Electronic Supplementary Material (ESI) for Environmental Science: Processes & Impacts. This journal is © The Royal Society of Chemistry 2024

#### **Supplementary Information II (SI-II)**

# Combining predictive and analytical methods to elucidate pharmaceutical biotransformation in activated sludge

Leo Trostel<sup>1†</sup> & Claudia Coll<sup>1†</sup>, Kathrin Fenner<sup>1,2,\*</sup>, Jasmin Hafner<sup>1,2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Environmental Chemistry, Swiss Federal Institute of Aquatic Science and Technology

(Eawag), 8600 Dübendorf, Zürich, Switzerland

<sup>2</sup> Department of Chemistry, University of Zürich, 8057 Zürich, Switzerland

<sup>†</sup>These authors contributed equally: Leo Trostel, Claudia Coll

\* Corresponding Author: kathrin.fenner@eawag.ch

Phone: +41 58 765 5085

Fax: +41 58 765 5802

# **Table of Contents**

S	1.	Dat	a Table for tested APIs4		
Sž	2.	Dat	Data Table for Identified TPs		
S3. Biotransformation pathways and Structure Elucidation			transformation pathways and Structure Elucidation10		
	S3.	1	Biotransformation rules11		
	\$3.2 \$3.3 \$3.4		Aliskiren15		
			Amlodipine		
			Atomoxetine		
	S3.:	5	Budesonide		
	S3.	6	Canagliflozin		
	S3.′	7	Clopidogrel		
	S3.	8	Dapagliflozin		
	S3.9	9	Dasatinib		
	S3.	10	Dolutegravir		
	S3.	11	Duloxetine74		
	S3.	12	Ezetimbe78		
	S3.	13	Fexofenadine		
	S3.	14	Hydrochlorothiazide		
	S3.	15	Irbesartan102		
	S3.	16	Keto-desogestrel		
	S3.	17	Lumiracoxib109		
	S3.	18	Metformin		
	S3.	19	Mirtazapine		
	S3.2	20	Olanzapine		
	S3.2	21	Omeprazole		
	S3.2	22	Panobinostat		
	S3.2	23	Pemetrexed144		

	S3.24	Pioglitazone	
	S3.25	Quetiapine	
	S3.26	Rivastigmine	
	S3.27	Rosuvastatin	200
	S3.28	Tadalafil	210
	S3.29	Terbinafine	214
	S3.30	Ticagrelor	238
	S3.31	Valsartan	245
	S3.32	Vildagliptin	254
S	S4. Par	rents without identified TPs	258
	S4.1	Atazanavir	
	S4.2	Atovaquone	258
	S4.3	Clotrimazol	259
	S4.4	Dienogest	259
	S4.5	Efavirenz	
	S4.6	Fingolimod	
	S4.7	Mometasone	
	S4.8	Naloxegol	
	S4.9	Nilotinib	
	S4.10	Regorafenib	
	S4.11	Vorinostat	
S	85. Ret	ferences	

## **S1.** Data Table for tested APIs

Name	Code	SMILES	CAS number
Acalabrutinib	Aca	CC#CC(=O)N1CCCC1C2=NC(=C3N2C=CN=C3N)C4=CC=C(C=C4)C(=O)NC5=CC=CC =N5	1420477-60-6
Aliskiren fumarate	Ali	CC(C)C(CC1=CC(=C(C=C1)OC)OCCCOC)CC(C(CC(C)C)C(=O)NCC(C)(C)C(=O)N)O )N	173334-58-2
Amlodipine besylate	Aml	CCOC(=0)C1=C(NC(=C(C1C2=CC=C2C1)C(=0)OC)C)COCCN	111470-99-6
Atazanavir sulfate	Ata	CC(C)(C)C(C(=O)NC(CC1=CC=CC=C1)C(CN(CC2=CC=C(C=C2)C3=CC=CC=N3)NC(= O)C(C(C)(C)C)NC(=O)OC)O)NC(=O)OC	229975-97-7
Atomoxetine	Atm	CC1=CC=CC=C1OC(CCNC)C2=CC=C2	83015-26-3
Atovaquone	Atv	C1CC(CCC1C2=CC=C(C=C2)Cl)C3=C(C4=CC=C4C(=O)C3=O)O	95233-18-4
Budesonide	Bud	CCCC10C2CC3C4CCC5=CC(=0)C=CC5(C4C(CC3(C2(01)C(=0)C0)C)0)C	51333-22-3
Canagliflozin hydrate	Can	CC1=C(C=C(C=C1)C2C(C(C(C(O2)CO)O)O)O)CC3=CC=C(S3)C4=CC=C(C=C4)F	842133-18-0
Ceritinib	Cer	CC1=CC(=C(C=C1C2CCNCC2)OC(C)C)NC3=NC=C(C(=N3)NC4=CC=CC=C4S(=O)(=O))C(C)C)C1	1032900-25-6
Clopidogrel bisulfate	Clp	COC(=0)C(C1=CC=CC=C1Cl)N2CCC3=C(C2)C=CS3	120202-66-6
Clotrimazol	Clt	C1=CC=C(C=C1)C(C2=CC=C2)(C3=CC=C3C1)N4C=CN=C4	23593-75-1
Dapagliflozin	Dap	CCOC1=CC=C(C=C1)CC2=C(C=CC(=C2)C3C(C(C(C(O3)CO)O)O)O)C1	461432-26-8
Dasatinib	Das	CC1=C(C(=CC=C1)Cl)NC(=O)C2=CN=C(S2)NC3=CC(=NC(=N3)C)N4CCN(CC4)CCO	302962-49-8
Dienogest	Die	CC12CCC3=C4CCC(=O)C=C4CCC3C1CCC2(CC#N)O	65928-58-7
Dolutegravir sodium	Dol	CC1CCOC2N1C(=0)C3=C(C(=0)C(=CN3C2)C(=0)NCC4=C(C=C(C=C4)F)F)O	1051375-16-6
Duloxetine	Dul	CNCCC(C1=CC=CS1)OC2=CC=CC3=CC=C32	116539-59-4
Efavirenz	Efa	C1CC1C#CC2(C3=C(C=CC(=C3)C1)NC(=O)O2)C(F)(F)F	154598-52-4

Supplementary Table S1: List of APIs tested in the sludge biotransformation experiment

Ezetimibe	Eze	C1=CC(=CC=C1C2C(C(=O)N2C3=CC=C(C=C3)F)CCC(C4=CC=C(C=C4)F)O)O	439081-02-4
Fexofenadine	Fex	CC(C)(C1=CC=C(C=C1)C(CCCN2CCC(CC2)C(C3=CC=CC=C3)(C4=CC=CC=C4)O)O)C (=O)O	83799-24-0
Fingolimod hydrochloride	Fin	CCCCCCCC1=CC=C(C=C1)CCC(CO)(CO)N	162359-55-9
Hydrochloroth iazide	Hyd	C1NC2=CC(=C(C=C2S(=O)(=O)N1)S(=O)(=O)N)Cl	58-93-5
Irbesartan	Irb	CCCCC1=NC2(CCCC2)C(=O)N1CC3=CC=C(C=C3)C4=CC=C4C5=NNN=N5	138402-11-6
Keto- desogestrel/ Etonogestrel	Ket	CCC12CC(=C)C3C(C1CCC2(C#C)O)CCC4=CC(=O)CCC34	54048-10-1
Lumiracoxib	Lum	CC1=CC(=C(C=C1)NC2=C(C=CC=C2C1)F)CC(=O)O	220991-20-8
Metformin hydrochloride	Met	CN(C)C(=N)N=C(N)N	1115-70-4
Mirtazapine	Mir	CN1CCN2C(C1)C3=CC=C3CC4=C2N=CC=C4	85650-52-8
Mometasone furoate	Mom	CC1CC2C3CCC4=CC(=0)C=CC4(C3(C(CC2(C1(C(=0)CC1)OC(=0)C5=CC=CO5)C)O)C l)C	83919-23-7
Naloxegol	Nal	COCCOCCOCCOCCOCCOCCOCCOCCCCCCCCCCCCCCC	854601-70-0
Nilotinib	Nil	CC1=C(C=C(C=C1)C(=O)NC2=CC(=C2)C(F)(F)F)N3C=C(N=C3)C)NC4=NC=CC(=N4)C5=CN=CC=C5	641571-10-0
Olanzapine	Ola	CC1=CC2=C(S1)NC3=CC=CC=C3N=C2N4CCN(CC4)C	132539-06-1
Omeprazole	Ome	CC1=CN=C(C(=C1OC)C)CS(=O)C2=NC3=C(N2)C=C(C=C3)OC	73590-58-6
Orlistat	Orl	CCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCOCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCC	96829-58-2
Panobinostat lactate	Pan	CC1=C(C2=CC=C2N1)CCNCC3=CC=C(C=C3)C=CC(=O)NO	404950-80-7
Pemetrexed	Pem	C1=CC(=CC=C1CCC2=CNC3=C2C(=O)NC(=N3)N)C(=O)NC(CCC(=O)O)C(=O)O	137281-23-3
Pioglitazone hydrochloride	Pio	CCC1=CN=C(C=C1)CCOC2=CC=C(C=C2)CC3C(=O)NC(=O)S3	112529-15-4
Quetiapine fumarate	Que	C1CN(CCN1CCOCCO)C2=NC3=CC=CC=C3SC4=CC=CC=C42	111974-72-2
Regorafenib	Reg	CNC(=O)C1=NC=CC(=C1)OC2=CC(=C(C=C2)NC(=O)NC3=CC(=C(C=C3)Cl)C(F)(F)F) F	755037-03-7

