oxygen species and a recognized marker of oxidative stress. Changes in arginine (Arg), aspartate (Asp) and glutamine (Gln) suggest alterations to critical processes for endothelial function. Gln is a precursor for de novo synthesis of Arg through intestinal uptake of Gln and release of citrulline, which is then converted to Arg at the kidney. Arg is a direct precursor of nitric oxide (NO), which is generated in the endothelium by endothelial NO synthase. Changes in NO production result in disruption to vascular homeostasis, and have been implicated in a wide range of pathological states. These findings are consistent with other metabolic profiling studies of air pollution, which showed associations of exposure to PM$_{2.5}$ and ozone with decreased Arg and elevated Asp.

Cross-sectional comparison using all detected m/z features identified complementary metabolic changes associated with UFP. In addition to Gln, Asp, MetSO and CySS, PLS-DA identified other metabolic intermediates quantified by reference standardization, including linolenic acid, alanine (Ala), lysine (Lys), glutamate (Glu) and threonine (Thr). The observed changes for linolenic acid and Thr were consistent with associations observed in MWAS of benzo[a]pyrene; decreases in linolenic acid and Glu provide additional evidence of oxidative stress related changes. Glu is a precursor for glutathione, the second major thiol redox couple for antioxidant defense. Linoleic acid is an isomeric polyunsaturated fatty acid.
that includes an omega-3 (alpha-linolenic acid) and omega-6 (gamma-linolenic acid) species. Polyunsaturated fatty acids are susceptible to lipid peroxidation, which occurs through oxidant attack at carbon-carbon bonds with subsequent hydrogen abstraction and oxygen insertion. Increased oxidative stress and formation of in vivo ROS has been well documented in exposure to particulate matter. Elevated 4-hydroxynonenal (4-HNE), a lipid peroxidation biomarker, supports increased formation of ROS. 4-HNE is a relatively stable, major aldehyde product formed during lipid peroxidation that exhibits cytotoxicity and reacts with a wide range of different biomolecules, including proteins, lipids and nucleic acids. Lipid peroxidation products have also been implicated as a pro-inflammatory signaling molecule and in the pathogenesis of multiple diseases.

Metabolites consistent with increased risk for endothelial dysfunction were also identified. Both dimethylarginine and agmatine have the potential to inhibit NO synthase and were increased with UFP exposure. Dimethylarginine (DMA) exists in an asymmetric (ADMA) and symmetric (SDMA) form; due to the chromatography technique used in this study it was not possible to separate the two isomers and the measured intensity represents the sum of the two. Both ADMA and SDMA form through enzymatic methylation of arginine residues, which is catalyzed by S-adenosylmethionine protein N-methyltransferase and methylated by S-adenosylmethionine (SAMe). ADMA is a competitive inhibitor of NO synthase that can result in arginine deficiency and disruption to endothelial homeostasis. ADMA has been linked to risk factors for cardiovascular disease, including hyperhomocysteinemia, hypercholesterolemia, obesity and inflammation. While not directly inhibiting NO, SDMA competes with arginine for endothelial transporters, and has been shown to reduce NO production in intact endothelial cells. Agmatine, which is a decarboxylation product of arginine, inhibits inducible NO synthase and acts as a modulator of NO production. 5-methyltetrahydrofolic acid (5-MTHF) is the most biologically active form of folic acid and was associated with UFP. 5-MTHF has been implicated in dysregulation of homocysteine levels and identified as a tentative biomarker of cardiovascular disease.

In addition to changes in endogenous metabolites, chemical biomarkers of exposure to air pollution were positively correlated with UFP exposure. These included two PAH metabolites, benzo(a)pyrene diol epoxide (BPDE) and trans-dimethylbenz(a)anthracene−5,6-dihydrodiol (tDMBA-DH). BPDE is a chemical carcinogen formed through oxidation of benzo[a]pyrene, resulting in a metabolically active species. tDMBA-DH is a precursor to the metabolically active, dipole epoxide metabolite of dimethylbenz(a)anthracene (DMBA). Similar to benzo[a]pyrene, DMBA is a recognized carcinogen, with modes of action including formation of DNA adducts through binding to dAdo and dGuo DNA residues. Cresols, which include three different isomers (para-, meta-, ortho-), are combustion products widely distributed throughout the environment. Sources include automobile exhaust, tobacco smoke and combustion of organic materials, with concentrations largely dependent on the distance from the source due to degradation in the atmosphere. Although participant selection was biased towards non-smokers, the nicotine metabolites cotinine and cotinine-glucuronide were detected. To assess if any individuals were active smokers, cotinine levels were quantified using reference standardization. Excluding two individuals from the low UFP exposure group with cotinine levels of 4.9 and 1.8 ng/mL, for all other participants cotinine was either not detected or
below 1 ng/mL. A plasma cotinine level greater than 10 ng/mL is typically used to identify active smokers. Thus, cotinine levels suggest only passive exposure to cigarette smoke and were at very low levels in all but two samples.

