|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
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| ID | As Source | Soil As | IVBA | IVBA SD | RBA | RBA SE | RBA Assay |
|  |  | (ppm) | (%) | (%) | (%) | (%) |  |
| 1 | Mining/smelting | 676 | 13.0 | 0.7 | 38.1 | 1.6 | Swine UEF |
| 2 | Mining/smelting | 313 | 32.5 | 1.6 | 52.4 | 2.0 | Swine UEF |
| 3 | Pesticide (orchard) | 290 | 21.0 | 1.1 | 31.0 | 4.0 | Swine UEF |
| 4 | Pesticide (orchard) | 388 | 18.6 | 0.9 | 40.8 | 1.8 | Swine UEF |
| 5 | Pesticide (orchard) | 382 | 19.4 | 0.4 | 48.7 | 4.7 | Swine UEF |
| 6 | Pesticide (orchard) | 364 | 30.6 | 1.5 | 52.8 | 2.3 | Swine UEF |
| 7 | Mining/smelting | 234 | 8.8 | 0.3 | 17.8 | 3.2 | Swine UEF |
| 8 | Mining/smelting | 367 | 6.0 | 0.3 | 23.6 | 2.4 | Swine UEF |
| 9 | Mining/smelting | 181 | 50.4 | 2.5 | 50.7 | 5.9 | Swine UEF |
| 10 | Mining | 200 | 78.0 | 3.9 | 60.2 | 2.7 | Swine UEF |
| 11 | Mining | 3957 | 11.0 | 0.6 | 18.6 | 0.9 | Swine UEF |
| 12 | Mining/smelting | 590 | 55.1 | 2.8 | 44.1 | 2.3 | Swine UEF |
| 13 | Mining/smelting | 1400 | 42.2 | 0.6 | 41.8 | 1.4 | Swine UEF |
| 14 | Mining/smelting | 312 | 41.8 | 2.1 | 40.3 | 3.6 | Swine UEF |
| 15 | Mining/smelting | 983 | 33.2 | 1.7 | 42.2 | 3.8 | Swine UEF |
| 16 | Mining/smelting | 390 | 40.3 | 0.7 | 36.7 | 3.3 | Swine UEF |
| 17 | Mining/smelting | 813 | 22.0 | 1.1 | 23.8 | 2.4 | Swine UEF |
| 18 | Mining/smelting | 368 | 18.7 | 0.9 | 21.2 | 2.1 | Swine UEF |
| 19 | Mining/smelting | 516 | 18.6 | 0.9 | 23.5 | 2.6 | Swine UEF |
| 20 | Herbicide (railway corridor) | 267 | 57.3 | 2.2 | 72.2 | 19.9 | Swine AUC |
| 21 | Herbicide (railway corridor) | 42 | 42.7 | 0.8 | 41.6 | 6.6 | Swine AUC |
| 22 | Herbicide (railway corridor) | 1114 | 17.2 | 0.4 | 20.0 | 9.5 | Swine AUC |
| 23 | Herbicide (railway corridor) | 257 | 10.5 | 0.1 | 10.1 | 2.5 | Swine AUC |
| 24 | Herbicide (railway corridor) | 751 | 22.2 | 0.0 | 22.5 | 2.2 | Swine AUC |
| 25 | Herbicide (railway corridor) | 91 | 80.0 | 0.3 | 80.5 | 6.9 | Swine AUC |
| 26 | Pesticide (dip site) | 713 | 17.8 | 0.1 | 29.3 | 8.7 | Swine AUC |
| 27 | Pesticide (dip site) | 228 | 55.4 | 0.6 | 43.8 | 5.6 | Swine AUC |
| 28 | Mining | 807 | 40.0 | 0.1 | 41.7 | 4.4 | Swine AUC |
| 29 | Mining | 577 | 3.8 | 0.0 | 7.0 | 2.9 | Swine AUC |
| 30 | Gossan | 190 | 19.0 | 0.2 | 16.4 | 5.2 | Swine AUC |
| 31 | Gossan | 88 | 14.0 | 0.2 | 12.1 | 4.9 | Swine AUC |
| 32 | Pesticide | 275 | 5.7 | 0.2 | 10.8 | 0.7 | Swine AUC |
| 33 | Pesticide | 210 | 7.7 | 0.4 | 12.9 | 1.2 | Swine AUC |
| 34 | Pesticide | 81 | 41.7 | 1.1 | 6.8 | 1.2 | Swine AUC |
| 35 | Pesticide | 358 | 6.5 | 0.1 | 10.1 | 3.5 | Swine AUC |
| 36 | Pesticide | 200 | 13.1 | 0.3 | 10.9 | 3.9 | Swine AUC |
| 37 | Pesticide | 215 | 7.2 | 0.2 | 18.2 | 3.8 | Swine AUC |
| 38 | Pesticide | 981 | 9.7 | 0.2 | 16.4 | 3.6 | Swine AUC |
| 39 | Pesticide | 1221 | 15.1 | 0.6 | 15.7 | 1.9 | Swine AUC |
| 40 | Mining | 949 | 52.9 | 0.1 | 45.8 | 2.6 | Swine AUC |
| 41 | Mining | 1126 | 36.9 | 1.1 | 30.7 | 4.1 | Swine AUC |
| 42 | Mining | 1695 | 38.1 | 1.3 | 27.5 | 0.7 | Swine AUC |
| 43 | Mining | 1306 | 78.4 | 0.4 | 70.5 | 6.8 | Swine AUC |
| 44 | Mining | 2270 | 43.5 | 3.4 | 36.2 | 1.5 | Swine AUC |
| 45 | Mining | 244 | 18.1 | 0.40 | 15.5 | 1.3 | Mouse UEF |
| 46 | Mining | 173 | 6.8 | 0.80 | 14.1 | 1.2 | Mouse UEF |
| 47 | Mining | 6899 | 17.5 | 0.60 | 14.7 | 1.0 | Mouse UEF |
