Relationship between Composition and Toxicity of Motor Vehicle Emission Samples

Jacob D. McDonald,¹ Ingvar Eide,² JeanClare Seagrave,¹ Barbara Zielinska,³ Kevin Whitney,⁴ Douglas R. Lawson,⁵ and Joe L. Mauderly¹

¹Lovelace Respiratory Research Institute, Albuquerque, New Mexico, USA; ²Statoil Research Centre, Trondheim, Norway; ³Desert Research Institute, Reno, Nevada, USA; ⁴Southwest Research Institute, San Antonio, Texas, USA; ⁵National Renewable Energy Laboratory, Golden, Colorado, USA

In this study we investigated the statistical relationship between particle and semivolatile organic chemical constituents in gasoline and diesel vehicle exhaust samples, and toxicity as measured by inflammation and tissue damage in rat lungs and mutagenicity in bacteria. Exhaust samples were collected from "normal" and "high-emitting" gasoline and diesel light-duty vehicles. We employed a combination of principal component analysis (PCA) and partial least-squares regression (PLS; also known as projection to latent structures) to evaluate the relationships between chemical composition of vehicle exhaust and toxicity. The PLS analysis revealed the chemical constituents covarying most strongly with toxicity and produced models predicting the relative toxicity of the samples with good accuracy. The specific nitro-polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons important for mutagenicity were the same chemicals that have been implicated by decades of bioassay-directed fractionation. These chemicals were not related to lung toxicity, which was associated with organic carbon and select organic compounds that are present in lubricating oil. The results demonstrate the utility of the PCA/PLS approach for evaluating composition-response relationships in complex mixture exposures and also provide a starting point for confirming causality and determining the mechanisms of the lung effects. Key words: diesel exhaust, gasoline exhaust, hopane, mutagenicity, PAHs, particulate matter health effects, principal component analysis, semivolatile organic carbon, sterane, toxicity of motor vehicle emissions. Environ Health Perspect 112:1527-1538 (2004). doi:10.1289/ehp.6976 available via http://dx.doi.org/ [Online 15 July 2004]

Mobile source emissions are important contributors to ambient air pollution and have been associated with cancer-related and noncancer-related health effects. Recent work has shown that health effects and ambient air pollution increase with proximity to roadways, suggesting that motor vehicle traffic (engine emissions) contributes a large share to ambient health effects (Nicolai et al. 2003; Pearson et al. 2000; van Vliet et al. 1997; Venn et al. 2001). Two interrelated issues pertaining to the health hazards of motor vehicle emissions continue to present serious challenges to manufacturers, regulatory decision makers, toxicologists, and risk assessors. First, it is important to identify the most important contributors to health risk among the myriad physical-chemical species contained in emissions. Second, it is important to be able to estimate changes in health risks that will result from changes in the composition of emissions. Both issues are important for ensuring that the most health-relevant components are controlled and that technologic strategies for meeting emissions regulations reduce rather than increase hazards. The current knowledge base does little to support such judgments because there have been few direct comparisons of the health effects of different types of emissions. Moreover, except for bioassay-directed fractionation schemes that have identified nitro-polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons as major drivers of bacterial mutagenicity, few approaches have been used to determine the chemical species driving the health hazards of complex emissions.

We have reported the results of studies in which both bacterial mutagenicity (by Ames tests) and lung toxicity assays of inflammation, cytotoxicity, and lung tissue damage (Seagrave et al. 2002) were assessed to rank the toxic potency of motor vehicle exhaust samples of different chemical composition. That work used combined suspensions of particulate material (PM) and vapor-phase semivolatile organic carbon (SVOC) samples collected from a range of in-use (rented from owners) gasoline- and diesel-powered vehicles, including "high-emitting" vehicles. Preliminary studies showed that it was important to include the vapor-phase SVOC because it comprised a large portion of the mass [defined by gravimetric weight as described by Seagrave et al. (2002)] emitted from some vehicles and could contribute substantially to toxicity as evidenced by evaluation of lung inflammatory responses of separated PM and SVOC samples collected from a traffic tunnel (Seagrave et al. 2001). The samples were combined into seven distinct groups of gasoline and diesel-powered vehicles. There was a 5-fold range in the potency of the samples for lung injury, and samples from high-emitting vehicles (both diesel and gasoline powered) had the highest pulmonary toxicity per unit of mass. There was also up to a 10-fold

difference in the bacterial mutagenicity among these samples, with no clear difference between the potency of diesel exhaust and gasoline exhaust on the basis of mutations per milligram of sample.

We also reported the results of detailed compositional measurements of the exhaust samples described above (Zielinska et al. 2004). In the present work, we applied multivariate data analysis to determine the relationship between composition and health response. We selected a statistical approach that had been successfully used to determine the key components of organic extracts of diesel exhaust particles causing mutations in bacteria (Eide et al. 2001, 2002; Sjogren et al. 1996) and aryl hydrocarbon receptor induction (Sjogren et al. 1996). The combined principal component analysis (PCA) and partial least-squares regression (PLS; also known as projections to latent structures) approach allows analysis of the similarities and differences in the specific health responses (e.g., mutagenicity vs. lung toxicity) relative to composition. The product of this work is an assessment of the ability of the PLS to "explain" the composition-response relationship and an indication of which chemical compounds in the exhaust samples were most strongly associated with the health response.

Materials and Methods

In this article we summarize only the general approaches used for collection, chemical characterization, and toxicity evaluation of vehicle exhaust samples that have been reported in detail elsewhere (Seagrave et al. 2002; Zielinska et al. 2004). The classifications of vehicle samples, chemical/physical classes measured in these samples, and the

Address correspondence to J.D. McDonald, Lovelace Respiratory Research Institute, 2425 Ridgecrest Dr. SE, Albuquerque, NM 87108 USA. Telephone: (505) 348-9455. Fax: (505) 348-4980. E-mail: jmcdonal@lrri.org

The authors declare they have no competing financial interests.

Received 21 January 2004; accepted 14 July 2004.

E. Johanson and S. Rännar (Umetrics, Umea, Sweden) provided valuable discussions.

This work was supported by the Office of Freedom Car and Vehicle Technologies, U.S. Department of Energy. The views and opinions of the authors do not necessarily reflect those of the U.S. Government or any agency thereof.

toxicologic evaluations conducted (including health response category) are summarized in Table 1.

Emission samples. Particle and vaporphase SVOC fractions were collected using filters (for particles) and polyurethane foam/XAD-4 resin traps (for vapor-phase SVOC), respectively, from diluted, fresh emissions from vehicles operated on chassis dynamometers over the unified driving cycle at the Southwest Research Institute (San Antonio, TX, USA) (Whitney 2000, Zielinska et al. 2004). The unified driving cycle is a high-speed, rapid-acceleration test cycle, consisting of a 300-sec cold start phase followed by a 1,135-sec hot stabilized phase,

 Table 1. Summary description of engine samples, chemical measurements, and toxicity measurements.

Exhaust samples ^a
Gasoline
G
G ₃₀
WG
BG
Diesel
Diesel
U ₃₀
HU Charried measurements (hubble)
Total partials and SVOC mass
Carbon (organic, clomontal, thermal fractions)
Transition motals
Ather metals
Metalloids
Nonmetal elements
Bicyclic or two-ring PAH organic compounds
Tricyclic or three-ring PAH organic compounds
Tetracyclic or four-ring PAH organic compounds
Five-ring PAH organic compounds
Six-ring PAH organic compounds
Seven-ring PAH organic compounds
Oxygenated PAH organic compounds (including quinone
Sulfur-containing PAHs
Nitro-PAH organic compounds
Hopane/sterane organic compounds (unique to oil)
I oxicity measurements
Luliy toxicity
Lavage matrophils
Total lavage leukocytes
Histopathologic inflammation
Macrophage inflammatory protein-2
Cytotoxicity potency estimates
Lactate dehvdrogenase
Lavage protein
Histopathologic tissue injury
Parenchymal change potency estimates
Histopathologic structural remodeling
General toxicity potency estimates
Total histopathology
Lung weight as percentage of body weight
Bacterial mutagenicity
iviulagenicity potency estimates
1 A 30 - 23
1A30 + 33 TA100 _ 99
TA100 = 33 $TA100 \pm 99$
1A100 + 03

^aDescribed by Whitney (2000). ^bDescribed by Zielinska et al. (2004). ^cDescribed by Seagrave et al. (2002).

and a 300-sec hot start phase, which is a repeat of the first phase. The maximum speed employed in the cycle was 67.2 mph, with a maximum acceleration of 6.9 mph/sec. Five vehicles or composite groups of vehicles were included: a group of five "normal-emitting' gasoline vehicles (G); a group of three normal-emitting diesel vehicles (D); two "highemitting" single gasoline vehicles emitting white (WG) or black (BG) smoke; and a single high-emitting diesel vehicle (HD). Specific emission rates for these vehicles are reported elsewhere (Zielinska et al. 2004). All vehicles were in-use light- or medium-duty passenger cars, pickup trucks, or vans, ranging from 1976 to 2000 model years and were tested with fuel and crankcase oil as received (recruited in San Antonio, TX, USA). The normal-emitting groups were sampled while operating both at room temperature and at approximately 30°F (~ -1 °C; G₃₀, D₃₀).

Chemical characterization of emission samples. The chemical composition of the particle and SVOC fractions of each of the seven samples was analyzed at the Desert Research Institute (Reno, NV, USA) as described elsewhere (Zielinska et al. 2004). Analyses included temperature fractions of organic and elemental carbon, elements (metals and associated analytes), inorganic ions (sulfate, nitrate), and speciation of resolvable organic compounds. The temperature fractions were obtained using the IMPROVE thermal carbon analysis technique (Chow et al. 2001), in which eight discrete fractions of carbon are vaporized in a changing temperature and helium/oxygen atmosphere. The temperature fractions are grouped into four "organic" and four "elemental" carbon designations as shown in Table 2. Although these are not explicitly chemical fractions (related to both chemical and physical properties), they provide data on differences among the emission samples and have been used in source apportionment modeling studies to differentiate among motor vehicle and other types of emissions (e.g., Maykut et al. 2003; Watson et al. 2002). The organic species measured focused on components that have been used in previous studies to illustrate differences among motor vehicle and other types of emissions. The classes of organic compounds included polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs), ranging in molecular weight from 128 to 300 Da, a mass range that spans from compounds that are considered to be exclusively gases to species found exclusively in the particle phase. Several subclasses of PAHs, including oxygenated PAHs (oxy-PAHs: ketones, aldehydes, quinones), nitro-PAHs, and sulfur-containing PAHs were measured. Hopanes and steranes, two classes of compounds that are found in lubricating oil (McDonald et al. 2003; Rogge et al.

1993), were also measured. A total of 184 composition variables were measured.

Toxicologic evaluations. Aliquots of the PM and SVOC extracts (in acetone) were provided (by Desert Research Institute) to the Lovelace Respiratory Research Institute for toxicity testing [description of sample extraction and handling described briefly below and in more detail by Seagrave et al. (2002)]. The PM and SVOC samples were combined (original PM and SVOC were extracted separately) and either mixed with Salmonella culture media (Ames bacterial reverse mutation assay) or instilled into lungs of F344/CRL rats (Charles River Laboratory, Wilmington, MA, USA) over a range of total mass (PM plus SVOC) doses (Seagrave et al. 2002). Responses in rat lungs were evaluated at 4 hr (the cytokine MIP-2) or 24 hr (all other responses) after dosing, as described previously (Seagrave et al. 2002). Lungs were removed and weighed, and then cells, protein, enzymes, and chemical mediators of inflammation were measured in bronchoalveolar lavage collected from the right cardiac, diaphragmatic, and intermediate lobes. The left lung was then fixed and examined by light microscopy for histologic evidence of inflammation and tissue damage. In all, 11 lung response variables were measured. Bacterial mutagenicity was evaluated in Ames tester strains TA98 and TA100, both with and without metabolic activation by a liver microsome preparation (S9) (Seagrave et al. 2002). Dose-response relationships were analyzed for each variable and for each emission sample, and (toxic) potency factors were derived from these analyses (Seagrave et al. 2002).

Normalization of data for multivariate data analysis. Data were normalized to weight fraction before statistical analysis by dividing the composition values by the sum of PM and SVOC mass (i.e., composition per unit of total mass). PM was the mass determined on the filter and extracted into solution. As discussed previously (Seagrave et al. 2002), the extraction protocol used to transfer PM into suspension involved agitation, gentle brushing, and sonication in acetone. Analysis of aliquots of the particle extracts was used to measure the recovery of the mass of material in solution compared with the mass weighed on filters before extraction. The recovery for PM was 80-100% for gasoline exhaust samples and 65-70% for diesel exhaust samples. The decreased extraction efficiency for the diesel exhaust samples was likely caused by difficulty in removing elemental carbon from the filters. The SVOC mass was determined by gravimetric analysis of spikes of extracts that were evaporated to dryness to remove the solvent (acetone). Because the compositional data are not reported as weight fractions elsewhere (Zielinska et al. 2004 reported emission rates), we include discussion on the mass

composition of the samples and also include the data as Appendix 1 of this report.

Multivariate data analysis (pattern recognition and prediction). The compositional data were structured in an X-matrix with one row per exhaust sample (i.e., a total of seven rows) and one column per predictor variable (initially, 184 compositional parameters). The mutagenicity and lung toxicity data were structured in a Y-matrix with seven rows and one column per response variable (i.e., a total of 15 responses). Multivariate data analysis was performed with Simca-P 10.0 (Umetrics, Umeå, Sweden). PCA (Jackson 1991) was performed on the X-matrix to evaluate similarities between mixtures and on the Y-matrix to group responses. PLS was used for the regression modeling to correlate the measured responses to the compositional parameters (Wold et al. 1984). PLS was used for the regression modeling because it overcomes the problems of intercorrelated predictor variables and data matrices where the number of variables exceeds the number of samples (Kettaneh-Wold 1992; Kvalheim 1989).

The purpose of PCA is to define "structure," or patterns, in data that exist in multiple dimensions. Both the PCA and PLS techniques use the same basic data simplification principles by projecting linear planes (or hyperplanes) into a multidimensional grouping of data (Kettaneh-Wold 1992; Kvalheim 1989). A principal component or a PLS component is a straight least-squares regression line (or plane) through the sample points in the multidimensional space (Sjogren et al. 1996). Each component will "explain" a portion of the variance in the data set. Typically, multiple components are required to explain most of the variance. However, it is desirable to have few principal or PLS components relative to the number of samples for optimal confidence in the outcome of the analysis.

The primary difference between PCA and PLS is that PCA is performed on one data matrix (e.g., X or Y) and PLS evaluates both (X and Y) simultaneously to both develop a predictive model (e.g., predict Y from X) and to evaluate relationships between specific X and Y variables (e.g., which chemicals covary with toxicity?). PCA is first used to identify characteristics of data in either the X- or Y-matrix. The principal outcome of this analysis is the identification of data that "cluster" together similarly and thus are assumed to have a systematic relationship. This application of PCA is illustrated in "Results" by the finding that mutagenicity and pulmonary toxicity variables did not cluster together but that variables within each category did cluster together. This indicated that separate PLS models would be needed for mutagenicity and toxicity.

A PCA analysis was first conducted on the 7×184 X-matrix to evaluate similarities between samples by "score plots" and on the

 7×15 Y-matrix to determine groupings (similarities) among response variables by "loading plots." This grouping was used to segregate the response variables into covarying groups of responses that could be analyzed by PLS. PLS was initially carried out with all 184 predictor variables; however, because of the low number of samples, PLS had to be carried out

Table 2. Chemical/physical variables (X-matrix) included in the final PLS model for lung toxicity.

