Tissue Distribution and Maternal Transfer of Poly- and Perfluorinated Compounds in Chinese Sturgeon (*Acipenser sinensis*): Implications for Reproductive Risk

HUI PENG,[†] QIWEI WEI,^{*,‡} YI WAN,[§] JOHN P. GIESY,^{§,||} LUOXIN LI,[‡] AND JIANYING HU^{*,†}

Laboratory for Earth Surface Processes, College of Urban and Environmental Sciences, Peking University, Beijing 100871, China, Laboratory of Freshwater Biodiversity Conservation and Utilization, Ministry of Agriculture of China, Yangtze River Fisheries Research Institute, Chinese Academy of Fisheries Science, Jingzhou, Hubei 434000, China, Department of Veterinary Biomedical Sciences and Toxicology Centre, University of Saskatchewan, Saskatoon, Saskatchewan, S7J 5B3, Canada, and Zoology Department, Center for Integrative Toxicology, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan 48824

Received October 25, 2009. Revised manuscript received January 27, 2010. Accepted January 29, 2010.

It is critical to investigate the tissue distribution and maternal transfer of poly- and perfluorinated compounds (PFCs) in wild fish for assessing potential effects on ecosystems. Concentrations of 23 PFCs in nine organs and egg were measured in 16 17- to 25-year-old female Chinese sturgeon (Acipenser sinensis, an anadromous fish), that died during propagation. Three polyfluorinated amides were detected in stomach, intestine, and gills and 7:3 FTCA was specifically accumulated in liver. The greatest total concentration of PFCs in egg was 35.1 \pm 10.4 ng/g www and was predominated by perfluorooctane sulfonate (PFOS) and perfluorotridecanoate acid (PFTriDA). The longerchain C₁₁-C₁₄ and C₁₆ perfluorinated carboxylates were more accumulated in Chinese sturgeon than PFOS, partly due to the increasing trends of PFCAs with fish age. Maternal transfer ratios of PFCs expressed as ratios of concentrations in the egg to those in the liver ranged from 0.79 (perfluorooctanoate) to 5.5 (PFTriDA), depending on their carbon chain lengths or protein-water coefficients. The PFOS equivalent of PFC mixtures, calculated by multiplying the relative potency factor of each PFC to PFOS by the corresponding concentration, ranged from 90.6 to 262 ng/g. The hazard quotient was 0.20, implying potential reproductive effects of PFCs on Chinese sturgeon.

Introduction

Poly- and perfluorinated compounds (PFCs) are a class of widely used, persistent, bioaccumulative compounds that

are ubiquitous in the environment (1). PFCs have been used in many products including fire-fighting foams, inks, and water repellents, and as coatings on paper and textiles during the past 50 years (2). Recently, due to their global detection in different environmental matrices (atmosphere (3), precipitation (4), surface water (5), and biota (6)) and toxicity (7), PFCs have received greater scientific and regulatory scrutiny. Some PFCs have been associated with alternations in gap junction intercellular communication, lipid metabolism, cholesterol and steroid levels, impaired development (8, 9), and a significant reduction in the hatching success of chicken embryos following injection of environmentally relevant concentrations of perfluorooctane sulfonate (PFOS) into eggs (10).

Despite their relatively small acid-dissociation constants (pK_a) (11) and the fact that they preferentially partition to protein instead of lipids, PFCs have been reported to pose a potential environmental risk through accumulation by higher trophic level organisms such as in polar bears and dolphins (12, 13). Investigating distributions of PFCs among tissues is important for understanding their pharmacokinetic and toxic effects on organisms, and some studies have been conducted on air-respiring mammals and birds including harbor seals (Phoca vitulina), harbor porpoises (Phocoena phocoena relicta), and the common guillemot (Uria aalge) (14-16). Within these studies, relatively great variations in concentrations have been observed among homologues and species. As water-respiring organisms, fish exhibit different pharmacokinetics and toxicity from air-respiring mammals and birds (17). However, only one experimental exposure has investigated tissue distributions of perfluorinated acids (PFAs), including perfluorooctanoate (PFOA), C₁₀-C₁₃ perfluorocarboxylic acids (PFCAs), perfluorohexane sulfonate (PFHxS), and PFOS in fish (18). While providing preliminary information on the pharmacokinetics of PFCs in fish, maternal transfer of PFCs to eggs was not determined. During embryonic development, organisms usually exhibit greater sensitivity to pollutant exposure, especially for oviparous/ egg-producing organisms such as fish and birds (19). Accumulation of residues in eggs by maternal transfer is the predominant exposure route for embryos, which can result in reproductive and early development toxicities, and therefore contribute to population-level effects (20-22). Fishspecific developmental toxicities including pericardial edema and malformations of the tail, have been reported for zebrafish (Danio rerio) exposed to PFOS (21), indicating maternal transfer of PFCs to fish eggs is of concern.

Indirect contamination of aquatic environments with PFC precursors such as fluorotelomer alcohols (FTOHs), polyfluorinated amides, fluorotelomer iodides, olefins, acrylates, and phosphates has been proposed in previous research (24, 25). Previous studies have validated the transformation processes from FTOHs to the corresponding PFCAs via atmospheric oxidation, microbial degradation, and rat metabolism, in which both saturated and unsaturated fluorotelomer carboxylates (FTCAs and FTUCAs) have been observed as the intermediate metabolites (26-28). During the transformation from polyfluorinated amides to corresponding PFAs, perfluorooctane sulfonamide (PFOSA), 2-(perfluorooctanesulfonamido) acetic acid (FOSAA), and 2-(Nethylperfluorooctane sulfonamido) acetic acid (N-EtFOSAA) have been reported as intermediate metabolites (29, 30). The detection of PFOSA and some FTCAs and FTUCAs in wildlife such as ringed seals (Phoca hispida) and seabirds (31, 32) supports the PFC-precursor hypothesis, which may be a

^{*} Address correspondence to either author. J.H. tel and fax: 86-10-62765520; e-mail: hujy@urban.pku.edu.cn. Q.W. tel and fax: 86-716-8128881; e-mail: weiqw@yfi.ac.cn.

[†] Peking University.

[‡] Chinese Academy of Fisheries Science.

[§] University of Saskatchewan.

[&]quot;Michigan State University.

significant source of PFCs in marine environments in addition to PFCs accumulated by Chinese sturgeon in the Yangtze River.

Due to the rapid decline of its population, the Chinese sturgeon (Acipenser sinensis) is listed as a grade I protected animal in China. This decline has been attributed to chemical contamination in addition to dam construction and the resulting loss of habitat, especially in spawning areas, and overfishing (20, 33, 34). In this study, concentrations of 23 PFCs including 10 PFCAs (C₆-C₁₄, and C₁₆ PFCAs), 4 perfluorinated sulfonic acids (PFSAs, C6-C8, C10 PFSAs), and related chemicals including 5 FTCAs and FTUCAs (6:2 FTCA, 6:2 FTUCA, 10:2 FTCA, 10:2 FTUCA, and 7:3 FTCA) and 4 polyfluorinated amides (FOSAA, N-MeFOSAA, N-EtFOSAA, PFOSA) were measured in the egg, liver, kidney, gallbladder, intestine, stomach, muscle, heart, gill, and ovary of 16 wildcaught female Chinese sturgeon. The distribution and relative concentrations of PFCs among tissues and age-related accumulation patterns were investigated, with an emphasis on maternal transfer to eggs, and a preliminary assessment of potential effects of the Yangtze River PFC mixture on the reproduction of Chinese sturgeon by use of hazard quotients (HQs).

Materials and Methods

Chemicals and Reagents. Details are given in Supporting Information.

Sample Collection and Artificial Fertilization for Chinese Sturgeon. The Chinese sturgeon is anadromous with initial reproduction occurring at an average age of approximately 14 y (33). Every June or July, maturing adults leave the ocean and ascend the main channel of the Yangtze River to spawn, and stay in the river for a period of approximately 1 y before reproducing in middle October to early November, after which they return to the sea for 3 to 5 y before spawning again. The Yangtze River is the largest river in China and flows through urban and industrial areas. Concentrations of PFCs in Yangtze River (<0.005-2.1 ng/L for PFHxS, 0.29-14 ng/L for PFOS, 2.1–260 ng/L for PFOA, <0.005–10 ng/L for PFNA) are greater than those in the marine environment (<0.005-1.36 ng/L for PFHxS, <0.023-9.68 ng/L for PFOS, 0.243-15.3 ng/L for PFOA, 0.002-0.692 ng/L for PFNA) (35, 36). It seems that Yangtze River would have contributed large contributions to the PFCs exposure in Chinese sturgeon. Further studies on the clearance rate and food item should be conducted to investigate the exposure route to Chinese sturgeon.

Because they are listed as a grade I protected animal in China, a limited number of Chinese sturgeon were allowed to be captured (by roller hook) for propagation and scientific study, and then released back into the Yangtze River. However, during artificial propagation some of the sturgeon died. Between 2003 and 2006, eggs were collected for artificial spawning while other organs were collected from individuals who died. Samples were kept at -20 °C until analysis. Ages of sturgeons were estimated by growth layers in the cleithrum, as described in previous research (*33*). Details of the samples are shown in Table S1, Supporting Information.

Details about the artificial fertilization for Chinese sturgeon have been described by Hu et al. (*20*). From 2003 to 2006, 16 females were captured from Yangtze River for artificial fertilization. Information on reproductive performance was obtained for 7 of these females. Fecundity was calculated by dividing the number of eggs by body weight (kg). Unfertilized eggs were counted and discarded, and the fertilization was also calculated. Survival was then expressed by the percentage of the number of survival larval sturgeon in total fertilized eggs. Details are given in Table S2, Supporting Information. **Quantification of PFCs and Quality Assurance/Quality Control.** Sample extraction was based on the ion pairing method as described in a previous paper (1), and the details are given in Supporting Information.

Data Analysis. Details are given in Supporting Information.

Results and Discussion

Concentrations of Perfluorinated Acids (PFAs) and Distributions among Tissues. Of the 14 PFAs including 10 PFCAs and 4 PFSAs, all but PFHxA and PFHpS were detected, with PFTriDA detected in all but one of the 56 samples. The total concentrations of detected PFAs (Σ PFAs) in different tissues are shown (Table 1). Representative chromatograms for each individual PFC are given in Figure S1, Supporting Information. The greatest mean concentration (p < 0.01) of 35.1 ± 10.4 ng Σ PFAs/g ww, and 14.2 ± 5.5 ng Σ PFAs/g ww were observed in egg and liver, respectively. These concentrations were 10-100 times greater than those in other organs (Figure 1a).