| 48 | Mining | 280 | 53.6 | 0.20 | 39.9 | 1.7 | Mouse UEF |
| 49 | Mining | 4495 | 8.8 | 0.10 | 14.5 | 1.6 | Mouse UEF |
| 50 | Mining | 448 | 22.8 | 0.6 | 17.2 | 0.5 | Mouse UEF |
| 51 | Mining | 195 | 25.7 | 3.4 | 18.8 | 2.7 | Mouse UEF |
| 52 | Mining/smelting | 837 | 18.2 | 2.70 | 11.2 | 0.3 | Mouse UEF |
| 53 | Mining/smelting | 182 | 32.9 | 0.20 | 26.7 | 1.8 | Mouse UEF |
| 54 | Mining/smelting | 990 | 73.1 | 0.60 | 48.7 | 2.4 | Mouse UEF |
| 55 | Mining/smelting | 829 | 74.3 | 1.30 | 49.7 | 2.1 | Mouse UEF |
| 56 | Mining/smelting | 379 | 53.2 | 0.50 | 51.6 | 2.1 | Mouse UEF |
| 57 | Pesticide (orchard) | 322 | 18.8 | 0.30 | 26.3 | 1.4 | Mouse UEF |
| 58 | Pesticide (orchard) | 462 | 16.1 | 0.40 | 35.2 | 2.0 | Mouse UEF |
| 59 | Pesticide (orchard) | 401 | 18.0 | 0.20 | 20.9 | 2.2 | Mouse UEF |
| 60 | Pesticide (orchard) | 422 | 27.9 | 0.80 | 35.0 | 1.8 | Mouse UEF |
| 61 | Pesticide (orchard) | 340 | 35.4 | 1.90 | 33.2 | 2.4 | Mouse UEF |
| 62 | Pesticide (orchard) | 396 | 48.1 | 0.80 | 46.4 | 1.4 | Mouse UEF |
| 63 | Pesticide (dip site) | 965 | 9.0 | 0.40 | 21.7 | 1.5 | Mouse UEF |
| 64 | Pesticide (dip site) | 313 | 36.4 | 1.30 | 29.1 | 1.7 | Mouse UEF |
| 65 | Herbicide (railway corridor) | 246 | 47.0 | 2.10 | 45.1 | 2.7 | Mouse UEF |
| 66 | Herbicide (railway corridor) | 108 | 27.0 | 0.80 | 23.8 | 1.9 | Mouse UEF |
| 67 | Herbicide (railway corridor) | 184 | 11.9 | 0.20 | 23.0 | 1.8 | Mouse UEF |
| 68 | Herbicide (railway corridor) | 981 | 54.3 | 2.50 | 36.3 | 1.3 | Mouse UEF |
| 69 | Mining | 573 | 3.5 | 0.30 | 6.4 | 0.3 | Mouse UEF |
| 70 | Mining | 583 | 21.2 | 0.20 | 14.2 | 0.3 | Mouse UEF |
| 71 | Gossan | 239 | 12.3 | 0.70 | 20.4 | 1.9 | Mouse UEF |
| 72 | Mining | 197 | 21.9 | 0.20 | 29.0 | 2.7 | Mouse UEF |
| 73 | Mining | 884 | 16.9 | 0.40 | 23.2 | 3.3 | Mouse UEF |
| 74 | Mining | 293 | 12.3 | 0.30 | 17.9 | 0.7 | Mouse UEF |
| 75 | Mining | 223 | 17.3 | 0.10 | 19.8 | 1.9 | Mouse UEF |
| 76 | Mining | 494 | 15.5 | 0.10 | 18.0 | 1.8 | Mouse UEF |
| 77 | Mining | 738 | 13.4 | 3.50 | 11.2 | 0.9 | Mouse UEF |
| 78 | Mining | 777 | 0.0 | 0.00 | 4.3 | 0.7 | Mouse UEF |
| 79 | Mining | 943 | 0.1 | 0.00 | 3.0 | 0.2 | Mouse UEF |
| 80 | Mining | 898 | 0.1 | 0.00 | 1.9 | 0.2 | Mouse UEF |
| 81 | Mining | 668 | 0.0 | 0.00 | 3.6 | 0.3 | Mouse UEF |
| 82 | Mining/smelting (SRM) | 601 | 54.0 | 4.10 | 42.9 | 1.2 | Mouse UEF |
| 83 | Mining/smelting (SRM) | 1513 | 41.8 | 1.70 | 42.1 | 1.1 | Mouse UEF |
| 84 | Mining/smelting (SRM) | 879 | 14.5 | 0.20 | 14.6 | 0.8 | Mouse UEF |
| As, arsenic; AUC, area under the curve; ID, sample identification number; IVBA, *in vitro* bioaccessibility; RBA, relative bioavailability; SD, standard deviation; SE, standard error; SRM, standard reference material; UEF, urinary excretion fraction | | | | | | | |



Figure S-1. Ordinary least squares linear regression model for data from Laboratory A (n=40; RBA estimated with mouse UEF assay; Bradham et al 2011).



Figure S-2. Ordinary least squares linear regression model for data from Laboratory B (n-19; RBA estimated with swine UEF assay; Brattin and Casteel, 2013).



Figure S-3. Ordinary least squares linear regression model for data from Laboratory C (n=24; RBA estimated with swine AUC assay; Rees et al. 2009). The data point labeled *outlier* was not used in fitting the regression model.