Particulate mass PM Semivabilitie organic mass NVQ : Nitrate NQ : Suffate SQ : Ammonium NH, i Particle organic cabon mass Particle organic cabon Etemental carbon TC Total carbon thermal fraction OTTC 2nd carbon thermal fraction ETTC Thransition metals ETTC Bit carbon thermal fraction ETTC Transition metals Taras. met Afkali earth metals Earth metals Metalloids Metalloids Non-metal Coroup 3A metals Group 3A metals 3A metals Group 3A metals Sa metals Fo	Chemical/physical component	Name used for loading plot
Semivabile organic mass SV0C Nitrate NO ₃ Sultate SO ₄ Ammonium NH ₄ Particle organic carbon mass Particle organic carbon Elemental carbon TC Total carbon thermal fraction OTC 2nd carbon thermal fraction Q2TC 3d carbon thermal fraction Q4TC Sh carbon thermal fraction Q4TC Sh carbon thermal fraction ETC Th carbon thermal fraction ETC Wetalloids Metalloids Non-metal Foroup 3A metals Group 3A metals SA Total PAH SVOC PAH SVOC PAHs SVOC PAH PM PAHs Foroup 7A Toral PAHs STring PAH Toral PAHs	Particulate mass	PM
NitrateNU, SulfateNU, SUlfateAmmoniumNH, Patticle organic carbon massPatticle organic carbonElemental carbonECTotal carbonCCTotal carbon thermal fractionOTTC2 darbon thermal fractionOTTC2 darbon thermal fractionOTTC2 darbon thermal fractionOTTC3 darbon thermal fractionOTTC4 harbon thermal fractionOTTC5 harbon thermal fractionETTC7 harbon thermal fractionETTC7 harbon thermal fractionETC8 harbon thermal fractionETC7 harbon thermal fractionTrans.met7 harbon thermal fractionNon-met <td>Semivolatile organic mass</td> <td>SVOC</td>	Semivolatile organic mass	SVOC
Suffate SU4 Ammonium NH, Particle organic carbon mass Particle organic carbon Particle organic carbon C Total carbon thermal fraction OTTC 2nd carbon thermal fraction OZTC 3rd carbon thermal fraction OZTC 3rd carbon thermal fraction OZTC 5th carbon thermal fraction OZTC 5th carbon thermal fraction ETTC 7th carbon thermal fraction ETTC 8th carbon thermal fraction ETTC 7th carbon thermal fraction ETTC 8th carbon thermal fractin String PAH <td>Nitrate</td> <td>NO₃</td>	Nitrate	NO ₃
Ammoniania Marka Section Applied Section Secti	Sulfate	SU ₄
Tanks upon tableTrade of the controlTotal carbonTCIst carbon thermal fractionOTTC2nd carbon thermal fractionOTTC2nd carbon thermal fractionOTTC3nd carbon thermal fractionOTTC3nd carbon thermal fractionOTTC3th carbon thermal fractionOTTC3th carbon thermal fractionETTC7th carbon thermal fractionETTC7th carbon thermal fractionETTC7th carbon thermal fractionETTC7th carbon thermal fractionETTC8th carbon thermal fractionString PAH8th ca	Particle organic carbon mass	Particle organic carbon
Total carbonTC1st carbon thermal fraction01TC2nd carbon thermal fraction02TC3rd carbon thermal fraction03TC4h carbon thermal fraction04TC5th carbon thermal fraction04TC5th carbon thermal fraction04TC5th carbon thermal fraction04TC8th carbon thermal fraction04TC7th carbon thermal fraction04TC8th carbon thermal	Flemental carbon	FC.
1st carbon thermal fractionOTC2nd carbon thermal fractionOSTC3rd carbon thermal fractionOSTC3rd carbon thermal fractionOTC6th carbon thermal fractionOTC6th carbon thermal fractionETC7th carbon thermal fractionETC8th carbon thermal fractionMateralioidsMetalloidsMetalloidsNon-metalStarbon thermal fraction9th metalsTotal PAH8th carbon thermal fractionPM9th metalsTotal PAH9th carbon thermal fractionPM9th metalsTotal PAH9th carbon thermal fractionPM9th fractionStarbon thermal fraction9th fractionStarbon thermal fraction9	Total carbon	TC
2nd carbon thermal fractionQ2TC3d carbon thermal fractionQ3TC4th carbon thermal fractionQ4TC5th carbon thermal fractionE1TC6th carbon thermal fractionE1TC7th carbon thermal fractionE3TC8th carbon thermal fractionE3TC7th arbon thermal fractionE3TC7th arbon thermal fractionE3TC7th arbon thermal fractionEarth metMetalloidsMonetalleMetalloidsNon-met6roup 3A metalsA metals7to ap 3A metalsSA metals7to ap 3A metalsSA metals7to ap 4AnSVOC PAHVOC PAHsPMPAHNor-ring PAHsPM PAHTwo-ring PAHsS-ring PAHFuve-ring PAHsS-ring PAHFuve-ring PAHsS-ring PAHFuve-ring PAHsS-ring PAHSC2720S-130(H).176(H)-diasteraneS2C2720S-130(H).176(H)-diasteraneS3C2720S-130(H).176(H)-diasteraneS4C2720S-130(H).176(H)-diasteraneS1C2720S-130(H).176(H)-diasteraneS1C2720S-130(H).176(H)-diasteraneS1C2720S-130(H).176(H)-diasteraneS1C2720S-130(H).176(H)-diasteraneS1C2720S-130(H).176(H)-diasteraneS1C2720S-130(H).176(H)-diasteraneS1C2720S-130(H).176(H)-diasteraneS1C2720S-130(H).176(H)-diasteraneS1C2720S-130(H).176(H)-diasteraneS1C2720S-130(H).176(H)-diasteraneS1C2720S-130(H).176(H)-diasteran	1st carbon thermal fraction	01TC
3rd carbon thermal fraction 04TC 5th carbon thermal fraction 0FTC 6th carbon thermal fraction ETC 7th carbon thermal fraction Earth met Alkali earth metals Farth met Metalloids Non-met 7coup 3A metals 3A metals Group 4A metals Ametals Total PAHs SVOC PAH SVOC PAHs SVOC PAH STod IPAHs S-ring PAH Trov-ring PAHs S-ring PAH Five-ring PAHs S-ring PAH Strict Straterane S1 C27-20R-130(H), 170(H)-diasterane S1 C27-20R-30(H), 170(H)-diasterane S1 C27-20R-30(H), 170(H)-diasterane S1 C27-20R-Sod(H), 140(H), 170(H)-postane <td< td=""><td>2nd carbon thermal fraction</td><td>02TC</td></td<>	2nd carbon thermal fraction	02TC
4fn carbon thermal fraction QH1C 6th carbon thermal fraction E1TC 7th carbon thermal fraction E2TC 8th carbon thermal fraction E3TC Transition metals Trans. met Alkali earth metals Earth met Metaloids Metaloids Nonmetal elements Non-met Group 3A metals 3A metals Total PAHs SVOC PAH SVOC PAHs SVOC PAH PM PAHs PM PAH Twee-ring PAHs 2-ring PAH Fue-ring PAHs 3-ring PAH Fue-ring PAHs 3-ring PAH Fue-ring PAHs 5-ring PAH Strop PAH Strop PAH Oxy-PAH Oxy-PAH Oxy-PAHs Strop PAH Oxy-PAHs Strop PAH C27-20S - 130(H), 170(H)-diasterane S1 C27-20S - 130(H), 170(H)-diasterane S3 C27-20S - 130(H), 170(H)-diasterane S6 C27-20S - 130(H), 170(H)-diasterane S1 C27-20S - 130(H), 170(H)-diasterane S1 C27-20S - 130(H), 170(H)-diasterane S1 C27-20S - 130(H	3rd carbon thermal fraction	O3TC
and radio merimal fraction CF1C The action thermal fraction E3TC Rich action thermal fraction E3TC Rich action thermal fraction E3TC Transition metals Trans.met Alkali earth metals Earth met Metalloids Metalloids Non-metal Group AA metals Group AA metals AA metals Group AA metals AA metals Group AA metals SVOC PAH VM PAHs VPM PAH SVOC PAH PM PAH SVOC PAH PM PAH Fure-ring PAHs 2-ring PAH Fure-ring PAHs 5-ring PAH Fure-ring PAHs 5-ring PAH Oxygenated PAHs Symp PAH C27-200-130(H),17a(H)-diasterane S1 C27-201-310(H),17a(H)-diasterane S3 C27-201-310(H),17a(H)-diasterane S6 C27-201-310(H),17a(H)-diasterane S6 C27-201-310(H),17a(H)-diasterane S6 C27-201-310(H),17a(H)-diasterane S1 C27-201-310(H),17a(H)-diasterane S6 C27-201-32(H),17a(H)-diasterane S1 <t< td=""><td>4th carbon thermal fraction</td><td>U41C</td></t<>	4th carbon thermal fraction	U41C
Dir Latorio Hermal fractionE110Brit carbon thermal fractionE21C8th carbon thermal fractionE21C8th carbon thermal fractionEarthTransition metalsTrans.metAlkali earth metalsEarth metalsNon-metal elementsNon-metalsGroup 3A metals3A metalsGroup 4A metals4A metalsTotal PAHsSVOC PAHSVOC PAHsSVOC PAHPM PAHsPM PAHTwo-ring PAHs2-ring PAHFour-ring PAHs3-ring PAHFour-ring PAHs3-ring PAHFour-ring PAHs5-ring PAHFour-ring PAHs5-ring PAHFour-ring PAHs5-ring PAHStrice-PAHsS-ring PAHNitro-PAHStrice-PAHOxy-PaHStrice-PAHOxy-PaHStrice-PAHOxy-PaH-IStrice-PAH <td>Sth carbon thermal fraction</td> <td></td>	Sth carbon thermal fraction	
Rth carbon thermal fractionE3TCTransition metalsTrans. metAlkali earth metalsEarth metMetalloidsMetalloidsNonmetal elementsNon-metGroup 3A metals3A metalsGroup 3A metals3A metalsGroup 3A metals4A metalsTotal PAHSVOC PAHSVOC PAHPM PAHTwo-ring PAHs2-ring PAHTore-ring PAHs3-ring PAHFure-ring PAHs5-ring PAHFure-ring PAHs5-ring PAHFure-ring PAHs5-ring PAHC27-205-13β(H) 17cd(H)-diasteraneS2C27-205-13β(H),17cd(H)-diasteraneS2C27-205-33(H),17g(H)-diasteraneS3C27-205-34(H),17g(H)-diasteraneS3C27-205-35c(H),14g(H),17g(H)-diasteraneS4C28-205-36(H),14g(H),17g(H)-diasteraneS1C28-205-5c(H),14g(H),17g(H)-diasteraneS1C28-205-5c(H),14g(H),17g(H)-diasteraneS1C27-205-5c(H),14g(H),17g(H)-diasteraneS1C28-205-5c(H),14g(H),17g(H)-tolestaneS1C28-205-5c(H),14g(H),17g(H)-tolestaneS1C28-205-5c(H),14g(H),17g(H)-tolestaneS1C28-205-5c(H),14g(H),17g(H)-tolestaneS1C28-205-5c(H),14g(H),17g(H)-tolestaneS1C28-205-5c(H),14g(H),17g(H)-tolestaneS1C28-205-5c(H),14g(H),17g(H)-tolestaneS1C28-205-5c(H),14g(H),17g(H)-tolestaneS1C28-205-5c(H),14g(H),17g(H)-tolestaneS1C28-205-5c(H),14g(H),17g(H)-tolestaneS18C28-205-5c(H),14g(H),17g(H)-tol	7th carbon thermal fraction	ETTC
Transition metalsTransmetAlkali earth metalsEarth metAlkali earth metalsEarth metMontelal elementsNon-metGroup AA metals3A metalsGroup AA metalsAA metalsGroup AA metalsTotal PAHSVOC PAHSVOC PAHSVOC PAHSPM PAHTwo-ring PAHS2-ring PAHThree-ring PAHS3-ring PAHFour-ring PAHS5-ring PAHFour-ring PAHS5-ring PAHFour-ring PAHS5-ring PAHNitro-PAHS0x-PAHDayrented PAHS5-ring PAHCZ-20S-13gH1/17cd(H)-diasteraneS2CZ-20S-13gH1/17cd(H)-diasteraneS2CZ-20S-13gH1/17cd(H)-diasteraneS3CZ-20S-13gH1/17cd(H)-diasteraneS4CZ-20S-5cd(H).14cd(H)-rolestaneS6CZ-20S-5cd(H).14cd(H)-rolestaneS1CZ-20S-5cd(H).14cd(H)-rolestaneS1CZ-20S-5cd(H).14cd(H)-rolestaneS1CZ-20S-5cd(H).14gH1/17g(H)-rolestaneS1CZ-20S-5cd(H).14gH1/17g(H)-rolestaneS1CZ-20S-5cd(H).14g(H).17g(H)-rolestaneS1CZ-20S-5cd(H).14g(H).17g(H)-rolestaneS1CZ-20S-5cd(H).14g(H).17g(H)-rolestaneS1CZ-20S-5cd(H).14g(H).17g(H)-rolestaneS1CZ-20S-5cd(H).14g(H).17g(H)-rolestaneS1CZ-20S-5cd(H).14g(H).17g(H)-rolestaneS1CZ-20S-5cd(H).14g(H).17g(H)-rolestaneS1CZ-20S-5cd(H).14g(H).17g(H)-rolestaneS1CZ-20S-5cd(H).14g(H).17g(H)-rolestaneS1CZ-20S-5cd(H).14g(H).17g(8th carbon thermal fraction	E3TC
Alkali earth metalsEarth metMetalloidsMetalloidsMonmetal elementsNon-metGroup 3A metals3A metalsGroup 3A metals4A metalsTotal PAHsTotal PAHSVOC PAHsSVOC PAHPM PAHsPM PAHTwo-ring PAHs2-ring PAHFlow-ring PAHs4-ring PAHFlow-ring PAHs5-ring PAHFlow-ring PAHs5-ring PAHFlow-ring PAHs5-ring PAHFlow-ring PAHs5-ring PAHFlow-ring PAHs5-ring PAHVito-PAHs0xy-PAHOxgenated PAHs0xy-PAHC27-208-138/H1/176/H1-diasteraneS1C27-208-138/H1/176/H1-diasteraneS2C27-208-138/H1/176/H1-diasteraneS3C27-208-138/H1/178/H1-diasteraneS6C27-208-138/H1/178/H1-diasteraneS3C27-208-138/H1/178/H1-diasteraneS8C27-208-5cl(H1, 146(H1-cholestaneS9C27-208-5cl(H1, 146(H1-rode)S1C27-208-5cl(H1, 146(H1-rode)S1C27-208-5cl(H1, 146(H1, 176(H)-ergostaneS10C28-208-5cl(H1, 146(H1, 176(H)-ergostaneS16C28-208-5cl(H1, 146(H1, 176(H)-ergostaneS17C28-208-5cl(H1, 146(H1, 17	Transition metals	Trans. met
MetalloidsMetalloidsNonmetal elementsNon-metGroup 3A metals3A metalsGroup 4A metals4A metalsGroup 4A metalsTotal PAHSVOC PAHSVOC PAHW PAHSPM PAHTwo-ring PAHS2-ring PAHTou-ring PAHS3-ring PAHTou-ring PAHS5-ring PAHFive-ring PAHS5-ring PAHFive-ring PAHS5-ring PAHNitro-PAHSNitro-PAHDaygenated PAHS5-ring PAHNitro-PAHSStatementC27-20S-13B(H).170(H)-diasteraneS2C27-20S-13B(H).170(H)-diasteraneS3C27-20S-13B(H).170(H)-diasteraneS3C27-20S-13B(H).170(H)-diasteraneS3C27-20S-13B(H).170(H)-diasteraneS4C27-20S-13B(H).170(H)-diasteraneS3C27-20S-13B(H).170(H)-diasteraneS1C27-20S-13B(H).170(H)-diasteraneS1C27-20S-13B(H).170(H)-diasteraneS1C27-20S-50(H).140(H).170(H)-diasteraneS1C27-20S-50(H).140(H).170(H)-diasteraneS1C27-20S-50(H).140(H).170(H)-diasteraneS1C28-20R-50(H).140(H).170(H)-diasteraneS1C28-20R-50(H).140(H).170(H)-diasteraneS1C28-20R-50(H).140(H).170(H)-diasteraneS1C28-20R-50(H).140(H).170(H)-diasteraneS1C28-20R-50(H).140(H).170(H)-diasteraneS1C28-20R-50(H).140(H).170(H)-diasteraneS1C28-20R-50(H).140(H).170(H)-diasteraneS1C28-20R-50(H).140(H).170(H)-diasteraneS1C28-20R-50(H).	Alkali earth metals	Earth met
Normetal elementsNon-metGroup 3A metals3A metalsGroup 4A metals4A metalsTotal PAHsTotal PAHSV0C PAHsSV0C PAHPM PAHsPM PAHTwo-ring PAHs2-ring PAHFuv-ring PAHs3-ring PAHFuv-ring PAHs5-ring PAHFuv-ring PAHs5-ring PAHFuv-ring PAHs5-ring PAHFuv-ring PAHs5-ring PAHStructureS-ring PAHVitro-PAHsNitro-PAHOxyePanted PAHs0xy-PAHC27-208-13g(H), 17a(H)-diasteraneS1C27-208-13g(H), 17a(H)-diasteraneS2C27-208-13g(H), 17a(H)-diasteraneS3C27-208-13g(H), 17a(H)-diasteraneS4C28-208-13g(H), 17a(H)-diasteraneS6C27-208-13a(H), 17g(H)-diasteraneS6C27-208-13a(H), 17g(H)-diasteraneS6C27-208-5a(H), 14g(H)-cholestaneS7C27-208-5a(H), 14g(H)-cholestaneS1C27-208-5a(H), 14g(H), 17g(H)-beistaneS1C28-208-5a(H), 14g(H), 17g(H)-beistaneS12C27-208-5a(H), 14g(H), 17a(H)-beigstaneS16C28-208-5a(H), 14g(H), 17a(H)-beigstaneS16C28-208-5a(H), 14g(H), 17a(H)-beigstaneS16C28-208-5a(H), 14g(H), 17a(H)-beigstaneS16C28-208-5a(H), 14g(H), 17a(H)-beigstaneS16C28-208-5a(H), 14g(H), 17a(H)-beigstaneS16C28-208-5a(H), 14g(H), 17a(H)-beignastaneS16C28-208-5a(H), 14g(H), 17a(H)-beignastaneS16C28-208-5a(H), 14g(H), 17a(H)-beignastaneS18	Metalloids	Metalloids
Group AA metals3A metalsTotal PAHsTotal PAHSV0C PAHsPM PAHSV0C PAHsPM PAHTwo-ring PAHs2-ring PAHThree-ring PAHs3-ring PAHFue-ring PAHs5-ring PAHFive-ring PAHs5-ring PAHFive-ring PAHs5-ring PAHVogenated PAHs5-ring PAHVogenated PAHs0x-PAHC27-208-130(H), 17 α (H)-disteraneS1C27-208-130(H), 17 α (H)-disteraneS2C27-208-52(H), 14 α (H)-disteraneS3C27-208-52(H), 14 α (H)-cholestaneS5C27-208-52(H), 14 α (H)-cholestaneS6C27-208-52(H), 14 α (H)-cholestaneS6C27-208-52(H), 14 α (H)-cholestaneS8C27-208-52(H), 14 α (H)-r0(H)-cholestaneS1C28-208-52(H), 14 α (H)-r0(H)-cholestaneS1C28-208-52(H), 14 α (H), 17 α (H)-cholestaneS1C28-208-52(H), 14 α (H), 17 α (H)-cholestaneS1C29-208-52(H), 14 α (H), 17 α (H)-cholestaneS1C29-208-5	Nonmetal elements	Non-met
$ \begin{array}{c} 0 \text{Log} + \text{A} \text{ Interals} & \text{Total PAH} \\ \text{SVOC PAHs} & \text{Total PAH} \\ \text{SVOC PAHs} & \text{PM PAH} \\ \hline \text{Two-ring PAHs} & \text{PM PAH} \\ \hline \text{Two-ring PAHs} & \text{PM PAH} \\ \hline \text{Two-ring PAHs} & \text{S-ring PAH} \\ \hline \text{Two-ring PAHs} & \text{S-ring PAH} \\ \hline \text{Five-ring PAHs} & \text{S-ring PAH} \\ \hline \text{Five-ring PAHs} & \text{S-ring PAH} \\ \hline \text{Sucr PAHs} & \text{Nitro-PAH} \\ \hline \text{Oxy-PAH} & \text{Oxy-PAH} \\ \hline \text{C27-208-13g(H), 17\alpha(H)-diasterane} & \text{S1} \\ \hline \text{C27-208-13g(H), 17\alpha(H)-diasterane} & \text{S2} \\ \hline \text{C27-208-13g(H), 17\alpha(H)-diasterane} & \text{S2} \\ \hline \text{C27-208-13g(H), 17\alpha(H)-diasterane} & \text{S3} \\ \hline \text{C27-208-5\alpha(H), 14\alpha(H), -cholestane} & \text{S6} \\ \hline \text{C27-208-5\alpha(H), 14\alpha(H), -cholestane} & \text{S6} \\ \hline \text{C27-208-5\alpha(H), 14\alpha(H), -cholestane} & \text{S1} \\ \hline \text{C28-208-5\alpha(H), 14\alpha(H), 17\alpha(H)-ergostane} & \text{S1} \\ \hline \text{C28-208-5\alpha(H), 14\alpha(H), 17\alpha(H)-stigmastane} & \text{S1} \\ \hline \text{C28-208-5\alpha(H), 14\alpha(H), 17\alpha(H)-ergostane} &$	Group 3A metals	3A metals
