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Table S1. The results of performing confirmative latent Dirichlet allocation (CLDA) on 731 discovered scientific articles.

|  | Topic 1: Microplastic | Topic 2: Human Toxicity |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No. | Word | Association <br> Degree | Word | Association <br> Degree |
| 1 | Marine | 284 | Environment | 172 |
| 2 | Environment | 269 | Water | 121 |
| 3 | Water | 210 | Particle | 101 |
| 4 | Particle | 110 | Concentration | 100 |
| 5 | Sea | 100 | Effect | 80 |
| 6 | Pollution | 100 | Marine | 80 |
| 7 | Sediment | 100 | Exposure | 75 |
| 8 | Debris | 95 | Surface | 60 |
| 9 | Soil | 35 | Soil | 31 |
| 10 | River | 29 | Increase | 27 |

The data are the top 10 words highly related to the topic. The larger the value of the association degree, the more relevant it is to the topic.

Table S2. Experimental condition for 3 different microparticles

| $\begin{gathered} \text { Exp. } \\ \text { No } \end{gathered}$ | Particle Concentration |  |  | Number of microparticles ( $n$ ) |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | ( $\mu \mathrm{g} / \mathrm{mL}$ ) |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | PS | PVC | ABS | PS | PVC | ABS |
| 1 | 33.33 | 33.33 | 33.33 | $184.14 \pm 24.48$ | $39.90 \pm 5.04$ | $21.38 \pm 9.81$ |
| 2 | 50 | 50 | 0 | $276.22 \pm 36.72$ | $59.86 \pm 7.56$ | 0 |
| 3 | 50 | 0 | 50 | $276.22 \pm 36.72$ | 0 | $32.07 \pm 14.71$ |
| 4 | 0 | 50 | 50 | 0 | $59.86 \pm 7.56$ | $32.07 \pm 14.71$ |
| 5 | 100 | 0 | 0 | $553.43 \pm 36.72$ | 0 | 0 |
| 6 | 0 | 100 | 0 | 0 | $119.71 \pm 15.13$ | 0 |
| 7 | 0 | 0 | 100 | 0 | 0 | $64.13 \pm 29.43$ |

PS, polystyrene; PVC, poly(vinyl chloride); ABS, acrylonitrile butadiene styrene.


Figure S1. Normalized viability (\%) of each microplastic combination ( $\mathrm{n}=37 \sim 50$ ). The significance between two groups was denoted as *, ${ }^{* *},{ }^{* * *}$ for the $p<0.05, p<0.01, p<0.001$, respectively.

Table S3. The data obtained under the simplex-centroid design.

| Design | Component fraction |  |  | Observed Response Values | Average <br> Response |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Point | PS | PVC | ABS | $(N=314)$ | Value |
|  |  |  |  |  | $\bar{y}$ |
| 1 |  |  |  | 104.06, 92.85, 95.19, 92.38, 79.30, |  |
|  |  |  |  | 93.08, 85.07, 88.86, 90.13, 96.46, |  |
|  |  |  |  | 112.86, 89.81, 89.2, 86.17, 90.41, |  |
|  |  |  |  | 115.16, 113.8, 85.65, 94.28, 91.56, |  |
|  |  |  |  | 104.13, 97.83, 98.88, 93.28, 88.37, |  |
|  | 1/3 | 1/3 | 1/3 | 127.60, 114.12, 90.75, 104.97, 106.13, | 96.9 |
|  |  |  |  | 72.88, 81.72, 73.36, 76.72, 93.84, |  |
|  |  |  |  | 107.5, 103.48, 97.90, 93.49, 93.36, |  |
|  |  |  |  | 99.37, 104.30, 106.06, 96.66, 103.83, |  |
|  |  |  |  | 118.53, 101.05, 101.79, 108.37, 95.97 |  |
|  |  |  |  | ( $\left.n_{1}=50\right)$ |  |
| 2 |  |  |  | 101.49, 87.71, 77.44, 93.55, 81.17, |  |
|  |  |  |  | 95.19, 87.60, 90.13, 90.55, 104.05, |  |
|  |  |  |  | 105.58, 81.31, 89.20, 80.10, 82.52, |  |
|  |  |  |  | 106.08, 101.09, 92.01, 98.82, 95.64, |  |
|  | 1/2 | 1/2 | 0 | 105.53, 93.28, 96.08, 92.23, 89.77, | 92.1 |
|  |  |  |  | 105.39, 86.23, 85.44, 75.92, 91.67, |  |
|  |  |  |  | 82.69, 76.43, 72.88, 79.99, 77.78, |  |
|  |  |  |  | 106.59, 94.40, 101.27, 90.37, 99.20, |  |
|  |  |  |  | 96.43, 97.6, 83.16, 87.86, 87.62, |  |