Disease typically manifests as disruption to homeostatic control, and understanding systemic changes associated with exposure can improve insight into the mechanisms underlying exposure-related diseases. Pathway enrichment analyses showed systemic changes to a range of biochemical processes, including oxidative stress and endothelial function. Pathways altered with exposure included sulfur amino acid metabolism, linoleate metabolism, glutamate and arginine/proline metabolism. In addition, seven metabolites from porphyrin metabolism were identified using HILIC. Porphyrins are critical co-factors for the synthesis of hemoglobin; alterations in hemoglobin to levels outside normal physiological range has been associated with increased risk for cardiac events. Additional metabolic alterations associated with UFP exposure important to human health include inflammatory processes (leukotriene metabolism), the microbiome (sialic acid metabolism, propionate metabolism and butanoate metabolism), mitochondrial bioenergetics (pentose phosphate pathway, fatty acid activation, TCA cycle, pyruvate metabolism, glycolysis and gluconeogenesis), co-factor metabolism (vitamin B3, vitamin B9 and ascorbate/aldarate metabolism) and nucleotide metabolism (purine and pyrimidine metabolism). Thus, these results show exposure-associated metabolic variations were present for the biochemical processes that are central in maintaining homeostasis and health; additional characterization will be needed to evaluate if these alterations occur to an extent consistent with disease and to show causal relationships.

We acknowledge several limitations of this study. As a whole, this population presumably carries a higher burden of exposure to traffic-related air pollution than residents in suburban and rural areas. Second, participant selection excluded smokers and was designed for cross-sectional comparison of low and high UFP exposures. The results from this study represent a population averaged response to UFP exposure. We could not evaluate how short-term, daily exposures influence intra-individual variation in response to air pollution, or evaluate the effect of circadian rhythm. Metabolism has long been known to exhibit diurnal cycles that could influence response to traffic-related air pollution, with time of day, amount of sleep, timing of meals, and light-dark cycles are associated with metabolic fluctuations for control of energy expenditure and intake distribution during the waking period. In addition, the results from this study are correlative in nature. We could not account for unknown confounders, other unanticipated exposures associated with traffic, living in these neighborhoods or indoor generation of UFP from other sources, such as cooking or heating, nor identify the exact mechanism through which these metabolic associations occurred. Third, while confidence-based methods were used for annotation of metabolites, unidentifiable signals were not extensively characterized. Despite these limitations, we identified UFP associated changes to the metabolic phenotype. The results demonstrate the use of HRM as a viable platform for untargeted characterization of molecular mechanisms underlying environmental exposures and represent one of the first metabolomic characterizations of long-term exposure to air pollution.

In the present study, we applied HRM to identify metabolic variations associated with near-highway exposures. Annual, personal UFP exposure was determined using high-resolution
spatial-temporal models to predict PNC with time-activity adjustments, and metabolic
differences were evaluated for participants with low and high exposure. We identified
metabolic alterations associated with exposure that are consistent with inhibition of nitric
oxide production and elevated oxidative stress. These alterations included a shift in the CyS/
CySS couple towards a more positive steady-state redox potential, elevated dimethylarginine
and elevated levels of 4- HNE, all of which are recognized risk factors for atherosclerosis,
endothelial dysfunction and cardiovascular disease. Metabolic pathway enrichment suggests
that long-term UFP exposure leads to systemic changes in a wide range of biochemical
processes that have important implications for health. Taken together, the results from this
study are consistent with long-term exposure to traffic-related air pollution leading to
increased oxidative stress and changes to metabolic regulators of endothelial function.
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Figure 1:
Metabolome-wide association study of UFP exposure using HILIC HRM data. A) PLS-DA identified 178 m/z features discriminating CAFEH participants with low and high exposure, clearly separating the two groups. B) Metabolic network structure using PLS-DA selected features and raw HILIC data identified an additional 928 m/z features strongly correlated with the discriminatory metabolites. Correlation network data was then used to evaluate metabolic pathway enrichment. C) Metabolic pathways associated with exposure correlation network using HILIC with positive ESI at p< 0.05.
Figure 2:
Metabolome-wide association study of UFP exposure using C18 with negative ESI HRM data. A) PLS-DA identified 138 m/z features discriminating CAFEH participants with low and high exposure, providing clear separation between the two groups. B) The metabolic correlation network identified an additional 721 m/z features meeting the correlation and p thresholds, which was then evaluated for metabolic pathway enrichment. C). Metabolic...
pathways associated with exposure correlation network using RPC with negative ESI at \( p < 0.05 \).
Table 1:

Population characteristics and UFP exposure levels

| Characteristic                        | Total | Low exposure | High exposure | p    |
|---------------------------------------|-------|--------------|---------------|------|
| Number of individuals                 | 59    | 28           | 31            |      |
| Mean PNC ± SD                         | 20,000± 4,400 | 16,000 ± 2,000 | 24,000± 2,600 | <0.0001 |
| Sex                                   |       |              |               |      |
| Female                                | 30    | 13           | 17            | 0.70 |
| Male                                  | 29    | 15           | 14            |      |
| Age                                   |       |              |               |      |
| ≤50                                   | 25    | 15           | 10            | 0.16 |
| >50                                   | 34    | 13           | 21            |      |
| Statin use                            | 14    | 4            | 10            | 0.28 |
| Diabetes Medication Use               | 3     | 0            | 3             | 0.32 |
| Neighborhood                          |       |              |               |      |
| Somerville                            | 28    | 6            | 22            | <0.0001 |
| Dorchester & South Boston             | 31    | 26           | 5             |      |
| BMI                                   |       |              |               |      |
| Normal (< 25)                         | 22    | 12           | 10            |      |
| Overweight (25–30)                    | 19    | 7            | 12            | 0.51 |
| Obese (> 30)                          | 18    | 9            | 9             |      |
| Education                             |       |              |               |      |
| Less than high school diploma         | 10    | 1            | 9             |      |
| Highschool diploma                    | 12    | 5            | 7             |      |
| Undergraduate degree                  | 22    | 10           | 12            | 0.007 |
| Graduate degree                       | 15    | 12           | 3             |      |
| Orthogonal distance to highway (m)    |       |              |               |      |
| <50                                   | 9     | 1            | 8             |      |
| 50–100                                | 7     | 4            | 3             |      |
| 100–500                               | 32    | 14           | 18            | 0.02 |
| >500                                  | 11    | 9            | 2             |      |
Table 2:
Measured concentrations for amino acid, amino acid metabolites and clinical health marker levels