$ \begin{aligned} & \text{Form} \\ &$	Total PAHs	4A ΠΕΙΔΙS Total ΡΔΗ
PM PAHPM PAHTwo-ring PAHs2-ring PAHThree-ring PAHs3-ring PAHFure-ring PAHs4-ring PAHFure-ring PAHs5-ring PAHFive-ring PAHs5-ring PAHVargenated PAHs0xy-PAHC27-205-13β(H),170(H)-diasterane\$1C27-205-13β(H),170(H)-diasterane\$1C27-205-13β(H),170(H)-diasterane\$3C27-205-13β(H),170(H)-diasterane\$3C27-205-13β(H),170(H)-diasterane\$3C27-205-13β(H),170(H)-diasterane\$3C27-205-13β(H),170(H)-diasterane\$5C27-205-50(H),140(H)-tholestane\$6C27-205-50(H),140(H),170(H)-cholestane\$9C28-207-50(H),140(H),170(H)-cholestane\$11C29-208-50(H),140(H),170(H)-cholestane\$12C27-208-50(H),140(H),170(H)-cholestane\$12C27-208-50(H),140(H),170(H)-cholestane\$13C28-208-50(H),140(H),170(H)-cholestane\$13C28-208-50(H),140(H),170(H)-cholestane\$14C29-208-50(H),140(H),170(H)-stigmastane\$15C27-tetracyclic terpane\$15C28-208-50(H),140(H),170(H)-stigmastane\$16C29-208-50(H),140(H),170(H)-stigmastane\$16C29-208-50(H),140(H),170(H)-stigmastane\$17C28-208-50(H),140(H),170(H)-stigmastane\$18C29-208-50(H),140(H),170(H)-stigmastane\$18C29-208-50(H),140(H),170(H)-stigmastane\$16C29-208-50(H),140(H),170(H)-stigmastane\$17C28-208-50(H),140(H),170(H)-stigmastane\$18C29-208-50(H),140(H),170(H)-stigmastane\$1	SVOC PAHs	SVOC PAH
Two-ring PAHs2-ring PAHThree-ring PAHs3-ring PAHFour-ring PAHs4-ring PAHFive-ring PAHs5-ring PAH> Five-ring PAHs5-ring PAHNitro-PAHNitro-PAHOxy-PAHsNitro-PAHOxy-PAHs0xy-PAHC27-208-13β(H).17a(H)-diasteraneS1C27-208-13β(H).17a(H)-diasteraneS2C27-208-13β(H).17a(H)-diasteraneS3C27-208-13β(H).17a(H)-diasteraneS3C27-208-13β(H).17a(H)-diasteraneS4C28-208-13β(H).17a(H)-diasteraneS5C27-208-5a(H).14β(H)-diasteraneS6C27-208-5a(H).14β(H)-diasteraneS6C27-208-5a(H).14β(H)-toolestaneS7C27-208-5a(H).14β(H)-toolestaneS9C28-208-5a(H).14β(H).17b(H)-etoolestaneS1C28-208-5a(H).14β(H).17b(H)-etoolestaneS1C28-208-5a(H).14β(H).17b(H)-etoolestaneS1C28-208-5a(H).14g(H).17b(H)-etoolestaneS1C28-208-5a(H).14a(H).17a(H)-etoolestaneS1C28-208-5a(H).14a(H).17a(H)-etoolestaneS1C28-208-5a(H).14a(H).17a(H)-etoolestaneS1C28-208-5a(H).14a(H).17a(H)-etoolestaneS1C28-208-5a(H).14a(H).17a(H)-etoolestaneS1C28-208-5a(H).14a(H).17a(H)-etoolestaneS1C28-208-5a(H).14a(H).17a(H)-etoolestaneS1C28-208-5a(H).14a(H).17a(H)-etoolestaneS1C28-208-5a(H).14a(H).17a(H)-etoolestaneS1C28-208-5a(H).14a(H).17a(H)-etoolestaneS1C28-208-5a(H).14a(H).17a(H)-etoolestaneS1C28-208-5a(H).1	PM PAHs	PM PAH
Three-ring PAHs3-ring PAHFour-ring PAHs4-ring PAHsFive-ring PAHs5-ring PAH> Five-ring PAHs5-ring PAH> Nitro-PAHs0xy-PAHOxy-PAHs0xy-PAHC27-205-138[H1,172(H1)-diasteraneS1C27-205-130(H1,178(H1)-diasteraneS2C27-205-130(H1,178(H1)-diasteraneS3C27-205-130(H1,178(H1)-diasteraneS4C28-205-138(H1,174(H1)-diasteraneS5C27-205-50(H1,144(H1)-cholestaneS6C27-205-50(H1,144(H1)-cholestaneS8C27-205-50(H1,144(H1)-trollestaneS8C27-205-50(H1,144(H1),174(H1)-cholestaneS8C27-205-50(H1,144(H1),174(H1)-ergostaneS11C28-205-50(H1,144(H1),174(H1)-ergostaneS11C28-205-50(H1,144(H1),174(H1)-ergostaneS13C28-207-50(H1,144(H1),174(H1)-ergostaneS13C28-208-50(H1,144(H1),174(H1)-ergostaneS13C28-208-50(H1,144(H1),174(H1)-ergostaneS16C29-205-50(H1,144(H1),174(H1)-ergostaneS16C29-208-50(H1,144(H1),174(H1)-ergostaneS16C29-208-50(H1,144(H1),174(H1)-ergostaneS16C29-208-50(H1,144(H1),174(H1)-ergostaneS16C29-208-50(H1,144(H1),174(H1)-ergostaneS16C29-208-50(H1,144(H1),174(H1)-ergostaneS16C29-208-50(H1,144(H1),174(H1)-stigmastaneS19C29-208-50(H1,144(H1),174(H1)-stigmastaneS19C29-208-50(H1,144(H1),174(H1)-stigmastaneS19C29-208-50(H1,144(H1,174(H1)-stigmastaneS19C29-208-50(H1,144(H1,174(H1)-stigmastaneS19 </td <td>Two-ring PAHs</td> <td>2-ring PAH</td>	Two-ring PAHs	2-ring PAH
Four-ring PAHs4-ring PAHFive-ring PAHs5-ring PAH> Five-ring PAHs>5-ring PAHNitro-PAHsNitro-PAHC27-20S-13β(H),17a(H)-diasteraneS1C27-20S-13g(H),17a(H)-diasteraneS2C27-20S-13g(H),17a(H)-diasteraneS3C27-20S-13g(H),17a(H)-diasteraneS3C27-20S-13g(H),17a(H)-diasteraneS4C27-20S-13g(H),17a(H)-diasteraneS4C27-20S-13g(H),17a(H)-diasteraneS6C27-20S-13g(H),17a(H)-diasteraneS6C27-20S-5a(H),14g(H)-toolestaneS7C27-20S-5a(H),14g(H),17a(H)-bolestaneS9C27-20S-5a(H),14g(H),17a(H)-ergostaneS10C28-20S-5a(H),14g(H),17a(H)-ergostaneS12C27-tetracyclic terpaneS13C28-20B-5a(H),14g(H),17a(H)-ergostaneS13C28-20B-5a(H),14g(H),17a(H)-ergostaneS14C27-tetracyclic terpaneS16C29-20B-13a(H),17a(H)-tigmastaneS18C29-20B-5a(H),14g(H),17a(H)-stigmastaneS19C29-20B-5a(H),14g(H),17a(H)-stigmastaneS19C29-20B-5a(H),14g(H),17a(H)-stigmastaneS19C29-20B-5a(H),14g(H),17a(H)-stigmastaneS19C29-20B-5a(H),14g(H),17a(H)-stigmastaneS19C29-20B-5a(H),14g(H),17a(H)-stigmastaneH3C29-20B-5a(H),14g(H),17a(H)-stigmastaneH3C29-20B-5a(H),14g(H),17a(H)-stigmastaneH3C29-20B-5a(H),14g(H),17a(H)-stigmastaneH3C29-20B-5a(H),14g(H),17a(H)-stigmastaneH3C29-20B-5a(H),14g(H),17a(H)-stigmastaneH3C29-17a(H),21g(H)-30-non	Three-ring PAHs	3-ring PAH
Five-ring PAHs 5-ring PAH Nitro-PAHs Nitro-PAH Nitro-PAHs 0xy-PAH C27-205-13g(H),17a(H)-diasterane S1 C27-205-13g(H),17a(H)-diasterane S2 C27-205-13g(H),17a(H)-diasterane S3 C27-205-13g(H),17a(H)-diasterane S4 C27-205-13g(H),17a(H)-diasterane S4 C27-205-13g(H),17a(H)-diasterane S5 C27-205-5a(H),14g(H)-tohelsatane S6 C27-205-5a(H),14g(H),17a(H)-bolestane S8 C27-205-5a(H),14g(H),17a(H)-bolestane S9 C27-207-5a(H),14g(H),17a(H)-propstane S10 C28-205-5a(H),14g(H),17a(H)-ergostane S12 C27-terracyclic terpane S13 C29-207-5a(H),14g(H),17a(H)-ergostane S12 C27-terracyclic terpane S13 C28-205-5a(H),14g(H),17a(H)-ergostane S14 C27-terracyclic terpane S15 C28-terracyclic terpane S16 C29-207-5a(H),14g(H),17a(H)-ergostane S17 C28-terracyclic terpane S16 C29-207-5a(H),14g(H),17a(H)-stigmastane S17 C28-terracyclic terpane S18 C29-207-5a(H),14	Four-ring PAHs	4-ring PAH
$\begin{array}{llllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllll$	Five-ring PAHs	5-ring PAH
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	> FIVE-FING PAHS Nitro_PAHs	> 5-ring PAH Nitro-PAH
C72-205-136(H).17 α (H)-diasterane S1 C27-205-137(H).17 β (H)-diasterane S2 C27-205-137(H).17 β (H)-diasterane S3 C27-205-137(H).17 β (H)-diasterane S4 C27-205-137(H).17 β (H)-diasterane S5 C27-205-137(H).14 β (H)-cholestane S6 C27-205-5 α (H).14 β (H)-cholestane S6 C27-205-5 α (H).14 β (H)-cholestane S8 C27-205-5 α (H).14 β (H)-cholestane S9 C27-205-5 α (H).14 β (H)-cholestane S1 C28-205-5 α (H).14 β (H)-cholestane S1 C28-205-6 α (H).14 β (H)-17 α (H)-ergostane S11 C28-205-6 α (H).14 α (H)-17 α (H)-ergostane S13 C28-205-6 α (H).14 α (H).17 α (H)-ergostane S14 C27-tetracyclic terpane S15 C28-205-5 α (H).14 α (H).17 α (H)-ergostane S16 C29-205-5 α (H).14 α (H).17 α (H)-ergostane S17 C28-205-5 α (H).14 α (H).17 α (H)-ergostane S16 C29-205-5 α (H).14 α (H).17 α (H)-ergostane S16 C29-207-5 α (H).14 β (H).17 β (H)-stigmastane S19 C29-207-5 α (H).14 β (H).17 β (H)-stigmastane S19 C29-207-5 α (H).14 β (H).17 β (H)-stigmastane S19 <td< td=""><td>Oxygenated PAHs</td><td>Oxv-PAH</td></td<>	Oxygenated PAHs	Oxv-PAH
C27-20R-13p(H),17 α (H)-diasterane S2 C27-20R-13a(H),17p(H)-diasterane S3 C27-20R-13a(H),17p(H)-diasterane S4 C27-20R-5a(H),14p(H)-cholestane S6 C27-20R-5a(H),14p(H)-cholestane S7 C27-20S-5a(H),14p(H),17p(H)-cholestane S8 C27-20S-5a(H),14p(H),17p(H)-cholestane S8 C27-20S-5a(H),14p(H),17p(H)-ergostane S1 C28-20S-5a(H),14p(H),17p(H)-ergostane S1 C28-20R-5a(H),14p(H),17p(H)-ergostane S1 C28-20R-5a(H),14p(H),17p(H)-ergostane S1 C28-20R-5a(H),14p(H),17p(H)-ergostane S1 C29-20R-5a(H),14p(H),17p(H)-ergostane S1 C29-20R-5a(H),14p(H),17a(H)-ergostane S1 C29-20R-5a(H),14p(H),17a(H)-ergostane S1 C29-20R-5a(H),14p(H),17p(H)-stigmastane S1 C29-20R-5a(H),14p(H),17p(H)-stigmastane S1 C29-20R-5a(H),14p(H),17p(H)-stigmastane S1 C29-20R-5a(H),14p(H),17p(H)-stigmastane S1 C29-20R-5a(H),14p(H),17p(H)-stigmastane S1 C29-20R-5a(H),14p(H),17p(H)-stigmastane S1 C29-20R-5a(H),14p(H),21p(H)-22,29,30-trisonrhopane	$C27-20S-13B(H),17\alpha(H)$ -diasterane	S1
C27-20S-13 α (H),17 β (H)-diasterane S3 C27-20R-13 α (H),17 α (H)-diasterane S4 C27-20R-5 α (H),14 α (H)-cholestane S5 C27-20R-5 α (H),14 α (H)-cholestane S7 C27-20R-5 α (H),14 β (H)-cholestane S8 C27-20R-5 α (H),14 β (H)-17 α (H)-cholestane S9 C27-20R-5 α (H),14 β (H),17 α (H)-cholestane S9 C28-20S-5 α (H),14 β (H),17 α (H)-ergostane S11 C29-20R-13 α (H),17 β (H)-ergostane S12 C27-terracyclic terpane S13 C28-20R-5 α (H),14 α (H),17 α (H)-ergostane S14 C27-terracyclic terpane S13 C28-20R-5 α (H),14 α (H),17 α (H)-ergostane S13 C28-20R-5 α (H),14 α (H),17 α (H)-ergostane S14 C27-terracyclic terpane S15 C28-tetracyclic terpane S16 C29-20S-5 α (H),14 β (H),17 α (H)-stigmastane S19 C29-20R-5 α (H),14 β (H),17 β (H)-stigmastane S19 C29-20R-5 α (H),14 β (H),17 α (H)-ergostane H1 17 α (H),18 α (H),21 β (H)-22,29,30-trisnorhopane H1 17 α (H),19 β (H)-22,28,30-trisnorhopane H1 17 α (H),19 β (H)-22,28,30-b	C27-20R-13 β (H),17 α (H)-diasterane	S2
$C27-20R-13\alpha(H), 17\beta(H)-diasterane S5 C27-20S-5\alpha(H), 14\alpha(H)-cholestane S6 C27-20S-5\alpha(H), 14\beta(H), 17\beta(H)-cholestane S8 C27-20S-5\alpha(H), 14\alpha(H), 17\alpha(H)-cholestane S9 C27-20S-5\alpha(H), 14\alpha(H), 17\alpha(H)-cholestane S9 C28-20S-5\alpha(H), 14\alpha(H), 17\alpha(H)-cholestane S9 C28-20S-5\alpha(H), 14\alpha(H), 17\alpha(H)-ergostane S10 C28-20S-5\alpha(H), 14\beta(H), 17\beta(H)-cholestane S11 C28-20R-5\alpha(H), 14\alpha(H), 17\alpha(H)-ergostane S12 C27-tetracyclic terpane S13 C28-20R-5\alpha(H), 14\alpha(H), 17\alpha(H)-ergostane S14 C29-20R-5\alpha(H), 14\alpha(H), 17\alpha(H)-ergostane S14 C29-20R-5\alpha(H), 14\alpha(H), 17\alpha(H)-ergostane S15 C28-tetracyclic terpane II S15 C29-20R-5\alpha(H), 14\alpha(H), 17\alpha(H)-stigmastane S18 C29-20R-5\alpha(H), 14\alpha(H), 17\alpha(H)-stigmastane S19 C29-20R-5\alpha(H), 14\alpha(H), 17\alpha(H)-stigmastane S20 B\alpha(H), 21\beta(H)-22, 23, 0-trisnorhopane H1 17\alpha(H), 18\alpha(H), 21\beta(H)-25, 28, 30-trisnorhopane H2 C29-20R-5\alpha(H), 14\alpha(H), 17\alpha(H)-stigmastane H3 17\alpha(H), 21\beta(H)-30-norhopane H4 17\alpha(H), 21\beta(H)-30-norhopane H5 17$	C27-20S-13 α (H),17 β (H)-diasterane	S3
$C28-20S-13\beta(H), 17\alpha(H)-diasterane S5 C27-20S-5\alpha(H), 14\alpha(H)-cholestane S6 C27-20R-5\alpha(H), 14\beta(H), 17\beta(H)-cholestane S8 C27-20R-5\alpha(H), 14\alpha(H), 17\alpha(H)-ergostane S9 C28-20S-5\alpha(H), 14\alpha(H), 17\alpha(H)-ergostane S10 C28-20S-5\alpha(H), 14\alpha(H), 17\alpha(H)-ergostane S11 C29-20R-13\alpha(H), 14\alpha(H), 17\alpha(H)-ergostane S12 C27-20R-5\alpha(H), 14\alpha(H), 17\alpha(H)-ergostane S13 C28-20R-5\alpha(H), 14\alpha(H), 17\alpha(H)-ergostane S13 C28-20R-5\alpha(H), 14\alpha(H), 17\alpha(H)-ergostane S14 C27-tetracyclic terpane II S15 C28-tetracyclic terpane II S16 C29-20S-5\alpha(H), 14\alpha(H), 17\alpha(H)-stigmastane S17 C29-20S-5\alpha(H), 14\alpha(H), 17\alpha(H)-stigmastane S19 C29-20S-5\alpha(H), 14\alpha(H), 17\beta(H)-stigmastane S20 C4H, 14\alpha(H), 17\alpha(H)-stigmastane S20 C29-20S-5\alpha(H), 14\alpha(H), 17\beta(H)-stigmastane H1 C29-20R-5\alpha(H), 14\alpha(H), 17\alpha(H)-stigmastane H2 C29-20R-5\alpha(H), 14\alpha(H), 17\alpha(H)-stigmastane H2 C29-20R-5\alpha(H), 14\alpha(H), 17\alpha(H)-stigmastane H3 T7\alpha(H), 21\beta(H)-22, 29, 30-trisnorhopane H3 T7\alpha(H), 12\beta(H)-23, 30-bisnorhopane H3 $	C27-20R-13 α (H),17 β (H)-diasterane	S4
C27-208-50(H), 140(H)-cholestane S0 $C27-208-50(H), 140(H), 170(H)-cholestane S8 C27-208-50(H), 140(H), 170(H)-cholestane S9 C28-208-50(H), 140(H), 170(H)-cholestane S10 C28-208-50(H), 140(H), 170(H)-ergostane S11 C29-208-50(H), 140(H), 170(H)-ergostane S12 C27-tetracyclic terpane S13 C28-208-50(H), 140(H), 170(H)-ergostane S14 C27-tetracyclic terpane S15 C28-tetracyclic terpane S16 C29-208-50(H), 140(H), 170(H)-stigmastane S17 C28-tetracyclic terpane S18 C29-208-50(H), 140(H), 170(H)-stigmastane S19 C29-208-50(H), 140(H), 170(H)-stigmastane S20 80(H), 210(H)-22, 29, 30-trisnorhopane H1 170(H), 210(H)-22, 29, 30-trisnorhopane H2 C29-208-50(H), 140(H), 170(H)-stigmastane H3 170(H), 180(H), 211(H)-18, 30-trisnorhopane H4 170(H), 180(H), 210(H)-25, 28, 30-trisnorhopane H3 170(H), 180(H), 210(H)-25, 28, 30-trisnorhopane H3 170(H), 210(H)-22, 29, 30-trisnorhopane H4 170(H), 210(H)-22, 29, 30-trisnorhopane H4 $	$C28-20S-13\beta(H),1/\alpha(H)-diasterane$	S5
$C27-20S-5\alpha(H), 14\beta(H), 17\beta(H)-cholestane S8 C27-20S-5\alpha(H), 14\alpha(H), 17\alpha(H)-cholestane S9 C28-20S-5\alpha(H), 14\alpha(H), 17\alpha(H)-ergostane S10 C28-20R-5\alpha(H), 14\beta(H), 17\beta(H)-ergostane S11 C29-20R-13\alpha(H), 17\beta(H)-ergostane S12 C27-tetracyclic terpane S13 C28-20R-5\alpha(H), 14\alpha(H), 17\alpha(H)-ergostane S13 C28-20R-5\alpha(H), 14\alpha(H), 17\alpha(H)-ergostane S14 C27-tetracyclic terpane S15 C28-20R-5\alpha(H), 14\alpha(H), 17\alpha(H)-stigmastane S16 C29-20S-5\alpha(H), 14\alpha(H), 17\alpha(H)-stigmastane S18 C29-20R-5\alpha(H), 14\beta(H), 17\beta(H)-stigmastane S19 C29-20R-5\alpha(H), 14\beta(H), 17\beta(H)-stigmastane S19 C29-20R-5\alpha(H), 14\beta(H), 17\beta(H)-stigmastane S19 C29-20R-5\alpha(H), 14\beta(H), 17\beta(H)-stigmastane S10 C29-20R-5\alpha(H), 14\beta(H), 17\beta(H)-stigmastane H1 7\alpha(H), 21\beta(H)-22, 29, 30-trisnorhopane H2 C29-20R-5\alpha(H), 14\alpha(H), 17\alpha(H)-stigmastane H3 7\alpha(H), 21\beta(H)-22, 29, 30-trisnorhopane H2 C29-20R-5\alpha(H), 14\alpha(H), 17\alpha(H)-stigmastane H3 7\alpha(H), 21\beta(H)-30-norhopane H4 7\alpha(H), 21\beta(H)-30-norhopane H6 8$	C27 20B Eqc(H) 14Q(H) - CHORStatle	50 97
C27-20R-5 α (H),14 α (H),17 α (H)-engostane S9 C28-20S-5 α (H),14 α (H),17 α (H)-ergostane S10 C28-20R-5 α (H),14 α (H),17 α (H)-ergostane S11 C29-20R-13 α (H),17 β (H)-diasterane S12 C27-tetracyclic terpane S13 C28-20R-5 α (H),14 α (H),17 α (H)-ergostane S14 C27-tetracyclic terpane S15 C28-20R-5 α (H),14 α (H),17 α (H)-ergostane S16 C29-20R-5 α (H),14 α (H),17 α (H)-stigmastane S17 C28-tetracyclic terpane II S18 C29-20R-5 α (H),14 α (H),17 α (H)-stigmastane S19 C29-20R-5 α (H),14 β (H),17 β (H)-stigmastane S19 C29-20R-5 α (H),14 β (H),17 β (H)-stigmastane S20 18 α (H),21 β (H)-22,29,30-trisonchopane H1 7 α (H),21 β (H)-22,29,30-trisonchopane H2 C29-20R-5 α (H),14 α (H),17 α (H)-stigmastane H3 17 α (H),21 β (H)-22,29,30-trisonchopane H2 C29-20R-5 α (H),14 α (H),17 α (H)-stigmastane H3 17 α (H),21 β (H)-22,29,30-trisonchopane H4 17 α (H),21 β (H)-22,30,30-bisonchopane H2 C29-20R-5 α (H),14 α (H),17 α (H)-stigmastane H3 17 α (H),21 β (H)-80,a)-norneohopane H	$C27-20S-5\alpha(H)$ 14B(H) 17B(H)-cholestane	57 S8