$110.91,102.99,100.00,104.33$
( $n_{2}=49$ )
102.66, 88.18, 87.25, 83.27, 79.54, 93.93, 93.93, 91.82, 106.16, 93.5, 112.26, 86.17, 94.05, 86.77, 83.74, 109.26, 99.27, 98.82, 82.48, 87.47, 104.83, 94.33, 95.03, 90.47, 83.47,
$1 / 2 \quad 105.33,82.39,79.10,74.28,92.28$, 84.71, 76.43, 79.32, 90.38, 85.09, 103.09, 92.19, 92.19, 93.49, 93.49, 96.08, 91.73, 84.21, 73.53, 87.86, $114.34,103.29,87.45,91.48,90.74$ $\left(n_{3}=50\right)$
103.36, 99.86, 94.25, 89.35, 93.32, 97.72, 94.35, 98.57, 106.58, 100.67, 118.33, 93.45, 92.84, 92.84, 94.05, 116.07, 102.91, 97.91, 91.10, 97.00, 115.69, 97.83, 91.87, 97.13, 98.88,
$0 \quad 1 / 2$
1/2 85.93, 72.26, 64.57, 69.76, 86.72,
117.51, 96.25, 86.34, 89.42, 94.52, 105.29, 97.25, 92.58, 106.2, 103.48, 97.13, 99.25, 85.86, 88.09, 96.31, 114.79, 99.70,, $68.92,95.37,88.35$ ( $n_{4}=50$ )
$5 \quad 1 \quad 0 \quad 0 \quad 96.88,90.55,81.69,90.55,90.55$,
86.17, 84.34, 83.74, 80.10, 95.87, 109.26, 96.55, 92.01, 88.83, 89.74, 96.78, 92.93, 101.33, 103.08, 95.77, 96.15, 107.69, 110.77, 88.56, 76.75, 87.39, 96.08, 90.76, 74.00, 83.04, 80.34, 79.75, 112.40, 97.61, 89.99, 92.53, 99.4
( $n_{5}=37$ )
100.67, 81.27, 88.86, 89.29, 98.57, 90.41, 72.21, 81.92, 74.03, 92.84, 114.71, 109.72, 101.54, 97.46, 101.54, $117.79,87.67,104.83,100.28,103.08$,

6
0
1 0 78.84, 79.51, 85.67, 88.27, 106.20, 95.9 101.53, 87.26, 103.61, 93.10, 110.41, 93.85, 98.66, 106.65, 104.89, 106.42, 98.36, 93.28, $93.73,101.79$
$\left(n_{6}=39\right)$
89.71, 84.22, 87.6, 88.44, 99.83, 93.45, 93.45, 101.33, 82.52, 94.66, 112.89, 92.92, 102.00, 98.37, 95.19, 111.49, 99.93, 103.78, 107.99, 96.08, 88.75, $\begin{array}{llll}7 & 0 & 0 & 1\end{array}$
$90.19,90.86,97.40,90.24,101.79$,
98.03, 93.10, 99.00, 95.61, 99.37,
95.02, 95.49, 93.26, 94.17, 89.84,
91.93, 94.62, 92.08

PS, polystyrene; PVC, poly(vinyl chloride); ABS, acrylonitrile butadiene styrene.


Figure S2. The simplex coordinate system.


Figure S3. The simplex-centroid design. The blue dots mean the seven experimental points
(fraction of three microplastics) at which the experiment will be performed.