Ratios of concentrations in the liver to those in the muscle (liver/muscle ratios, LMR) for PFOS, PFUnDA, PFDoDA, and PFTriDA were compared with those reported for other animals (14-16). The LMRs of PFOS, PFUnDA, PFDoDA, and PFTriDA for Chinese sturgeon were 61.5, 63.4, 11.1, and 55.3, respectively, which were generally greater than those in harbor seal (3.0 for PFOS), harbor porpoise (more than 8.0 for PFOS), or common guillemot (8.6, 19.0, 6.4, and 5.5 for PFOS, PFUnDA, PFDoDA, PFTriDA, respectively). The relatively large variation of LMRs among species may lead to improper estimates on trophodynamic behaviors when concentrations of PFCs in liver are used (13, 37). Concentrations of PFOS and Σ PFCAs in Chinese sturgeon eggs were 14.6 ± 9.3 and 20.1 ± 19.6 ng/g ww, respectively, which were greater than those in the liver (5.8 \pm 3.2 ng PFOS/g ww and 7.6 ± 5.8 ng Σ PFCAs/g ww). While occurrence of PFCs in livers of fish has been reported (1, 38), there are few reports of PFCs in fish eggs. Only PFOS was detected in lake whitefish (Coregonus clupeaformis) and brown trout (Cyprinus carpio) eggs among four target PFCs (PFHxS, PFOS, PFOSA, and PFOA) (38).

Patterns of relative concentrations of PFAs in different tissues varied only slightly (Figure 2a), with the pattern in the gallbladder being the most different. PFOS was the predominant PFA, accounting for 41.6%, 43.0%, and 75.7% of *SPFAs* in egg, liver, and gallbladder, respectively. Among the nine detected PFCAs, PFTriDA was the most abundant in all tissues except muscle, accounting for 27.5% (gallbladder) to 70.6% (stomach) of the total PFCAs. Accumulation of PFTriDA was even greater than that of PFOS in the gills (51.0%), heart (28.6%), stomach (60.5%), ovary (41.2%), and intestine (38.7%). PFUnDA was another predominant PFCA and accounted for 10.2% of Σ PFCAs in muscle to 23.0% in gallbladder. This PFTriDA-dominated pattern is different from those previously reported, where PFOA, PFNA, or PFUnDA were generally the most abundant (31, 39), a result that has previously been observed in seabirds (40). To further understand the patterns of relative concentrations of PFCAs among tissues of Chinese sturgeon, the most prevalent C6-C10 PFCAs reported in other studies were classified as shorterchain PFCAs, while the C₁₁-C₁₄ and C₁₆ PFCAs were classified as longer-chain PFCAs. The shorter-chain PFCAs, longerchain PFCAs, and PFSAs in Chinese sturgeon liver contributed 10%, 46%, and 44% of total PFAs, respectively (Figure 2b). Such a congener-specific pattern leads to the relatively great Σ PFCAs/PFOS ratio in Chinese sturgeon (1.3 in the liver and 1.4 in the egg) compared to the guillemot (0.24 in the liver and 0.10 in the egg), polar bear from Sanikiluaq (0.10 in the liver), and herring gulls from Røst (0.20 in the egg) (16, 39, 41).

To evaluate selective bioaccumulation of PFCs in Chinese sturgeon, regression analyses were conducted between age

TABLE	1. Mean	Concentrations	(ng/g ww) and R	langes (of Poly-	and	Perfluorinated	Com	pounds i	in Chinese	Sturr	qeon

tissues	E ^a	L	I.	н	St	Ov	м	Gi	Gb	к
	<i>n</i> = 14	<i>n</i> = 7	<i>n</i> = 7	<i>n</i> = 5	<i>n</i> = 5	<i>n</i> = 4	<i>n</i> = 6	<i>n</i> = 6	<i>n</i> = 1	<i>n</i> = 1
PFHxA	nd ^{<i>b</i>}	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd
PFHpA	nd	0.19 ± 0.16 (nd-0.56)	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd
PFOA	0.15 ± 0.09 (nd-0.42)	0.16 ± 0.06 (nd-0.26)	0.07 ± 0.03 (nd-0.13)	0.10 ± 0.05 (0.04-0.18)	0.09 ± 0.02 (0.06-0.12)	0.07 ± 0.02 (0.05-0.09)	nd—0.17 (2/6)	0.13 ± 0.02 (nd-0.18)	0.06	nd
PFNA	0.27 ± 0.27 (nd-1.03)	0.25 ± 0.12 (0.07-0.40)	0.07 ± 0.02 (0.05-0.10)	0.21 ± 0.28 (nd-0.70)	nd	nd	0.12 ± 0.03 (nd-0.18)	nd	0.05	nd
PFDA	1.1 ± 0.48 (0.51-1.7)	0.79 ± 0.3 (0.62-1.4)	nd	0.12 ± 0.10 (nd-0.28)	nd-0.09 (2/5)	0.13 ± 0.06 (0.08-0.20)	nd	0.06 ± 0.03 (nd-0.10)	0.13	0.75
PFUnDA	3.8 ± 1.4 (1.7-5.1)	1.6 ± 0.96 (0.53-3.2)	0.15 ± 0.13 (0.05-0.44)	0.23 ± 0.18 (0.06-0.44)	0.15 ± 0.18 (nd-0.46)	0.43 ± 0.32 (0.14-0.89)	0.03 ± 0.01 (nd-0.04)	0.15 ± 0.10 (0.04-0.34)	0.14	1.3
PFDoDA	1.4 ± 0.6 (0.78-2.7)	0.38 ± 0.20 (0.17-0.65)	0.15 ± 0.16 (nd-0.50)	0.09 ± 0.05 (nd-0.16)	0.07 ± 0.08 (nd-0.21)	0.12 ± 0.07 (nd-0.21)	0.03 ± 0.02 (nd-0.07)	0.08 ± 0.02 (nd-0.11)	0.07	1.1
PFTriDA	12.4 ± 4.6 (7 4-22 6)	3.9 ± 4.3 (0.95-13.1)	0.79 ± 1.3 (0.11-3.7)	0.50 ± 0.41 (0.13-0.99)	0.87 ± 1.3 (0 11-3 1)	0.93 ± 0.68 (0.09-1.8)	0.07 ± 0.06 (nd-0.18)	0.80 ± 0.97 (0.17-2.7)	0.17	7.5
PFTeDA	0.96 ± 0.25 (0.78-1.4)	0.27 ± 0.19 (0.65-0.8)	0.09 ± 0.11	0.08 ± 0.03 (nd-0.13)	nd	0.13 ± 0.07 (0.08-0.24)	nd	0.10 ± 0.09 (nd-0.28)	nd	1.7
PFHxDA	0.28 ± 0.10 (nd-0.47)	nd-0.07	nd-0.15	nd	nd	0.07 ± 0.04 (nd-0.12)	nd	0.08 ± 0.03 (nd-0.14)	nd	nd
PFHxS	nd	0.10 ± 0.02 (nd-0.16)	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd
PFHpS	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd
PFOS	14.6 ± 9.3 (7.2–27.6)	5.8 ± 3.2 (1.6–9.2)	0.52 ± 0.38 (0.25-1.2)	0.40 ± 0.25 (nd-0.62)	0.21 ± 0.23 (0.08-0.61)	0.38 ± 0.34 (0.09-0.81)	0.09 ± 0.09 (nd -0.27)	0.16 ± 0.18 (nd-0.52)	1.9	1.8
PFDS	0.24 ± 0.24 (0.07-1.0)	0.05 ± 0.01 (0.04-0.07)	0.20 ± 0.39 (nd-1.1)	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	0.29
7:3 FTCA	nd	0.57 ± 0.45 (0.13-1.4)	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd
6:2 FTCA	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd
6:2 FTUCA	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd
10:2 FTCA	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd
10:2 FTUCA	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd
FOSAA	nd	nd	nd—0.06 (2/7)	nd	0.05 ± 0.02 (nd-0.12)	nd	nd	0.06 ± 0.04 (nd-0.11)	nd	nd
N-MeFOSAA	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd
N-EtFOSAA	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd-0.05 (1/5)	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd
PFOSA	nd	0.06 ± 0.07 (nd–0.18)	0.23 ± 0.34 (nd–0.98)	0.03 ± 0.04 (nd-0.11)	0.41 ± 0.63 (nd-1.5)	0.10 ± 0.11 (0.03-0.26)	0.04 ± 0.02 (nd-0.07)	0.27 ± 0.26 (0.08-0.77)	nd	0.98
N-EtFOSA	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd
∑PFCs	$\begin{array}{c} 35.1 \pm 10.4 \\ (21.0 - 55.5) \end{array}$	14.2 ± 5.5 (6.7–22.7)	$\begin{array}{c} \textbf{2.3} \pm \textbf{2.4} \\ \textbf{(0.82} - \textbf{7.8)} \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 1.8 \pm 0.98 \\ (0.86 {-} 3.1) \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 1.9 \pm 2.3 \\ (0.64 {-} 6.1) \end{array}$	2.4 ± 1.1 (1.4-4.1)	$\begin{array}{c} 0.38 \pm 0.18 \\ (0.27 {-} 0.53) \end{array}$	1.9 ± 1.6 (0.70-5.2)	2.5	15.5

^a E: egg; L: liver; M: muscle; H: heart; Ov: ovary; St: stomach; I: intestine; Gi: gill; K: kidney; Gb: gallbladder. ^b Not detected. ^c 1 of 7 samples was detected above MDL.

and log₁₀-transformed concentrations of PFCs in egg. Increasing age-related trends were also found for longer-chain PFCAs including PFUnDA, PFDoDA, PFTriDA, PFTeDA, and PFHxDA (slope = 0.01 - 0.03, $r^2 = 0.02 - 0.29$, p = 0.049 - 0.605). No statistically significant associations were found between shorter-chain C₆-C₁₀ PFCAs or PFOS (Figure S2, Supporting Information). Possible reasons for such homologue-specific profiles in Chinese sturgeon are its status as a higher-level predator feeding on insects and fish, water-respiration, and relatively long life span. This set of characteristics and slower excretion rate of longer-chain PFCs compared to more hydrophilic shorter-chain PFAs including PFOS, might lead to a specific accumulation of the longer-chain PFCAs. This pattern was also observed in rainbow trout (42). Thus, it is likely that there would be greater accumulation of longerchain PFCAs and large ΣPFCAs/PFOS, which would result in a relatively large ratio in Chinese sturgeon.