C28-20S-5 α (H), 14 α (H), 17 α (H)-ergostane S10 C28-20R-5 α (H), 14 β (H), 17 β (H)-ergostane S11 C29-20R-13 α (H), 17 β (H)-ergostane S12 C27-tetracyclic terpane S13 C28-20R-5 α (H), 14 α (H), 17 α (H)-ergostane S14 C27-tetracyclic terpane S15 C28-tetracyclic terpane S16 C29-20S-5 α (H), 14 α (H), 17 α (H)-stigmastane S17 C28-tetracyclic terpane S18 C29-20S-5 α (H), 14 β (H), 17 β (H)-stigmastane S19 C29-20S-5 α (H), 14 β (H), 17 β (H)-stigmastane S20 18 α (H), 21 β (H)-22, 29, 30-trisnorhopane H1 17 α (H), 18 α (H), 21 β (H)-25, 28, 30-trisnorhopane H2 C29-20R-5 α (H), 14 β (H), 17 α (H)-stigmastane H3 17 α (H), 21 β (H)-22, 29, 30-trisnorhopane H2 C29-20R-5 α (H), 14 β (H), 17 α (H)-stigmastane H3 17 α (H), 21 β (H)-22, 29, 30-trisnorhopane H2 C29-20R-5 α (H), 14 β (H), 17 α (H)-stigmastane H3 17 α (H), 21 β (H)-26, 28, 30-trisnorhopane H3 17 α (H), 21 β (H)-26, 28, 30-trisnorhopane H3 17 α (H), 21 β (H)-30-norneohopane H4 17 α (H), 21 β (H)-30-norneohopane	$C27-20R-5\alpha(H), 14\alpha(H), 17\alpha(H)-cholestane$	S9
C28-20R-5 α (H),14 β (H),17 β (H)-ergostane S11 C29-20R-13 α (H),17 α (H)-diasterane S12 C27-tetracyclic terpane S13 C28-20R-5 α (H),14 α (H),17 α (H)-ergostane S15 C28-tetracyclic terpane S16 C29-20S-5 α (H),14 α (H),17 α (H)-stigmastane S17 C28-tetracyclic terpane S18 C29-20S-5 α (H),14 α (H),17 α (H)-stigmastane S18 C29-20S-5 α (H),14 β (H),17 β (H)-stigmastane S19 C29-20S-5 α (H),14 β (H),17 β (H)-stigmastane S20 18 α (H),21 β (H)-22,29,30-trisnorhopane H1 7 α (H),21 β (H)-25,28,30-trisnorhopane H2 C29-20R-5 α (H),14 α (H),17 α (H)-stigmastane H3 17 α (H),21 β (H)-22,29,30-trisnorhopane H1 7 α (H),21 β (H)-22,29,30-trisnorhopane H3 17 α (H),21 β (H)-30-norneohopane H4 17 α (H),21 β (H)-30-norneohopane H5 17 α (H),21 β (H)-30-norneohopane H6 18 α (H),21 β (H)-30-norneohopane H1 17 α (H),21	C28-20S-5a(H),14a(H),17a(H)-ergostane	S10
C29-20R-13 α (H),17 β (H)-diasterane S12 C27-tetracyclic terpane S13 C28-20R-5 α (H),14 α (H),17 α (H)-ergostane S14 C27-tetracyclic terpane II S15 C28-tetracyclic terpane S16 C29-20S-5 α (H),14 α (H),17 α (H)-stigmastane S17 C28-tetracyclic terpane II S18 C29-20S-5 α (H),14 β (H),17 β (H)-stigmastane S19 C29-20S-5 α (H),14 β (H),17 β (H)-stigmastane S20 18 α (H),21 β (H)-22,29,30-trisnorhopane H1 7 α (H),21 β (H)-22,29,30-trisnorhopane H2 C29-20S-5 α (H),14 α (H),17 α (H)-stigmastane H3 17 α (H),21 β (H)-30-norhopane H3 17 α (H),21 β (H)-30-norhopane H4 17 α (H),21 β (H)-30-norhopane H6 18 α (H),21 β (H)-30-norhopane H8 17 α (H),21 β (H)-30-norhopane H9 22S-17 α (H),21 β (H)-30,31-bishomohopane	C28-20R-5 α (H),14 β (H),17 β (H)-ergostane	S11
(22/-tetracyclic terpane S13 (28-20R-5 α (H),14 α (H),17 α (H)-ergostane S14 (27-tetracyclic terpane II S15 (28-tetracyclic terpane S16 (29-20S-5 α (H),14 α (H),17 α (H)-stigmastane S17 (28-tetracyclic terpane II S18 (29-20S-5 α (H),14 β (H),17 β (H)-stigmastane S19 (29-20S-5 α (H),14 β (H),17 β (H)-stigmastane S20 18 α (H),21 β (H)-22,29,30-trisnorhopane H1 (7 α (H),21 β (H)-25,28,30-trisnorhopane H2 (29-20F-5 α (H),14 α (H),17 α (H)-stigmastane H3 (7 α (H),21 β (H)-25,28,30-trisnorhopane H2 (29-20F-5 α (H),14 α (H),17 α (H)-stigmastane H3 (7 α (H),21 β (H)-25,28,30-trisnorhopane H2 (29-20F-5 α (H),14 α (H),17 α (H)-stigmastane H3 (7 α (H),21 β (H)-20,30-toisnorhopane H4 (7 α (H),21 β (H)-30-norhopane H5 (7 α (H),21 β (H)-30-norhopane H6 (8 α (H),21 β (H)-30-norhopane H7 (7 α (H),21 β (H)-30-norhopane H9 (2S-17 α (H),21 β (H)-30,31-bishomohopane H10 (2S-17 α (H),21 β (H)-30,31-bishomohopane H12 (2S-17 α (H),21 β (H)-30,31	C29-20R-13 α (H),17 β (H)-diasterane	S12
C22-20h-30((h), 140(h), 170(h)-leig0statile S14 C27-tetracyclic terpane II S15 C28-tetracyclic terpane I S16 C29-20S-5 α (H), 14 α (H), 17 α (H)-stigmastane S17 C28-tetracyclic terpane II S18 C29-20S-5 α (H), 14 β (H), 17 β (H)-stigmastane S19 C29-20S-5 α (H), 14 β (H), 17 β (H)-stigmastane S20 18 α (H), 21 β (H)-22, 29, 30-trisnorhopane H1 7 α (H), 18 α (H), 21 β (H)-25, 28, 30-trisnorhopane H2 C29-20R-5 α (H), 14 α (H), 17 α (H)-stigmastane H3 17 α (H), 18 α (H), 21 β (H)-25, 28, 30-trisnorhopane H3 17 α (H), 18 α (H), 21 β (H)-25, 28, 30-trisnorhopane H3 17 α (H), 21 β (H)-20, 30-trisnorhopane H3 17 α (H), 21 β (H)-30-norhopane H5 17 α (H), 21 β (H)-30-norhopane H6 18 α (H), 21 β (H)-30-norhopane H8 17 α (H), 21 β (H)-30-norhopane H9 22S-17 α (H), 21 β (H)-30-homohopane H1 22S-17 α (H), 21 β (H)-30, 31-bishomohopane H12 22S-17 α (H), 21 β (H)-30, 31-bishomohopane H13 22R-17 α (H), 21 β (H)-30, 31-bishomohopane H14 22S-17 α (H), 21 β (H)-30, 31, 32-trishomohopane	C2P-tetracyclic terpane	S13
D21 bits bits D22 bits bits D23 bits bits D24 bits bits D24 bits bits D23 bits bits D24 bits bits D25 bits bits bits D24 bits bits bits D25 bits bits bits bits D25 bits bits bits bits D25 bits bits bits bits bits D25 bits bits bits bits bits bits D25 bits b	C28-20N-30(N), 140(N), 170(N)-etgustane C27-tetracyclic ternano II	S14 S15
C29-205-5 α (H),14 α (H),17 α (H)-stigmastaneS17C29-205-5 α (H),14 α (H),17 β (H)-stigmastaneS18C29-205-5 α (H),14 β (H),17 β (H)-stigmastaneS2018 α (H),21 β (H)-22,29,30-trisnorhopaneH117 α (H),18 α (H),21 β (H)-25,28,30-trisnorhopaneH2C29-205-5 α (H),14 α (H),17 α (H)-stigmastaneH317 α (H),18 α (H),21 β (H)-25,28,30-trisnorhopaneH317 α (H),18 α (H),22 β (H)-22,29,30-trisnorhopaneH417 α (H),21 β (H)-22,29,30-trisnorhopaneH417 α (H),21 β (H)-30-norhopaneH517 α (H),21 β (H)-30-norhopaneH618 α (H),21 β (H)-30-norhopaneH817 α (H),21 β (H)-30-norhopaneH9225-17 α (H),21 β (H)-30,31-bishomohopaneH1117 β (H),21 β (H)-30,31-bishomohopaneH12225-17 α (H),21 β (H)-30,31-bishomohopaneH14225-17 α (H),21 β (H)-30,31-bishomohopaneH15228-17 α (H),21 β (H)-30,31,32-trishomohopaneH16	C28-tetracyclic ternane	S16
C28-tetracyclic terpane II S18 C29-20R-5 α (H),14 β (H),17 β (H)-stigmastane S19 C29-20S-5 α (H),14 β (H),17 β (H)-stigmastane S20 18 α (H),21 β (H)-22,29,30-trisnorhopane H1 17 α (H),18 α (H),21 β (H)-25,28,30-trisnorhopane H2 C29-20R-5 α (H),14 μ (H),17 α (H)-stigmastane H3 17 α (H),18 α (H),22 β (H)-25,28,30-trisnorhopane H3 17 α (H),21 β (H)-22,29,30-trisnorhopane H3 17 α (H),21 β (H)-22,29,30-trisnorhopane H3 17 α (H),21 β (H)-30-norhopane H4 17 α (H),21 β (H)-30-norhopane H5 17 α (H),21 β (H)-30-norhopane H6 18 α (H),21 β (H)-30-norhopane H8 17 α (H),21 β (H)-30-norhopane H9 22S-17 α (H),21 β (H)-30,31-bishomohopane H10 22S-17 α (H),21 β (H)-30,31-bishomohopane H12 22S-17 α (H),21 β (H)-30,31-bishomohopane H13 22R-17 α (H),21 β (H)-30,31-bishomohopane H14 22S-17 α (H),21 β (H)-30,31-bishomohopane H14 22S-17 α (H),21 β (H)-30,31,32-trishomohopane H15	C29-20S-5 α (H),14 α (H),17 α (H)-stigmastane	S17
C29-20R-5 α (H),14 β (H),17 β (H)-stigmastane S19 C29-20S-5 α (H),14 β (H),17 β (H)-stigmastane S20 18 α (H),21 β (H)-22,29,30-trisnorhopane H1 17 α (H),18 α (H),21 β (H)-25,28,30-trisnorhopane H2 C29-20R-5 α (H),14 α (H),17 α (H)-stigmastane H3 17 α (H),21 β (H)-22,29,30-trisnorhopane H3 17 α (H),21 β (H)-22,29,30-trisnorhopane H4 17 α (H),21 β (H)-22,29,30-trisnorhopane H5 17 α (H),21 β (H)-30-norhopane H5 17 α (H),21 β (H)-30-norhopane H6 18 α (H),21 β (H)-30-norhopane H6 18 α (H),21 β (H)-30-norhopane H7 17 α (H),21 β (H)-30-norhopane H8 17 α (H),21 β (H)-30-homohopane H9 22S-17 α (H),21 β (H)-30-homohopane H10 22R-17 α (H),21 β (H)-30,31-bishomohopane H12 22S-17 α (H),21 β (H)-30,31-bishomohopane H13 22R-17 α (H),21 β (H)-30,31-bishomohopane H14 22S-17 α (H),21 β (H)-30,31-bishomohopane H14 22S-17 α (H),21 β (H)-30,31,32-trishomohopane H15 22R-17 α (H),21 β (H)-30,31,32-trishomohopane H15	C28-tetracyclic terpane II	S18
C29-20S-5a(H),14B(H),17B(H)-stigmastane S20 18a(H),21B(H)-22,29,30-trisnorhopane H1 17a(H),18a(H),21B(H)-25,28,30-trisnorhopane H2 C29-20F-5a(H),14a(H),17a(H)-stigmastane H3 17a(H),18a(H),21B(H)-22,29,30-trisnorhopane H4 17a(H),21B(H)-22,29,30-trisnorhopane H4 17a(H),21B(H)-22,29,30-trisnorhopane H4 17a(H),21B(H)-22,29,30-trisnorhopane H4 17a(H),21B(H)-30-norhopane H5 17a(H),21B(H)-30-norhopane H6 18a(H),21B(H)-30-norhopane H6 18a(H),21B(H)-30-norhopane H7 17a(H),21B(H)-30-norhopane H8 17a(H),21B(H)-30-norhopane H9 22S-17a(H),21B(H)-30-homohopane H10 22R-17a(H),21B(H)-30,31-bishomohopane H12 22S-17a(H),21B(H)-30,31-bishomohopane H13 22R-17a(H),21B(H)-30,31-bishomohopane H14 22S-17a(H),21B(H)-30,31-bishomohopane H14 22S-17a(H),21B(H)-30,31-bishomohopane H15 22R-17a(H),21B(H)-30,31,32-trishomohopane H15	C29-20R-5 α (H),14 β (H),17 β (H)-stigmastane	S19
$18\alpha(H), 21\beta(H) - 22, 29, 30$ -trisnorhopane H1 $17\alpha(H), 18\alpha(H), 21\beta(H) - 25, 28, 30$ -trisnorhopane H2 $C29 - 20R - 5\alpha(H), 14\alpha(H), 17\alpha(H) - stigmastane H3 17\alpha(H), 21\beta(H) - 22, 29, 30-trisnorhopane H4 17\alpha(H), 21\beta(H) - 22, 29, 30-trisnorhopane H4 17\alpha(H), 21\beta(H) - 28, 30-bisnorhopane H5 17\alpha(H), 21\beta(H) - 30-norhopane H6 18\alpha(H), 21\beta(H) - 30-norhopane H7 17\alpha(H), 21\beta(H) - 30-norhopane H7 17\alpha(H), 21\beta(H) - 30-norhopane H9 22S - 17\alpha(H), 21\beta(H) - 30-homohopane H10 22S - 17\alpha(H), 21\beta(H) - 30, 31-bishomohopane H11 17\beta(H), 21\beta(H) - 30, 31-bishomohopane H12 22S - 17\alpha(H), 21\beta(H) - 30, 31-bishomohopane H13 22R - 17\alpha(H), 21\beta(H) - 30, 31-bishomohopane H14 22S - 17\alpha(H), 21\beta(H) - 30, 31, 32-trishomohopane H15 22R - 17\alpha(H), 21\beta(H) - 30, 31, 32-trishomohopane H15 $	C29-20S-5 α (H),14 β (H),17 β (H)-stigmastane	S20
$17\alpha(H), 13\alpha(H), 12\beta(H)-23, 26, 30-01510100 patieHZC29-20R-5\alpha(H), 14\alpha(H), 17\alpha(H)-stigmastaneH317\alpha(H), 21\beta(H)-22, 29, 30-trisnorhopaneH417\alpha(H), 21\beta(H)-28, 30-bisnorhopaneH517\alpha(H), 21\beta(H)-30-norhopaneH618\alpha(H), 21\beta(H)-30-norhopaneH717\alpha(H), 21\beta(H)-30-norhopaneH717\alpha(H), 21\beta(H)-30-norhopaneH922S-17\alpha(H), 21\beta(H)-30-homohopaneH1022S-17\alpha(H), 21\beta(H)-30-homohopaneH1117\beta(H), 21\alpha(H), 21\beta(H)-30, 31-bishomohopaneH1222S-17\alpha(H), 21\beta(H)-30, 31-bishomohopaneH1322R-17\alpha(H), 21\beta(H)-30, 31-bishomohopaneH1422S-17\alpha(H), 21\beta(H)-30, 31-bishomohopaneH1422S-17\alpha(H), 21\beta(H)-30, 31, 32-trishomohopaneH1522R-17\alpha(H), 21\beta(H)-30, 31, 32-trishomohopaneH16$	$18\alpha(H), 21\beta(H)-22, 29, 30-trisnorhopane$	HI
$17\alpha(H),21\beta(H)-22,29,30-trisnorhopane H4 17\alpha(H),18\alpha(H),21\beta(H)-22,30-trisnorhopane H5 17\alpha(H),18\alpha(H),21\beta(H)-28,30-bisnorhopane H6 18\alpha(H),21\beta(H)-30-norhopane H6 18\alpha(H),21\beta(H)-30-nornoehopane H7 17\alpha(H),21\beta(H)-30-nornoehopane H7 17\alpha(H),21\beta(H)-30-nornoehopane H8 17\beta(H),21\alpha(H)-hopane H9 22S-17\alpha(H),21\beta(H)-30-homohopane H10 22R-17\alpha(H),21\beta(H)-30-homohopane H11 17\beta(H),21\beta(H)-30-homohopane H12 22S-17\alpha(H),21\beta(H)-30,31-bishomohopane H13 22R-17\alpha(H),21\beta(H)-30,31-bishomohopane H14 22S-17\alpha(H),21\beta(H)-30,31-bishomohopane H14 22S-17\alpha(H),21\beta(H)-30,31,32-trishomohopane H15 22R-17\alpha(H),21\beta(H)-30,31,32-trishomohopane H16 $	1/0(H),180(H),21p(H)-25,28,30-trisnornopane	HZ H3
17α(H), 18α(H), 21β(H)-28,30-bisophopaneH117α(H), 18α(H), 21β(H)-28,30-bisophopaneH517α(H), 18α(H), 21β(H)-30-norneohopaneH717α(H), 21β(H)-30-norneohopaneH817β(H), 21α(H)-hopaneH922S-17α(H), 21β(H)-30-homohopaneH1022R-17α(H), 21β(H)-30-homohopaneH1117β(H), 21β(H)-30-homohopaneH1122R-17α(H), 21β(H)-30-homohopaneH1222S-17α(H), 21β(H)-30-homohopaneH1222S-17α(H), 21β(H)-30, 31-bishomohopaneH1322R-17α(H), 21β(H)-30, 31-bishomohopaneH1422S-17α(H), 21β(H)-30, 31, 32-trishomohopaneH1522R-17α(H), 21β(H)-30, 31, 32-trishomohopaneH15	$17\alpha(H)$ 21B(H)-22 29 30-trisportopane	H4
17α(H),21β(H)-30-norhopaneH618α(H),21β(H)-30-norneohopaneH717α(H),21β(H)-hopaneH817β(H),21α(H)-hopaneH922S-17α(H),21β(H)-30-homohopaneH1022R-17α(H),21β(H)-30-homohopaneH1117β(H),21β(H)-30-homohopaneH1222R-17α(H),21β(H)-30,31-bishomohopaneH1322R-17α(H),21β(H)-30,31-bishomohopaneH1422S-17α(H),21β(H)-30,31-bishomohopaneH1422R-17α(H),21β(H)-30,31-bishomohopaneH1422R-17α(H),21β(H)-30,31,32-trishomohopaneH1522R-17α(H),21β(H)-30,31,32-trishomohopaneH16	$17\alpha(H), 18\alpha(H), 21\beta(H)-28, 30$ -bisnorhopane	H5
$18\alpha(H), 21\beta(H)-30$ -norneohopane H7 $17\alpha(H), 21\beta(H)$ -hopane H8 $17\beta(H), 21\alpha(H)$ -hopane H9 $22S-17\alpha(H), 21\beta(H)-30$ -homohopane H10 $22R-17\alpha(H), 21\beta(H)-30$ -homohopane H11 $17\beta(H), 21\beta(H)-30$ -homohopane H12 $22S-17\alpha(H), 21\beta(H)-30$ -homohopane H12 $22S-17\alpha(H), 21\beta(H)-30, 31$ -bishomohopane H13 $22R-17\alpha(H), 21\beta(H)-30, 31$ -bishomohopane H14 $22S-17\alpha(H), 21\beta(H)-30, 31, 32$ -trishomohopane H15 $22R-17\alpha(H), 21\beta(H)-30, 31, 32$ -trishomohopane H16	$17\alpha(H), 21\beta(H)-30$ -norhopane	H6
$17\alpha(H), 21\beta(H)$ -hopane H8 $17\beta(H), 21\alpha(H)$ -hopane H9 $22S-17\alpha(H), 21\beta(H)$ -30-homohopane H10 $22R-17\alpha(H), 21\beta(H)$ -30-homohopane H11 $17\beta(H), 21\beta(H)$ -hopane H12 $22S-17\alpha(H), 21\beta(H)$ -30-homohopane H12 $22S-17\alpha(H), 21\beta(H)$ -30,31-bishomohopane H13 $22R-17\alpha(H), 21\beta(H)$ -30,31-bishomohopane H14 $22S-17\alpha(H), 21\beta(H)$ -30,31,32-trishomohopane H15 $22R-17\alpha(H), 21\beta(H)$ -30,31,32-trishomohopane H16	$18\alpha(H), 21\beta(H)-30$ -norneohopane	H7
$1/\beta(H), 21\alpha(H), hopane H9 22S-17\alpha(H), 21\beta(H)-30-homohopane H10 22R-17\alpha(H), 21\beta(H)-30-homohopane H11 17\beta(H), 21\beta(H)-hopane H12 22S-17\alpha(H), 21\beta(H)-30, 31-bishomohopane H13 22R-17\alpha(H), 21\beta(H)-30, 31-bishomohopane H14 22S-17\alpha(H), 21\beta(H)-30, 31-bishomohopane H14 22S-17\alpha(H), 21\beta(H)-30, 31, 32-trishomohopane H15 22R-17\alpha(H), 21\beta(H)-30, 31, 32-trishomohopane H16 $	$17\alpha(H), 21\beta(H)$ -hopane	H8
$225 - 17 \alpha(\Pi), 21 \beta(\Pi) - 30 - homohopane H10 22R - 17 \alpha(H), 21\beta(H) - 30 - homohopane H11 17\beta(H), 21\beta(H) - 30 - homohopane H12 22S - 17 \alpha(H), 21\beta(H) - 30, 31 - bishomohopane H13 22R - 17 \alpha(H), 21\beta(H) - 30, 31 - bishomohopane H14 22S - 17 \alpha(H), 21\beta(H) - 30, 31, 32 - trishomohopane H15 22R - 17 \alpha(H), 21\beta(H) - 30, 31, 32 - trishomohopane H16 $	1/β(H),Z1α(H)-hopane	H9
Image: Product Production Opene Image: Product Production Opene Image: Product Produ	223-17α(H) 21β(H)-30-homohopane	HIU H11
11211222S-17 α (H),21β(H)-30,31-bishomohopaneH1322R-17 α (H),21β(H)-30,31-bishomohopaneH1422S-17 α (H),21β(H)-30,31,32-trishomohopaneH1522R-17 α (H),21β(H)-30,31,32-trishomohopaneH16	17B(H) 21B(H)-honane	H12
22R-17α(H),21β(H)-30,31-bishomohopane H14 22S-17α(H),21β(H)-30,31,32-trishomohopane H15 22R-17α(H),21β(H)-30,31,32-trishomohopane H15	$22S-17\alpha(H),21\beta(H)-30,31$ -bishomohopane	H13
22S-17α(H),21β(H)-30,31,32-trishomohopane H15 22R-17α(H),21β(H)-30,31,32-trishomohopane H16	22R-17α(H),21β(H)-30,31-bishomohopane	H14
22R-17α(H),21β(H)-30,31,32-trishomohopane H16	22S-17α(H),21β(H)-30,31,32-trishomohopane	H15
	22K-17α(H),21β(H)-30,31,32-trishomohopane	H16

