

# **Committee on mutagenicity of chemicals in food, consumer products and the environment (COM)**

## **Guidance on a strategy for genotoxicity testing of chemicals**

Continued consideration and comments of the updated COM 'Guidance document on a strategy for genotoxicity testing of chemicals'.

# Contents

Executive summary.....	3
I. Preface.....	5
II. Introduction .....	7
III. Significance of chemical-induced mutation for human health .....	9
IV. General principles of testing strategy.....	9
V. Genotoxicity testing strategy.....	11
Stage 0: preliminary considerations prior to genotoxicity testing.....	12
Stage 1: in vitro genotoxicity testing.....	14
Discussion of stage 1 tests: general aspects .....	17
Discussion of stage 1 strategy: specific core tests.....	21
Discussion stage 1: non-core tests .....	25
Summary stage 1 (in vitro genotoxicity testing).....	28
Stage 2: in vivo genotoxicity tests .....	29
Discussion of stage 2 initial testing strategy - general aspects .....	35
Discussion of stage 2: recommended in vivo genotoxicity tests.....	36
Discussion of stage 2: supplementary tests .....	40
Summary stage 2 (in vivo genotoxicity testing).....	43
Possible future developments .....	44
References.....	54
Annexe 1.....	73
Tabulation of genotoxicity tests (in Stages 1 and 2) and mutagenic/genotoxicity endpoints detected .....	73

# Executive summary

1. The Committee on Mutagenicity of Chemicals in Food, Consumer Products and the Environment (COM) has a remit to provide UK government departments and agencies with advice on the most suitable approaches to testing chemical substances for [genotoxicity](#). The COM published guidance in 1981, 1989, 2000 and again in 2011. This document incorporates some significant changes and reports the COM views regarding the most appropriate strategy for genotoxicity testing ([Figure 1](#)) reached in 2020, bringing the guidance document up to date.
2. It should be noted that in this updated guidance, several key areas have been identified as potentially requiring frequent updating, due to their fast-moving nature. To facilitate such updates, a standalone document has been prepared outlining the currently available status of testing strategies for [germ cell mutagens](#) (paragraphs 88 to 91) guidance document G7. This was included in the previous version of the guidance document. In addition, standalone documents have been prepared detailing the use of 3D tissue models for genotoxicity testing (guidance document G8) and guidance document G9, 'Test guidance strategies for manufactured [nanomaterials](#)'. Both of these areas were not included in the previous version of the guidance document and are now briefly detailed in paragraphs 28 and 35, respectively.
3. The COM recommends a staged approach to testing:
  - Stage 0 consists of preliminary considerations which include physico-chemical properties of the test chemical substance, Structure Activity Relationships (SAR), and information from screening tests<sup>1</sup>. However, data from SAR and screening tests should not overrule test data from adequately designed and conducted genotoxicity tests.
  - Stage 1 consists of [in vitro](#) genotoxicity tests. The COM recommends a core-test battery of the [Ames test](#) combined with the in vitro [micronucleus](#) test. This combination provides information on 3 types of genetic damage for which data is required (namely,

---

<sup>1</sup> Note that the terms 'test' and 'assay' are used interchangeably throughout the document to reflect naming conventions.

[gene mutation](#), [chromosomal damage](#) and [aneuploidy](#)) and gives appropriate sensitivity to detect chemical genotoxins. As also supported by the OECD, the COM consider that there is no need to independently replicate adequately designed and conducted core in vitro tests which are either clearly negative or clearly positive. The strategy document also considers the contribution that can be made by a number of non-core in vitro tests.

- Stage 2 consists of [in vivo](#) genotoxicity tests. A case-by-case strategy should be developed to answer one or more of the following specific queries:

- 1) Investigation of genotoxic end point(s) identified in Stage 1.
  - 2) Investigation of genotoxicity in [tumour](#) target tissue(s).
  - 3) Investigation of potential for germ cell genotoxicity.
  - 4) Investigation of in vivo genotoxicity for chemicals which were negative in Stage 1 but where there is high or moderate and prolonged exposure.
  - 5) Investigation of genotoxicity in site of contact tissues.
4. The core tests in Stage 2 are the rodent micronucleus/chromosome aberration assays for aneuploidy and [clastogenicity](#), the [transgenic](#) rodent gene mutation assay and the rodent alkaline [comet assay](#) for [DNA damage](#).
5. Usually, negative results obtained in a carefully selected in vivo test (possibly studying more than one endpoint and tissue) will be sufficient to address positive results found in vitro. However, a further test(s) may be needed if some of the genotoxic effects seen in Stage 1 in vitro tests had not been adequately studied in vivo (for example, the chemical affects multiple mutagenic endpoints), or other aspects of the genotoxic potential of the chemical had not been fully resolved (for example, a human [metabolite](#) is identified that is not formed, or only in small amounts, in rodents, or in the case where an investigation of heritable effects was required). The strategy document also considers the contribution that can be made by a number of non-core in vivo tests. In most instances information from core in vivo tests is sufficient to evaluate the in vivo genotoxicity of chemical substances. A supplementary in vivo test strategy can provide additional information on a case-by-case basis, to investigate aspects such as further characterisation of germ cell