Concentrations and Distributions of Precursors in Tissues. Among the 4 target polyfluorinated amides, PFOSA, FOSAA, and N-EtFOSAA were detected. Chromatograms of these three compounds are shown in Figure S1, Supporting Information. While these precursors have been reported to occur in water of Lakes Ontario and Erie (*43*) and in human blood from Washington State, U.S. (*44*), this is the first report of FOSAA occurring in wildlife. PFOSA was mainly detected in the intestine (0.23 \pm 0.34 ng/g ww), stomach (0.41 \pm 0.63 ng/g ww), and gills (0.27 \pm 0.26 ng/g ww) which were even small accumulation of PFOSA into the liver of the Chinese sturgeon was similar to that observed for guillemot, in which PFOSA was detected in the kidney (0.53 ng/g ww) and egg (0.79 ng/g ww) but not in the muscle or liver (16). However, PFOSA was not detected in the eggs of Chinese sturgeon, which suggests a species-specific difference in transfer to eggs. FOSAA was detected only in absorptive organs including the intestine (0.03 and 0.06 ng/g ww in two samples), stomach (0.05 \pm 0.02 ng/g ww), and gills (0.06 \pm 0.04 ng/g ww). Similarly, a relatively small concentration of N-EtFOSAA was detected in one sample of stomach. These results suggest that polyfluorinated amides such as PFOSA, FOSAA, and N-EtFOSAA would be accumulated through absorptive organs and then rapidly metabolized by Chinese sturgeon. Metabolism of PFOSA has been observed in both rat and rainbow trout liver microsomes (30, 41), and FOSAA and N-EtFOSAA have been also reported to be rapidly metabolized and exhibited relatively short half-lives in blood (44). Of the 5 FTCAs and FTUCAs, only 7:3 FTCA was detected, specifically in liver (0.57 \pm 0.45 ng/g ww). This result is comparable to that observed for the liver of ringed seals (0.5-2.5 ng/g ww)from Sachs Harbor (45). A potential cause of this pattern is that 7:3 FTCA is an intermediate metabolite during the pathway from 8:2 FTOH to PFOA and PFNA. This is consistent with the finding of 7:3 FTCA in the livers of rats exposed to

greater than those of PFOS, and the concentration in liver

was relatively small ($0.06 \pm 0.07 \text{ ng/g ww}$) (Figure 1b). The



FIGURE 1. Tissue distribution of Σ PFAs, PFOSA, and 7:3 FTCA in Chinese sturgeon. The straight horizontal line represents the median concentration. The 25th and 75th percentiles define the boxes and the whiskers represent the 10th and 90th percentiles. The circular symbol represents an outlier (defined as observation >1.5 times the interquartile range from the edge of the box) and the asterisk represents an extreme (defined as observation >3 times the interquartile range from the edge of the box). The hatching boxes represent the absorbed organs.

8:2 FTOH (25). Alternatively, 7:3 FTCA could be absorbed from water or diet and then accumulated in liver or rapidly metabolized to PFCAs. These distribution characteristics of polyfluorinated amides and FTCAs (and FTUCAs) in Chinese sturgeon indicate a potential contribution of precursors to observed concentrations of PFAs residues in wildlife.

Accumulation of PFAs in Eggs. Concentrations of longerchain PFCAs and PFOS detected in eggs were several times greater than those in the liver. ELRs were calculated based on individuals, and relatively large ELRs of 1.9 for PFOS and 0.79 (PFOA) to 5.5 (PFTriDA) were calculated for PFCAs. Overall, ELRs were greater than those in guillemot, which ranged from 0.39 for PFNA to 2.69 for PFOS (*16*). They were also greater than the ratios for triphenyltin (TPT, 0.34), hexachlorobenzene (HCB, 0.61), and total 1,1,1-trichloro-2,2-bis-(4'-chlorophenyl) ethanes (DDTs, 0.27) in Chinese sturgeon (*20*, *33*). A significant positive correlation (slope = 0.64, $r^2 = 0.53$, p < 0.001) between ELRs of PFCAs and chain length was observed (Figure 3a). PFOS exhibited an even larger ELR than did the PFCAs with similar carbon chainlength. The mechanism for the preferential transfer of PFCs



FIGURE 2. Relative contribution (percent) of different PFAs to total PFAs in (a) different tissues of Chinese sturgeon; (b) livers of Chinese sturgeon (only PFCs with >5% relative contributions are presented). The error term indicates standard deviation.

to the egg of Chinese sturgeon is unknown. However, in birds, PFOS has been suggested to be accumulated in the liver, and then transferred to egg as a protein–PFOS complex (*16*). Based on such a potential mechanism, the correlation between the protein–water partition coefficients (log K_{pw}) of PFAs (data from ref *17*) was investigated. Statistically significant, positive correlations were observed between ELRs and log K_{pw} (slope = 1.22, $r^2 = 0.69$, p < 0.001) (Figure 3b). This result suggests that the relatively large ELRs of some PFAs could be due to transport of protein-bound PFCAs, rather than a simple equilibrium among lipid pools as is observed for organo-chlorine compounds such as PCBs.

Preliminary Reproductive Risk Assessment. A preliminary estimation of potential effects of PFCs on reproduction of Chinese sturgeon was conducted by calculation of hazard quotients (HQs). Because Chinese sturgeon eggs contained several PFCs of different chain length and there is little information on the toxicity of these compounds, especially in fish eggs, some estimation of their relative toxic potencies (RPs) had to be made. As an initial estimate of the overall mixture toxicity, RP values were developed to normalize concentrations of each PFC to an equivalent concentration of PFOS. The total concentrations of PFOS equivalents (PFOS-EQs) were calculated as the sum of the products of the RPs and the associated concentration of each detected PFC. RP values were calculated using cytotoxicity data for PFAs as determined by in vitro assays compiled from the literature (46, 47). It is understood that there may be different RP values based on different end points and that the in vitro responses might not relate directly to in vivo responses, but based on previous studies, there is information to suggest that this is a reasonable initial estimation of toxic potency (48, 40). Thus, in this study, the RPs of PFOA, PFNA, PFDA, PFDoDA, PFTeDA, PFHxDA, and PFOS were obtained by normalizing the PFAs EC₅₀ concentrations of cytotoxicity to PFOS EC₅₀ (EC_{50PFOS}/EC_{50PFA}) (details are given in Supporting Informa-



FIGURE 3. Correlations between egg to liver ratios (ELRs) of PFCAs, PFOS, and carbon chain length (a) and logarithm of the protein-water partition coefficients ($\log_{10}K_{pw}$) (b). **D**PFOS; **O**PFCAs; PFHxDA was detected in only one liver sample, the standard deviation was not calculated); Ratio = 0.6398 × chain length - 4.1634, $r^2 = 0.53$, p < 0.001 (PFOS was excluded). Ratio = 1.22 × log K_{pw} - 2.34, $r^2 = 0.69$, p < 0.001. log₁₀ K_{pw} values were available from ref 17. The error term indicates standard deviation.

TABLE 2. Correlations Among Fecundity, Fertilization, and Survival, and Log₁₀-Transformed Concentrations of PFAs and PFOS-EQs in Egg

	fecundity	fertilization	survival
∑PFCAs PFOS	slope = 553, r^2 = 0.03, p = 0.69 slope = 184, r^2 = 0.04, p = 0.67	slope = -29 , $r^2 = 0.01$, $p = 0.82$ slope = -6 , $r^2 = 0.01$, $p = 0.88$	slope = -176 , $r^2 = 0.32$, $p = 0.18$ slope = 41, $r^2 = 0.18$, $p = 0.34$
PFOS-EQ	slope = 927, $r^2 = 0.07$, $p = 0.56$	slope = -37 , $r^2 = 0.01$, $p = 0.81$	slope = -143 , $r^2 = 0.16$, $p = 0.38$

tion). Such calculated RPs for PFAs to cause in vitro cytotoxicity were comparable to those derived from other end points, such as acyl-CoA oxidase activities and inhibition potentials of cellular communication (*8*, 49), and inhibition potentials of cellular communication have been applied to estimate ecological risk assessment of birds (40).

Relative contributions of different PFAs to the concentration of Σ PFOS-EQ in egg were investigated (Figure S3, Supporting Information). The longer-chain C₁₃ PFCA accounted for the greatest proportion of Σ PFOS-EQ in egg. As an assessment of the sensitivity of Σ PFOS-EQ to variations in RP values based on cytotoxicity were calculated, PFTriDA and PFOS contributed to the greatest proportion of Σ PFOS-EQ. To reduce uncertainty in these sorts of assessments, additional information on the reproductive toxicity of longerchained PFCAs and PFOS to fish is needed.

To estimate the risk associated with the protection of the 90th percentile of Chinese sturgeon, concentrations of $\Sigma PFOS-EQ$ in eggs were log-transformed to more closely approximate the normal probability distribution, and then the 90th percentile $\Sigma PFOS-EQ$ concentration (2.14 \times 10² ng/g in eggs) was determined. The 90th percentile concentration was then divided by the benchmark dose, expressed as the toxicological reference value (TRV_{NOAEL}) (eq 1)

$$HQ = 90$$
th percentile PFOS-EQ concentration/TRV_{NOAEL} (1)

Previous studies on trans-generational toxicities of PFCs have reported the NOAEL values using the curve between the survival decrease of F1 generation and the dose of PFOS (*50, 51*). Since the Chinese sturgeon is an endangered species, the most sensitive species for which toxicity information was available was selected for the preliminary risk assessment. The toxicity reference value (TRV_{NOAEL}) was estimated to be 1.1 μ g PFOS/g ww egg based on the NOAEL_{survival} of 10 μ g PFOS/L for F1 generation in zebrafish (*51*) and a bioconcentration factor (BCF_{egg}) of 115 for accumulation from water to egg of fathead minnows (*50*).

Since the HQ of 0.20 was less than 1.0, reproductive impairment would not be expected to be caused by current

PFC concentrations in Chinese sturgeon eggs from the Yangtze River. However, the risk assessment for Chinese sturgeon should be interpreted with caution since no sturgeon-specific information on toxicity of any PFCs to eggs is available, uncertainty factors (UFs) should be eliminated in the further study.

To further evaluate the suspected reproductive toxicity posed by PFAs in eggs, associations among Σ PFCAs, PFOS, Σ PFOS-EQ and reproductive end points including fecundity, fertilization, and survival were investigated by correlation analyses (Table 2). Although no statistically significant associations were found, weak negative correlations between Σ PFCAs or PFOS-EQ and reproductive end points especially for survival were observed, suggesting potential effects of PFCs on the reproduction of Chinese sturgeon. However, more detailed toxicity information on reproduction of Chinese sturgeon, especially for longer-chain PFCAs, is required to reduce the uncertainty in the risk assessment.

Acknowledgments

Financial support from the National Natural Science Foundation of China (40632009), the National Basic Research Program of China (2007CB407304), and Three-Gorges Project Corporation for Ecological and Environmental Compensation (071490) are gratefully acknowledged. Portions of this research were supported by a Discovery Grant from the National Science and Engineering Research Council of Canada (Project 326415-07) and a grant from Western Economic Diversification Canada (Projects6578 and 6807). J.P.G. was supported by the Canada Research Chair program and an at large Chair Professorship at the Department of Biology and Chemistry and Research Centre for Coastal Pollution and Conservation, City University of Hong Kong.

Supporting Information Available

Text, figures, and tables addressing (1) details of Chinese sturgeon samples; (2) 23 chemicals used in the analysis; (3) extraction methods and instrumental conditions; (4) data analysis and RPs calculations; (5) recoveries and MDLs of

PFCs in different tissue matrices; (6) chromatograms of detected PFCs; (7) correlations between concentrations of longer-chain PFCAs and PFOS in eggs and age; (8) relative contributions to PFOS-EQ. This information is available free of charge via the Internet at http://pubs.acs.org.