Ridaforolimus	Rid	CC1CCC2CC(C(=CC=CC=CC(CC(C(=0)C(C(=CC(C(=0)CC(OC(=0)C3CCCCN3C(=0)C(=0)C1(O2)O)C(C)CC4CCC(C(A)OC)OP(=0)(C)C)C)O)OC(C)C)C)C)C)C)C)C)C)C)C)C)C)C	572924-54-0
Rivastigmine			123441 03 2
hydrochloride	Riv	CCN(C)C(=O)OC1=CC=CC(=C1)C(C)N(C)C	123441-03-2
Rosuvastatin			147008 20 2
calcium	Ros	CC(C)C1=NC(=NC(=C1C=CC(CC(CC(=O)O)O)O)C2=CC=C(C=C2)F)N(C)S(=O)(=O)C	14/098-20-2
Tadalafil	Tad	CN1CC(=0)N2C(C1=0)CC3=C(C2C4=CC5=C(C=C4)OCO5)NC6=CC=C2C36	171596-29-5
Terbinafine			01161 71 6
hydrochloride	Ter	CC(C)(C)C#CC=CCN(C)CC1=CC=CC2=CC=CC=C21	91101-/1-0
		CCCSC1=NC(=C2C(=N1)N(N=N2)C3CC(C(C3O)O)OCCO)NC4CC4C5=CC(=C(C=C5)F)	274602 27 5
Ticagrelor	Tic	F	2/4095-27-5
Valsartan	Val	CCCCC(=O)N(CC1=CC=C(C=C1)C2=CC=CC=C2C3=NNN=N3)C(C(C)C)C(=O)O	137862-53-4
Vildagliptin	Vil	C1CC(N(C1)C(=O)CNC23CC4CC(C2)CC(C4)(C3)O)C#N	274901-16-5
Vorinostat	Vor	C1=CC=C(C=C1)NC(=O)CCCCCCC(=O)NO	149647-78-9

# S2. Data Table for Identified TPs

The reported SMILES corresponds to the predicted structure and does not necessarily represent the found structural information.

#### Supplementary Table S2: List of tentatively identified TPs

Name	SMILES	CAS Number(s)
12_TP_Ali	COc1ccc(CC(C(N)C(0)CC(C(=0)NCC(C)(C)C(N)=0)C(C)C)C(C)C)cc1OCCC(=0)O	949925-75-1
Aml_TP_12	CCOC(=O)C1=C(COCC(=O)O)NC(C)=C(C(=O)OC)C1c1ccccc1C1	90445-14-0
Atm TP 9	CNCCC(Oc1ccccc1C(=O)O)c1ccccc1	540729-11-1
Can TP 7	Cc1ccc(C(0)C(0)C(0)C(0)C(=0)C(=0)0)cc1Cc1ccc(-c2ccc(F)cc2)s1	Not found
Clp_TP_10	O=Cc1ccsc1CCNC(C(=O)O)c1ccccc1Cl	Not found
Clp TP 5	$O = C(O)C(c_1c_cc_c_1C_1)N_1CCc_2s_cc_2C_1$	1246814-52-7, 324757-50-8, 144457-28-3, 90055-55-3
TP Clp 16	O = C(O)c(creation) + 1cccccc(C)	Not found
Clp TP 3	COC(=O)C(NCCc1sccc1C=O)c1ccccc1C1	Not found
Clp TP 11	COC(=O)C(NCCc1sccc1C(=O)O)c1ccccc1C1	Not found
TP_Dap_14	CCOc1ccc(Cc2cc(C(=O)C(O)C(O)C(O)C(=O)O)ccc2C1)cc1	Not found
TP_Das_8	Cc1nc(Nc2ncc(C(=O)Nc3c(C)cccc3Cl)s2)cc(N2CCN(CC(=O)O)CC2)n1	910297-53-9
Dol_TP_4	CC1CCOC(C=O)N1C(=O)c1[nH]cc(C(=O)NCc2ccc(F)cc2F)c(=O)c1O	Not found
Eze_TP_2	O=C1C(CCC(O)c2ccc(F)cc2)C(c2ccc(O)c(O)c2)N1c1ccc(F)cc1	Not found
Eze_TP_15	O=C(CCC1C(=O)N(c2ccc(F)cc2)C1c1ccc(O)cc1)c1ccc(F)cc1	191330-56-0
TP Fex 22	CC(C)(C(=O)O)c1ccc(C(=O)CCCNCCC(CC=O)C(O)(c2cccc2)c2cccc2)cc1	Not found
Fex_TP_3	OC(c1ccccc1)(c1ccccc1)C1CCNCC1	115-46-8
Fex TP 13	CC(C)(C(=O)O)c1ccc(C(=O)CCCN2CCC(C(O)(c3ccccc3)c3ccccc3)CC2)cc1	76811-98-8
Fex_TP_4	CC(C)(C(=O)O)c1ccc(C(O)CCC(=O)O)cc1	Not found
Val_TP_7	O=C(O)c1ccc(-c2ccccc2-c2nn[nH]n2)cc1	164265-78-5
Irb_TP_1	CCCCC(=NC1(C(=O)O)CCCC1)NCc1ccc(-c2ccccc2-c2nn[nH]n2)cc1	Not found
Val TP 12	CCCCC(=O)NCc1ccc(-c2ccccc2-c2nn[nH]n2)cc1	Not found
Val_TP_5	NCc1ccc(-c2ccccc2-c2nn[nH]n2)cc1	147225-68-1
Ket_TP_2	C=C1CC2(CC)C(CCC2(0)CC=0)C2CCC3=CC(=0)CCC3C12	Not found
TP_Lum_11	$\frac{\text{Cc1ccc}(\text{Nc2c}(\text{F})\text{cccc2Cl})\text{c}(\text{C}(\text{O})\text{C}(=\text{O})\text{O})\text{c}1}{\text{Cc1ccc}(\text{F})\text{ccc2Cl})\text{c}(\text{C}(\text{O})\text{C}(=\text{O})\text{O})\text{c}1}$	Not found
TP_Mir_34	CN(CC(=O)O)CC(=O)clccccclCclcccnclN	Not found
Mir_TP_1	CN(CC=O)CC1Nc2nccc2Cc2cccc21	Not found
TP_Mir_27	CNCCNc1ncccc1Cc1ccccc1C(=O)C(=O)O	Not found
Ola_TP_2	Cclcc2c(s1)Nclccccc1N=C2NCCN(C)CC=O	Not found