genotoxicity, and DNA [adduct](#) data which can provide information to elucidate the mode of genotoxic action of [carcinogenic](#) chemicals.

## I. Preface

6. The COM is an independent expert advisory committee whose members are appointed by the secretary of state for health and social care and the chair of the Food Standards Agency (FSA) following an appointments exercise involving public advertisement. Members serve in their own capacity as independent experts and observe a published code of practice including principles relating to the declaration of possible conflicting interests.
7. The remit of the COM is to advise any UK government departments and agencies with an interest in the safety of chemicals across various sectors on the human health aspects of the mutagenicity and genotoxicity of chemicals (these terms are defined for the purposes of this guidance document in paragraphs 9 to 11 below). The Secretariat is provided by UK Health Security Agency (UKHSA) who lead, and the FSA. Other government departments with an interest provide assessors to the COM; these are specifically from the Department of Health and Social Care (DHSC), the Department of Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (Defra), the Chemicals Regulation Division (CRD) of the Health and Safety Executive (HSE) (responsible for legislation regulating chemicals, pesticides, biocides and detergents), the Environment Agency (EA), the Veterinary Medicines Directorate (VMD; a Defra agency responsible for the licensing of veterinary drugs) and the Medicines and Healthcare products Regulatory Agency (MHRA; a DHSC agency responsible for the licensing of human medicines). In addition, there are assessors from the Scottish Government, the Welsh Assembly Government and the Northern Ireland Assembly.
8. The role of the COM is advisory. It has no regulatory status, although its advice may be provided to a body that does have such a role (for example, HSE CRD for occupational aspects and for pesticides and so on). Its remit is to advise on the human health aspects of the genotoxicity of chemicals, and this may involve advice on a specific chemical, and

also on testing strategies and research. This guidance document focuses on testing strategies for chemicals for which there is no available genotoxicity data. Separate guidance on [a strategy for the genotoxicity testing and mutagenic hazard assessment of chemicals with inadequate genotoxicity data](#) was published in 2011. Throughout this guidance the COM has referred to the genotoxicity testing of chemical(s) which refers to a specified chemical or material, including any additive necessary to preserve its stability and any impurity deriving from the process used. The COM usually provides advice on a specific chemical which can be equated to a single chemical or compound. Provision of advice on radiation aspects is not within the scope of the COM.

9. The COM also has a general remit to advise on important general principles or new scientific discoveries in connection with potential mutagenic and genotoxic hazards (inherent properties of chemicals) or [risk](#) (the likelihood of mutagenic or genotoxic effects occurring after a given exposure to a chemical) and to present recommendations for genotoxicity testing. In practice the bulk of the work of the COM relates to assessing genotoxicity tests and providing advice on the genotoxic [hazard](#) of chemicals.
10. In the context of testing strategies, the COM first published guidelines for the testing of chemicals for mutagenicity in 1981, and these were revised in 1989 and 2000 ([32](#)). These provided guidance to the relevant government departments and agencies on best practice for testing at those times. The rationale developed by COM in 2000, particularly in relation to the testing of all potential mutagenic endpoints, was adopted by the International Workshops on Genotoxicity Testing (IWGT) ([106](#)). The need for guidance to be periodically updated, to reflect advances in development and validation of methods, was recognised and substantially revised guidance was published in 2011 ([32](#)). Testing strategies, the same or similar to those outlined in the 2011 COM guidance, have been adopted by some regulatory bodies, including the European Food Safety Authority (EFSA) ([40](#)) and included in the notes on Guidance from the Scientific Committee on Consumer Safety (SCCS) ([141](#)) and in the Registration, Evaluation, Authorisation and Restriction of Chemicals (REACH) regulation ([38](#)).
11. A further revision of the guidance has been undertaken. This version ([33](#)) of the guidance outlines the strategy that COM consider to be the most scientifically