on subsets and groups of predictor variables, as explained in "Results."

Before analyses, the data were mean centered and scaled to unit variance as described previously (Jackson 1991; Wold et al. 1984). Data distributions were evaluated and determined to require no further normalization (e.g., log transformations) before analysis. The results of the PLS analysis were evaluated in terms of both goodness of fit (R^2 , analogous to Pearson correlation coefficient) and goodness of prediction (Q^2 , determined by cross-validation procedures described in Appendix 2). Each response end point was modeled individually (15 total), and the model results were evaluated by cross-validation procedures. To ascertain that the overall PLS models contained systematic (nonrandom) associations, we validated the models by performing PLS after randomizing (reordering) the values in the Y-matrix as described previously (Eide et al. 2001). This validation procedure is referred to as validation by response permutation (van der Voet 1994). A more detailed description of the validation approach and an example for the validation of one model are included in Appendix 2.

Results

Composition of emission samples. The mass composition of the emission samples is summarized in Figure 1. These results have been reported elsewhere (Zielinska et al. 2004) but only in units of mass/mile traveled. The normalemitter and black-smoker gasoline samples were composed primarily of vapor-phase SVOC mass, whereas the others were composed primarily of PM. The PM composition ranged from approximately 20 to 95% organic carbon, with no obvious distinction in the proportion of organic carbon between diesel- and gasoline-powered vehicles. This plot does not portray the differences in specific organic classes; the data



Figure 1. Composition of engine exhaust samples normalized to weight fraction. Individual components were divided by the concentration of total particle and SVOC mass. The sum of particle and SVOC mass equals 100%.

for individual chemical species are reported in Appendix 1.

The proportions of elements and PAH compounds among these samples were variable, and there was no clear difference in the classifications of vehicles (e.g., high emitter vs. normal emitter or gasoline vs. diesel) that emit higher proportions (as a weight fraction) of any of these classes. In contrast, the higher-emitting vehicles clearly showed higher proportions of the hopane and sterane compounds (components of lubricating oils).

Principal component analysis. The loading plot shown in Figure 2 was obtained from PCA on the toxicity data and shows the clustering of the 15 different toxicity measurements according to their similarity in responses to the exhaust samples. The 11 lung toxicity responses clustered together in one group, whereas the four bacterial mutagenicity responses occurred at different spots. This indicated that the lung toxicity responses were associated with similar chemical components and that these components were different from those associated with

the mutagenicity responses. As a consequence, regression modeling with PLS was done with the 11 lung toxicity end points simultaneously (it is advantageous to use multiple responses because they will support one another in the model), and the four mutagenicity end points were modeled separately.

PLS analysis of lung toxicity data. The goal in developing the PLS model was to explain the most variation in the data using the smallest number of PLS components. Initially, PLS was performed with all 184 compositional variables versus the 11 lung toxicity responses. Although it was possible to obtain a PLS model with high \hat{R}^2 and relatively high Q^2 with all 184 predictor variables, validation by response permutation showed that the overall PLS model could be due to chance because of the large number of compositional variables relative to the relatively small number of samples. To alleviate this, we performed the PLS analysis after grouping most of the individual compositional variables by chemical class (e.g., hopanes) or subclass (e.g., two-ring PAHs).



Figure 2. Loading plot showing the groupings among the 15 toxicity measurements. Measurements grouped together responded similarly to the exhaust samples, and their proximity reflects the degree of similarity of responses. Separation of mutagenicity and lung toxicity groups suggested that they responded to different chemical components.



Figure 3. Goodness of fit (R^2) and prediction (Q^2) from the PLS model (68 variables and 11 responses).

The number of variables was reduced from 184 to 34, and PLS was carried out with these 34 variables versus the 11 lung toxicity responses. The resulting PLS model performance was acceptable ($R^2 = 0.95$; $Q^2 = 0.35$) with only two PLS components and was hence used only to obtain first-pass indication of which groups of compounds associated (covaried) most strongly with the lung toxicity responses. According to loadings and PLS regression coefficients (not shown), the variables that associated most strongly with the 11 toxicity responses were particulate organic carbon, select thermal fractions of the carbon analysis, and the hopane and sterane classes of compounds.