Figure S4. Nine experimental points (the red dots) for test data.

Table S4. Summary of statistical inference for the quadratic model.

| Parameter | Estimate | Standard | $p$-Value |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Error |  |  |
| $\beta_{1}$ | 91.77 | 1.65 | $<2.00 \times 10^{-16}$ |
| $\beta_{2}$ | 95.54 | 1.60 | $<2.00 \times 10^{-16}$ |
| $\beta_{3}$ | 95.19 | 1.60 | $<2.00 \times 10^{-16}$ |
| $\beta_{12}$ | -1.29 | 6.89 | 0.852 |
| $\beta_{13}$ | -3.41 | 6.86 | 0.619 |
| $\beta_{23}$ | 5.41 | 6.82 | 0.428 |

F-statistic: 4572 on 6 and 308 degrees of freedom; $p$-value: $<2.20 \times 10^{-16}$
Shapiro-Wilk normality test: $\mathrm{W}=0.99, \quad p$-value $=0.21$
Multiple $R^{2}=0.9889$, Adjusted $R^{2}=0.9887$,
Root Mean Square Error $($ RMSE $)$ for test data $=0.45(\%)$
Mean Absolute Error (MAE) for test data $=0.36$ (\%)

Table S5. Summary of statistical inference for the linear model.

| Parameter | Estimate | Standard | $p$-Value |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Error |  |  |
| $\beta_{1}$ | 91.16 | 1.30 | $<2.00 \times 10^{-16}$ |
| $\beta_{2}$ | 96.03 | 1.28 | $<2.00 \times 10^{-16}$ |
| $\beta_{3}$ | 95.42 | 1.28 | $<2.00 \times 10^{-16}$ |

F-statistic: 9204 on 3 and 311 degrees of freedom; $p$-value: $<2.20 \times 10^{-16}$
Shapiro-Wilk normality test: $\mathrm{W}=0.99, \quad p_{\text {-value }}=0.24$
Multiple $R^{2}=0.9889$, Adjusted $R^{2}=0.9888$
Root Mean Square Error (RMSE) for test data $=0.72(\%)$
Mean Absolute Error (MAE) for test data $=0.57$ (\%)

Table S6. The test data to evaluate the predictive performance of our linear model.

| Experimental <br> group | Component fraction |  |  | Observed | Average <br> Response | Predicted |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | PS | PVC | ABS |  |  | Response |
|  |  |  |  |  | Value | Value |
|  |  |  |  | ( $N=46$ ) |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | $\bar{y}$ | $\hat{y}$ |


$\left.\begin{array}{ccccccc}\hline & & & 96.95,92.53, \\ 93.36 \\ \left(n_{6}=5\right)\end{array}\right)$

Root Mean Square Error (RMSE) for test data $=0.448(\%)$
Mean Absolute Error (MAE) for test data $=0.357(\%)$

## Appendix 1.

As shown in eq (1), the simplex-centroid design considering the second-order interaction we used can be generalized when there are three or more variables.
$y=\sum_{i=1}^{m} \beta_{i} x_{i}+\sum \sum_{i<j}^{m} \beta_{i j} x_{i} x_{j}+\epsilon$

Where m is the number of independent variables and $\sum \sum_{i<j}^{m} \beta_{i j} x_{i} x_{j}$ means that adding all possible combinations where $i>j$. In addition, the constraints for each independent variable are generalized as follows.

$$
\begin{align*}
& x_{i} \geq 0, i=1,2, \ldots, m  \tag{2}\\
& \sum_{i=1}^{m} x_{i}=1 \tag{3}
\end{align*}
$$

Due to the above constraints, the experimental space is not defined in the m-dimensional orthogonal coordinate system but in the (m-1)-dimensional simplex coordinate system. a simplex is a generalization of the concept of a triangle or tetrahedron to any dimension in geometry. For example, as shown in the following figure, the 1D simplex means a line, the 2D simplex (experimental space of our model) means a triangle, and the 3D simplex means a tetrahedron.


1. 1 D simplex experimental space

2. 2D simplex experimental space

Figure A1. Simplex experiment space with 2, 3, and 4 independent variables.