appropriate given available methods and recognises the need to avoid the use of live animals where practical and validated alternative methods are available. The COM believes that the approach outlined presents an overview of the core principles of genotoxicity testing and will remain valid for several years. It is acknowledged that existing national or international testing strategies will be at different stages of review and hence inconsistencies are expected. The COM guidance is not intended to supersede or replace existing national or international sector-specific genotoxicity testing strategies (for example, those recommended for pharmaceuticals by the International Conference on Harmonisation of Technical Requirements for Registration of Pharmaceuticals for Human Use<sup>2</sup> (ICH) (ICH, 2011), for chemicals assessed under REACH Regulations (EC1906/2006) ([38](#)), or by EFSA ([39](#)).

## II. Introduction

12. The COM last published guidance on a strategy for the testing of chemicals for mutagenic potential in 2011 ([32](#)). The guidance outlined in 2011 was based on the development of new approaches to identifying genotoxic hazards in vitro including new approaches to identify misleading positive results and evaluate target organ genotoxicity in vivo. There is also a need for a testing strategy which can encompass chemicals such as cosmetics where no animal tests are permitted under European Union (EU) law. It is the objective of this paper to set out a scientifically valid testing strategy comprising those methods which the COM believe to be the most informative with regards to the detection of genotoxic hazard and (when possible) are well validated. There is no discussion of methods which experience has shown to be suboptimal in determining genotoxicity. Details of methodologies are not given since they are provided in the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) test guidelines (TG), the EU Test Methods Regulation (EC 440/2008) and the IWGT guidance.

---

<sup>2</sup> Now known as International Council on Harmonisation of Technical Requirements for Registration of Pharmaceuticals for Human Use.

13. The [genome](#) can be damaged in a variety of ways either spontaneously or from exposure to genotoxic agents. The term 'mutagenic' refers to the ability of a chemical to induce a permanent change in the amount or structure of the genetic material of an organism, which may result in an heritable change in the characteristics of the organism. Chemicals inducing mutations are referred to as mutagens (they are mutagenic). These alterations may involve individual [genes](#), blocks of genes, or whole [chromosomes](#). Mutations involving single genes may be a consequence of effects on single DNA bases (point mutations) or of larger changes, including deletions and rearrangements of DNA. The potential to induce mutation is measured in test systems that detect a broader range of genetic changes than simply mutation – they measure genotoxicity. Mutagenicity is accepted as a key event in carcinogenicity. [Epigenetic](#) changes, that could also be heritable, fall outside the scope of this guidance.
14. Genotoxicity refers to interaction with, or damage to, DNA and/or other cellular components which regulate the fidelity of the genome. It is a broad term that, as well as mutation, includes damage to DNA such as the production of DNA adducts, by the chemical itself or its metabolites. Cells have the capacity to protect themselves from such potentially lethal or mutagenic genotoxic effects by many repair processes and therefore many genotoxic events do not become evident as mutations. However, the capacity to damage the genome (genotoxicity) is an indicator of potential mutagenicity. Thus, some methods that measure genotoxicity do not provide direct evidence of heritable mutation.
15. The objective of genotoxicity testing is to exclude or identify potential hazards to humans and, for those chemicals that are positive, to aid in the elucidation of the [mode of action](#) (MoA). This guidance therefore presents a strategy for genotoxicity testing since this term encompasses all the assays included in the strategy. Consequently, it is important to generate information on 3 types of genetic damage, namely gene mutation, changes to chromosome structure (that is, clastogenicity) and number (that is, aneuploidy), to provide comprehensive coverage of the mutagenic potential of a chemical.
16. The COM reaffirms its view, published in 1989, 2000 and 2011, that there is currently no single validated assay that can provide comprehensive information on all 3 types of



genetic damage and thus, it is necessary to subject a given test chemical to several different assays. The range of assays discussed in this document include those using prokaryotes (bacteria) and mammalian cells in vitro, and whole mammals, where effects in a wide range of target organs including germ cells can be measured. Assays may be classified on the basis of genetic endpoints (for example, gene mutation, clastogenicity, aneugenicity and tests for DNA damage) or by consideration of the different phylogenetic levels (for example, bacteria, and mammalian cells) represented and also in mammals by the tissues or target organs studied.

### **III. Significance of chemical-induced mutation for human health**

17. A mutation in the germ cells of sexually reproducing organisms may be transmitted to the offspring, whereas a mutation that occurs in somatic cells may be transferred only to descendant daughter cells. Mutagenic chemicals may present a hazard to health since exposure to a mutagen carries the risk of inducing germ-line mutations, with the possibility of inherited disorders, and the risk of somatic mutations including those leading to cancer.
18. A separate statement discussing [the significance of chemical-induced mutation to human health](#) was published in 2012.