The 34-variable PLS model was followed by a PLS model in which some compositional variables were ungrouped into their individual compounds (the hopanes and steranes). This gave a final 68-variable X-matrix (Table 2) that performed well (Figure 3 shows performance for each lung toxicity measurement; overall model performance: $R^2 = 0.93$; $Q^2 = 0.72$), accounting for approximately 70% of the variation in the data by just two PLS components (53 and 15% by the first and second PLS components, respectively). Each of the 11 toxicity response PLS models showed satisfactory-to-excellent performance in the validation by permutation tests (results of validations not shown, except the example given in Appendix 2). The model performance indicators for each lung response category (Figure 3) indicated that the model had better predictive capability for direct measures of inflammation (e.g., cell count, histopathology) than for indirect indicators (e.g., MIP-2). An example of the high quality of the model prediction is shown in Figure 4, which illustrates the observed versus predicted response for histologic evidence of lung inflammation.

Once the predictive model was determined, the strength of association (PLS loadings) between the chemical components and the individual lung toxicity responses was evaluated in a loading plot (Figure 5). This plot, analogous to the plot shown in Figure 2 for the 15 toxicity variables, shows the clustering of toxicity and chemical component variables, illustrating the chemical components that were most closely associated (covaried) with lung toxicity. The plot combines the covariance from the two PLS components that were



Figure 4. Observed versus predicted histologic inflammation, showing good predictive performance of the PLS model. *R*²= 0.97.

required for the 68-variable model. The chemical variables have been abbreviated or grouped in the plot, and the full names associated with the abbreviations are given in Table 2 (the abbreviations give an indication of the chemical class). The components that had the strongest association with lung toxicity were most of the hopanes, steranes, and particle-phase organic carbon. The hopanes and steranes are compounds that are found in crude oil and are thus emitted as part of the crankcase oil emissions. These compounds are derived from the diagenesis of plant materials (e.g., conversion of phytosterols to steranes). Their characteristic structures have been described elsewhere (e.g., Rogge et al. 1993). The analysis of fuel and crankcase oil collected from the vehicles studied here (reported in Zielinska et al. 2004) showed that the hopanes and steranes were in high concentrations in oil (as expected) and only trace amounts of the steranes were observed in fuel. High-oil-burning vehicles will also show large amounts of particle-phase organic carbon. The most volatile thermal fractions from the carbon analysis along with one elemental carbon temperature fraction and nitrate also covaried with the lung toxicity responses. Other components, namely, the metals and PAHs, had little or no correlation with the lung responses.

PLS analysis of mutagenicity data. PLS of the mutagenicity data using either the complete set (184) or the first reduced set (34) of chemical variables in the X data matrix was performed without satisfactory results. The 34-variable data set grouped together the chemical components that were known, based on previous studies, to be mutagenic. However, grouping by compound classes did not reveal associations between composition and mutagenicity and did not yield satisfactory performance in the PLS model. A separate strategy for configuring the X data matrix was adapted that ungrouped the individual nitro- and oxy-PAHs known to be direct

mutagens and used them in a reduced data set of 23 variables (Table 3). The best model performance ($R^2 = 0.98$; $Q^2 = 0.73$) was obtained with these variables applied to the TA98 and TA100 strains without S9 metabolic activation. Figure 6 shows the observed versus predicted mutagenicity with this PLS model for strain TA100. The models for TA98 and TA100 could explain approximately 60% of the variation with three PLS components. In contrast, PLS models did not perform well for TA98 and TA100 strains with metabolic activation (not shown). This was not surprising because most of the mutagens that have been implicated in engine exhaust are direct acting (e.g., do not require metabolic activation). In addition, the presence of S9 may suppress mutagenicity by inactivating or adsorbing certain mutagens (Shah et al. 1990).

Figure 7 shows the loading plot with combined mutagenicity and chemical variables. Similar to what was expected based on the known mutagenicity of these compounds, the particle-bound higher-molecular-weight nitro-PAH compounds had the highest association with mutagenicity, whereas most of the oxy-PAHs and volatile nitro-PAHs had poor or no association. The similarity between the PLS model associations identified in this study and chemical components that were previously known to drive mutagenicity helped validate the PCA/PLS approach for evaluating composition-response relationships for lung toxicity, for which composition-response relationships were not known in advance.

Discussion

The present study represents a step toward a better understanding of the physical-chemical components of engine emissions presenting the greatest lung health hazards. There is growing recognition of the need to develop a more integrated understanding of the air quality-health relationship (Mauderly 2003;



Component 1

Figure 5. Loading plot showing the lung toxicity and 68 chemical components for the first and second PLS components. Proximity to the lung toxicity responses reflects the strength of association (degree of covariance) of individual chemical components to the response. See Table 2 for abbreviations. ^aCarbon analysis fractions.

National Research Council 2001), but disentangling the relative roles of air contaminants in complex environmental pollution and source emissions has progressed slowly. Except for the biodirected fractionation approach that identified certain nitro-PAHs as driving bacterial mutagenic responses, there has been little progress in determining the specific species causing the effects of physically and chemically complex combustion emission mixtures. Most epidemiology and toxicology has focused on specific pollutants (e.g., unspeciated PM or nitrogen dioxide) or treated complex emission exposure atmospheres as a single material. Studies comparing the effects of filtered and unfiltered emissions (Maejima et al. 2001) or the effects of the elemental carbon and extractable organic fractions of diesel soot (Nel et al. 2001) are examples of simplified biodirected fractionation but fall far short of testing the roles of the full range of emission species. Epidemiologists commonly employ multivariate analyses involving multiple environmental pollutants, but have data for only a few pollutant species and usually focus on determining the influence of copollutants on estimates of the effects of the single pollutant (or class, e.g., PM) of chief interest (Samet et al. 2000). In a study conceptually more similar to the present study, Wellenius et al.

 Table 3. Chemical/physical variables (X-matrix) used for final PLS model of mutagenicity.

Oxygenated PAH organic compounds 9-Fluorenone Xanthone Acenaphthenequinone Perinaphthenone Anthraquinone 9-Anthraldehyde Benz[a]anthracene-7,12-dione Nitro-PAH organic compounds 1-Nitronaphthalene 2-Nitronaphthalene 2-Methyl-1-nitronaphthalene β-Methyl-1-nitronaphthalene β-Methyl-1-nitronaphthalene β-Methyl-1-nitronaphthalene β-Methyl-1-nitronaphthalene β-Nitrobiphenyl 4-Nitrobiphenyl
Benz[a]anthracene-7,12-dione
Nitro-PAH organic compounds
1-Nitronaphthalene
2-Nitronaphthalene
2-Methyl-1-nitronaphthalene
lpha-Methyl-1-nitronaphthalene
β-Methyl-1-nitronaphthalene
2-Nitrobiphenyl
4-Nitrobiphenyl
5-Nitroacenaphthene
9-Nitroanthracene
2-Nitrofluoranthene
3-Nitrofluoranthene
1-Nitropyrene
7-Nitrobenzlajanthracene
6-Nitrochrysene
6-Nitrobenzolajpyrene



Figure 6. Observed versus predicted mutagenicity of TA100 (without S9), showing good predictive performance of the PLS model. R^2 = 0.98.

(2003) applied multivariate regression modeling to data from multiple exposures of dogs to concentrated ambient air PM to identify an association between silicon and cardiac effects, but studied only the PM fraction of pollution and did not have data on speciated organic compounds. There are no previous reports of the use of multivariate analyses to disentangle the roles of both the vapor and PM organic phases of engine emissions.

This study, although certainly an oversimplification of environmental exposures to inhaled emissions, demonstrates that PCA/PLS has potential for exploring complex exposure composition-health response associations, given a suitable data set. The utility of this approach in identifying putative causal agents in diesel exhaust samples had been demonstrated but with only a single health response (mutagenicity) and a larger number of samples (Eide et al. 2002). A challenge in applying PLS in the present study was the inclusion of many health responses (15) and composition variables (184) but only seven samples—a very practical situation in view of the limited sample (or exposure) number and diversity typical of environmental studies. The approach worked well largely because of success in grouping covarying composition and response variables and reducing their relationships into a number of principal components smaller than the number of samples. Grouping compositional components by class, however, has the disadvantage of making the often-false assumption that all species within the class are equally toxic per unit of mass or that the proportions among the grouped compounds are similar. This assumption was certainly not true for mutagenicity, in which case total nitro-PAH mass was poorly predictive, but foreknowledge of the mutagenicity of particular species allowed development of a more focused and highly predictive model. In the absence of little previous information on the contributions of individual components, as was the case for lung toxicity,

iterative approaches to grouping the composition into classes and disaggregating classes into individual compounds can be used to explore and optimize models. The small number of samples also raised the possibility that apparently meaningful composition-response relationships could reflect random (nonsystematic) statistical associations. The cross-validation and confirmatory steps were critical to developing confidence that the associations portrayed by the models having the best fit and predictive performance were in fact systematic (nonrandom). Overall, the results suggested that PCA/PLS can be useful for identifying composition-response associations for complex exposures even when the number of exposure cases is small. An alternative to grouping and variable selection is hierarchical PLS [described by Wold et al. (1996)], which was used (not shown) to confirm the conclusions of the PCA/PLS results presented in this article.

The use of collected and processed samples, wherein acetone was used to extract species from the collected exhaust material, was a limitation of this study. First, the exhaust collections account for only a portion of the exhaust. Although attempts were made to quantitatively remove 100% of the PM from the filters, only approximately 65-70% of the PM from diesel exhaust samples with high amounts of inorganic carbon could be removed. Although the vapor-phase SVOCs were collected, the samples did not include the most volatile vapor and gas components of the exhaust. In addition, it is known that chemical artifacts can be induced during sample collection and processing (Arey et al. 1988), and it is possible that there were potentially important compositional differences between the collected samples used for this study and the original emissions. However, confidence in the present results derives from the fact that the hopanes and steranes having the strongest associations with toxicity are not formed by artifact, are chemically stable (not prone to decomposition), and are known



Figure 7. Loading plot showing the mutagenicity and chemical components for the first and second PLS components. Proximity to the mutagenicity responses reflects the strength of association (degree of covariance) of individual chemical components to the responses.

components of lubricating oil. Thus, although the roles of components that might have been lost during sample processing could not be tested, the components most strongly associated with the lung responses were extremely unlikely to be artifacts.

Instillation of extracted material into the lung has limitations in evaluation of the health hazard of materials that are inhaled in the environment. The instillation of collected nonvolatile material could not accurately mimic the particle size-dependent deposition pattern of inhaled PM. The comparative utility of dosing by inhalation and instillation has been reviewed (Driscoll et al. 2000), and although inhalation remains the "gold standard" for hazard assessment, instillation has proven useful for comparing effects among samples and screening for potential cause-effect relationships. Exposure of cultured cells is another alternative to inhalation for comparative toxicity screening, but work preceding the present analysis demonstrated that lung responses to instilled samples and responses of cultured epithelial cells and lung macrophages to the same samples gave quite different sample rankings (Seagrave et al. 2003). Compared with cell culture, lung instillation was considered the more relevant approach for identifying potential public health hazards. In view of the difficulty, cost, and time requirements of conducting inhalation exposures to a wide range of vehicle emissions, the study provided a test of the utility of a practical, albeit limited, approach to identifying chemical composition-toxicity associations warranting closer examination.

However good the models developed from the present sample set might be, caution must be exercised in extrapolating these results broadly to all gasoline and diesel engine emissions. The concordance of the present results for mutagenicity with preexisting information on the importance of nitrogenated PAHs in different combustion emissions (e.g., Lewtas et al. 1992) suggests that the mutagenicity model might be broadly applicable to normal- and highemitting gasoline and diesel engines and lends confidence that the lung toxicity results are also likely to be valid beyond this sample set. However, it is clear that lung toxicity was driven largely by the coincident differences in composition and toxicity between the samples from high-emitting and normal-emitting vehicles. The finding that lubricating oil tracers were highly associated with lung toxicity in this sample set does not necessarily mean that oil emissions would be the major determinant of lung toxicity in all engine emissions, and especially among emissions from engines having low oil consumption. The addition of more samples to the analysis, and especially samples differing even more

markedly in composition, would bolster confidence in the results and their applicability across a broader spectrum of engine emissions. Regardless, the present results strongly indicate that attention should be given to oilderived as well as fuel-derived emissions and suggest that as total emissions from fuel combustion continue to fall, oil-derived emissions could contribute relatively more to any residual health hazards.

There is little information on the effects of motor oil in the lung. Subchronic inhalation exposure of rats to high concentrations of aerosolized petroleum oils, including a formulation representing unused motor oil, produced only modest toxicity (Dalbey 2001). It is likely that the toxicity of motor oil increases with use. Zielinska et al. (2004) analyzed the composition of fuel and crankcase oil from the vehicles used in the present study. They reported that diesel fuel was enriched in light and semivolatile PAHs compared with gasoline fuel. In contrast, used oil from the gasoline-powered vehicles in this study was enriched in PAHs, including heavy, particlephase PAHs, compared with used diesel oil. Lubricating oil in the gasoline vehicles apparently serves as a "sink" for the partitioning of combustion- or fuel-derived components; thus, it is important to consider the time in use of oil in studies of the contribution of oil components to the toxicity of engine emissions. Only one study has investigated the toxicity of used motor oil; Costa and Amdur (1979) reported a 28% increase in pulmonary resistance in guinea pigs exposed to used motor oil, but the variability in the pulmonary measurements rendered the difference from control animals insignificant. Clearly, more work needs to be done to investigate the toxicity of used motor oil as it is emitted in motor vehicle emissions.

A final caveat is that the statistical composition-response associations resulting from this work do not prove causality. There is considerable information indicating that nitro-PAHs cause mutations in bacteria, but there is little information on the effects of hopanes and steranes in the lung. It is possible that these putative agents could have covaried in mass concentration with unknown proximal causal species, rather than actually causing the responses. Although the composition of the samples was determined in detail, the measured mass by organic speciation accounted for only a small percentage (average ~10%) of the total SVOC + PM mass. Additional samples having different toxicity and chemical composition would strengthen the confidence in the observed associations. The causality of specific chemical classes or components of exhaust can be examined in complementary studies, including exposure to inhaled emissions containing different contributions from

crankcase oil, "doping" samples with the putative causal agents, and/or progressive fractionation and testing of samples (i.e., bioassay directed fractionation).

The bioassay-directed fractionation approach may be useful for confirming and further evaluating the components that correlate with pulmonary toxicity. However, an important consideration in applying bioassaydirected fractionation for pulmonary toxicity is the much larger effort and cost of the *in vivo* assays relative to the simpler, less expensive bacterial mutagenicity assays that have been used. As mentioned above, in vitro testing with lung cells ranked the samples quite differently from the in vivo results (Seagrave et al. 2003). Because in vivo toxicity should be more relevant to human health hazard than in vitro results, it appears unlikely that biodirected fractionation for nonmutagenic lung toxicity can be done using in vitro assays.

Conclusions

Despite its several limitations, this study provides important insights into the physicalchemical components of engine emissions that most strongly influence the toxicity of inhaled emissions. We extend the previous conclusion (Seagrave et al. 2002) that highemitting vehicles contribute disproportionately to the health hazards of engine emissions, to conclude now that crankcase oil-derived, particle-associated organic compounds may contribute strongly to the inflammatory effects of inhaled emissions from high-emitting vehicles. Importantly, the chemicals most closely associated with pulmonary toxicity were different from the chemicals (e.g., nitro-PAHs and oxy-PAHs such as quinones) that were associated with bacterial mutagenicity. This is especially important considering the small amount of information available on chemicals that are associated with pulmonary toxicity. Further work is warranted to confirm the causality of specific classes and compounds, to confirm that oil-derived components are important to the toxicity of inhaled (as well as instilled) emissions, and to determine the relative importance of oil- versus fuel-derived components to the health hazards of emissions from a broader range of normal- and high-emitting vehicles. Moreover, we conclude that the PCA/PLS analytical strategy shows promise for disentangling composition-response associations, even when the exposures are extremely complex, the number of exposures is limited, and multiple responses are measured. In such situations, the success of the approach hinges on the extent to which composition and response variables can be lumped into covarying groups such that predictive models require a number of principal components substantially less than the number of exposures.