TP_Ola_6	CNCCN(CC(=O)O)C1=Nc2ccccc2Nc2sc(C)cc21	Not found
		1261393-28-5,
Ome TP 1	COclecc2nc(S(=O)(=O)Cc3ncc(C)c(OC)c3C)[nH]c2c1	1189891-71-1, 88546-55-8
Pan TP 1	O=Cc1ccc(C=CC(=0)NO)cc1	Not found
Pan TP 4	NCc1ccc(C=CC(=O)NO)cc1	Not found
TP Pan 14	Ccl[nH]c2ccccc2c1C(O)CN	926196-01-2
TP Pem 42	$Nc1nc2[nH]cc(CC(\Omega)c3ccc(\Omega)c(\Omega)c3)c2c(=\Omega)[nH]]$	Not found
TP Pem 14	$\frac{1}{10000000000000000000000000000000000$	Not found
Pem_TP_2	Nc1nc2[nH]cc(CCc3ccc(C(=O)O)cc3)c2c(=O)[nH]1	137281-39-1
Pio_TP_9	CCc1ccc(CCOc2ccc(CC3C(=O)NC(=O)S3=O)cc2)nc1	Not found
Pio_TP_8	CCc1ccc(CCOc2ccc(CC(=O)C(=O)NC(=O)S)cc2)nc1	Not found
16_TP_Pio	O=C1NC(=O)C(Cc2ccc(OCCc3ccc(CCO)cn3)cc2)S1	625853-72-7
14_TP_Pio	O=CCc1ccc(CCOc2ccc(CC3SC(=O)NC3=O)cc2)nc1	Not found
19_TP_Que	Nc1ccccc1Sc1ccccc1C(=O)N1CCN(CC(=O)O)CC1	Not found
TP_Que_35	Nc1ccccc1Sc1ccccc1C(=O)N1CCN(CC=O)CC1	Not found
TP Que 32	Nc1ccccc1S(=O)c1ccccc1C(=O)N1CCNCC1	Not found
Que_TP_1	O=CCN(CCNC1=Nc2ccccc2Sc2ccccc21)CCOCCO	Not found
		1189866-35-0,
Que IP 3	$C_{1} = C_{1} = C_{1$	5/4/-48-8
13_TP_Que	O = C(O)COUCHTCCN(C2=Nc3ccccc3sc3ccccc32)CCT	Not found
18_1P_Que	O=C(O)CN1CCN(C2=Nc3ccccc3Sc3ccccc32)CC1	1217706-31-4
		194930-03-5,
		851086-95-8,
Riv TP 1	$CC(c1cccc(\Omega)c1)N(C)C$	139306-10-8,
		948051-93-2,
Riv_TP_5	CCN(C)C(=O)Oc1cccc(C(C)NC)c1	923035-05-6
Riv_TP_6	CC(c1ccc(O)c(O)c1)N(C)C	Not found
Ros_TP_15	CC(C)c1nc(N(C)S(C)(=O)=O)nc(-c2ccc(F)cc2)c1C=CC(O)CC(=O)O	Not found
Ros_TP_12	CC(C)c1nc(N(C)S(C)(=O)=O)nc(-c2ccc(F)cc2)c1C=CC(=O)O	Not found
Ros_TP_2	CC(C)c1nc(N(C)S(C)(=O)=O)nc(-c2ccc(F)cc2)c1C=CC(=O)CC(O)CC(=O)O	1422619-13-3
TP_Ros_12	CC(=O)C=Cc1c(-c2ccc(F)cc2)nc(N(C)S(C)(=O)=O)nc1C(C)C	Not found
Tad_TP_4	CN1CC(=O)N2C(c3ccc4c(c3)OCO4)c3[nH]c4ccccc4c3C(O)C2C1=O	Not found
TP_Ter_33	CC(C)(C)C#CC=CCNCc1cccc2c(O)c(O)ccc12	Not found
		1189686-07-4,
Ter TP 2	CNCc1cccc2ccccc12	1033/20-13-6, 14489-75-9
		162227-13-6,
		162227-13-6,
Ter_TP_11	CN(CC=CC#CC(C)(C)CO)Cc1cccc2cccc12	162227-13-6
TP Ter 15	CN(CC=CC#CC(C)(C)C(=O)O)Cc1cccc2ccccc12	1246833-21-5, 99473-14-0
Ter TP 12	CNCC=CC#CC(C)(C)CO	Not found
		1185238-58-7,
TP_Ter_24	CC(C)(C#CC=CCNCc1cccc2cccc12)C(=O)O	99473-15-1
TP_Tic_34	CCCS(=O)c1nc(NC2CC2c2ccc(F)c(F)c2)c2nnn(C3CC(OCC(=O)O)C(O)C3O)c2n1	Not found
Tic_TP_4	CCCSc1nc(NC2CC2c2ccc(F)c(F)c2)c2nnn(C3CC(OCC(=O)O)C(O)C3O)c2n1	Not found
Val TP 5	NCc1ccc(-c2ccccc2-c2nn[nH]n2)cc1	147225-68-1

Val_TP_12	CCCCC(=O)NCc1ccc(-c2ccccc2-c2nn[nH]n2)cc1	Not found
Val_TP_7	O=C(O)c1ccc(-c2ccccc2-c2nn[nH]n2)cc1	164265-78-5
Vil_TP_1	O=C(O)CNC12CC3CC(CC(O)(C3)C1)C2	1032564-18-3
L	egend: I = EAWAG/BBD-PPS, 2 = enviPath-BBD, 3 = enviPath-BBD+SOIL, 4 = enviPath-B	BD+SLUDGE, 5 =
	Manual Predictions	
3_TP_Aml	ClC1=CC=CC=C1C2=C(C(OCC)=O)C(COCC(O)=O)=NC(C)=C2C(OC)=O	113994-45-9
9_TP_Hyd	ClC1=C(S(N)(=O)=O)C=C(S(NC=N2)(=O)=O)C2=C1	58-94-6
10_TP_Riv	CC([N+](C)([O-])C)C1=CC(OC(N(C)CC)=O)=CC=C1	NA
15 TP Pio	O=C(C(S1)CC(C=C2)=CC=C2OCCC3=CC=C(CC(O)=O)C=N3)NC1=O	146062-48-8
20 TP Met	NC(/N=C(N)/N)=O	141-83-3
21 TP Ter	CC(C)(C)C#C/C=C/CN(CO)CC1=CC=CC2=C1C=CC=C2	162227-13-6
22 TP_Ter	CC(C)(C)C#C/C=C/CN(CO)C(0)C1=CC=CC2=C1C=CC=C2	NA
Bud_TP_9	CCCC1OC2CC3C4CCC5=CC(=0)CC(0)C5(C)C4C(=0)CC3(C)C2(C(=0)C(=0)0)01	Not found
	TPs from Conjugation Reactions	
Aml_TP_ace	ClC1=CC=CC=C1C2C(C(OCC)=O)=C(COCCNC(C)=O)NC(C)=C2C(OC)=O	Not found
Aml_TP_succ	ClC1=CC=CC=C1C2C(C(OCC)=O)=C(COCCNC(CCC(O)=O)=O)NC(C)=C2C(OC)=O	Not found
Atm_TP_succ	CC1=CC=CC=C10[C@@H](C2=CC=CC=C2)CCN(C(CCC(0)=0)=0)C	Not found
Dul_TP_succ	CN(C(CCC(0)=0)=0)CCC(C1=CC=CS1)OC2=CC=CC3=CC=C32	Not found

#### S3. Biotransformation pathways and Structure Elucidation

The biotransformation pathways for all found TPs are shown in this section. The used bt rules are indicated next to reaction arrow. Further information about the rules can be found in the biotransformation section and on the EAWAG-PPS/BBD website (<u>http://eawag-bbd.ethz.ch/servlets/pageservlet?ptype=allrules</u>). Exact mass corresponds to the monoisotopic mass of the uncharged molecule. Brackets in pathway indicate unobserved hypothetical intermediates to improve readability. Unidentified isomeric structures were reported as brackets with added modification.

The pathways are followed by time series plots of a given parent and its corresponding TPs in biotransformation (BT) reactors and unspiked (UC), sorption (SC) and abiotic (AB) control reactors.

This section reports structural evidence for found transformation products, which was obtained by the interpretation of MS<sup>2</sup> spectra. Spectra are shown as mirror plot with the corresponding parent compound or *mzCloud* match. NCE of TP and parent are not necessarily identical. If data was obtained by second measurements using stepped collision energies, it was indicated in the suffix of the name. Confidence levels were assigned independently from plausible isomers; however, potential structural isomers were mentioned. Fragments were annotated with structure and chemical formula using Fish scoring (based on *MassFrontier* using default parameters) of *Compound Discoverer*. Manually annotated fragments were reported with mass difference in ppm to calculated mass of given composition. Plausible neutral losses were indicated with arrows.

#### **S3.1** Biotransformation rules



#### Supporting Information II



X = CI, Br, I, H L = O, NH, C=O



#### Supporting Information II



R = H, alkyl, (aryl)

#### S3.2 Aliskiren



15





35 fragment ions with identical nominal masses and chemical composition were observed in both parent and TP positive MS<sup>2</sup> spectra. The neutral loss of water and ammonia was also observed for both. Additionally, [M-H]<sup>-</sup> ion was detected, which supports the transformation to a carboxylate. However, no comparison with parent compound was possible since it was only detected in positive mode.