| Metabolite                        | All participants Mean ± SD | Low Exposure Mean ± SD | High Exposure Mean ± SD | HMDB Range | Cohen's d | p    |
|-----------------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------|-------------------------|------------|-----------|------|
| **Amino Acids**                   |                            |                        |                         |            |           |      |
| Alanine                           | 206±145                    | 178±116                | 231±164                 | 259–607    | 0.37      | 0.16 |
| Arginine *                        | 35 ± 14                    | 31 ± 13                | 38 ± 14                 | 60–224     | 0.57      | 0.032|
| Asparagine                        | 33 ± 16                    | 33 ± 15                | 32 ± 17                 | 16–57      | −0.08     | 0.76 |
| Aspartic acid *                   | 10 ± 7                     | 12 ± 7                 | 8 ± 5                   | 16–26      | −0.65     | 0.014|
| Citrulline                        | 27 ± 14                    | 26 ± 13                | 29 ± 14                 | 27–38      | 0.17      | 0.51 |
| Cystine *                         | 103 ± 46                   | 88 ± 35                | 117 ± 51                | 36–90      | 0.68      | 0.012|
| Glutamic acid                     |                            |                        |                         |            |           |      |
| Glutamine *                       | 43 ± 18                    | 44 ± 18                | 41 ± 19                 | 24–151     | −0.17     | 0.52 |
| Histidine                         |                            |                        |                         |            |           |      |
| Leucine/Isoleucine                | 260 ± 202                  | 265 ± 226              | 255±182                 | 155–355    | −0.05     | 0.86 |
| Lysine                            | 162 ± 59                   | 156 ± 70               | 167 ± 49                | 178–456    | 0.18      | 0.50 |
| Methionine                        | 23 ± 10                    | 21 ± 5                 | 25 ± 13                 | 22–46      | 0.36      | 0.18 |
| Ornithine                         | 13 ± 6                     | 14 ± 7                 | 13 ± 5                  | 53–135     | −0.13     | 0.61 |
| Phenylalanine                     | 60 ± 16                    | 58 ± 18                | 62 ± 14                 | 48–169     | 0.21      | 0.41 |
| Proline                           | 213 ±188                   | 200±172                | 225 ± 203               | 168–239    | 0.13      | 0.62 |
| Serine                            | 55 ± 17                    | 54 ± 14                | 57 ± 20                 | 42–238     | 0.19      | 0.47 |
| Taurine                           | 141 ±42                    | 144 ±51                | 139 ± 33                | 42–198     | −0.13     | 0.62 |
| Threonine                         | 122 ± 36                   | 119 ± 34               | 124 ± 38                | 102–260    | 0.15      | 0.58 |
| Tryptophan                        | 58 ± 18                    | 58 ± 17                | 58 ± 19                 | 37–60      | 0        | 1.00 |
| Tyrosine                          | 59 ± 16                    | 58 ± 17                | 60 ± 15                 | 54–144     | 0.13      | 0.62 |
| Valine                            | 194±117                    | 185 ±89                | 202±139                 | 178–260    | 0.15      | 0.58 |
| **Amino Acid Metabolites**        |                            |                        |                         |            |           |      |
| 5-Hydroxy-L-tryptophan (nM)       | 17 ± 5                     | 17 ± 6                 | 16 ± 5                  | 16–20      | −0.09     | 0.73 |
| Hippurate                         | 1.2 ± 1.8                  | 1.5 ± 2                | 0.9 ± 1.3               | 0–5        | −0.30     | 0.25 |
| Homocysteine                      | 3 ± 5                      | 3 ± 3                  | 4 ± 6                   | 6–12       | 0.18      | 0.50 |
| Kynurenine                        | 2.7 ± 1                    | 2.8 ± 1.2              | 2.6 ± 0.8               | 0.7–3      | −0.11     | 0.68 |
| Methionine sulfoxide **           | 1.8 ± 0.5                  | 1.6 ± 0.4              | 1.9 ± 0.5               | 3–5        | 0.72      | 0.008|
| Methyl-histidine                  | 4 ± 3                      | 4 ± 3                  | 3 ± 3                   | 0–12       | −0.22     | 0.40 |
| Acetyl-D-Tryptophan (nM)          | 148±161                    | 155±164                | 142±161                 | NA         | −0.08     | 0.76 |
| Oxoproline                        | 40 ± 21                    | 42 ± 22                | 39 ± 21                 | 13–161     | −0.18     | 0.49 |
| Phenylpyruvic acid                | 1.2 ± 0.3                  | 1.2 ± 0.3              | 1.3 ± 0.3               | 0.5–0.6    | 0.38      | 0.15 |
| **Clinical Markers**              |                            |                        |                         |            |           |      |
| Lactic acid                       | 903 ± 745                  | 797 ±589               | 999±861                 | 740–2400   | 0.27      | 0.30 |
| Glucose (mM)                      | 4.3 ± 1.3                  | 4.304 ± 1.4            | 4.2 ± 1.3               | 3.9–6.1    | −0.05     | 0.86 |
| Cortisol (nM)                     | 414±265                    | 418±302                | 410±232                 | 28–660     | −0.03     | 0.92 |
| Cholesterol (mM)                  | 3.9 ± 2.5                  | 3.7 ± 2.5              | 4.1 ± 2.5               | 4.5–7      | 0.14      | 0.58 |
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| Metabolite   | All participants Mean ± SD | Low Exposure Mean ± SD | High Exposure Mean ± SD | HMDB Range | Cohen's $d$ | $p$  |
|-------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|-------------------------|------------|-------------|-----|
| Creatinine  | 88 ± 38                     | 94 ± 40                | 83 ± 37                 | 56–109     | −0.29       | 0.27 |
| Urea (mM)   | 3.6 ± 2.3                   | 3.9 ± 2.6              | 3.3 ± 1.91              | 4–9        | −0.27       | 0.30 |
| Creatine    | 19 ± 14                     | 17 ± 8                 | 21 ± 17                 | 8.4–65     | 0.36        | 0.18 |
| Uric acid   | 241 ± 85                    | 248 ± 79               | 234 ± 90                | 238–506    | −0.16       | 0.55 |
| Histamine (nM) | 22 ± 9                      | 20 ± 9                 | 24 ± 9                  | 0.31–2.2   | 0.41        | 0.12 |