Appendix 1.	. Entire compositi	onal data set presente	ed as weight fraction.
		•	0

Ille in the former of the second		J					
	BG	WG	HD	G	G ₃₀	D	D ₃₀
Total PM and SV/OC							
Particlo mass	0 200077	0 600100	0 620750	0 162120	0 205502	0 717567	0 602145
	0.2000/7	0.003400	0.020733	0.102120	0.233303	0.717307	0.033143
	0.711123	0.310320	0.371241	0.03/0/2	0.704417	0.202433	0.300600
	0.000001	0.000001	0.000017	0.001000	0.001100	0 000007	0.00000
Chioride	0.000891	0.0000001	0.000017	0.001062	0.001106	0.000637	0.000000
Nitrate	0.000294	0.001022	0.000345	0.000273	0.000422	0.000254	0.000585
Sulfate	0.002643	0.002143	0.003073	0.004721	0.013193	0.174678	0.049407
Ammonium	0.001337	0.001251	0.001060	0.004087	0.009031	0.003130	0.001317
Sodium	0.000099	0.000227	0.000516	0.000001	0.000000	0.000185	0.000117
Carbon							
Particle organic carbon mass	0.195937	0.657895	0.488888	0.084029	0.100675	0.141816	0.461659
Elemental carbon	0.044261	0.020826	0.130267	0.040269	0.148137	0.348723	0.123590
Total carbon	0.207543	0.569073	0.537674	0.110293	0.232034	0.466659	0.508301
Carbon splits							
01TC	0.087617	0 197504	0 267370	0 031775	0 045685	0.056771	0 099821
02TC	0.066411	0 297777	0 140208	0.014997	0.018800	0.025543	0.031097
O3TC	0.000411	0.237777	0.140200	0.013365	0.010000	0.020040	0.001007
		0.002741	0.000000	0.010000	0.014003	0.020010	0.030404
	0.009070	0.009900	0.009971	0.010214	0.013101	0.020170	0.031034
	0.020049	0.119907	0.03/3/0	0.013078	0.008207	0.004008	0.200722
EIIC	0.059643	0.110620	0.035683	0.043630	0.053664	0.196258	0.217269
E2IC	0.001662	0.009845	0.125607	0.007894	0.101237	0.155739	0.123341
E3TC	0.000164	0.000285	0.000121	0.000233	0.000108	0.000068	0.000244
Transition metals							
Titanium	0.00008	0.000000	0.000000	0.000016	0.000004	0.000027	0.000033
Vanadium	0.000000	0.000004	0.000002	0.000003	0.000018	0.000012	0.000000
Chromium	0.000088	0.000009	0.000020	0.000051	0.000107	0.000585	0.000473
Manganese	0.000161	0.000008	0.000003	0.000064	0.000086	0.000078	0.000108
Iron mass	0.022771	0.000475	0.000280	0.012046	0.012934	0.011622	0.026206
Cobalt	0.000002	0.0000170	0.000006	0.000000	0.000000	0.000005	0.020200
Nickol	0.000002	0.000000	0.000000	0.000000	0.000000	0.0000000	0.000022
Coppor	0.000034	0.000002	0.0000000	0.000023	0.000030	0.000202	0.000311
Zine	0.000332	0.000043	0.000002	0.000113	0.000110	0.000070	0.000113
	0.002077	0.000030	0.000389	0.001004	0.001200	0.000879	0.001239
Yttrium	0.000006	0.000007	0.000000	0.000002	0.000003	0.000006	0.000011
Zirconium	0.000030	0.000018	0.000000	0.000024	0.000054	0.000010	0.000021
Molybdenum	0.000017	0.000000	0.000000	0.000002	0.000004	0.000000	0.000000
Palladium	0.000022	0.000000	0.000003	0.000001	0.000001	0.000000	0.000007
Silver	0.000021	0.000000	0.000035	0.000009	0.000000	0.000065	0.000000
Cadmium	0.000012	0.000000	0.000000	0.000001	0.000010	0.000001	0.000000
Lanthanum	0.000000	0.000000	0.000000	0.000020	0.000000	0.000022	0.000000
Gold	0.000020	0.000004	0.000025	0.000016	0.000018	0.000020	0.000039
Mercurv	0.000002	0.000009	0.000021	0.000002	0.000001	0.000002	0.000000
Other metals							
Magnesium	0.000831	0 000449	0 000110	0 000296	0 000133	0 000146	0 000140
Δluminum mass	0.0000001	0.0000110	0.0000110	0.000200	0.000100	0.000110	0.000110
Potassium	0.000204	0.000000	0.000000	0.000232	0.000200	0.000022	0.001040
Calcium	0.000000	0.000000	0.000000	0.000140	0.000007	0.0000007	0.000027
Callium	0.001374	0.000304	0.000000	0.001025	0.001303	0.001700	0.002423
	0.000003	0.000000	0.000010	0.000000	0.000001	0.000001	0.000000
Rubialum	0.000004	0.000008	0.000005	0.000002	0.000003	0.000005	0.000004
Strontium	0.000000	0.000003	0.000008	0.000004	0.000002	0.000005	0.000008
Indium	0.000028	0.000101	0.000107	0.000012	0.000005	0.000027	0.000023
Barium	0.000064	0.000234	0.000000	0.000101	0.000033	0.000249	0.000000
Thallium	0.000000	0.000025	0.000012	0.000005	0.000003	0.000017	0.000013
Lead	0.004843	0.000034	0.000046	0.000264	0.000397	0.000041	0.000036
Uranium	0.000001	0.000007	0.000021	0.000004	0.000000	0.000005	0.000000
Metalloids							
Silicon mass	0.005000	0.000951	0.000918	0.007752	0.002787	0.003295	0.004616
Arsenic	0.00000	0.000000	0.000000	0.000001	0.000002	0.000004	0.000000
Tin	0.000050	0.000064	0.000033	0.000032	0.000023	0.000024	0.000047
Antimony	0.000006	0.0000001	0.0000000	0.000002	0.000020	0.000021	0.000036
Nonmetal elements	0.000000	0.000001	0.000172	0.000000	0.000004	0.000000	0.000000
Sulfur	0.002054	0.001025	0.001500	0.001710	0.002100	0.020206	0.010411
Chloring	0.002304	0.001823	0.001008	0.001710	0.002100	0.028200	0.010411
Chionne	U.UUU/2b	0.000008	0.000016	0.000236	0.000601	0.000000	0.000000
Phosphorous	0.001334	0.000274	0.000152	0.000978	0.000591	0.000139	0.000545
Selenium	0.000001	0.000002	0.000006	0.000003	0.000002	0.000010	0.000008
Bromine	0.000028	0.000004	0.000003	0.000004	0.000001	0.000010	0.000000
						Conti	nued nevt nade
						CONTIN	ноги, полі раув

Appendix 1. Continued

The second							
	BG	WG	HD	G	G ₃₀	D	D ₃₀
Bicyclic or two-ring PAH Organic Compounds							
Naphthalene	0.003309	0.003459	0.000626	0.045334	0.003114	0.003792	0.011416
2-Menaphthalene	0.001595	0.002445	0.000997	0.017146	0.002901	0.002079	0.003719
1-Menaphthalene	0.001034	0.002018	0.001099	0.016027	0.002357	0.002054	0.003757
2 6 + 2 7-Dimenanthalene	0.003518	0.002303	0 000676	0 008528	0.006724	0.001017	0.001218
$1.6 \pm 1.3 \pm 1.7$ -Dimethylpanhthalone	0.000010	0.002000	0.001158	0.01288/	0.009602	0.001726	0.001210
2.2 + 1.4 + 1.5 Dimensional the long	0.004000	0.003033	0.001130	0.012004	0.003002	0.001720	0.002030
	0.000000	0.001010	0.000371	0.004193	0.003209	0.000302	0.000709
I,Z-Dimetnyinaphtnaiene	0.000401	0.000984	0.000195	0.001914	0.001984	0.000248	0.000252
1-Ethyl-2-methylnaphthalene	0.002846	0.002836	0.000218	0.004541	0.004886	0.000375	0.000480
Biphenyl	0.001059	0.000927	0.000379	0.005099	0.002949	0.000635	0.000976
2-Methylbiphenyl	0.000169	0.000157	0.000102	0.000821	0.000306	0.000167	0.000178
3-Methylbiphenyl	0.000233	0.001011	0.000539	0.005404	0.001538	0.000921	0.001338
4-Methylbiphenyl	0.000104	0.000519	0.000207	0.002470	0.000749	0.000355	0.000613
Bibenzyl	0.000792	0.004328	0.000068	0.006136	0.004549	0.000701	0.001061
α-Trimethylnanhthalene	0 000427	0.001258	0 000304	0 004647	0 002628	0 000666	0.001060
1-Ethyl-2-methylnaphthalene	0.000127	0.001200	0.0000001	0.001017	0.033530	0.000881	0.001511
R Trimethylpenhthelene	0.014773	0.000000	0.000020	0.000010	0.000000	0.000001	0.001057
	0.000200	0.000900	0.000401	0.004000	0.002411	0.000099	0.001037
γ-irimetnyinaphtnaiene	0.000177	0.000925	0.000336	0.004009	0.001965	0.000016	0.000953
2-Ethyl-1-methylnaphthalene	0.000020	0.000114	0.000009	0.000169	0.000150	0.000014	0.000024
ε-Trimethylnaphthalene	0.000111	0.000475	0.000296	0.002788	0.001094	0.000414	0.000658
f-Trimethylnaphthalene	0.000119	0.000455	0.000258	0.002878	0.001180	0.000425	0.000666
2,3,5-Trimethylnaphthalene	0.000172	0.001039	0.000509	0.005509	0.002367	0.000790	0.001268
2,4,5-Trimethylnaphthalene	0.000057	0.000399	0.000054	0.001224	0.000795	0.000092	0.000252
i-Trimethylnaphthalene	0.000048	0.000306	0.000125	0.001293	0.000505	0.000202	0.000303
1 4 5-Trimethylnanhthalene	0 000644	0 000408	0.000065	0.002682	0.002074	0.000288	0.000222
1 2 8-Trimethylnaphthalene	0.000044	0.000400	0.000000	0.002002	0.002074	0.000200	0.000222
Tricyclic or three ring PAH organic compounds	0.000233	0.000213	0.000011	0.001430	0.001124	0.000127	0.000132
Assessment the land	0.002601	0.004102	0.000115	0.000041	0.025500	0.000406	0.002122
Acenaphunyiene	0.002091	0.004103	0.000115	0.008941	0.020090	0.000480	0.002132
Acenaphthene	0.000280	0.000414	0.000046	0.001136	0.001579	0.000107	0.000242
Fluorene	0.0008/9	0.003382	0.000238	0.012595	0.008075	0.000760	0.003204
Phenanthrene	0.001121	0.001538	0.000546	0.008017	0.008055	0.000650	0.001958
α-Methylfluorene	0.000187	0.000616	0.000218	0.002117	0.000878	0.000291	0.000519
1-Methylfluorene	0.000126	0.000471	0.000166	0.002054	0.000583	0.000312	0.000509
β-Methylfluorene	0.000062	0.000177	0.000037	0.000477	0.000206	0.000082	0.000117
α-Methylphenanthrene	0.000159	0.000513	0.000238	0.002131	0.000709	0.000260	0.000519
2-Methylphenanthrene	0.000188	0.000629	0.000238	0.002574	0.000856	0.000351	0.000633
2 Methylphenanthrene	0.000176	0.000601	0.000200	0.002071	0.000862	0.000196	0.0000000
1 Mothylphononthrono	0.000170	0.000001	0.000133	0.001523	0.000521	0.000130	0.000473
	0.000147	0.000431	0.000110	0.001330	0.000321	0.000242	0.000303
	0.000031	0.000135	0.000034	0.000037	0.000145	0.000085	0.000100
α-Dimethylphenanthrene	0.000052	0.000234	0.000071	0.000979	0.000184	0.000123	0.000246
B-Dimethylphenanthrene	0.000029	0.000138	0.000035	0.000632	0.000108	0.000087	0.000162
γ -Dimethylphenanthrene	0.000116	0.000606	0.000125	0.001837	0.000448	0.000227	0.000460
1,7-Dimethylphenanthrene	0.000073	0.000392	0.000057	0.000940	0.000268	0.000103	0.000231
d-Dimethylphenanthrene	0.000024	0.000131	0.000026	0.000567	0.000103	0.000070	0.000145
ε-Dimethylphenanthrene	0.000053	0.000353	0.000037	0.000803	0.000248	0.000091	0.000188
Anthracene	0.000228	0.000438	0.000041	0.001107	0.001244	0.000046	0.000258
9-Methylanthracene	0.000028	0.000098	0.000001	0.000129	0.000052	0.000021	0.000029
Retene	0.000010	0.000005	0.000003	0 000032	0.000010	0.000006	0 000008
Tetracyclic or four-ring PAH organic compounds	0.000010	0.000000	0.000000	0.000002	0.000010	0.000000	0.000000
2.2 Renzefluerene	0 000156	0 001202	0 000002	0 000057	0.0012/11	0.000012	0.000102
Elucranthono	0.000130	0.001203	0.000003	0.000337	0.001241	0.000013	0.000132
Private	0.000404	0.000770	0.000020	0.002044	0.003014	0.000097	0.000000
Pyrene	0.000344	0.000409	0.000058	0.002116	0.001901	0.000045	0.000548
1-Methylfluorene + a-methylfluorene	0.000002	0.000012	0.000001	0.000008	0.000007	0.000001	0.000000
b-Methylpyrene + b-methylfluorene	0.000122	0.000851	0.000009	0.000769	0.000654	0.000031	0.000164
c-Methylpyrene + c-methylfluorene	0.000084	0.000620	0.000002	0.000462	0.000573	0.000009	0.000094
4-Methylpyrene	0.000027	0.000109	0.000010	0.000227	0.000084	0.000006	0.000058
1-Methylpyrene	0.000023	0.000127	0.000006	0.000196	0.000078	0.000003	0.000050
Benzo[c]phenanthrene	0.000032	0.000101	0.000001	0.000207	0.000216	0.000006	0.000052
Benz[a]anthracene	0.000065	0 000173	0.000002	0.000275	0 000293	0 000004	0.000067
7-Methylhenz[a]anthracene	0.0000000	0.0000002	0.000000	0.0000270	0.0000200	0.000000	0.000000
Chrysono	0.000001	0.000002	0.000006	0.000002	0.000516	0.000000	0.000000
5 6 Mothylebrycono	0.000033	0.000200	0.000000	0.000045	0.000010	0.000022	0.000227
Five ring DALL organic compounds	0.000000	0.000000	0.000001	0.000039	0.000031	0.000027	0.000013
Five-mig PAH organic compounds	0.000074	0.0004.07	0.000000	0.000440	0.000000	0.000000	0.0004.00
Benzo[<i>b</i> + <i>j</i> + <i>k</i>]FL	0.0000/1	0.000137	0.000003	0.000449	0.000326	0.000008	0.000122
7-IViethylbenzolajpyrene	0.000001	0.000003	0.000000	0.000007	0.000006	0.000003	0.000002
Benzo[e]pyrene	0.000031	0.000090	0.000002	0.000225	0.000147	0.000003	0.000060
Perylene	0.000010	0.000023	0.000000	0.000010	0.000062	0.000001	0.000002
Benzo[a]pyrene	0.000038	0.000099	0.000001	0.000089	0.000225	0.000028	0.000022