12\_TP\_Ali



211210\_134\_BT\_2\_HB\_7\_72h (F156) #4482, RT=14.466 min, MS2, FTMS (+), (HCD, DDA, 552.3638@25, +1)

17

## 12\_TP\_Ali\_neg



12\_TP\_Ali\_remeas



Ali\_remeas

## S3.3 Amlodipine





21





 $MS^2$  fragments at 149, 176 and 208 m/z were observed for both the parent and the TP. Ion at nominal mass 409 in parent  $MS^2$  is not the  $[M+H]^+$  ion, because of large mass error (12.54 ppm). Ion at nominal mass 447 in TP  $MS^2$  is probably an interfering ion, resulting in fragments below 200 m/z. No chlorobenzene loss was observed for the parent. Absence of ammonia loss in TP spectrum indicates the modification of terminal amine in parent. In negative measured spectrum,  $[M-H]^-$  indicates carboxylic acid moiety. First fragmentation of  $[M-H]^-$  is confirmed by C<sub>2</sub>H<sub>3</sub>O<sub>2</sub> fragment. Two other fragmentation patterns, which were observed for  $[M+H]^+$  ion, are feasible.

#### Aml\_TP\_12



Aml

Aml\_TP\_12



Aml\_TP\_12\_remeas



Aml\_remeas

#### S3.3.2. 3 TP Aml



This TP was confirmed by reference standard.

3\_Aml\_TP



Aml





#### S3.3.3. Aml TP ace



The TP and the parent compound share fragments at 149, 165, 176, 206, 208 and 334 m/z. and show methanol loss. The absence of neutral ammonia loss suggests the transformation to an amide.





Aml

Aml\_TP\_ace\_remeas



Aml\_remeas

#### S3.3.4. Aml TP succ



The TP and the parent compound share fragments at 176, 208 and 334 m/z and also both show methanol loss. The absence of neutral ammonia loss suggests the transformation to an amide.





Aml\_TP\_succ\_remeas



Aml\_remeas

#### S3.4 Atomoxetine



#### S3.4.1. Atm TP 9



No matching fragments with parent compound, except for nominal mass 148, which shows a large mass difference of 5.5 ppm. Potential OH loss, but with large mass difference of 8.8 ppm. COOH modification could not be confirmed by scan in negative mode.






### S3.4.2. Atm TP succ



Fragment matches with parent compound at 91 and 117 m/z. Neutral loss of water indicates *N*-succinylation of parent. Both show loss of  $C_7H_8O$ . [M-H]<sup>-</sup> ion for further confirmation of the carboxylate could not be found.





Atm\_remeas

## S3.5 Budesonide



#### S3.5.1. Bud TP 9



Many fragment-matches between TP and parent confirm the steroid backbone. The loss of water can be observed twice for the parent, whereas for the TP it can be observed 3 times, suggesting the TP is the product of hydroxylation and oxidation of terminal alcohol to carboxylate. The COOH moiety could not be confirmed by an [M-H]<sup>-</sup> ion.





Bud

## S3.6 Canagliflozin



## 

S3.6.1. Can TP 7

MS spectra of parent could only be acquired in positive mode, whereas TP only in negative mode. [M-H]<sup>-</sup> ion of TP suggests the presence of a carboxylate, which supports the oxidation of the primary alcohol. Oxidative cleavage of the ether bond is supported by fragments of nominal mass 473 and 455.





Can\_TP\_7\_remeas



## S3.7 Clopidogrel





48

S3.7.1. Clp TP 3  $\begin{bmatrix}
(f) \\
($ 

Many fragment-matches in lower m/z range support substructure. Both parent and TP show loss of methyl formate ( $-C_2H_4O_2$ ). The absence of nominal masses 322 and 262 – structures with bicyclic ring intact – in TP spectrum indicate oxidative *N*-dealkylation. The human metabolite 2-oxo-clopidogrel as reported by Loer et al.<sup>8</sup> shares the same mass and cannot be excluded as a possible candidate.

### Clp\_TP\_3



Clp\_TP\_3\_remeas



#### S3.7.2. Clp TP 5



Many fragment-matches in lower m/z range support substructure of parent. Parent spectrum shows methanol loss, whereas TP spectrum shows water loss. This indicates the hydrolysis of the ester parent compound. No [M-H]<sup>-</sup> ion could be detected for this TP to increase confidence of carboxylate moiety. Furthermore, MS<sup>2</sup> of TP showed full match with *mzCloud* database and reference standard.



# Clp\_TP\_5 (reference standard)



#### S3.7.3. Clp TP 10



Many fragment-matches in lower m/z range support substructure of parent. Loss of formic acid and absence of methyl formate loss (nominal mass 264 does not correspond to correct molecular formula due to large mass error of 0.37 u) support hydrolysis of ester. No [M-H]<sup>-</sup> ion could be detected for this TP to increase confidence of carboxylate moiety.





#### S3.7.4. Clp TP 11



Many fragment-matches in lower m/z range support substructure of parent. Parent and TP show loss of methyl formate ( $-C_2H_4O_2$ ). The absence of nominal masses 322 and 262 (structures with bicyclic ring intact) in TP spectrum indicate oxidative *N*-dealkylation. The loss of methanol together with water is only present in TP spectra, which could support carboxylate. No [M-H]<sup>-</sup> ion was detected.

## Clp\_TP\_11



Clp\_TP\_11\_remeas



#### S3.7.5. TP Clp 16



Nominal masses 111, 125 and 152 were also observed for parent comound. Absence of methanol loss, which was observed for Clp TP 11, indicates full hydrolysis of both ester bonds.





TP\_Clp\_16\_remeas





## S3.8 Dapagliflozin



63



S3.8.1. TP Dap 14

Two distinct peaks in chromatogram at RT 18.6 and 18.8. These could be two isomers or the RT alignment failed. MS<sup>2</sup> spectra of both look very similar. Parent was only found in positive mode, so no comparison was possible. CO<sub>2</sub> loss from [M-H]<sup>-</sup> ion indicates COOH moiety after ring opening.

# TP\_Dap\_13\_(14)



TP\_Dap\_14\_(13)

TP\_Dap\_13\_(14)\_remeas



## S3.9 Dasatinib





19 Ions with identical nominal masses and chemical composition were found for the TP and the parent. Especially, fragments at 317, 401 and 427 m/z confirm the same backbone for both. Neutral loss of CO<sub>2</sub> supports the oxidation of the terminal alcohol.

TP\_Das\_8



69

TP\_Das\_8\_remeas



Das\_remeas

## S3.10 Dolutegravir



#### S3.10.1. Dol TP 4



Only 3 annotations with *in silico* fragmentation tool due to low NCE, but covers all high intensity peaks. No additional information could be obtained in the remeasured scans.
# Dol\_TP\_4



## S3.11 Duloxetine





### S3.11.1. Dul TP succ

Ion with nominal mass 398 does not correspond to  $[M+H]^+$  of TP. Fragment with 123 m/z was found for both TP and parent. Fragments derived from succinyl group are absent in MS<sup>2</sup> of parent compound.





Dul\_TP\_succ\_remeas



Dul\_remeas

### S3.12 Ezetimbe





### S3.12.1. Eze TP 2



No [M+H]<sup>+</sup> ion found for neither parent nor TP. Ion with highest m/z corresponds to fragment after water loss. Comparison of ions at nominal masses 297 and 299 indicate hydroxylation in TP and parent spectra, respectively. No additional information could be obtained in the remeasured scans.

## Eze\_TP\_2



### S3.12.2. Eze TP 15



The absence of water loss in TP and comparison of nominal masses 297 and 299 (difference of H<sub>2</sub>) indicate oxidation of hydroxyl group to ketone.

Eze\_TP\_15



Eze

# S3.13 Fexofenadine





85

## **S3.13.1.** Fex TP 3



Structure of TP could be confirmed with *mzCloud* library match and with reference standard after remeasuring.

Fex\_TP\_3



mzCloud library

Fex\_TP\_3\_remeas\_ref\_std



### S3.13.2. Fex TP 4



Ions with nominal masses 55, 79, 133, 153 were observed in both parental and TP positive MS<sup>2</sup> spectra. [M-H]<sup>-</sup> ion and CO<sub>2</sub> loss indicate carboxylic acid.