### **IV. General principles of testing strategy**

19. The COM recommends a 2-stage testing strategy (Stages 1 and 2) for the detection of the genotoxic hazard of chemicals which can be supported by appropriate preliminary screening tests and/or in silico data (Stage 0).
20. Initial testing for genotoxic potential in Stage 1 is based upon 2 core in vitro tests that are chosen to provide information on gene mutation, clastogenicity and aneuploidy, with case-by-case additional testing and investigation depending on the results of these initial genotoxicity tests. All in vitro tests should be designed to provide the best chance of

detecting potential activity, with respect to (a) the exogenous metabolic activation system (S9 - see Glossary) (b) the ability of the compound or its metabolite(s) to reach the target DNA and/or targets such as the cell division apparatus and (c) the ability of the genetic test system to detect the given type of genotoxic event. Where international guidelines are available, the assays should be carried out to conform to those internationally recognised documents for example, as published by the OECD, the IWGT and in the EU test methods Regulation (EC 440/2008). The same approach to testing can be used for chemicals where in vivo genotoxicity testing is not permitted (for example, cosmetics). Investigations regarding MoA are important to derive conclusions on [biological relevance](#) of in vitro genotoxicity test results, to aid in overall risk assessment, and to inform on the strategy for in vivo tests. This is of particular importance for those chemicals where no in vivo genotoxicity testing is permitted.

21. For most chemicals, results from the 2 Stage 1 core tests should be sufficient to reach a conclusion on the presence or absence of mutagenic potential. However, in some instances, even when Stage 1 tests are negative, regulatory authorities may require consideration of the need for in vivo Stage 2 testing particularly where exposure is considered to be high, or moderate and prolonged (for example, most human medicines), or where there is a chemical class precedent (that is, structural relationship) of positive in vivo genotoxicity data. Guidance on the level of exposure which equates to high, moderate or prolonged is beyond the remit of the COM.
22. Stage 2 consists of a number of in vivo tests designed to investigate whether in vitro genotoxic activity including specific end points identified by in vitro tests can be expressed in the whole animal. This may also include assays for specific target organs (for example, rodent tumours detected in carcinogenicity bioassays) or in germ cells. Few chemicals are active only in vivo and in such cases this may be due to a number of factors such as metabolic differences, the influence of gut flora, higher exposures in vivo compared to in vitro, pharmacological (for example, folate depletion or receptor kinase inhibition) and extreme physiological effects ([158](#)).
23. There is currently no single in vivo test which can assay all 3 types of genetic damage ([154](#)) and thus a strategy for Stage 2 has to be designed based on the nature of

genotoxic effects identified in Stage 1 and the possibility that genotoxic activity will only be expressed in vivo as discussed above. However, consideration should be given to the possibility of evaluating different genotoxicity endpoints in a single set of test animals.

24. There should be a clear strategy for planning tests within each stage and for progressing from Stage 1 to Stage 2. Clear statements can be made regarding the initial in vitro tests to be used in Stage 1 as these methods have been well studied, whereas the strategy for Stage 2 is more complex and, if not a specific regulatory requirement, needs to be developed on a case-by-case basis.
25. Under the strategy recommended by COM, the use of animals in genotoxicity testing is primarily required when it is necessary to investigate whether genotoxic activity detected in Stage 1 in vitro is reproduced in vivo, to study target organ genotoxicity (for example involvement of genotoxicity in rodent tumours) and to evaluate the potential for heritable mutagenic effects. Genotoxicity testing using animals, when required by guidance, should be carried out when there is no suitable alternative, and the minimum number of animals should be used, consistent with obtaining valid results. If feasible, studies can be conducted as an adjunct to single or repeat dose toxicity studies. The COM supports current and future developments to replace, refine or reduce the need for animals, consistent with the principles of the 3Rs.<sup>3</sup>

## V. Genotoxicity testing strategy

26. The COM guidance provides a strategy for testing chemicals where no genotoxicity data is available. Test chemicals may also contain impurities at varying levels which may exhibit genotoxic activity. Separate guidance on [the genotoxicity assessment of impurities](#) is available online. The assessment and control of genotoxic impurities is the subject of an ICH Guideline (M7) and ICH M7(R1) and a [Question and Answer document](#).