1. Concentrations are given in μM unless noted otherwise

2. $^*$ $p<0.05$;

   $^{**}$ $p<0.01$
| Metabolite                        | All participants Mean ± SD | TAA UFP <19,000 Mean ± SD | TAA UFP >19,000 Mean ± SD | Reference range | Cohen’s d | P   |
|----------------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------|-----------------|-----------|-----|
| **Fatty Acid and Lipid Metabolism** |                             |                             |                            |                 |           |     |
| Carnitine                        | 38±22                       | 42±23                       | 35±21                      | 26–79           | −0.33     | 0.21|
| Lauric acid                      | 25 ± 17                     | 23 ± 13                     | 27 ± 20                    | 2–36            | 0.24      | 0.36|
| Acetyl-carnitine                 | 2 ± 1                       | 3 ± 2                       | 2 ± 0.9                    | 3–8             | −0.38     | 0.14|
| Myristoleic acid                 | 18 ± 16                     | 17 ± 16                     | 18 ± 15                    | 2–19            | 0.06      | 0.82|
| Myristic acid                    | 65 ± 73                     | 83 ± 91                     | 49 ± 49                    | 58–248          | −0.47     | 0.07|
| Palmitoleic acid                 | 256 ± 224                   | 243±185                     | 267 ± 257                  | 105–454         | 0.11      | 0.68|
| Palmitic acid (mM)               | 1.8 ± 1.1                   | 2.0 ± 1.3                   | 1.6 ± 0.8                  | 1.9–3           | −0.36     | 0.17|
| Margaric acid                    | 1.2 ± 1.1                   | 1.2 ± 1.05                  | 1.2 ± 1.1                  | 1–3             | 0.01      | 0.98|
| gamma/alpha-Linolenic acid       | 54 ± 38                     | 45 ± 26                     | 63 ± 45                    | 24–86           | 0.48      | 0.08|
| Linoleic acid (mM)               | 2.9 ± 1.6                   | 2.7 ± 1.4                   | 3.1 ± 1.7                  | 2.6–4.6         | 0.28      | 0.28|
| Oleic acid (mM)                  | 1.8 ± 1.2                   | 1.6 ± 1.0                   | 1.8 ± 1.3                  | 1.4–3.2         | 0.19      | 0.46|
| Stearic acid                     | 591 ± 431                   | 628 ± 384                   | 559±474                    | 515–939         | −0.16     | 0.54|
| Eicosapentaenoic acid (nM)       | 447 ± 345                   | 438±369                     | 454 ± 328                  | 400–1800        | 0.05      | 0.86|
| Arachidonic acid                 | 1001±639                    | 1080 ± 817                  | 929±422                    | 538–1070        | −0.23     | 0.37|
| homo-gamma-Linolenic acid        | 140 ± 75                    | 132 ± 71                    | 146 ± 79                   | 98–232          | 0.18      | 0.49|
| 11,14-Eicosadieinoic acid (nM)   | 305 ± 246                   | 294 ± 258                   | 315±239                    | 250–580         | 0.09      | 0.74|
| Eicosenoic acid                  | 22 ± 58                     | 23 ± 49                     | 21 ± 66                    | 9–22            | −0.03     | 0.91|
| Docosahexaenoic acid             | 333±312                     | 383±419                     | 288±162                    | 72–227          | −0.30     | 0.25|
| Docosapentaenoic acid            | 53 ± 28                     | 52 ± 29                     | 54 ± 28                    | 26–59           | 0.08      | 0.77|
| Adrenic acid (nM)                | 440±321                     | 453±353                     | 429±294                    | 500–1500        | −0.07     | 0.77|
| Respolvin E2 (nM)                | 0.15 ± 0.16                  | 0.14 ± 0.19                 | 0.15 ± 0.14                | 2–11            | 0.04      | 0.89|