Fex\_TP\_4\_remeas





Fex\_TP\_4\_remeas



#### S3.13.3. Fex TP 13



Both parent and TP show loss of water. Absence of second water loss for TP could suggests the oxidation of secondary alcohol. Fragments with nominal masses 82, 91, 111, 115, 117, 143, 191, 233 and 250 were observed for parent as well as TP. Especially, ions at 233 and 250 m/z confirm substructure and by their fragmentation support the oxidation of secondary alcohol. [M-H]<sup>-</sup> ion for TP and CO<sub>2</sub> loss in MS<sup>1</sup> were identified, which supports carboxylic acid group.

## Fex\_TP\_13



Fex\_TP\_13\_remeas



Fex\_remeas

### S3.13.4. TP Fex 22



Fragment ions with nominal mass 117, 191 and 233 were also observed for parent compound. Hydroxylation could also have occurred  $\Box$  to tertiary amine, leading either to another ring opening or stable hemiaminal. *N*-oxidation would also be possible.

## Fex\_TP\_22\_remeas



Fex\_remeas

# S3.14 Hydrochlorothiazide





This TP was confirmed by a full *mzCloud* spectrum library match and by reference standard. This TP was not predicted by any prediction method.





mzCloud

# 9\_TP\_Hyd\_remeas\_ref\_standard



mzCloud

### S3.15 Irbesartan



### S3.15.1. Irb TP 1



Water loss of [M+H]<sup>+</sup> ion in TP spectrum therefor – without considering electrons – has same mass as parent compound and supports hydrolysis of lactam. [M-H]<sup>-</sup> ion could not be identified, which could indicate carboxylate function. Ion with nominal mass 235 in mass spectrum of the TP corresponds to fragment after benzyl cleavage and was detected for both compounds. This TP was also found in the abiotic control and may therefore also be an abiotic reaction in lower pH range. The hydrolysis of lactam reliefs strain from 5-membered *spiro* ring system, which supports spontaneous reaction. Nevertheless, the chromatogram intensity was higher in biotransformation samples. Val TP 5, 7 and 12 were also counted as detected TPs for this parent, but data is found in valsartan section.

# lrb\_TP\_1



Irb

Irb\_TP\_1\_remeas



Irb\_remeas

## S3.16 Keto-desogestrel





79 matching fragments with parent (but possibly with different proposed structure) fully confirm the steroid backbone. Parent  $[M+H]^+$  ion shows successive water loss twice, whereas the TP  $[M+H]^+$  ion probably loses H<sub>2</sub>O three times. The expected intermediates show larger mass difference than 5 ppm and may be due to an interfering ion.






### S3.17 Lumiracoxib



### S3.17.1. TP Lum 11



Fragments with nominal masses 71 (2x) and 212 were observed in parent and TP spectra, however no structural annotation from *MassFrontier* was made. Neutral loss of water and formic acid was also detected for both, which indicates carboxylic acid functionality. Further, water loss suggest hydroxylation  $\Box$  to COOH or on methyl group. 4'-hydroxyl-lumiracoxib could also fit the obtained data.

# TP\_Lum\_11\_remeas



Lum\_remeas

#### S3.18 Metformin



#### S3.18.1. 20 TP Met



This TP was confirmed by reference standard. This TP was also found in the unspiked control reactors, but this was expected since metformin is used in a large scale and has a high concentration in wastewater. The samples taken from the biotransformation reactors showed higher areas in the chromatogram. However, this could also be due to higher activity of microorganism as a result of additional nutrition.

## 20\_TP\_Met







# S3.19 Mirtazapine





#### **S3.19.1.** Mir TP 1



Nominal masses 56, 58, 70, 107, 110, 115, 117, 144, 167, 168, 180, 194, 195, 208, 209, 223, 235 and 264 were also observed for the parent compound, where especially mass 195 confirms substructure. The water loss was only present in TP not in parent spectrum, which supports the formation of an aldehyde. The TP shares the chemical formula of 8-

Hydroxymirtazapine, however fragments with m/z 195, 208, 209, 264 suggest no hydroxylation of aromatic of 7-membered ring system and the library spectrum of 8-Hydroxymirtazapine is no good match. Multiple structural isomers are possible leading to the same chemical formula, therefore only confidence level 3 was chosen.

## Mir\_TP\_1



Mir\_TP\_1\_remeas





Mir\_TP\_1\_remeas



mzCloud (8-Hydroxymirtazapine)

#### S3.19.2. TP Mir 27



Two compounds with identical molecular formula at RT 7.7 (TP Mir 27) and 10.3 (TP Mir 34) were found. 8 structural isomers were predicted. Fragments with m/z 195, 208 and 209 suggest no hydroxylation of aromatic of 7-membered ring system.

## TP\_Mir\_27\_remeas





#### S3.19.3. TP Mir 34



Two compounds with identical molecular formula at RT 7.7 (TP Mir 27) and 10.3 (TP Mir 34) were found. 8 structural isomers were predicted.

## TP\_Mir\_34\_remeas





### S3.20 Olanzapine



126

#### S3.20.1. Ola TP 2



Nominal mass 84 was also observed for parent compound. Water loss, which is only present in TP MS<sup>2</sup> scan, indicates oxidation.





Ola

#### S3.20.2. TP Ola 6



Only [M-H]<sup>-</sup> and plausible CO<sub>2</sub> loss detected. No further information could be obtained in the remeasured sample.

# TP\_Ola\_6



# S3.21 Omeprazole



S3.21.1. Ome TP 1



Structure of TP could be confirmed with *mzCloud* library match. Fragment with nominal mass 214 corresponds to  $\Box$ -cleavage of sulfone group. Additionally, SO<sub>2</sub> loss was observed, which further supports the oxidation of the sulfur atom.



Ome\_TP\_1







### S3.22 Panobinostat





#### S3.22.1. Pan TP 1



TP shows no matches with parent spectra. Fragments at nominal masses 91 and 65 suggest toluene substructure, whereas mass 134 hints at hydroxylamide group. Parent compound was only observed in original measurement.

# Pan\_TP\_1



Pan\_TP\_1\_remeas



Pan

#### S3.22.2. Pan TP 4



Nominal mass 120 was also observed for the parent compound. Fragments at nominal mass 91 supports toluene substructure. The neutral loss of ammonia supports the oxidative N-dealkylation  $\Box$  to the methyl-indole moiety and not  $\Box$  to the benzyl as in Pan TP 1.

## Pan\_TP\_4



Pan

#### S3.22.3. TP Pan 14



No fragments were shared between TP and parent. Neutral loss of ammonia was observed for both.

# TP\_Pan\_14\_remeas



Pan

### S3.23 Pemetrexed




#### S3.23.1. Pem TP 2



Nominal masses 163 and 281 was also observed for parent compound, which corresponds to allyl cleavage, and water loss respectively.  $[M-H]^-$  ion could not be identified, which could indicate carboxylate function. Ion with nominal mass 299 was not present in parental MS<sup>1</sup> scan. The mass could shares the same value as  $[M+H]^+$  ion of TP, but no feasible fragmentation reaction was found. The parent was not detected in the stepped NCE measurements.

# Pem\_TP\_2



Pem

Pem\_TP\_2\_remeas



#### S3.23.2. TP Pem 42



Fragments with nominal mass 163 were observed in the  $MS^2$  for parent and TP compounds, which indicates hydroxylation of either benzene or methylene. Fragmentation or neutral loss of C<sub>5</sub>H<sub>7</sub>NO<sub>3</sub> (pyroglutamic acid) was not observed for TP, which indicates cleavage of side chain.





Pem

TP\_Pem\_42\_remeas



### S3.23.3. TP Pem 14



No matches with parent compound. Water loss was detected for both, while ammonia loss was only detected for TP.





Pem





## S3.24 Pioglitazone







Three isomers were found with RT 12.8 (16 TP Pio), RT 14.0 (Pio TP 9) and 16.3 (Pio TP 8). Chemical formula could possibly arise from oxidative *S*-dealkylation (Pio TP 8), hydroxylation (16 TP Pio) or oxidation to sulfoxide (Pio TP 9). Structures were assigned according to best match with MS<sup>2</sup> spectrum. TP shows matches with parent spectra for ions at 79, 91, 95, 106, 107, 118, 119, 120, 121 and 134. However, fragments with nominal masses 95 and 134 support no hydroxylation on benzyl or pyridine moiety respectively. Similar fragmentation pattern ( $-C_{10}H_9NO_3S$ ) was observed for both. Neutral water loss was observed in a different MS<sup>2</sup> scan.