---

<sup>3</sup> [The 3Rs](#)

27. The strategy recommended in the following sections is concerned with testing for genotoxic activity of chemicals and does not specifically address complex mixtures of chemicals.

## Stage 0: Preliminary considerations prior to genotoxicity testing

28. The intrinsic chemical and toxicological properties of the test chemical must be considered before devising the genotoxicity testing programme. Manufactured nanomaterials present particular considerations with regards to genotoxicity testing and these are discussed in a separate document 'G9 Test Guidance Strategies for Genotoxicity Testing of Manufactured nanomaterials' ([34](#)).

## Physico-chemical and toxicological properties

29. The physico-chemical properties of the test chemical (for example, acid dissociation constant (pKa), partition coefficient, solubility, volatility and stability in, and potential reactions with, solvents/vehicles) and its purity can affect the ease of conduct and results of in vitro tests. For example, the tolerance of cells to acidic chemicals can be enhanced by neutralisation but this may affect the inherent reactivity of chemicals with DNA ([69](#)). Potential reactions of the test chemical with solvent /vehicle should also be considered (for example, cisplatin reacts with dimethyl sulfoxide (DMSO)) ([47](#)). Alternatively, low solubility may limit the feasibility of undertaking some or all of the in vitro mutagenicity tests recommended in this strategy. The potential for auto-oxidation of the test chemical in the culture medium can also affect the outcome of in vitro genotoxicity tests ([92](#)). It is noteworthy that the toxic properties of test chemicals, such as target organ effects, or irritancy or corrosivity in contact with skin or mucous membranes and their toxicokinetics and metabolism will influence the choice of route of administration and the highest dose level achievable in Stage 2 in vivo mutagenicity tests.

## Quantitative structure activity relationships (QSAR)

30. The expected mutagenic potential of a chemical can be assessed from its chemical structure, which may provide structural alerts for mutagenicity. The COM has previously agreed that where no genotoxicity data is available, initial assessment of potential genotoxicity can be based on publicly available QSAR models. A range of QSARs have been developed to predict genotoxicity and COM considered updated information on these models in February 2018. It was concluded that whilst it remained useful to evaluate data generated from QSAR models, in particular as a negative predictor for screening purposes, no changes to the previously recommended guidance (detailed more fully within the 2011 version of the COM Guidance document; [32](#)) were warranted.
31. Overall, QSAR approaches for the prediction of genotoxic activity can be a valuable tool to aid in the high throughput screening of compounds, the provision of assessments for chemicals for which no genotoxicity test data is available and also prioritisation for genotoxicity testing. QSAR can also aid in the interpretation of genetic toxicology tests. Expert judgement is needed when reaching conclusions on mutagenic hazard on the basis of QSAR information alone, and such predictions cannot replace the need to undertake the in vitro and in vivo genotoxicity tests required to derive conclusions on mutagenic hazard and risk. In reaching conclusions, data from well conducted in vitro or in vivo genotoxicity tests should be attributed a much higher [weight of evidence](#) than QSAR predictions, although all information should be assessed on a case-by-case basis.

## Screening tests

32. With regard to this guidance, genotoxicity screening tests refers to high throughput or scaled-down tests which have been designed to be rapid, economical, reproducible, require only small amounts of test chemicals (typically below 50 mg) and have a high concordance with comparator genotoxicity end points in genotoxicity tests; these tests are also often referred to as pre-screening tests. None of the available genotoxicity screening tests have reached the stage of development where they could routinely be

used to replace data generated from guideline-compliant in vitro genotoxicity testing. COM therefore does not recommend any particular test for screening purposes.

33. A number of in vitro systems for use as screening tests have been proposed and are described in full in the previous version of the COM Guidance ([32](#)). It is recognised that a screening strategy can be useful for companies to carry out preliminary investigations or to prioritise compounds. However, COM is unable to give recommendations concerning screening tests as developments in the field are rapid.