Literature Cited

- Giesy, J. P.; Kannan, K. Global distribution of perfluorooctane sulfonate in wildlife. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* 2001, 35, 1339–1342.
- (2) Giesy, J. P.; Kannan, K. Perfluorochemical Surfactants in the Environment. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* 2002, *36*, 146A–152A.
- (3) Shoeib, M.; Harner, T.; Vlahos, P. Perfluorinated chemicals in the Arctic atmosphere. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* 2006, 40, 7577– 7583.
- (4) Scott, B. F.; Spencer, C.; Mabury, S. A.; Muir, D. C. G. Poly and perfluorinated carboxylates in North American precipitation. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* 2006, 40, 7167–7174.
- (5) Boulanger, B.; Peck, A. M.; Schnoor, J. L.; Hornbuckle, K. C. Mass budget of perfluorooctane surfactants in Lake Ontario. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* 2005, 39, 74–79.
- (6) Houde, M.; Martin, J. W.; Letcher, R. J.; Solomon, K. R.; Muir, D. C. G. Biological monitoring of polyfluoroalkyl substances: A review. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* 2006, 40, 3463–3473.
- (7) Beach, S. A.; Newsted, J. L.; Coady, K.; Giesy, J. P. Ecotoxicological Evaluation of Perfluorooctanesulfonate (PFOS). *Rev. Environ. Contam. Toxicol.* 2006, 186, 133–174.
- (8) Upham, B. L.; Deocampo, N. D.; Wurl, B.; Trosko, J. E. Inhibition of gap junctional intercellular communication by perfluorinated fatty acids is dependent on the chain length of the fluorinated tail. *Int. J. Cancer* **1998**, *778*, 491–495.
- (9) Luebker, D. J.; York, R. G.; Hansen, K. J.; Moore, J. A.; Butenhoff, J. L. Neonatal mortality from in utero exposure to perfluorooctanesulfonate (PFOS) in Sprague-Dawley rats: Doseresponse, and biochemical and pharamacokinetic parameters. *Toxicology* 2005, 215, 149–169.
- (10) Molina, E. D.; Fitzgerald, S. D.; Giesy, J. P.; Kannan, K.; Mitchell, R.; Bursian, S. J. Effects of air cell injection of perfluorooctane sulfonate before incubation on development of the white leghorn chicken (*Gallus domesticus*) embryo. *Environ. Toxicol. Chem./SETAC* **2006**, *25*, 227–232.
- (11) Gross, K. U. The p*K*a values of PFOA and other highly fluorinated carboxylic acids. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* **2008**, *42*, 456–458.
- (12) Dietz, R.; Bossi, R.; Riget, F. F.; Sonne, C.; Born, E. W. Increasing perfluoroalkyl contaminants in East Greenland polar bears (*Ursus maritimus*): A new toxic threat to the Arctic bears. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* **2008**, *42*, 2701–2707.
- (13) Houde, M.; Bujas, T. A. D.; Small, J.; Wells, R. S.; Fair, P. A.; Bossart, G. D.; Solomon, K. R.; Muir, D. C. G. Biomagnification of perfluoroalkyl compounds in the bottlenose dolphin (*Tursiops truncatus*) food web. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* **2006**, *40*, 4138–4144.
- (14) Van de Vijver, K. I.; Hoff, P.; Das, K.; Brasseur, S.; Van Dongen, W.; Esmans, E.; Reijnders, P.; Blust, R.; De Coen, W. Tissue distribution of perfluorinated chemicals in harbor seals (*Phoca vitulina*) from the Dutch Wadden Sea. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* 2005, 39, 6978–6984.
- (15) Van de Vijver, K. I.; Holsbeek, L.; Das, K.; Blust, R.; Joiris, C.; de Coen, W. Occurrence of perfluorooctane sulfonate and other perfluorinated alkylated substances in harbor porpoises from the Black Sea. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* **2007**, *41*, 315–320.
- (16) Holmstrom, K. E.; Berger, U. Tissue distribution of perfluorinated surfactants in common guillemot (*Uria aalge*) from the Baltic Sea. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* **2008**, *42*, 5879–5884.
- (17) Kelly, B. C.; Ikonomou, M. G.; Blair, J. D.; Surridge, B.; Hoover, D.; Grace, R.; Gobas, F. A. P. C. Perfluoroalkyl Contaminants in an Arctic Marine Food Web: Trophic Magnification and Wildlife Exposure. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* **2009**, *43*, 4037–4043.
- (18) Martin, J. W.; Mabury, S. A.; Solomon, K. R.; Muir, D. C. G. Bioconcentration and tissue distribution of perfluorinated acids in rainbow trout (*Oncorhynchus mykiss*). *Environ. Toxicol. Chem./SETAC* **2003**, *22*, 196–204.
- (19) Russell, R. W.; Gobas, F. A. P. C.; Haffner, G. D. Maternal transfer and in ovo exposure of organochlorines in oviparous organisms: A model and field verification. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* **1999**, *33*, 416–420.
- (20) Hu, J. Y.; Zhang, Z. B.; Wei, Q. W.; Zhen, H. J.; Zhao, Y. B.; Peng, H.; Wan, Y.; Giesy, J. P.; Li, L. X.; Zhang, B. Malformations of the endangered Chinese sturgeon, *Acipenser sinensis*, and its causal agent. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* **2009**, *106*, 9339–9344.

- (21) Ostrach, D. J.; Low-Marchelli, J. M.; Eder, K. J.; Whiteman, S. J.; Zinkl, J. G. Maternal transfer of xenobiotics and effects on larval striped bass in the San Francisco Estuary. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* 2008, *105*, 19354–19359.
- (22) Zhang, Z. B.; Hu, J. Y.; Zhen, H. J.; Wu, X. Q.; Huang, C. Reproductive inhibition and transgenerational toxicity of triphenyltin on medaka (*Oryzias latipes*) at environmentally relevant tip levels. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* **2008**, *33*, 8133–8.
- (23) Shi, X. J.; Du, Y. B.; Lam, P. K. S.; Wu, R. S. S.; Zhou, B. S. Developmental toxicity and alteration of gene expression in zebrafish embryos exposed to PFOS. *Toxicol. Appl. Pharmacol.* 2008, 230, 23–32.
- (24) Stock, N. L.; Lau, F. K.; Ellis, D. A.; Martin, J. W.; Muir, D. C. G.; Mabury, S. A. Polyfluorinated telomer alcohols and sulfonamides in the North American troposphere. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* 2004, 38, 991–996.
- (25) Prevedouros, K.; Cousins, I. T.; Buck, R. C.; Korzeniowski, S. H. Sources, fate and transport of perfluorocarboxylates. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* 2006, *40*, 32–44.
- (26) Fasano, W. J.; Carpenter, S. C.; Gannon, S. A.; Snow, T. A.; Stadler, J. C.; Kennedy, G. L.; Buck, R. C.; Korzeniowski, S. H.; Hinderliter, P. M.; Kemper, R. A. Absorption, distribution, metabolism, and elimination of 8–2 fluorotelomer alcohol in the rat. *Toxicol. Sci.* 2006, *91* (2), 341–355.
- (27) Ellis, D. A.; Martin, J. W.; De Silva, A. O.; Mabury, S. A.; Hurley, M. D.; Sulbaek Andersen, M. P.; Wallington, T. J. Degradation of fluorotelomer alcohols: A likely atmospheric source of perfluorinated carboxylic acids. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* 2004, 38, 3316–3321.
- (28) Wang, N.; Szostek, B.; Buck, R. C.; Folsom, P. W.; Sulecki, L. M.; Capka, V.; Berti, W. R.; Gannon, J. T. Fluorotelomer alcohol biodegradation—Direct evidence that perfluorinated carbon chains breakdown. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* **2005**, *39*, 7516–7528.
- (29) Rhoads, K. R.; Janssen, E. M. L.; Luthy, R. G.; Criddle, C. S. Aerobic biotransformation and fate of N-ethyl perfluorooctane sulfonamidoethanol (N-EtFOSE) in activated sludge. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* 2008, *42*, 2873–2878.
- (30) Xu, L.; Krenitsky, D. M.; Seacat, A. M.; Butenhoff, J. L.; Anders, M. W. Biotransformation of N-ethyl-N-(2-hydroxyethyl) perfluorooctanesulfonamide by rat liver microsomes, cytosol, and slices and by expressed rat and human cytochromes P450. *Chem. Res. Toxicol.* 2004, *17*, 767–775.
- (31) Butt, C. M.; Muir, D. C.; Stirling, I.; Kwan, M.; Mabury, S. A. Rapid response of arctic ringed seals to changes in perfluoroalkyl production. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* 2007, *41*, 42–49.
- (32) Butt, C. M.; Mabury, S. A.; Muir, D. C. G.; Braune, B. M. Prevalence of long-chained perfluorinated carboxylates in seabirds from the Canadian Arctic between 1975 and 2004. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* 2007, 41, 3521–3528.
- (33) Wan, Y.; Wei, Q. W.; Hu, J. Y.; Jin, X. H.; Zhang, Z. B.; Zhen, H. J.; Liu, J. Y. Levels, tissue distribution, and age-related accumulation of synthetic musk fragrances in Chinese sturgeon (*Acipenser sinensis*): Comparison to organochlorines. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* 2007, 41, 424–430.
- (34) Wei, Q.; Ke, F.; Zhang, J.; Zhuang, P.; Lu, J. D.; Zhou, R. Q.; Yang, W. H. Biology, fisheries, and conservation of sturgeons and paddlefish in China. *Environ. Biol. Fish.* **1997**, *48*, 241–255.
- (35) So, M. K.; Miyake, Y.; Yeung, W. Y.; Ho, Y. M.; Taniyasu, S.; Rostkowski, P.; Yamashita, N.; Zhou, B. S.; Shi, X. J.; Wang, J. X.; Giesy, J. P.; Yu, H.; Lam, P. K. S. Perfluorinated compounds in the Pearl River and Yangtze River of China. *Chemosphere* 2007, 68, 2085–2095.
- (36) Yamashita, N.; Kannan, K.; Taniyasu, S.; Horii, Y.; Petrick, G.; Gamo, T. A global survey of perfluorinated acids in oceans. *Mar. Pollut. Bull.* 2005, *51*, 658–668.
- (37) Tomy, G. T.; Pleskach, K.; Ferguson, S. H.; Hare, J.; Stern, G.; Macinnis, G.; Marvin, C. H.; Loseto, L. Trophodynamics of Some PFCs and BFRs in a Western Canadian Arctic Marine Food Web. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* 2009, *43*, 4076–4081.
- (38) Kannan, K.; Tao, L.; Sinclair, E.; Pastva, S. D.; Jude, D. J.; Giesy, J. P. Perfluorinated compounds in aquatic organisms at various trophic levels in a Great Lakes food chain. *Arch. Environ. Contam. Toxicol.* 2005, 48, 559–566.
- (39) Martin, J. W.; Smithwick, M. M.; Braune, B. M.; Hoekstra, P. F.; Muir, D. C. G.; Mabury, S. A. Identification of long-chain perfluorinated acids in biota from the Canadian Arctic. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* 2004, *38*, 373–380.
- (40) Yoo, H.; Kannan, K.; Kim, S. K.; Lee, K. T.; Newsted, J. L.; Giesy, J. P. Perfluoroalkyl Acids in the Egg Yolk of Birds from Lake Shihwa, Korea. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* 2008, 42, 5821– 5827.