## Pio\_TP\_8



Pio\_TP\_8\_remeas



Pio\_remeas



Three isomers were found with RT 12.8 (16 TP Pio), RT 14.0 (Pio TP 9) and 16.3 (Pio TP 8). Chemical formula could possibly arise from oxidative *S*-dealkylation (Pio TP 8), hydroxylation (16 TP Pio) or oxidation to sulfoxide (Pio TP 9). Structures were assigned according to best match with MS<sup>2</sup> spectrum. Fragment matches at m/z 95, 106, 118, 121 and 134, where 106, 121 and 134 indicate no hydroxylation of terminal carbon.







#### S3.24.3. 14 TP Pio



Fragment at 106 m/z was observed for both parent and TP. Ion with mass 148, which is absent in parental MS<sup>2</sup>, support oxidation of terminal carbon. Ketone derived from secondary alcohol as reported in Jaakkola et al.<sup>5</sup> is also possible.

## 14\_TP\_Pio\_remeas





#### S3.24.4. 15 TP Pio



Fragments with nominal masses 91, 106, 118, 119 and 120 were also observed for parent compound. Water loss from M+H ion, which was not present in 14 TP Pio, could indicate oxidation to carboxylic acid.

## 15\_TP\_Pio\_remeas



Pio\_remeas

#### S3.24.5. 16 TP Pio



Three isomers were found with RT 12.8 (16 TP Pio), RT 14.0 (Pio TP 9) and 16.3 (Pio TP 8). Chemical formula could possibly arise from oxidative *S*-dealkylation (Pio TP 8), hydroxylation (16 TP Pio) or oxidation to sulfoxide (Pio TP 9). Structures were assigned according to best match with MS<sup>2</sup> spectrum. No matches detected between parent compound and TP. Fragment with masses 150 and 134 for TP and parent respectively, show mass difference of one oxygen atom, which could suggest hydroxylation of terminal ethyl moiety. Formation of secondary alcohol instead of terminal is also plausible and was reported by Jaakkola et al.<sup>5</sup>

## 16\_TP\_Pio\_remeas





## S3.25 Quetiapine





169

## S3.25.1. Que TP 1



Nominal masses 68, 70, 89, 94, 132, 158, 196, 209, 210, 212, 219, 221, 227, 247, 251, 253 and 279 were also observed for the parent compound. Because of the many matches, it is unlikely that the oxidation occurred on the ring system. Thus, hydroxylation on the piperazine ring is probable and after cleavage leads to an aldehyde.





Que

Que\_TP\_1\_remeas





### S3.25.2. Que TP 3



Nominal masses 70, 209, 210, 221, 227, 247, 253 and 279 were also observed for the parent compound. Fragments in the MS<sup>2</sup> of the parent containing oxygen were absent in the MS<sup>2</sup> of the TP, which indicates deamination.





Que

Que\_TP\_3\_remeas



Que\_remeas

### S3.25.3. TP Que 32



Ions at m/z 79, 94, 120 and 136 were also observed for parent, but without structural annotation. Hydroxylation and/or subsequent ring opening leads to the same chemical formula.





Que

TP\_Que\_32\_remeas



Que\_remeas

## S3.25.4. TP Que 35

H<sub>2</sub>N -0 0 TP\_Que\_35 Chemical Formula: C19H21N3O2S Exact Mass: 355.1354 Level 3

Ions at m/z 70, 114, 196, 209, 210, 221, 227, 247, 253 and 279 were also observed for parent compound.

### TP\_Que\_35


TP\_Que\_35\_remeas



#### S3.25.5. 13 TP Que



Nominal masses 253 and 279 were also observed in parent  $MS^2$  spectra. Ion with m/z ratio of 172 is only present in TP scan, which indicates that the transformation occurred on the terminal alcohol. This TP was not predicted by any prediction method.

# 13\_TP\_Que



Que

# S3.25.6. 18 TP Que



Nominal masses 56, 72, 84, 253 and 279 were also observed in parent  $MS^2$  spectra. Ion with m/z ratio of 128 is only present in TP scan, which indicates oxidation after *N*-dealkylation. No  $[M-H]^-$  ion was detected for this TP. This TP was not predicted by any prediction method.

# 18\_TP\_Que



Que

#### S3.25.7. 19 TP Que

Ó ÓH 0 19\_TP\_Que Chemical Formula: C19H21N3O3S Exact Mass: 371.1304 Level 3

Fragments with nominal masses 70, 210, 221 and 253 were also observed for parent compound. Ion at 253 m/z had different structure proposal.

# 19\_TP\_Que



Que

# S3.26 Rivastigmine





#### S3.26.1. Riv TP 1



Nominal masses 121, 103 and 91 were also observed for the parent compound, where especially mass 91 supports substructure. Ions with the highest m/z ratio of both parent and TP are obtained by dimethylamine loss, which is then followed by the loss of water. The absence of nominal mass 149 in TP MS<sup>2</sup> suggests transformation.





#### S3.26.2. Riv TP 5

RIV\_TP\_5 Chemical Formula: C<sub>13</sub>H<sub>20</sub>N<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub> Exact Mass: 236.1525 Level 2b

Nominal masses 58 (2x), 79, 86, 91, 105 and 121 (2x), 131 and 206 were also observed for the parent compound, where especially the ion at 206 supports the demethylation on the amine.





Riv

Riv\_TP\_5\_remeas





#### S3.26.3. Riv TP 6



Nominal masses 91, 93, 103 and 121 were also observed for the parent compound, which confirms the benzene ring with its substituents and supports the hydrolysis transformation. The absence of water loss and the proposed structures of m/z 140, 154 and 164 in TP  $MS^2$  could support the hydroxylation of the aromatic ring. However, isomers with OH *para* to carbon substituent or *ortho* can't be distinguished.

# Riv\_TP\_6



Riv

Riv\_TP\_6\_remeas





#### S3.26.4. 10 TP Riv



Nominal masses 58, 86, 105, 121, 149 and 206 were also observed for the parent compound.  $MS^2$  spectra from parent and TP are very similar. Structure of mass 206 from *in silico* fragmentation tool suggests that modification occurred on or in close proximity of tertiary amine group. It is not possible to distinguish if TP is the product of *N*-oxidation or hydroxylation. However, tertiary amines tend to form *N*-oxides.<sup>19</sup> This TP was not predicted by any prediction method.

# 10\_TP\_Riv



#### S3.27 Rosuvastatin



200



#### S3.27.1. Ros TP 2



No matches were found with the parent compound, even though they are structurally very similar. The cause may be the lower NCE of 15 in comparison to the parent with a value of 35. Carbon dioxide loss could be observed in the MS<sup>2</sup> scan.



150

100

50

•

Anna instant



- 1

200

\*\*

220

300

de

10.00

1

-

#### S3.27.2. Ros TP 12



Fragments with nominal masses 79, 122, 133, 135, 149, 189, 201, 212, 216, 242, 243, 254, 256, 258 and 270 were also observed in the parental  $MS^2$  spectrum. However, only masses 122, 242 and 270 could be annotated with a predicted structure. The absence of ions at 89 and 97 m/z suggest oxidation followed by a hydrolysis reaction of the 1,3-diketone intermediate.

#### Ros\_TP\_12\_remeas



Ros\_remeas

#### S3.27.3. Ros TP 15



56 fragment ions were observed in  $MS^2$  of both TP and parent, which indicates modification on side chain. Structures of m/z 242 and 378 confirm structural backbone.

# Ros\_TP\_15\_remeas





#### S3.27.4. TP Ros 12



Ions at m/z 79, 122, 133, 135, 149, 160, 201, 215, 228, 239, 240, 242, 254, 256, 270, 298, 314 and 350 were also observed for parent compound. Mass 350 supports that the TP and parent share the same structural backbone. In TP spectrum CH<sub>2</sub>C=O loss was observed instead of water and acetic acid loss as in parental spectrum. Similar to Ros TP 12, this TP is the other possible product after oxidation and hydrolysis of 1,3-diketone.

# TP\_Ros\_12\_remeas



Ros\_remeas

#### S3.28 Tadalafil



S3.28.1. Tad TP 4



No matches were found with the parent compound except ion at m/z 185, even though they are structurally very similar. Same  $C_7H_6O_2$  loss in parent and TP could be observed.

