

Supplementary Materials

Assessment of Ingested Micro- and Nanoplastic (MNP)-Mediated Genotoxicity in an In Vitro Model of the Small Intestinal Epithelium (SIE)

Zhenning Yang ^{1,2}, Glen M DeLoid ^{1,3}, Joshua Baw ², Helmut Zarbl ^{3,4} and Philip Demokritou ^{1,3,4,*}

¹ Nanoscience and Advanced Materials Center, Environmental and Occupational Health Sciences Institute, Rutgers University, Piscataway, NJ, 08854

² Ernest Mario School of Pharmacy, Rutgers University, Piscataway, NJ, 08854

³ Environmental and Occupational Health Sciences Institute, Rutgers University, Piscataway, NJ, 08854

⁴ School of Public Health, Rutgers University, Piscataway, NJ, 08854. zy163@gsbs.rutgers.edu(Z.Y.);

gd424@eohsi.rutgers.edu(G.M.D.); jab954@scarletmail.rutgers.edu (J.B.); hz151@eohsi.rutgers.edu (H.Z.)

* Correspondence: philip.demokritou@rutgers.edu

Supplementary Table S1. Statistical Analysis Results of Colloidal properties of test MNPs in FFM.

	Concentration (mg/mL)	PS25C	PS1KC	PEI PM_{0.1}
Hydrodynamic diameter (nm)	0.05 vs. 0.25	ns	<i>p</i> <0.05	<i>p</i> <0.0001
	0.05 vs. 1.0	<i>p</i> <0.0001	<i>p</i> <0.01	<i>p</i> <0.0001
	0.25 vs. 1.0	<i>p</i> <0.0001	<i>p</i> <0.05	<i>p</i> <0.0001
Polydispersity Index/PdI	0.05 vs. 0.25	ns	ns	<i>p</i> <0.01
	0.05 vs. 1.0	<i>p</i> <0.001	ns	<i>p</i> <0.01
	0.25 vs. 1.0	<i>p</i> <0.001	ns	ns
z-potential (mV)	0.05 vs. 0.25	ns	ns	<i>p</i> <0.001
	0.05 vs. 1.0	<i>p</i> <0.05	<i>p</i> <0.01	<i>p</i> <0.0001
	0.25 vs. 1.0	<i>p</i> <0.05	<i>p</i> <0.05	ns