- (41) Verreault, J.; Berger, U.; Gabrielsen, G. W. Trends of perfluorinated alkyl substances in herring gull eggs from two coastal colonies in Northern Norway: 1983–2003. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* 2007, 41, 6671–6677.
- (42) Martin, J. W.; Mabury, S. A.; Solomon, K. R.; Muir, D. C. G. Dietary accumulation of perfluorinated acids in juvenile rainbow trout (*Oncorhynchus mykiss*). *Environ. Toxicol. Chem./SETAC* 2003, *22*, 189–195.
- (43) Boulanger, B.; Vargo, J.; Schnoor, J. L.; Hornbuckle, K. C. Detection of perfluorooctane surfactants in Great Lakes water. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* 2004, 38, 4064–4070.
- (44) Olsen, G. W.; Huang, H. Y.; Helzlsouer, K. J.; Hansen, K. J. I.; Butenhoff, J. L.; Mandel, J. H. Historical comparison of perfluorooctanesulfonate, perfluorooctanoate, and other fluorochemicals in human blood. *Environ. Health Perspect.* 2005, *113*, 539–545.
- (45) Powley, C. R.; George, S. W.; Russell, M. H.; Hoke, R. A.; Buck, R. C. Polyfluorinated chemicals in a spatially and temporally integrated food web in the western Arctic. *Chemosphere* 2008, 70, 664–672.
- (46) Kleszczyn'ski, K.; Gardzielewski, P.; Mulkiewicz, E.; Stepnowski, P.; Składanowski, A. C. Analysis of structure-cytotoxity in vitro relationship (SAR) for perfluorinated carboxylic acids. *Toxicol. In Vitro* **2007**, *21*, 1206–1211.

- (47) Hu, X. Z.; Hu, D. C. Effects of perfluorooctanoate and perfluorooctane sulfonate exposure on hepatoma Hep G2 cells. Arch. *Toxicol.* 2009, 83, 851–861.
- (48) Bernauer, U.; Oberemm, A.; Madle, S.; Gundert-Remy, U. The use of in vitro data in risk assessment. *Basic Clin. Pharmacol. Toxicol.* 2005, 96, 176–181.
- (49) Kudo, N.; Bandai, N.; Suzuki, E.; Katakura, M.; Kawashima, Y. Induction by perfluorinated fatty acids with different carbon chain length of peroxisomal β -oxidation in the liver of rats. *Chem. Biol. Interact.* **2000**, *124*, 119–132.
- (50) Ankley, G. T.; Kuehl, D. W.; Kahl, M. D.; Jensen, K. M.; Linnum, A.; Leino, R. L.; Villeneuve, D. A. Reproductive and developmental toxicity and bioconcentration of perfluorooctanesulfonate in a partial life-cycle test with the fathead minnow (*Pimephales promelas*). Environ. Toxicol. Chem./SETAC 2005, 24, 2316–2324.
- (51) Du, Y. B.; Shi, X. J.; Yu, K., Liu, C. S.; Zhou, B. S. In Interdisciplinary Studies on Environmental Chemistry-Biological Responses to Chemical Pollutants; Murakami, Y., Nakayama, K., Kitamura, S., Iwata, H., Tanabe, S., Eds.; Terrapub: Tokyo, 2008; pp 37–54.

ES903248D

1		SUPPORT INFORMATION	
2		for	
3	Tissue Dist	bution and Maternal Transfer of Poly- and Per-fluorinated Compounds in	n
4	Chinese Stu	geon (Acipenser sinensis): Implications for Reproductive Risk	
5	Hui PENG ¹	Qiwei WEI ² *, Yi WAN ³ , John P. GIESY ^{3,4} , Luoxin Li ² , and Jianying HU ¹ *	
6	¹ Laboratory	or Earth Surface Processes, College of Urban and Environmental Sciences	s,
7	Peking Univ	rsity, Beijing 100871, China	
8	² Laboratory	f Freshwater Biodiversity Conservation and Utilization, Ministry of Agricultur	e
9	of China; Y	igtze River Fisheries Research Institute, Chinese Academy of Fisheries Science	,
10	Jingzhou, H	pei 434000, China	
11	³ Departmen	of Veterinary Biomedical Sciences and Toxicology Centre, University of	of
12	Saskatchev	n, Saskatoon, Saskatchewan, S7J 5B3, Canada	
13	⁴ Zoology D	partment, Center for Integrative Toxicology, Michigan State University, East	st
14	Lansing, M	48824, USA	
15			
16			
17	Tables	4	
18	Figures	3	
19	Words	2383	
20			

This supporting information provides detailed descriptions of sample collection, artificial 21 22 fertilization, quantification of PFCs, quality assurance/quality control, correlation analysis between reproductive endpoints and PFAs, chromatograms of detected PFCs, and sensitivity 23 analysis of different PFAs. Figures, and tables addressing: (Table S1) details of Chinese 24 25 sturgeon samples; (Table S2) reproductive parameters of Chinese sturgeon; (Table S3) multiple reaction monitoring (MRM) of target PFCs; (Table S4) method detection limits 26 (MDLs) and recoveries; (Figure S1) chromatograms of detected PFCs; (Figure S2) 27 Correlations between concentrations (ng/g ww) of longer-chain PFCAs and PFOS in eggs and 28 age; (Figure S3) relative contributions to PFOS-EQ. 29

30

31 Chemicals and Reagents. Standards of the 23 target compounds (detailed information is

provided in Supporting Information) and three stable isotope labeled standards including 32 $1,2,3,4^{-13}C_4$ -perfluorooctanoic acid ($1,2,3,4^{-13}C_4$ -PFOA), $1,2,3,4^{-13}C_4$ -perfluorononanoic acid 33 $(1,2,3,4^{-13}C_4$ -PFNA), and $1,2,3,4^{-13}C_4$ -perfluorooctane sulfonate $(1,2,3,4^{-13}C_4$ -PFOS) were 34 35 purchased from Wellington Laboratories Inc. (Guelph, Ontario, Canada). All solvents, including methanol and methyl tert-butyl ether (MTBE), were all of HPLC grade and were 36 purchased from Fisher Chemicals (New Jersey, USA). Water was obtained from purification 37 of distilled water by a Milli-Q Synthesis water purification system (Millipore, Bedford, MA, 38 USA). 39

Quantification of PFCs and Quality Assurance/Quality Control. In brief, approximately 40 0.2-0.5 g of homogenized tissue was transferred to a 15 ml polypropylene (PP) centrifuge 41 tube. Fifty microliters (50 µl) of 20 µg/l mass-labeled internal standard 1,2,3,4-¹³C₄-PFOA, 42 1,2,3,4-¹³C₄-PFNA, and 1,2,3,4-¹³C₄-PFOS, 1 ml of 0.5 M tetrabutylammonium hydrogen 43 44 sulfate solution (TBAS), and 2 ml of 0.25 M sodium carbonate buffer were added for extraction. After mixing, 5 ml MTBE was added and the mixture was shaken for 20 minutes 45 at 300 rpm and then sonicated for 10 minutes. The organic layer was separated by 46 centrifugation at 3600 rpm for 15 min and then transferred to a second 15 ml PP tube. 47 Extraction was repeated twice and all three extracts were combined. The final extract was 48 blown to dryness under a gentle blow of nitrogen, and then reconstituted with 300 µl of 49 50 methanol and filtered through a 0.2 µm nylon mesh filter for analysis.

51 Aliquots of extracts were analyzed using a Waters ACQUITY UPLCTM system (Waters, 52 Milford, MA, USA) with a Waters Micromass Quattro Premier XE (triple-quadrapole) 53 detector operated in electrospray negative mode (ESI mode). Separation of PFCs was

S2

achieved with a Waters ACUITY UPLC BEH C18 column (1.7 µm; 2.1 mm × 100 mm), 54 preceded by a Waters ACUITY UPLC BEH C18 guard column (1.7 µm; 2.1 mm × 50 mm). 55 56 The guard column displaced the peaks caused by contamination from the HPLC such that 57 they did not interfere with the analytes in the samples. The injection volume was 5 μ l. Methanol (A) and 5 mM ammonium acetate (B) were used as the mobile phases. Initially 58 10% A was increased to 65% in 6 min, then increased to 75% at 7 min, a further 75% 59 methanol was increased to 100% over 4 min and kept for 2 min, followed by a decrease to 60 initial conditions of 10% A and held for 3 min to allow for equilibration. The flow rate was 61 The column and sample room temperatures were maintained at 40°C and 10°C, 0.2 mL/min. 62 63 respectively. Data were acquired under multiple reactions monitoring (MRM) mode and the 64 optimized parameters were described as follows: source temperature, 110°C; desolvation temperature, 350°C; capillary voltage, 2.50 kV; desolvation gas flow, 800 L/h; cone gas flow, 65 50 L/h; multiplier, 650 V (Table S3). 66

Since minor contamination of PFHxA was found during some batches, procedure blank 67 experiments were performed along with each batch of samples. Standard injections were 68 done among two or three sample injections, and methanol injections were done after each 69 standard injection to monitor background contamination. As for PFHxA with detectable 70 blank contamination, the method detection limits (MDLs) were defined to be three times the 71 72 procedure blanks, which ranged from 0.11 ng/g in the intestine to 0.36 ng/g in the egg. MDLs of other PFCs were defined for each tissue matrix as three times the noise, and ranged 73 from 0.02 ng/g for PFOSA to 1.8 ng/g for 6:2 FTCA (Table S4). The compound-specific 74 matrix spiking recoveries were determined for each organ by duplicates, and the values 75

76	ranged from 60% for 7:3 FTCA in the egg to 134% for FOSAA in the muscle.
77	Quantification was adjusted for recoveries by use of internal standards. Concentrations of
78	C ₆ -C ₈ PFCAs were corrected by ${}^{13}C_4$ -PFOA, C ₉₋ C ₁₄ (and C ₁₆) PFCAs by ${}^{13}C_4$ -PFNA, 6:2
79	FTUCA and 10:2 FTUCA by $^{13}C_2$ -6:2 FTUCA, 6:2 FTCA, 7:3 FTCA, 10:2 FTCA by
80	$^{13}C_2$ -6:2 FTCA, PFSAs and polyfluorinated amides by $^{13}C_4$ -PFOS, respectively. Average
81	recoveries for ${}^{13}C_4$ -PFOA, ${}^{13}C_4$ -PFNA, and ${}^{13}C_4$ -PFOS ranged from 69 ± 14% in the liver to
82	$87 \pm 14\%$ in the intestine, from $73 \pm 16\%$ in the egg to $98 \pm 13\%$ in the intestine, and from 77
83	\pm 13% in the muscle to 90 \pm 19% in the intestine, respectively. Average recoveries of ¹³ C ₂ -6:2
84	FTUCA and ${}^{13}C_2$ -6:2 FTCA in liver were 80 ± 6% and 81 ± 8%, respectively. Concentrations
85	of target analytes were determined based on calibration curves that were generated using
86	concentration series of 0, 20, 40, 80, 160, 320, 640, 1200, and 2400 pg/ml, which showed
87	strong linearity (correlation coefficients > 0.99).