Tad\_TP\_4



Tad\_TP\_4\_remeas



Tad\_remeas

#### S3.29 Terbinafine





# S3.29.1. Ter TP 2 $\overbrace{Fer_TP_2}^{Fer_TP_2}$ Chemical Formula: C12H13N Exact Mass: 171.1048 Level 2b

Fragments at nominal masses 141 and 115 were also observed for the parent compound. Absence of mass 119 and 121 indicates loss of carbon chain moiety.
Ter\_TP\_2



Ter\_TP\_2\_remeas



#### S3.29.2. Ter TP 11



Two compounds with the same chemical formula were found at RT 13.2 (Ter TP 11, intensity in chromatogram around 10<sup>6</sup>) and 15.4 (21 TP Ter, intensity in chromatogram around 10<sup>7</sup>), which suggests two distinct structural isomers. Matching fragments at nominal mass 141 confirming naphthalene subunit, but no water loss was observable. No further information for structure elucidation was found. This TP serves as intermediate for TP Ter 15.

# Ter\_TP\_11

211210\_086\_BT\_2\_DB\_7\_30h\_a (F108) #4826, RT=15.313 min, MS2, FTMS (+), (HCD, DDA, 308.2006@35, +1) FISh Coverage: 1 Matched, 9 Unmatched, 7 Skipped 1.0 141.06993 C11 H9 [M-e]+1 0.5 Intensity [counts] (10^6) .0 93.06994 95.04922 113.43775 119.33691 105.06992 121.10109 1.05999 60.36302 79.05433 / 60.04472 70.59842 193.10176 205.10167 261.16422 57)07010 C4 H9\[M-e]+1 81.06973 C6 H9 [M-e]+1 191.08717 119.08567 C9 H11 [M-e]+1 163.73827 170.09618 65.06906 C12 H12 N [M-e]+1 121.10123 C9 H13 [M-e]+1 79.05425 Ļ X 93.06996 ₽+ 55.05454 C4 H7 [M-e]+1 1/1 1  $\checkmark$ Ļ ×. -0.5 150.12820 C10 H16 N [M-e]+1 -йн 141.06989 C11 H9 [M-e]+1 -1.0 50 100 150 200 250 300 m/z

Ter

#### S3.29.3. Ter TP 12



Matching fragments at nominal masses 53, 55, 79, 81, 91, 93, 95 and 105 supporting chain-like substructure. These fragments were not annotated by *MassFrontier* due to their low intensity. Absence of masses 141 and 170 suggest cleavage of naphthalene unit. High mass fragments are obtained by allyl cleavage in TP as opposed to benzyl cleavage in parent spectrum. No water loss was observed to support hydroxy moiety. The loss of ammonia was only observed for the TP and not for the parent, which indicates the transformation from a 3° amine to a 2° amine.

# Ter\_TP\_12



Ter\_TP\_12\_remeas





### S3.29.4. TP Ter 15



Matching fragments at nominal masses 53, 55, 63, 79, 91, 105, 115, 123, 139, 141, 170, 179 and 205 confirming that backbone of parent is conserved. Missing signals of m/z 119 and 121 in TP MS<sup>2</sup> indicates oxidation of methyl to carboxylic acid. No [M-H]<sup>-</sup> ion or CO<sub>2</sub> loss was observed.

# TP\_Ter\_15



Ter

TP\_Ter\_15\_remeas



Ter\_remeas

## S3.29.5. TP Ter 24



Fragments with nominal masses 63, 105, 115, 123, 141, 179, 205 and 219 were also observed for parent compound. As for TP Ter 15, Missing signals of m/z 119 and 121 in TP MS<sup>2</sup> indicates oxidation of methyl to carboxylic acid. No [M-H]<sup>-</sup> ion or CO<sub>2</sub> loss was observed. Additionally, missing parent fragments with masses 150 and 170 indicate demethylation of amine.

# TP\_Ter\_24\_remeas



Ter\_remeas

## S3.29.6. TP Ter 33



Parent and TP MS<sup>2</sup> spectra show matching fragments with m/z 79, 81, 91, 93, 105, 119 and 123. Water loss indicates oxidation and matching fragment with mass 119, as well as absence of masses 141 and 170 supports dioxidation of naphthalene unit and thus conversion to a chatechol derivative.

TP\_Ter\_33



TP\_Ter\_33\_remeas



Ter\_remeas

#### S3.29.7. 21 TP Ter



Two compounds with the same chemical formula were found at RT 13.2 (Ter TP 11, intensity in chromatogram around 10<sup>6</sup>) and 15.4 (21 TP Ter, intensity in chromatogram around 10<sup>7</sup>), which suggests two distinct structural isomers. Matching fragments between parent and TP were found at m/z 53, 55, 57, 63, 79, 91, 93, 95, 103, 105, 115, 119, 121, 141, 205 and 261, where especially fragments 119, 121 and 261 exclude terminal hydroxylation and support the transformation on the tertiary amine. However, this compound could also be the hydroxylated intermediate for TP Ter 33 and TP Ter 24.

# 21\_TP\_Ter



Ter

21\_TP\_Ter\_remeas



Ter\_remeas

#### S3.29.8. 22 TP Ter



Matching fragments at nominal masses 91, 93, 115, 119 and 141 confirming substructure. Ion at m/z 141 suggests no hydroxylation of aromatic ring system. Ion at m/z 119 suggests no hydroxylation of terminal *tert*-butyl group.

The first oxidation step was proposed as an *N*-oxidation and the second as hydroxylation. However, dihydroxylation would be possible and lead to multiple potential structural isomers. The formation of germinal alcohols is unlikely, because they should spontaneously form ketones or aldehydes.

# 22\_TP\_Ter



Ter

22\_TP\_Ter\_remeas



# S3.30 Ticagrelor





---- AB\_7 --- DB\_7 --- HB\_7

## S3.30.1. Tic TP 4



Ions at m/z 81, 105, 127, 133 and 153 were also detected for parent compound, where especially 127 and 153 confirm benzyl moiety together with its substituents.

Tic\_TP\_4\_remeas





S3.30.2. TP Tic 34



Ions at m/z 81, 99, 127, 133 and 153 were also detected for parent compound, where especially 127 and 153 confirm benzyl moiety together with its substituents. These also suggest no hydroxylation of benzene of 3-membered ring. Fragment with mass 511 is the result of  $\Box$ -cleavage of sulfoxide, which was observed neither in parent nor Tic TP 4.

# TP\_Tic\_34

211210\_114\_BT\_2\_HB\_7\_48h (F136) #5941, RT=18.155 min, MS2, FTMS (+), (HCD, DDA, 553.1671@55, +1) FISh Coverage: 10 Matched, 5 Unmatched, 17 Skipped P C F но но-()| 100 · 5-153.05099 C9 H7 F2 [M-e]+1 99.04405 C5 H7 O2 [M-e]+1 127.03547 C7 H5 F2 [M-e]+1 50 P.C. 133.04480 HO VI ↓ ↓ ↓ ↓ ↓ 151.03566 C9 H5 F2 [M-e]+1 168.0614 sity [counts] (10^3) 141.05080 C8 H7 F2 [M-e]+1 81.03358 C5 H5 O [M-e]+1 4 205.05551 209.04834 180.45056 219.07268 232.06833 57.0338 69.0336 293.01633 351.75360 цģ  $\Box \frown \Box$ 0 1  $\neg$ 18903 295.08231 293.06509 C13 H11 F2 N4 S [M-e]+1 337.13119\_\_\_\_358.10721 335.11392 C16 H17 F2 N4 S [M-e]+1 164.80859 50 84.9626 6 81.03337 C5 H5 O [M-e]+1 146.01654 286.18903 453.13751 146.88815 Inten 415.13831 C21 H21 F2 N4 O S [M-e]+1 495.18375 HO VII 153.05144 C9 H7 F2 [M-e]+1 99.04404 C5 H7 O2 [M-e]+1 -50 нş, F-F но но-{]] 523.19263 C23 H29 F2 N6 O4 S [M+H]+1 127.03499 C7 H5 F2 [M-e]+1 -100 • FF 100 200 300 400 500 m/z

Tic

TP\_Tic\_34\_remeas



Tic\_remeas

## S3.31 Valsartan





# S3.31.1. Val TP 5

MS<sup>2</sup> scan of TP was not informative, because it only showed [M-H]<sup>-</sup> ion. Furthermore, comparison with parent was not possible due to polarity difference.