| Leukotriene B4 (pM)              | 5 ± 10                      | 4.7 ± 12                    | 5.1 ± 8                    | 0–600           | 0.04      | 0.89|
| Glycerophosphocholine            | 1.1 ± 1.1                   | 1.2 ± 1.0                   | 1.1 ± 0.9                  | NA              | −0.09     | 0.72|
| Sphingosine                      | 0.95 ± 0.8                   | 1 ± 0.8                     | 0.9 ± 0.8                  | 0.049–0.51      | −0.12     | 0.64|
| Sphinganine (nM)                 | 2 ± 4                       | 2 ± 5                       | 2 ± 4                      | 10–11           | −0.10     | 0.69|
| **Nucleotide metabolism**        |                             |                             |                            |                 |           |     |
| 5,6-Dihydrouracil (nM)           | 742 ± 362                   | 775 ± 394                   | 712±334                    | 20–1600         | −0.17     | 0.51|
| Hypoxanthine                     | 3 ± 4                       | 4 ± 5                       | 2 ± 2                      | 1.3–54.5        | −0.37     | 0.15|
| Xanthine (mM)                    | 560±1135                    | 720±1641                    | 416±154                    | 200–800         | −0.26     | 0.31|
| Uridine                          | 5 ± 3                       | 5 ± 3                       | 4 ± 2                      | 2.9–3.3         | −0.23     | 0.38|
| **TCA Cycle Metabolites**        |                             |                             |                            |                 |           |     |
| Pyruvic acid                     | 33 ± 14                     | 34 ± 16                     | 32 ± 12                    | 22–258          | −0.19     | 0.47|
| Succinic acid                    | 8 ± 1                       | 8 ± 1                       | 8 ± 1                      | 0–32            | −0.34     | 0.20|
| Malic acid                       | 1.4 ± 0.7                   | 1.5 ± 0.6                   | 1.3 ± 0.7                  | NA              | −0.31     | 0.23|
| Citric acid                      | 98 ± 52                     | 109 ± 58                    | 89 ± 44                    | 55–121          | −0.39     | 0.13|
| **Vitamins and Co-factors**      |                             |                             |                            |                 |           |     |
| Pyridoxal (nM)                   | 0.12 ± 0.12                  | 0.1 ± 0.1                   | 0.13 ± 0.15                | 0.2–0.3         | 0.21      | 0.43|
| Metabolite                        | All participants Mean ± SD | TAA UFP <19,000 Mean ± SD | TAA UFP >19,000 Mean ± SD | Reference range | Cohen’s $d$ | $P$  |
|----------------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------|------------|------|
| Pantothenic acid                 | 19 ± 29                     | 20 ± 24                     | 18 ± 33                     | 4.5–5.3         | –0.06      | 0.83 |
| alpha-tocopherol                 | 16 ± 9                      | 16 ± 9                      | 15 ± 9                      | 18–44           | –0.02      | 0.94 |
| Tetrahydrofolic acid (nM)        | 9 ± 4                       | 9 ± 4                       | 8 ± 3                       | 0–7             | –0.11      | 0.67 |
| Choline                          | 1.3 ± 0.5                   | 1.3 ± 0.5                   | 1.3 ± 0.6                   | 6.5–12.5        | –0.01      | 0.97 |
| Niacin                           | 6 ± 14                      | 4 ± 11                      | 8 ± 16                      | 43–55           | 0.34       | 0.20 |
| Methyl nicotinic acid (nM)       | 15 ± 34                     | 19 ± 49                     | 11 ± 8                      | NA              | –0.24      | 0.35 |