88 Data Analysis. A one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used to investigate the differences in concentrations of PFCs among tissues, and the Levene's test was used to check 89 equality of variances. Concentrations less than their respective method detection limits 90 (MDLs) were assigned a proxy value of MDL/2. Normal distributions of concentrations of 91 PFCs was determined by use of the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test. A log-transformation was 92 done to ensure the normality of the data distribution. Linear regression was performed to 93 94 evaluate relationships between concentrations of PFCs and age, the ratios of concentrations in the egg to those in the liver (ELRs), chain length, and protein-water partition coefficients (log 95 K_{pw}). All data analyses were performed with SPSS 15.0. 96

97 Relative Toxic Potencies (RPs) Calculations for Preliminary Risk Assessment. The RPs

98	of PFOA, PFNA, PFDA, PFDoDA, PFTeDA, PFHxDA and PFOS were obtained by
99	normalizing the PFAs EC_{50} concentrations of cytotoxicity to PFOS EC_{50} (EC_{50PFOS}/EC_{50PFA}).
100	The RPs of C ₇ PFCA, C ₈ PFCA, and C ₉ PFCA showed similar values which were 0.80, 1.00,
101	and 1.17, receptively. Greater RPs for C_{10} PFCA (6.55), C_{12} PFCA (6.68), and C_{14} PFCA
102	(7.64) compared to shorter carbon chain length were observed, showing similar RP values, but
103	that of C_{16} PFCA was relatively low (2.88). Such chain length-related toxicity has been
104	suggested to be the primary determinant of some types of toxicity of PFCs (7, 46), while it is
105	beyond the scope of this paper to discuss these relationships in detail. Since no QSAR data
106	for cytotoxicty of PFUnDA or PFTriDA were available, based on the similarity of RPs for
107	PFCA with chain length from 10 to 14, the mean (6.96) of C_{10} PFCA, C_{12} PFCA, and C_{14}
108	PFCA was used as those of PFUnDA and PFTriDA. RPs for PFOSA, FTCA and FTUCAs,
109	polyfluorinated amides, PFHpS and PFDS were ignored due to their low concentrations.
110	Concentrations of PFOS-EQ were calculated as the sum of the product of the concentration of
111	each PFC in egg multiplied by the respective RP, which ranged from 90.6 PFOS ng/g to 262
112	PFOS ng/g. These values were preferred to those derived from other endpoints because the
113	endpoint in the <i>in vitro</i> assays was cell lethality and the value to be predicted in Chinese
114	sturgeon was also lethality.

-							0 1
	Sample	Sex	Date of	Age	Body weight	Body length	Tissue collected
_	code		collection	(year)	(kg)	(cm)	
_	A0466	F	2003	24	254	285	L, St, I, Gi, K
	A0406	F	2004	18	174	245	E, M, H, Ov, St
	A0410	F	2004	17	140	246	E, L, M, H, Ov, St, I, Gb
	A0412	F	2004	24	230	287	E, L, M, H, St, I, Gi
	A0414	F	2004	25	263	285	E, L, I, Gi
	A0408	F	2004	22	230	258	E
	A0447	F	2005	19	192	247	E, L, M, H, Ov, I, Gi
	A0445	F	2005	18	187	237	L, M, H, Ov, I, Gi
	A0403	F	2005	24	260	280	E
	A0444	F	2005	23	224	270	E
	A0452	F	2005	23	207	282	E
	A0449	F	2005	22	252	275	E
	A0500	F	2005	22	227	261	E
	A0439	F	2006	21	223	262	E, L, M, H, St, I, Gi
	A0440	F	2006	17	176	250	E
	A0441	F	2006	24	240	300	E

120 SUPPORTING INFORMATION TABLE S1. Details of Chinese Sturgeon Samples.

E: egg; L: liver; M: muscle; H: heart; Ov: ovary^a; St: stomach; I: intestine; Gi: gill; K: kidney; Gb: gallbladder. a. ovary where the eggs has been fully released.

	Fecundity	Fertilization	Survival	PFOS-EQ
	(kg^{-1})	(%)	(%)	(ng/g, ww)
A0444	1342	68.9	81.3	181.8
A0441	792	55.0	74.6	132.3
A0452	1266	76.3	89.0	147.5
A0403	1246	61.3	75.0	132.8
A0447	1041	19.6	34.0	169.2
A0449	940	58.3	71.9	170.3
A0500	1048	46.9	100	139.2

SUPPORTING INFORMATION TABLE S2. PFOS-EQ, Reproductive Parameters
(Fecundity^a, Fertilization^b, and Survival^c) in 7 Individuals.

148 a. egg numbers per weight; b. percentage of fertilized eggs in the total eggs; c. percentage of

the 5-day survival larval in the fertilized eggs

150

151

Compound	Acronym	Parent	Daughter	Cone	Collision
		Ion	Ion	Voltage	Energy
Perfluorohexanoate	PFHxA	313	269	14	22
Perfluoroheptanoate	PFHpA	363	319	17	9
Perfluorooctanoate	PFOA	413	369	15	10
Perfluorononanoate	PFNA	463	419	18	9
Perfluorodecanoate	PFDA	513	469	20	12
Perfluoroundecanoate	PFUnDA	563	519	20	13
Perfluorododecanoate	PFDoDA	613	569	23	11
Perfluorotridecanoate	PFTriDA	663	619	23	12
Perfluorotetradecanoate	PFTeDA	713	669	19	15
Perfluorohexadecanoate	PFHxDA	813	769	23	13
Perfluorohexane sulfonate	PFHxS	399	80	52	40
Perfluoroheptanesulfonate	PFHpS	449	80	50	40
Perfluorooctane sulfonate	PFOS	499	80	62	37
Perfluorodecane sulfonate	PFDS	599	80	75	45
7:3 fluorotelomer saturated					
carboxylate	7:3 FTCA	441	337	21	15
6:2 fluorotelomer saturated					
carboxylate	6:2 FTCA	377	63	12	8
6:2 fluorotelomer					
unsaturated carboxylate	6:2 FTUCA	357	293	16	16
10:2 fluorotelomer saturated					
carboxylate	10:2 FTCA	577	493	22	12
10:2 fluorotelomer					
unsaturated carboxylate	10:2 FTUCA	557	493	22	20
2-(perfluorooctane					
sulfonamido) acetic acid	FOSAA	556	498	45	24
2-(N-methylperfluorooctane					
sulfonamide) acetic acid	N-MeFOSAA	570	419	36	22
2-(N-ethylperfluorooctane					
sulfonamido) acetic acid	N-EtFOSAA	584	419	32	22
perfluorooctane sulfonamide	PFOSA	498	78	42	34

153 SUPPORTING INFORMATION TABLE S3. Multiple Reaction Monitoring (MRM)
154 Transitions of Poly- and Per-fluorinated Compounds (PFCs)

	E	Egg	Ι	Liver	Μ	Iuscle	0	vary
	MDLs	Recovery	MDLs	Recovery	MDLs	Recovery	MDLs	Recovery
PFHxA	0.36	73±5%	1.02	71 ± 9%	0.32	112±10%	0.28	96±3%
PFHpA	0.08	91±4%	0.10	122±1%	0.08	108±28%	0.10	90±6%
PFOA	0.11	66±1%	0.13	88±1%	0.07	78±5%	0.05	73±5%
PFNA	0.18	79±4%	0.09	107±4%	0.05	120±5%	0.10	101±5%
PFDA	0.18	74±4%	0.15	89±15%	0.05	112 ± 29%	0.05	101±1%
PFUnDA	0.10	87±7%	0.07	102 ± 7%	0.02	110 ± 22%	0.05	88±4%
PFDoDA	0.10	95±16%	0.08	102±31%	0.04	112 ± 9%	0.05	111 ± 7%
PFTriDA	0.10	81±2%	0.11	106±15%	0.05	96±10%	0.05	112±19%
PFTeDA	0.07	107±16%	0.12	118 ± 2%	0.06	102 ± 26%	0.08	71 ± 4%
PFHxDA	0.10	89±25%	0.07	100±14%	0.06	74±9%	0.06	67±1%
PFHxS	0.05	74±3%	0.13	99±9%	0.05	83±11%	0.05	80±2%
PFHpS	0.09	81±5%	0.09	84±10%	0.05	61±5%	0.06	70±4%
PFOS	0.18	102±6%	0.33	89±7%	0.05	85±14%	0.06	92±15%
PFDS	0.07	92±2%	0.04	93±2%	0.05	74±15%	0.05	67±2%
7:3 FTCA	0.08	72±3%	0.10	72±3%	0.06	100 ± 28%	0.07	68±5%
6:2 FTCA	1.8	60±10%	1.4	77±9%	1.1	83±8%	1.0	88±5%
6:2 FTUCA	0.35	107±2%	0.35	80±10%	0.20	75±15%	0.20	78±7%
10:2 FTCA	0.65	100±6%	0.57	83±5%	0.50	80±10%	0.53	98±8%
10:2 FTUCA	0.05	86±2%	0.10	82±7%	0.13	90±5%	0.22	91±7%
FOSAA	0.07	61±5%	0.06	85±10%	0.05	134±24%	0.05	71±2%
N-MeFOSAA	0.07	64±8%	0.13	134±13%	0.06	95±21%	0.08	77±5%
N-EtFOSAA	0.06	85±7%	0.10	110 ± 6%	0.08	99±27%	0.05	81±3%
PFOSA	0.06	60±1%	0.05	82±1%	0.02	89±3%	0.07	79±1%
¹³ C ₄ -PFOA	/	69±14%	/	81±23%	/	77 ± 9%	/	74±5%
¹³ C ₄ -PFNA	/	73±16%	/	91±14%	/	84±18%	/	97±10%
¹³ C ₄ -PFOS ¹³ C ₂ -6:2	/	88±11%	/	88±18%	/	77±13%	/	79±4%
FTCA	/	/	/	81±8%	/	/	/	/
FTUCA	/	/	/	80±6%	/	/	/	/
	Ki	dney	Gal	lbladder	H	Heart	Int	estine
	MDLs	Recovery	MDLs	Recovery	MDLs	Recovery	MDLs	Recovery
PFHxA	0.12	85±19%	0.19	81±26%	0.21	96±22%	0.11	96±6%
PFHpA	0.12	100±4%	0.08	91±11%	0.08	86±7%	0.07	103±6%
PFOA	0.11	73±8%	0.06	76±7%	0.04	107±5%	0.05	71±3%
DEDIA		116-2106	0.04	124±18%	0.05	107±1%	0.05	108±4%
PFNA	0.14	110±2470						
PFNA PFDA	0.14 0.11	$10\pm24\%$ 104±14%	0.06	120±13%	0.05	108±10%	0.10	115±13%
PFNA PFDA PFUnDA	0.14 0.11 0.08	104±14% 90±9%	0.06 0.05	120±13% 90±11%	0.05 0.05	108±10% 99±7%	0.10 0.05	115±13% 99±8%
PFNA PFDA PFUnDA PFDoDA	0.14 0.11 0.08 0.22	104±14% 90±9% 96±17%	0.06 0.05 0.05	120±13% 90±11% 96±6%	0.05 0.05 0.06	108±10% 99±7% 117±14%	0.10 0.05 0.09	115±13% 99±8% 125±5%
PFNA PFDA PFUnDA PFDoDA PFTriDA	0.14 0.11 0.08 0.22 0.13	104±14% 90±9% 96±17% 114±3%	0.06 0.05 0.05 0.05	120±13% 90±11% 96±6% 112±1%	0.05 0.05 0.06 0.07	108±10% 99±7% 117±14% 115±6%	0.10 0.05 0.09 0.05	115±13% 99±8% 125±5% 100±6%