The structure was confirmed by library match and by reference standard.

# Val\_TP\_7



Val TP 7



# Val\_TP\_7\_reference\_standard



## S3.31.3. Val TP 12



30 matches with MS<sup>2</sup> scans of parent, but many without structure annotation. Ion with nominal mass 235 confirms structural backbone.

# Val\_TP\_12


Val\_TP\_12\_remeas



Val\_remeas

#### S3.32 Vildagliptin



#### S3.32.1. Vil TP 1



Comparison of TP and parent  $MS^2$  scan shows matching fragments at m/z 59, 81, 91, 93, 95, 105, 107, 123, 133 and 151. Thus, confirming adamantane moiety with m/z 133 and 151. Absence of pyrrolidine fragments (m/z 55, 97, 127 and 154) in TP supports hydrolysis, but no [M-H]<sup>-</sup> ion was observed. Ion with nominal mass 76 can only be achieved by hydrolysis of amide.

#### Vil\_TP\_1



Vil\_TP\_1\_remeas





# S4. Parents without identified TPs



#### S4.1 Atazanavir





# S4.3 Clotrimazol







### S4.5 Efavirenz



# S4.6 Fingolimod







# S4.8 Naloxegol



#### S4.9 Nilotinib



### S4.10 Regorafenib



## S4.11 Vorinostat



### **S5.** References

- Barnette, D. A.; Davis, M. A.; Dang, N. L.; Pidugu, A. S.; Hughes, T.; Swamidass, S. J.; Boysen, G.; Miller, G. P. Lamisil (Terbinafine) Toxicity: Determining Pathways to Bioactivation through Computational and Experimental Approaches. Biochemical Pharmacology 2018, 156, 10–21. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bcp.2018.07.043.
- Boix, C.; Ibáñez, M.; Zamora, T.; Sancho, J. V.; Niessen, W. M. A.; Hernández, F. Identification of New Omeprazole Metabolites in Wastewaters and Surface Waters. Science of The Total Environment 2014, 468–469, 706–714. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2013.08.095</u>.
- Gobburu, J. V. S.; Tammara, V.; Lesko, L.; Jhee, S. S.; Sramek, J. J.; Cutler, N. R.; Yuan, R. Pharmacokinetic-Pharmacodynamic Modeling of Rivastigmine, a Cholinesterase Inhibitor, in Patients with Alzheimer's Disease. The Journal of Clinical Pharmacology 2001, 41 (10), 1082– 1090. https://doi.org/10.1177/00912700122012689.
- Gulde, R.; Meier, U.; Schymanski, E. L.; Kohler, H.-P. E.; Helbling, D. E.; Derrer, S.; Rentsch, D.; Fenner, K. Systematic Exploration of Biotransformation Reactions of Amine-Containing Micropollutants in Activated Sludge. Environmental Science & Technology 2016, 50 (6), 2908– 2920. <u>https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.est.5b05186</u>.
- Gulde, R.; Rutsch, M.; Clerc, B.; Schollée, J. E.; von Gunten, U.; McArdell, C. S. Formation of Transformation Products during Ozonation of Secondary Wastewater Effluent and Their Fate in Post-Treatment: From Laboratory- to Full-Scale. Water Research 2021, 200 (totally 84), 117200. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.watres.2021.117200.
- Helbling, D. E.; Hollender, J.; Kohler, H. P. E.; Singer, H.; Fenner, K. High-Throughput Identification of Microbial Transformation Products of Organic Micropollutants. Environmental Science and Technology 2010, 44 (17), 6621–6627. https://doi.org/10.1021/es100970m.
- Henning, N.; Falås, P.; Castronovo, S.; Jewell, K. S.; Bester, K.; Ternes, T. A.; Wick, A. Biological Transformation of Fexofenadine and Sitagliptin by Carrier-Attached Biomass and Suspended Sludge from a Hybrid Moving Bed Biofilm Reactor. Water Research 2019, 167, 115034. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.watres.2019.115034</u>.
- Jaakkola, T.; Laitila, J.; Neuvonen, P. J.; Backman, J. T. Pioglitazone Is Metabolised by CYP2C8 and CYP3A4 in Vitro: Potential for Interactions with CYP2C8 Inhibitors. Basic Clin Pharmacol Toxicol 2006, 99 (1), 44–51. <u>https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1742-7843.2006.pto\_437.x</u>.
- Jansen, P. J.; Smith, W. K.; Baertschi, S. W.; Dorman, D. E.; Kemp, C. A. J.; McCune, K. A. Determination of the Degradation Chemistry of the Antitumor Agent Pemetrexed Disodium. Journal of Pharmaceutical Sciences 2016, 105 (11), 3256–3268. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.xphs.2016.06.029.

- Jiao, W.; Zhao, X.; Wu, G.; Zhang, X.; Wu, H.; Cui, Y. Bioactivation of Lumiracoxib in Human Liver Microsomes: Formation of GSH- and Amino Adducts through Acyl Glucuronide. Drug Testing and Analysis 2020, 12 (6), 827–835. <u>https://doi.org/10.1002/dta.2777</u>.
- Kiefer, K.; Du, L.; Singer, H.; Hollender, J. Identification of LC-HRMS Nontarget Signals in Groundwater after Source Related Prioritization. Water Research 2021, 196, 116994. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.watres.2021.116994</u>.
- Loer, H. L. H.; Türk, D.; Gómez-Mantilla, J. D.; Selzer, D.; Lehr, T. Physiologically Based Pharmacokinetic (PBPK) Modeling of Clopidogrel and Its Four Relevant Metabolites for CYP2B6, CYP2C8, CYP2C19, and CYP3A4 Drug–Drug–Gene Interaction Predictions. Pharmaceutics 2022, 14 (5), 915. <u>https://doi.org/10.3390/pharmaceutics14050915</u>.
- MacKenzie, K. R.; Zhao, M.; Barzi, M.; Wang, J.; Bissig, K.-D.; Maletic-Savatic, M.; Jung, S. Y.; Li, F. Metabolic Profiling of Norepinephrine Reuptake Inhibitor Atomoxetine. European Journal of Pharmaceutical Sciences 2020, 153, 105488. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejps.2020.105488</u>.
- Maculewicz, J.; Kowalska, D.; Świacka, K.; Toński, M.; Stepnowski, P.; Białk-Bielińska, A.; Dołżonek, J. Transformation Products of Pharmaceuticals in the Environment: Their Fate, (Eco)Toxicity and Bioaccumulation Potential. Science of The Total Environment 2022, 802, 149916. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2021.149916</u>.
- Mizuno, K.; Takeuchi, K.; Umehara, K.; Nakajima, M. Identification of Novel Metabolites of Vildagliptin in Rats: Thiazoline-Containing Thiol Adducts Formed via Cysteine or Glutathione Conjugation. Drug Metabolism and Disposition 2019, 47 (8), 809–817. <u>https://doi.org/10.1124/dmd.119.086546</u>.
- Psoma, A. K.; Rousis, N. I.; Georgantzi, E. N.; Thomaidis, N. S. An Integrated Approach to MS-Based Identification and Risk Assessment of Pharmaceutical Biotransformation in Wastewater. Science of The Total Environment 2021, 770, 144677. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.144677.
- Truver, M. T.; Jakobsson, G.; Chermà, M. D.; Swortwood, M. J.; Gréen, H.; Kronstrand, R. A Sensitive LC-MS/MS Method for the Quantitation of Oxycodone, Noroxycodone, 6α-Oxycodol, 6β-Oxycodol, Oxymorphone, and Noroxymorphone in Human Blood. Journal of Chromatography B 2021, 1171, 122625. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jchromb.2021.122625</u>.
- Waldmeier, F.; Glaenzel, U.; Wirz, B.; Oberer, L.; Schmid, D.; Seiberling, M.; Valencia, J.; Riviere, G. J.; End, P.; Vaidyanathan, S. Absorption, Distribution, Metabolism, and Elimination of the Direct Renin Inhibitor Aliskiren in Healthy Volunteers. Drug Metabolism and Disposition 2007, 35 (8), 1418–1428. <u>https://doi.org/10.1124/dmd.106.013797</u>.
- Weizel, A.; Schlüsener, M. P.; Dierkes, G.; Wick, A.; Ternes, T. A. Fate and Behavior of Progestogens in Activated Sludge Treatment: Kinetics and Transformation Products. Water Research 2021, 188, 116515. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.watres.2020.116515</u>.