$^{1}$ Concentrations are given in μM unless noted otherwise.
Table 4:
Select annotated metabolites detected using HILIC with positive ESI identified by cross-sectional PLS-DA low- and high-UFP exposure

| m/z       | Adduct | Identity                      | Identification confidence | VIP<sup>2</sup> | Cohen’s d | p        |
|-----------|--------|--------------------------------|---------------------------|----------------|-----------|----------|
| 134.0450  | M+H    | L-Aspartic acid                | 1                         | 2.56           | −0.73     | 0.007    |
| 279.2322  | M+H    | Alpha/gamma-Linolenic acid     | 1                         | 2.22           | −0.62     | 0.021    |
| 166.0534  | M+H    | Methionine sulfoxide           | 1                         | 2.46           | 0.70      | 0.010    |
| 241.0314  | M+H    | L-Cystine                      | 1                         | 2.61           | 0.74      | 0.006    |
| 134.0190  | M+2Na-H| Alanine                        | 1                         | 2.59           | 0.74      | 0.006    |
| 129.1024  | M+H-H2O| L-Lysine                       | 1                         | 2.71           | 0.78      | 0.004    |
| 169.0586  | M+Na   | L-Glutamine                    | 1                         | 3.35           | 1.01      | 2.98E-04 |
| 157.1225  | M+H    | 4-Hydroxynonenal               | 3                         | 2.17           | 0.60      | 0.024    |
| 225.1324  | M+Na   | Dimethylarginine               | 3                         | 2.79           | 0.79      | 0.003    |
| 217.0821  | M+ACN+Na| FAPy-adenine                   | 4                         | 2.58           | −0.74     | 0.006    |
| 233.0788  | M+ACN+H| gamma-Carboxyglutamic acid     | 4                         | 2.40           | −0.68     | 0.012    |
| 261.1448  | M+ACN+H| Pantothenic acid               | 4                         | 2.01           | 0.54      | 0.037    |
| 376.0578  | M+K    | S-(Hydroxymethyl)glutathione   | 4                         | 2.12           | 0.59      | 0.027    |
| 335.1255  | M+H-H2O| Cotinine glucuronide           | 4                         | 2.25           | 0.64      | 0.019    |
| 347.0650  | M+2Na-H| Benzo(a)pyrene diol epoxide    | 4                         | 2.33           | 0.65      | 0.015    |
| 337.1047  | M+Na   | 7,8-Dihydropteroic acid        | 4                         | 2.55           | 0.72      | 0.007    |
| 279.1116  | M+ACN+Na| Acetyl vitamin K5             | 4                         | 3.17           | 0.94      | 6.76E-04 |

1 Identification confidence based upon Schymanski et al. (2014)

2 VIP = Variable importance projection score
## Table 5:
Select annotated metabolites detected using RPC with negative ESI identified by cross-sectional PLS-DA low- and high-UFP exposure

| m/z       | Adduct   | Identity                  | Identification confidence | VIP2 | Cohen’s d | p     |
|-----------|----------|---------------------------|----------------------------|------|-----------|-------|
| 197.0684  | M+Na-2H  | Cotinine                  | 1                          | 2.43 | −0.69     | 0.013 |
| 132.0305  | M-H      | L-Aspartic acid           | 1                          | 2.48 | −0.68     | 0.011 |
| 128.0355  | M-H2O-H  | L-Glutamic acid           | 1                          | 2.03 | −0.55     | 0.039 |
| 118.0512  | M-H      | L-Threonine               | 1                          | 2.06 | 0.55      | 0.036 |
| 151.0404  | M-H      | 3,4-Dihydroxyphenylnacetaldehyde | 3                      | 2.14 | −0.57     | 0.029 |
| 272.4254  | M-3H     | 3-Sialyl Lewis            | 4                          | 2.17 | −0.59     | 0.027 |
| 107.0504  | M-H      | Cresol                    | 4                          | 2.01 | 0.53      | 0.041 |
| 289.1216  | M-H      | trans-dimethylbenz(a)anthracene – 5,6-dihydrodiol | 4                      | 2.01 | 0.54      | 0.041 |
| 494.1544  | M+Cl     | 5-Methyltetrahydrofolic acid | 4                      | 2.05 | 0.55      | 0.037 |
| 165.0924  | M+Cl     | Agmatine                  | 4                          | 2.43 | 0.68      | 0.013 |
| 157.0509  | M+Na-2H  | Tetrahydropteridine       | 4                          | 2.67 | 0.73      | 0.006 |
| 445.2942  | M-H      | 24-Oxo-1alpha2325-trihydroxyvitamin D3 | 4                      | 2.82 | 0.78      | 0.003 |
| 475.1970  | M-H      | 2-Methoxyestrone 3-glucuronide | 4                      | 2.80 | 0.78      | 0.004 |
| 322.9821  | M+Na-2H  | Ellagic acid              | 4                          | 2.83 | 0.79      | 3.38E-03 |

1. Identification confidence based upon Schymanski et al. (2014)
2. VIP=Variable importance projection score