SUPPORTING INFORMATION TABLE S4. Method Detection Limits (MDLs) (ng/g
ww) and Recoveries (n=2) of PFCs in Chinese Sturgeon.

PFHxDA	0.26	73±14%	0.07	87±11%	0.15	114 ± 21%	0.15	68±2%
PFHxS	0.10	80±2%	0.05	81±26%	0.07	78±2%	0.04	81±4%
PFHpS	0.1	74±4%	0.05	85±7%	0.10	92±4%	0.05	68±1%
PFOS	0.17	81±1%	0.05	90±8%	0.05	85±3%	0.11	81±6%
PFDS	0.08	70±8%	0.09	79±11%	0.08	75±7%	0.07	72 ± 9%
7:3 FTCA	0.07	78±16%	0.06	80±8%	0.09	66±2%	0.07	77±1%
6:2 FTCA	1.0	76±8%	1.2	81±5%	0.95	90±10%	0.90	78±2%
6:2 FTUCA	0.23	82±6%	0.18	87±8%	0.13	88±7%	0.15	70±9%
10:2 FTCA	0.56	87±11%	0.68	77±5%	0.46	103±12%	0.55	81±2%
10:2 FTUCA	0.20	83±13%	0.10	89±10%	0.12	85±3%	0.07	86±10%
FOSAA	0.11	90±16%	0.04	63±13%	0.03	86±7%	0.03	80±1%
N-MeFOSAA	0.09	82±20%	0.04	84±18%	0.03	124±11%	0.06	112±1%
N-EtFOSAA	0.09	71±19%	0.08	61±4%	0.04	92±7%	0.08	117±1%
PFOSA	0.06	67±14%	0.02	67±9%	0.02	65±1%	0.02	74±1%
¹³ C ₄ -PFOA	/	71%	/	70%	/	82±15%	/	87±14%
¹³ C ₄ -PFNA	/	82%	/	81%	/	78±13%	/	98±13%
¹³ C ₄ -PFOS	/	79%	/	79%	/	83±7%	/	90±19%
$^{13}C_2-6:2$	-							
FTCA	/	/	/	/	/	/	/	/
C ₂ -6:2 FTUCA	/	/	/	1	/	/	/	/
	-		(Gill	Sto	omach		
			MDI	D				
			MDLS	Recovery	MDLS	Recovery		
		PFHxA	0.31	Recovery 124±16%	0.25	102±10%		
	 H	PFHxA PFHpA	0.31 0.10	Recovery 124±16% 107±11%	0.25 0.07	Recovery 102±10% 85±11%		
	H	PFHxA PFHpA PFOA	0.31 0.10 0.08	Recovery 124±16% 107±11% 107±2%	0.25 0.07 0.06	Recovery 102±10% 85±11% 83±21%		
	H	PFHxA PFHpA PFOA PFNA	0.31 0.10 0.08 0.15	Recovery 124±16% 107±11% 107±2% 70±3%	MDLs 0.25 0.07 0.06 0.12	Recovery 102±10% 85±11% 83±21% 103±1%		
	H	PFHxA PFHpA PFOA PFNA PFDA	0.31 0.10 0.08 0.15 0.06	Recovery 124±16% 107±11% 107±2% 70±3% 117±23%	MDLs 0.25 0.07 0.06 0.12 0.07	Recovery 102±10% 85±11% 83±21% 103±1% 108±9%		
	I I P	PFHxA PFHpA PFOA PFNA PFDA FUnDA	MDLs 0.31 0.10 0.08 0.15 0.06 0.08	Recovery 124±16% 107±11% 107±2% 70±3% 117±23% 105±6%	MDLs 0.25 0.07 0.06 0.12 0.07 0.04	Recovery 102±10% 85±11% 83±21% 103±1% 108±9% 81±9%		
	H H P P	PFHxA PFHpA PFOA PFNA PFDA FUnDA FDoDA	MDLs 0.31 0.10 0.08 0.15 0.06 0.08 0.08	Recovery 124±16% 107±11% 107±2% 70±3% 117±23% 105±6% 109±4%	MDLs 0.25 0.07 0.06 0.12 0.07 0.04 0.05	Recovery 102±10% 85±11% 83±21% 103±1% 108±9% 81±9% 103±28%		
	I I P P P	PFHxA PFHpA PFOA PFNA PFDA FUnDA FDoDA FTriDA	MDLs 0.31 0.10 0.08 0.15 0.06 0.08 0.08 0.08	Recovery 124±16% 107±11% 107±2% 70±3% 117±23% 105±6% 109±4% 119±8%	MDLs 0.25 0.07 0.06 0.12 0.07 0.04 0.05 0.06	Recovery 102±10% 85±11% 83±21% 103±1% 108±9% 81±9% 103±28% 79±16%		
	P P P	PFHxA PFHpA PFOA PFNA PFDA FUnDA FDoDA FTriDA FTeDA	MDLs 0.31 0.10 0.08 0.15 0.06 0.08 0.08 0.08	Recovery 124±16% 107±11% 107±2% 70±3% 117±23% 105±6% 109±4% 119±8% 100±1%	MDLs 0.25 0.07 0.06 0.12 0.07 0.04 0.05 0.06 0.08	Recovery 102±10% 85±11% 83±21% 103±1% 108±9% 81±9% 103±28% 79±16% 102±4%		
	I I P P P P P	PFHxA PFHpA PFOA PFNA PFDA FUnDA FDoDA FTriDA FTriDA FTeDA FTeDA	MDLs 0.31 0.10 0.08 0.15 0.06 0.08 0.08 0.09	Recovery 124±16% 107±11% 107±2% 70±3% 117±23% 105±6% 109±4% 119±8% 100±1% 114±3%	MDLs 0.25 0.07 0.06 0.12 0.07 0.04 0.05 0.06 0.08 0.10	Recovery 102±10% 85±11% 83±21% 103±1% 108±9% 81±9% 103±28% 79±16% 102±4% 81±10%		
	F F P P P P	PFHxA PFHpA PFOA PFDA FDnDA FDoDA FTriDA FTriDA FTreDA FHxDA PFHxS	MDLs 0.31 0.10 0.08 0.15 0.06 0.08 0.08 0.08 0.09 0.07	Recovery 124±16% 107±11% 107±2% 70±3% 117±23% 105±6% 109±4% 119±8% 100±1% 114±3% 103±9%	MDLs 0.25 0.07 0.06 0.12 0.07 0.04 0.05 0.06 0.10 0.05	Recovery 102±10% 85±11% 83±21% 103±1% 108±9% 81±9% 103±28% 79±16% 102±4% 81±10% 82±10%		
	I I P P P P I I	PFHxA PFHpA PFOA PFNA PFDA FUnDA FDoDA FTriDA FTriDA FTeDA FHxDA PFHxS PFHpS	MDLs 0.31 0.10 0.08 0.15 0.06 0.08 0.08 0.08 0.09 0.07 0.05	Recovery 124±16% 107±11% 107±2% 70±3% 117±23% 105±6% 109±4% 119±8% 100±1% 114±3% 103±9% 77±1%	MDLs 0.25 0.07 0.06 0.12 0.07 0.04 0.05 0.06 0.08 0.10 0.05 0.05	Recovery 102±10% 85±11% 83±21% 103±1% 108±9% 81±9% 103±28% 79±16% 102±4% 81±10% 82±10% 62±1%		
	I I P P P P I I I	PFHxA PFHpA PFOA PFNA PFDA FUnDA FDoDA FTriDA FTriDA FTreDA FHxDA PFHxS PFHpS PFOS	MDLs 0.31 0.10 0.08 0.15 0.06 0.08 0.08 0.08 0.09 0.07 0.05 0.09	Recovery 124±16% 107±11% 107±2% 70±3% 117±23% 105±6% 109±4% 119±8% 100±1% 114±3% 103±9% 77±1% 78±8%	MDLs 0.25 0.07 0.06 0.12 0.07 0.04 0.05 0.06 0.10 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.05	Recovery 102±10% 85±11% 83±21% 103±1% 108±9% 81±9% 103±28% 79±16% 102±4% 81±10% 62±1% 99±10%		
	I I P P P P I I I	PFHxA PFOA PFOA PFDA FDoDA FDoDA FTriDA FTriDA FTeDA FHxDA PFHxS PFHpS PFOS PFDS	MDLs 0.31 0.10 0.08 0.15 0.06 0.08 0.08 0.09 0.07 0.05 0.09 0.17	Recovery 124±16% 107±11% 107±2% 70±3% 117±23% 105±6% 109±4% 119±8% 100±1% 114±3% 103±9% 77±1% 78±8% 77±1%	MDLs 0.25 0.07 0.06 0.12 0.07 0.04 0.05 0.06 0.08 0.10 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.06	Recovery 102±10% 85±11% 85±11% 103±1% 103±1% 108±9% 81±9% 103±28% 79±16% 102±4% 81±10% 82±10% 62±1% 99±10% 70±1%		
	F F P P F 1 1 7:	PFHxA PFHpA PFOA PFNA PFDA FUnDA FDoDA FTriDA FTriDA FTeDA FHxDA PFHxS PFHpS PFHpS PFOS PFDS 3 FTCA	MDLs 0.31 0.10 0.08 0.15 0.06 0.08 0.08 0.08 0.09 0.07 0.05 0.09 0.10 0.07	Recovery 124±16% 107±11% 107±2% 70±3% 117±23% 105±6% 109±4% 119±8% 100±1% 114±3% 103±9% 77±1% 78±8% 77±1% 68±0.3%	MDLs 0.25 0.07 0.06 0.12 0.07 0.04 0.05 0.06 0.08 0.10 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.06 0.09 0.09	Recovery 102±10% 85±11% 83±21% 103±1% 108±9% 81±9% 103±28% 79±16% 102±4% 81±10% 62±1% 99±10% 70±1% 74±9%		
	н Н Р Р Р Р Р Р 1 1 1 1 7: 6:	PFHxA PFOA PFOA PFDA FDoDA FDoDA FDoDA FTriDA FTeDA FTeDA FHxDA PFHxS PFHpS PFHpS PFOS PFDS 3 FTCA 2 FTCA	MDLs 0.31 0.10 0.08 0.15 0.06 0.08 0.08 0.09 0.07 0.05 0.09 0.10 0.07 0.05 0.09 0.10 0.07	Recovery 124±16% 107±11% 107±2% 70±3% 117±23% 105±6% 109±4% 119±8% 100±1% 114±3% 103±9% 77±1% 78±8% 77±1% 68±0.3% 76±7%	MDLs 0.25 0.07 0.06 0.12 0.07 0.04 0.05 0.06 0.08 0.10 0.05 0.05 0.06 0.09 1.0	Recovery 102±10% 85±11% 85±11% 83±21% 103±1% 108±9% 81±9% 103±28% 79±16% 102±4% 81±10% 82±10% 62±1% 99±10% 70±1% 74±9% 82±5%		
	I I P P P P I I I I I I I I I I I I I I	PFHxA PFOA PFOA PFDA FDoDA FDoDA FDoDA FTriDA FTeDA FTeDA FHxDA PFHxS PFHpS PFHpS PFOS PFDS 3 FTCA 2 FTCA 2 FTCA	MDLs 0.31 0.10 0.08 0.15 0.06 0.08 0.08 0.08 0.09 0.07 0.05 0.09 0.10 0.07 0.8 0.15	Recovery 124±16% 107±11% 107±2% 70±3% 117±23% 105±6% 109±4% 119±8% 100±1% 114±3% 103±9% 77±1% 78±8% 77±1% 68±0.3% 76±7% 83±7%	MDLs 0.25 0.07 0.06 0.12 0.07 0.04 0.05 0.06 0.05 0.06 0.05 0.06 0.05 0.06 0.09 1.0 0.15	Recovery 102±10% 85±11% 83±21% 103±1% 108±9% 81±9% 103±28% 79±16% 102±4% 81±10% 82±10% 62±1% 99±10% 70±1% 74±9% 82±5% 73±4%		
	F F P P P P P F I I I I I I I I I I I I	PFHxA PFOA PFOA PFDA FDoDA FDoDA FDoDA FTriDA FTeDA FTeDA FTeDA FHxS PFHxS PFHpS PFHpS PFOS 3 FTCA 2 FTCA 2 FTCA 2 FTCA	MDLs 0.31 0.10 0.08 0.15 0.06 0.08 0.08 0.08 0.09 0.07 0.05 0.09 0.10 0.07 0.55 0.93 0.10 0.07 0.8 0.15 0.59	Recovery 124±16% 107±11% 107±2% 70±3% 117±23% 105±6% 109±4% 119±8% 100±1% 114±3% 103±9% 77±1% 78±8% 76±7% 83±7% 78±8%	MDLs 0.25 0.07 0.06 0.12 0.07 0.04 0.05 0.06 0.08 0.10 0.05 0.06 0.08 0.10 0.05 0.06 0.09 0.09 1.0 0.15 0.64	Recovery 102±10% 85±11% 83±21% 103±1% 108±9% 81±9% 103±28% 79±16% 102±4% 81±10% 82±10% 62±1% 99±10% 70±1% 74±9% 82±5% 73±4% 82±9%		
	I I P P P P I I I I I I I I I I I I I I	PFHxA PFOA PFOA PFDA FDoDA FDoDA FDoDA FTriDA FTeDA FTreDA FTeDA FHxS PFHpS PFHpS PFDS 3 FTCA 2 FTCA 2 FTCA 2 FTCA 2 FTCA 2 FTCA	MDLs 0.31 0.10 0.08 0.15 0.06 0.08 0.08 0.09 0.09 0.07 0.05 0.09 0.10 0.07 0.31 0.10 0.07 0.8 0.15 0.59 0.27	Recovery 124±16% 107±11% 107±2% 70±3% 117±23% 105±6% 109±4% 119±8% 100±1% 114±3% 103±9% 77±1% 78±8% 77±1% 83±7% 78±8% 77±5%	MDLs 0.25 0.07 0.06 0.12 0.07 0.04 0.05 0.06 0.05 0.06 0.05 0.06 0.05 0.06 0.09 1.0 0.15 0.64 0.09	Recovery 102±10% 85±11% 83±21% 103±1% 108±9% 81±9% 103±28% 79±16% 102±4% 81±10% 82±10% 62±1% 99±10% 70±1% 74±9% 82±5% 73±4% 82±9% 77±12%		
	F F F F F F F F F F F F	PFHxA PFOA PFOA PFDA FDoDA FDoDA FDoDA FTriDA FTeDA FTeDA FTeDA FHxS PFHxS PFHpS PFHpS PFOS 3 FTCA 2 FTCA 2 FTCA 2 FTUCA 2 FTUCA 5 OSAA	MDLs 0.31 0.10 0.08 0.15 0.06 0.08 0.08 0.09 0.07 0.05 0.09 0.10 0.07 0.59 0.15 0.27 0.03	Recovery 124±16% 107±11% 107±2% 70±3% 117±23% 105±6% 109±4% 119±8% 100±1% 114±3% 103±9% 77±1% 78±8% 77±1% 68±0.3% 76±7% 83±7% 78±8% 77±5% 81±4%	MDLs 0.25 0.07 0.06 0.12 0.07 0.04 0.05 0.06 0.05 0.06 0.05 0.06 0.05 0.06 0.05 0.05 0.05 0.06 0.09 0.09 1.0 0.15 0.64 0.09 0.04	Recovery 102±10% 85±11% 85±11% 83±21% 103±1% 108±9% 81±9% 103±28% 79±16% 102±4% 81±10% 82±10% 62±1% 99±10% 70±1% 74±9% 82±5% 73±4% 82±9% 77±12% 82±16%		
	F F F F F F F F F F F N-M	PFHxA PFOA PFOA PFOA FDnDA FDoDA FDoDA FTriDA FTeDA FTriDA PFHxS PFHpS PFHpS PFDS 3 FTCA 2 FTCA 2 FTCA 2 FTCA 2 FTCA 2 FTCA 2 FTCA 2 FTCA 2 FTCA	MDLs 0.31 0.10 0.08 0.15 0.06 0.08 0.08 0.09 0.09 0.07 0.05 0.09 0.10 0.07 0.8 0.15 0.59 0.27 0.03 0.06	Recovery 124±16% 107±11% 107±2% 70±3% 117±23% 105±6% 109±4% 119±8% 100±1% 114±3% 103±9% 77±1% 78±8% 77±1% 68±0.3% 76±7% 83±7% 78±8% 77±5% 81±4% 119±10	MDLs 0.25 0.07 0.06 0.12 0.07 0.04 0.05 0.06 0.05 0.06 0.05 0.06 0.05 0.06 0.09 1.0 0.15 0.64 0.09 0.04 0.05	Recovery 102±10% 85±11% 85±11% 83±21% 103±1% 108±9% 81±9% 103±28% 79±16% 102±4% 81±10% 82±10% 62±1% 99±10% 70±1% 74±9% 82±5% 73±4% 82±9% 77±12% 82±16% 89±1%		