Appendix 1. Continued

Here a service							
	BG	WG	HD	G	G ₃₀	D	D ₃₀
Six-ring PAH organic compounds							
Indeno[123-cd]pyrene	0.000035	0.000071	0.000001	0.000204	0.000204	0.000002	0.000056
Benzo[ghi]perylene	0.000104	0.000107	0.000002	0.000276	0.000279	0.000003	0.000074
Dibenz[<i>ah</i> + <i>ac</i>]anthracene	0.000004	0.000015	0.000000	0.000032	0.000024	0.000000	0.000009
Seven-ring PAH organic compounds	0.000056	0 00007	0.000001	0 000070	0.000102	0.000002	0 000020
Coronene	0.000056	0.000007	0.000001	0.000078	0.000103	0.00002	0.000020
9-Fluorenone	0 007703	0 001677	0 000001	0 012351	0 020705	0 000564	0 000399
Xanthone	0.000000	0.000060	0.000071	0.000008	0.000099	0.000048	0.000002
Acenaphthenequinone	0.000000	0.000018	0.000002	0.000000	0.000000	0.000016	0.000000
Perinaphthenone	0.000000	0.000000	0.000020	0.000000	0.000000	0.000000	0.000000
Anthraquinone	0.000103	0.000466	0.000001	0.000712	0.000507	0.000034	0.000140
9-Anthraldehyde	0.000033	0.000000	0.000035	0.000309	0.000056	0.000112	0.000085
Benz[a]anthracene-7,12-dione	0.000003	0.000050	0.000000	0.000035	0.000055	0.000004	0.000009
Sulfur-containing PAH	0.000005	0.000004	0.000001	0.000001	0.000010	0,00000	0.000024
Nitro PAH organic compounds	0.000005	0.000064	0.000001	0.000091	0.000012	0.000005	0.000024
1-Nitronanhthalene	0 000012	0 00007	0 000012	0 000029	0 000008	0.000012	0 000013
2-Nitronaphthalene	0.0000012	0.000007	0.000012	0.000025	0.000000	0.0000012	0.000015
2-Methyl-1-nitronaphthalene	0.000001	0.000001	0.000000	0.000000	0.000001	0.000008	0.000001
α-Methyl-1-nitronaphthalene	0.000001	0.000001	0.000000	0.000001	0.000001	0.000001	0.000000
β-Methyl-1-nitronaphthalene	0.000003	0.00008	0.000003	0.000003	0.000003	0.000005	0.000003
2-Nitrobiphenyl	0.000000	0.000000	0.000000	0.000000	0.000000	0.000000	0.000000
4-Nitrobiphenyl	0.000005	0.000002	0.000012	0.000003	0.000002	0.000003	0.000007
5-Nitroacenaphthene	0.000000	0.000000	0.000000	0.000000	0.000000	0.000000	0.000000
9-Nitroanthracene	0.000000	0.000000	0.000000	0.000001	0.000002	0.000002	0.000002
2-Nitrofluoranthene	0.000000	0.00000	0.000000	0.000000	0.000000	0.000000	0.000000
3-INITOTIOTIONALITERE	0.000000	0.000000	0.000000	0.000000	0.000000	0.000000	0.000000
7-Nitrobenzl <i>a</i> lanthracene	0.000001	0.000001	0.000002	0.000001	0.000000	0.000013	0.000010
6-Nitrochrysene	0.000002	0.000000	0.000001	0.000006	0.000001	0.000002	0.000003
6-Nitrobenzo[a]pyrene	0.000000	0.000000	0.000001	0.000000	0.000000	0.000001	0.000005
Hopane/sterane organic compounds							
C27-20S-13 β (H),17 α (H)-diasterane	0.000010	0.000011	0.000010	0.000002	0.000002	0.000007	0.000004
C27-20R-13 β (H),17 α (H)-diasterane	0.000007	0.000006	0.000005	0.000002	0.000001	0.00006	0.000002
C27-20S-13 α (H),17 β (H)-diasterane	0.000003	0.000003	0.000003	0.000001	0.000000	0.000002	0.000001
$C27-2UR-13\alpha(H), 17\beta(H)-diasterane$	0.000004	0.000006	0.000004	0.000001	0.000001	0.000003	0.000001
C_2 205-13p(H), 17 α (H)-01asterane	0.000005	0.00004	0.000001	0.000001	0.000001	0.000002	0.000001
$C27-203-5\alpha(H)$, 14 $\alpha(H)$ -cholestane	0.000013	0.000007	0.000001	0.000001	0.000002	0.000000	0.000003
$C27-20S-5\alpha(H), 14\beta(H), 17\beta(H)-cholestane$	0.000007	0.000009	0.000012	0.000001	0.000002	0.000005	0.000003
C27-20R-5 α (H),14 α (H),17 α (H)-cholestane	0.000019	0.000022	0.000020	0.000003	0.000004	0.000007	0.000008
C28-20S-5a(H),14a(H),17a(H)-ergostane	0.000003	0.000005	0.000003	0.000001	0.000001	0.000003	0.000002
C28-20R-5 α (H),14 β (H),17 β (H)-ergostane	0.000007	0.000008	0.000010	0.000001	0.000001	0.000007	0.000003
C29-20R-13 α (H),17 β (H)-diasterane	0.000008	0.000016	0.000023	0.000002	0.000003	0.000006	0.000005
C27-Tetracyclic terpane	0.000010	0.000016	0.000037	0.000005	0.000004	0.000014	0.000007
C27 Tetrapuelia terpana	0.000004	0.000002	0.000008	0.000001	0.000001	0.000004	0.000002
C29 Tetracyclic terpane	0.000003	0.000002	0.000000	0.000001	0.000001	0.000004	0.000003
$C29-20S-5\alpha(H)$ 14 $\alpha(H)$ 17 $\alpha(H)$ -stigmastane	0.000003	0.000007	0.000144	0.000004	0.000004	0.000003	0.000003
C28-Tetracyclic terpane	0.000003	0.000012	0.000001	0.000001	0.000001	0.000005	0.000003
C29-20R-5 α (H),14 β (H),17 β (H)-stigmastane	0.000010	0.000015	0.000021	0.000001	0.000003	0.000008	0.000006
C29-20S-5 α (H),14 β (H),17 β (H)-stigmastane	0.000006	0.000010	0.000013	0.000001	0.000002	0.000006	0.000003
$18\alpha(H),21\beta(H)-22,29,30$ -trisnorhopane	0.000002	0.000002	0.000009	0.000000	0.000000	0.000001	0.000001
17α(H),18α(H),21β(H)-25,28,30-trisnorhopane	0.000001	0.000002	0.000006	0.000000	0.000000	0.000001	0.000001
C29-20R-5 α (H),14 α (H),17 α (H)-stigmastane	0.000008	0.000015	0.000016	0.000001	0.000003	0.000007	0.000004
$1/\alpha(H), 21\beta(H), 22, 29, 30$ -trisnorhopane	0.000042	0.000083	0.000106	0.000012	0.000016	0.000056	0.000030
$1/\alpha(H), 18\alpha(H), 21\beta(H)-28, 30-bisnornopane$	0.0000010	0.0000022	0.000000	0.0000072	0.000000	0.0000412	0.0000106
$17\alpha(\Pi),21\beta(\Pi)-30-10110pane$	0.0000319	0.0000090	0.0000000	0.0000073	0.0000093	0.0000412	0.0000190
$17\alpha(H)$ 21B(H)-honane	0.0000040	0.00000000	0.0000027	0.0000000	0.0000000	0.0000030	0.0000031
$17\beta(H), 21\alpha(H)$ -hopane	0.0000020	0.0000023	0.0000081	0.0000002	0.0000007	0.0000023	0.0000014
22S-17α(H),21β(H)-30-homohopane	0.0000146	0.0000345	0.0000514	0.0000027	0.0000046	0.0000187	0.0000088
22R-17 α (H),21 β (H)-30-homohopane	0.0000090	0.0000258	0.0000351	0.0000018	0.0000035	0.0000129	0.0000067
17β(H),21β(H)-hopane	0.0000031	0.0000123	0.0000040	0.0000004	0.0000010	0.0000043	0.0000019
22S-17 α (H),21 β (H)-30,31-bishomohopane	0.0000072	0.0000199	0.0000544	0.0000011	0.0000025	0.0000094	0.0000045
$22\text{K-1}/\alpha(\text{H}), 21\beta(\text{H})-30, 31-\text{bishomohopane}$	0.0000045	0.0000136	0.0000342	0.0000009	0.0000014	0.0000070	0.0000035
$223 - 17\alpha(H), 21p(H) - 30, 31, 32 - trishomohopane$	0.0000044	0.0000155	0.0000156	0.0000000	0.0000015	0.0000026	0.0000023
2211-170(1),210(1)-30,31,32-UISHOHOHOPANE	0.0000032	0.0000098	0.0000093	0.0000004	0.0000010	0.0000030	01000010

Appendix 2. Evaluation and Validation of PLS Model

Methods for evaluation of statistical modeling results. The PLS model results were evaluated based on indices of goodness of fit (R^2) and prediction capacity (Q^2). The R^2 goodness of fit coefficient is analogous to the multiple regression correlation coefficient (squared Pearson product-moment correlation between observed and predicted Y-values). Although this index provides insight into the strength of the observed association between model-predicted and observed health outcomes, it is not necessarily a reliable measure of the predictive capacity of models. Q^2 is calculated for this purpose. Based on the cross-validation technique described by Wold (1978), Q^2 assesses the model's ability to predict health outcomes for each individual sample when that sample is not used in the PLS model. The Q^2 goodness of prediction parameter is similar to R^2 in that it is based on the sums of squares of prediction errors. However, unlike the prediction errors used in calculating R^2 , the prediction errors for Q^2 are independent of the prediction itself, rendering Q^2 a more reliable index of prediction performance.

Both R^2 and Q^2 values were calculated for model predictions on the original data matrix as well as for 20 random orderings of the Y (health outcomes) data matrix, while keeping the X-matrix (emissions sample composition) fixed. As the randomly reordered Y-matrix (Y_r) changes, the correlation between the original Y-values and reordered Y-values, (i.e., $corr[Y_1, Y_r]$), decreases to smaller and smaller values. If there is an underlying systematic (nonrandom) relationship between the Y- and X-matrices, a PLS model constructed on the randomly reordered Y-values (i.e., Y_p) would be expected to exhibit predictive power that decreases (decreased Q^2) as corr $[Y_1, Y_r]$ decreases. If this does not occur, and the predictive capability of a model based on random pairings of the health outcome data with their emission sample predictors is as good as the predictive capability of the model based on the observed pairing of health outcome and emissions sample data, there is good evidence that the model is based on chance as opposed to systematic (nonrandom) associations between the health outcome and emission composition. Thus, the test of model plausibility is based upon the examination of relationship between corr $[Y_1, Y_r]$ and the Q^2 associated with reordered Y-values (i.e., $Q^2[Y_r]$). If the model is capturing a systematic (nonrandom) relationship, the scatter plot of $corr(Y_1, Y_p)$ versus $Q^2[Y_r]$ should exhibit a linear relationship, and the estimated intercept should be near zero. The R^2 value may be in the acceptable range even when the variation in the Y-matrix yields an unacceptable Q^2 , indicating that data exhibit correlations by chance but there are no clear differences in the associations between specific predictor variables and the dependent variables. This illustrates the importance of using the Q^2 criterion with permutation testing of these models, which is not always conducted and reported in the literature.

The overriding difficulty in performing the present analysis was the large number of predictor (composition) variables and relatively smaller number of emission samples on which to examine health outcomes. Without some strategy to group (and reduce) the number of composition variables, the identification of systematic (nonrandom) relationships between the composition variables and health outcomes might prove impossible. The strategy for grouping predictor variables focused

REFERENCES

- Arey J, Zielinska B, Atkinson R, Winer AM. 1988. Formation of nitroarenes during ambient high-volume sampling. Environ Sci Technol 22:457–462.
- Chow JC, Watson JG, Crow D, Lowenthal DH, Merrifield T. 2001. Comparison of IMPROVE and NIOSH carbon measurements. Aerosol Sci Technol 34:23–34.
- Costa DL, Amdur MO. 1979. Respiratory response of guinea pigs to oil mists. Am Ind Hyg Assoc J 40:673–679.

on composites (sums) of chemical classes or subclasses. This strategy allowed greater interpretive ability because the importance of specific classes of components could be identified. Compounds were also grouped because the lower number of predictor variables improved the model performance (R^2 , Q^2). The problem with grouping compounds in a particular chemical class is that the assumption is made that the individual compounds within that group contribute equally to toxicity. If there are differences among the toxicity of individual components, combining them might mask the effects of the most important components. In addition, grouping compounds masks the differences in the concentrations of individual compounds among the group.

Validation of statistical model, example. Each iteration of the PLS model was systematically validated as described herein. This began with evaluation of the performance parameters (R^2 and Q^2 , with 1.0 being perfect correlation or goodness of fit or prediction, respectively) of the base model, and was followed by validation by response permutation to ensure that the overall model was robust and not due to chance (random associations). As described, the final model plausibility was based on the relationship between $\operatorname{corr}[Y_1, Y_r]$ and the Q^2 associated with reordered response (in this study, response is toxicity) data. Here we give one example (Figure A2-1) of the result from the validation by response permutation for the PLS prediction of lavage protein. Twenty random variations (permutations) of the ordering of the compositional data were modeled by PLS, and the scatter plot of corr(\hat{Y}_1, Y_r) versus $Q^2[Y_r]$ (Figure A2-1) had an intercept near zero, indicating that the base model associations were nonrandom. An important point that is illustrated by this scatter plot is that each of the reordered Y-matrix models showed acceptable R^2 , even when there was poor Q^2 . This is important because models that rely on R^2 alone may show correlations between variables that are actually random associations, and this would not be detected without validation using the Q^2 criteria.

Each of the individual models and iterations of the groupings of the compositional variables was evaluated by this permutation of the Y-matrix. Only models where the slope of $\operatorname{corr}(Y_1, Y_r)$ versus $Q^2[Y_r]$ was near zero were accepted and used to show associations between compositional components and lung or mutagenicity responses.



Figure A2-1. Scatter plot of $\operatorname{corr}(Y,Y_r)$ versus $Q^2[Y_r]$. The near zero *y*-intercept of the line plotted through the Q^2 values confirms that the base model (right) is not due to random statistical associations, by showing that changes in the structure of the data decrease the performance of the model. High R^2 for nearly all of the model permutations illustrates the need for the Q^2 diagnostic because correlation (R^2) occurs under several conditions without good model performance.

Dalbey WE. 2001. Subchronic inhalation exposures to aerosols of three petroleum lubricants. Am Ind Hyg Assoc J 62:49–56. Driscoll KE. Costa DL. Hatch G. Henderson R. Oberdorster G.

- Salem H, et al. 2000. Intratracheal instillation as an exposure technique for the evaluation of respiratory tract toxicity: uses and limitations. Toxicol Sci 55:24–35.
 Eide I, Neverdal G, Thorvaldsen B, Grung B, Kvalheim OM. 2002
- Erde I, Neverdal G, I horvaldsen B, Grung B, Kvalheim UM. 2002. Toxicological evaluation of complex mixtures by pattern recognition: correlating chemical fingerprints to mutagenicity. Environ Health Perspect 110(suppl 6):985–988.
- Eide I, Neverdal G, Thorvaldsen B, Shen H, Grung B, Kvalheim O. 2001. Resolution of GC-MS data of complex PAC mixtures and regression modeling of mutagenicity by PLS. Environ Sci Technol 35:2314–2318.
- Jackson JE. 1991. A User's Guide to Principal Components. New York:John Wiley.
- Kettaneh-Wold N. 1992. Analysis of mixture data with partial least squares. Chemom Intell Lab Syst 14:57–69.
- Kvalheim OM. 1989. Model building in chemistry, a unified approach. Anal Chim Acta 223:53–73.

- Lewtas J, Lewis C, Zweidinger R, Stevens R, Cupitt L. 1992. Sources of genotoxicity and cancer risk in ambient air. Pharmacogenetics 2:288–296.
- Maejima K, Tamura K, Nakajima T, Taniguchi Y, Saito S, Takenada H. 2001. Effects of the inhalation of diesel exhaust, Kanto loam dust, or diesel exhaust without particles on immune responses in mice exposed to Japanese cedar (Cryptomeria japonica) pollen. Inhal Toxicol 13:1047–1063.
- Mauderly JL. 2003. Health effects of air pollution: the struggle for context [Editorial]. Environ Progr 22:2–4.
- Maykut N, Kim E, Lewas J, Larson TV. 2003. Source apportionment of PM_{2.5} at an urban IMPROVE site in Seattle, Washington. Environ Sci Technol 37:5135–5142.
- McDonald JD, Zielinska B, Sagebiel JC, McDaniel MR, Mousset-Jones P. 2003. Source apportionment of airborne fine particulate matter in an underground mine. J Air Waste Manage Assoc 53:386–395.
- National Research Council. 2001. National Research Council Particulate Matter Committee Report III: Research Priorities for Airborne Particulate Matter. Washington, DC:National Academies Press.
- Nel AE, Diaz-Sanchez D, Li N. 2001. The role of particulate pollutants in pulmonary inflammation and asthma: evidence for the involvement of organic chemicals and oxidative stress. Curr Opin Pulm Med 7:20–26.
- Nicolai T, Carr D, Weiland SK, Duhme H, von Ehrenstein O, Wagner O, et al. 2003. Urban traffic and pollutant exposure related to respiratory outcomes and atopy in a large sample of children. Eur Respir J 21:956–963.
- Pearson RL, Wachtel J, Ebi KL. 2000. Distance-weighted traffic density in proximity to a home is a risk factor for leukemia and other childhood cancers. J Air Waste Manage Assoc 50:175–180.

- Rogge WF, Hildemann LM, Mazurek MA, Cass GR. 1993. Sources of fine organic aerosol. II. Noncatalyst and catalystequipped automobiles and heavy-duty diesel trucks. Environ Sci Technol 27:636–651.
- Samet JM, Zeger SL, Dominici F, Curriero F, Coursac I, Dockery DW, et al. 2000. The National Morbidity, Mortality, and Air Pollution Study. Part II: Morbidity and mortality from air pollution in the United States. Res Rep Health Eff Inst 94(pt 2):5–70.
- Seagrave J, Mauderly JL, Seilkop SK. 2003. In vitro relative toxicity screening of combined particulate and semivolatile organic fractions of gasoline and diesel engine emissions. J Toxicol Environ Health A66:1113–1132.
- Seagrave J, McDonald JD, Gigliotti AP, Nikula KJ, Seilkop SK, Gurevich M, et al. 2002. Mutagenicity and *in vivo* toxicity of combined particulate and semivolatile organic fractions of gasoline and diesel engine emissions. Toxicol Sci 70:212–226.
- Seagrave JC, Berger J, Zielinska B, Sagebiel J, McDonald JD, Mauderly JL. 2001. Comparative acute toxicities of particulate matter and semi-volatile organic compound fractions of traffic tunnel air. Toxicologist 60:192.
- Shah AB, Combes RD, Rowland IR. 1990. Activation and detoxification of 1,8-dintropyrene by mammalian hepatic fractions in the Salmonella mutagenicity assay. Mutagenesis 5:45–49.
- Sjogren M, Li H, Banner C, Rafter J, Westerholm R, Rannug U. 1996. Influence of physical and chemical characteristics of diesel fuels and exhaust emissions on biological effects of particle extracts: a multivariate statistical analysis of ten diesel fuels. Chem Res Toxicol 9:197–207.
- Van der Voet H. 1994. Comparing the predictive accuracy of models using a simple randomization test. Chemom Intell Lab Syst 25:313–323.

- van Vliet P, Knape M, de Hartog J, Janssen N, Harssema H, Brunekreef B. 1997. Motor vehicle exhaust and chronic respiratory symptoms in children living near freeways. Environ Res 74:122–132.
- Venn AJ, Lewis SA, Cooper M, Hubbard R, Britton J. 2001. Living near a main road and the risk of wheezing illness in children. Am J Respir Crit Care Med 164:2177–2180.
- Watson JG, Zhu T, Chow JC, Engelbrecht J, Fujita EM, Wilson WE. 2002. Receptor modeling application framework for particle source apportionment. Chemosphere 49:1093–1136.
- Wellenius GA, Coull BA, Godleski JJ, Koutrakis P, Okabe K, Savage ST, et al. 2003. Inhalation of concentrated ambient air particles exacerbates myocardial ischemia in conscious dogs. Environ Health Perspect 111:402–408.
- Whitney KA. 2000. Collection of In-Use Mobile Source Emission Samples for Toxicity Testing. SwRI document 08.02602. Final report to the National Renewable Energy Laboratory. Golden, CO:National Renewable Energy Laboratory.
- Wold S. 1978. Cross-validatory estimation of the number of components in factor and principal components models. Technometrics 20:397–405.
- Wold S, Kettaneh N, Thessem K. 1996. Hierarchical multiblock PLS and PC models for easier model interpretation and as an alternative to variable selection. J Chemom 10:463–482.
- Wold S, Ruhe A, Wold H, Dunn WJ. 1984. The collinearity problem in linear regression. The partial least squares (PLS) approach to generalized inverses. SIAM J Sci Stat Comput 5:735–743.
- Zielinska B, Sagebiel J, McDonald J, Whitney K, Lawson DR. 2004. Emission rates and comparative composition of in-use diesel and gasoline fueled vehicle emissions. J Air Waste Manage Assoc 54:1138–1150.