PFOSA	0.04	75±4%	0.02	64±11%
¹³ C ₄ -PFOA	/	80±16%	/	84±12%
¹³ C ₄ -PFNA	/	88±12%	/	83±15%
¹³ C ₄ -PFOS	/	89±8%	/	84±3%
$^{13}C_2-6:2$ FTCA $^{13}C_2-6:2$	/	/	/	/
FTUCA	/	/	/	/

	$^{100}_{\&}$ PFTeDA 713 > 669 S/N:PtP=203.60	$\begin{array}{c} 100 \\ \text{PFHxDA} \\ 813 > 769 \\ \text{S/N:PtP=86.44} \end{array}$
	¹⁰⁰ ⊗ PFTriDA 663 > 619 S/N:PtP=558.40	$^{100}_{8}$ N-EtFOSAA 584> 419 A S/N:PtP=19.84
	¹⁰⁰ 8 PFDoDA613 > 569 AS/N:PtP=72.7	71 $^{100}_{88}$ FOSAA 556 > 498 S/N:PtP=47.05
	¹⁰⁰ ⁸ PFUnDA563> 519 A S/N:PtP=189.82	$^{100}_{\$}$ 7:3 FTCA $^{441} > 337$ S/N:PtP=13.89
	¹⁰⁰ 8 PFDA 513 > 469 A S/N:PtP=236.47	100 PFOSA 498> 78 AS/N:PtP=341.05
	¹⁰⁰ ⊗ PFNA 463 > 419 S/N:PtP=48.35	%PFDS 599> 80
	¹⁰⁰ \otimes PFOA 413 > 369 S/N:PtP=29.68	$\overset{100}{\approx} PFOS 499 > 80 \text{A} \qquad S/N:PtP = 1698.50$
	$^{100}_{\&}$ A PFHpA 363 > 319 S/N:PtP=24.46	¹⁰⁰ PFHxS 399 > 80 S/ N:PtP=7.08
180	8.00 8.40 8.80 9.20 9.60 10.00 10.40 10.	80 7.50 8.00 8.50 9.00 9.50 10.00 10.50 11.00
181	SUPPORTING INFORMATION FIGU	RE S1. Typical UPLC/MS/MS Chromatograms
182	of Detected PFCs in Chinese Sturgeon.	
183		
184		
185		
186		
187		
188		
189		
190		
191		



193 **SUPPORTING INFORMATION FIGURE S2.** Correlations between concentrations (ng/g 194 ww) of Longer-chain PFCAs and PFOS in eggs and age: $log_{10}C_{PFUnDA}=0.03\times age-0.10$, 195 $r^2=0.29$, p=0.049, $log_{10}C_{PFDoDA}=0.01\times age-0.09$, $r^2=0.02$, p=0.605, 196 $log_{10}C_{PFTriDA}=0.03\times age+0.44$, $r^2=0.25$, p=0.066, $log_{10}C_{PFTeDA}=0.02\times age-0.44$, $r^2=0.19$, 197 p=0.124, $log_{10}C_{PFOS}=-0.02\times age+1.44$, $r^2=0.03$, p=0.528.

199

200



203 SUPPORTING INFORMATION FIGURE S3. Relative Contribution of Each PFC to

204 PFOS-EQ in Eggs.