## Stage 1: in vitro genotoxicity testing

### Overview of strategy

34. The COM concluded in 1989, 2000 and 2011 that it was appropriate to concentrate on a relatively small number of assays, using validated, sensitive methods particularly chosen to avoid misleading negative or positive results when compared to in vivo testing results ([79](#), [80](#), [51](#), [52](#), [101](#), [126](#)). A detailed justification of the strategy is given in the previous version of the COM Guidance ([32](#)) and, as such, is not included here.
35. Misleading positive results are considered to be caused by a number of factors, including inappropriately high doses of chemical and the use of cell lines of rodent origin (for example, V79, CHO, CHL) that partially lack normal cell cycle control, have limited metabolic capacity (even with the addition of S9) and do not mimic site-specific metabolic capacity ([135](#)). The use of p53-competent human cells and careful control of cytotoxicity can help reduce the number of misleading positive results without compromising sensitivity ([51](#), [52](#)). The development of 3D tissue models is also hoped to reduce the number of misleading positive findings and improve the accuracy of predictions due to their improved metabolic capacity and proximity to in vivo gene expression and protein functions ([6](#), [9](#), [128](#), [129](#)). The current state of the science for 3D model development and validation is discussed in 'G8 3D Tissue Models for Genotoxicity Testing' ([35](#)).

36. As outlined above in paragraph 20 and shown in [Figure 2](#), Stage 1 involves tests for genotoxic activity using in vitro methods and comprises a 2 test core system, namely an in vitro bacterial test for gene mutation (Ames test) and an in vitro micronucleus test (MNvit), with the objective of assessing genotoxic potential by investigating 3 different end points (gene mutation, structural chromosomal damage and changes in chromosome number). A detailed justification of the strategy is given in the previous version of the COM Guidance ([32](#)).
37. A clear positive result in either of these 2 core tests is sufficient to define the chemical as an in vitro genotoxin, although further in vitro and/or in vivo testing may be undertaken to understand the relevance of the positive results. The committee considers this strategy allows for efficient identification of all genotoxic endpoints and that, by reducing the number of mammalian cell tests and following the most current version of the methodologies, the risk of misleading positive results (that is, when compared with in vivo genotoxicity data) is decreased.
38. Additional investigations of chemicals which give positive or repeated equivocal results in Stage 1 tests can include an assessment of mode(s) of in vitro genotoxic action. There are a number of reasons (discussed in paragraphs 43 to 45) why positive results in in vitro genotoxicity tests might occur by mode(s) of action not relevant to human health hazard assessment. Such MoA evaluation in vitro is particularly relevant for those chemicals (for example, cosmetics) where there is a regulatory constraint which precludes the use of in vivo genotoxicity assays in the testing strategy. The COM does not recommend the use of Stage 1 in vitro genotoxicity assays that have not been considered in detail in this guidance or for which OECD guidelines either do not exist or have been deleted. This includes assays for sister chromatid exchange, the in vitro [unscheduled DNA synthesis](#) (UDS) assay, the in vitro comet assay or tests using fungi or *Drosophila*. A table of genotoxic endpoints detected by each assay cited in Stage 1 of this strategy is given in [Annex 1](#).
39. For chemicals which give equivocal results or repeated small positive effects, when considering biological relevance, it is important to consider evidence of reproducibility in the same assay or in different assays detecting similar effects, and the magnitude of the

induced genotoxic effect in relation to historical negative control data, and then consider whether further in vitro genotoxicity testing is needed ([64](#), [78](#)). Further consideration of SAR data for these chemicals may also give valuable information ([25](#)).

40. If clear negative results are obtained in both core in vitro tests undertaken, it can generally be concluded that the chemical has no genotoxic activity. However, there are some occasions when additional in vitro and/or in vivo genotoxicity testing may be undertaken for chemicals giving a negative response in the 2 in vitro core genotoxicity tests. For example, in situations where tumours are found in rodents, where the in vitro metabolic activation systems are not optimal or where there are human-specific metabolites, there may be a need for further genotoxicity assessment. A further testing strategy would have to be designed on a case-by-case basis ([79](#), [106](#)). An IWGT working group has published guidance on this topic ([75](#)). An important part of any additional in vitro strategy should be consideration of the appropriate [exogenous](#) metabolic activation system (including alternative sources of S9 or other metabolic systems including genetically engineered cell lines) ([88](#)), or even the testing of specific, relevant metabolites. Further information on in vivo genotoxicity testing of such test chemicals is provided in Stage 2 of this strategy.
41. Information from other combinations of genotoxicity tests, which may include one or more non-core tests outlined below in paragraphs 66 to 71, may also give adequate data on all 3 endpoints on a case-by-case basis. In vitro genotoxicity tests (micronucleus scoring and comet) using human reconstructed skin may provide useful information on in vitro mutagenic hazard in circumstances where in vivo testing is not permitted, or when extensive dermal exposure is anticipated (for example, cosmetic ingredients) ([2](#), [18](#), [137](#), [134](#)).
42. The full Stage 1 strategy should be performed, and the results of studies evaluated before a decision is made on whether to proceed to Stage 2 testing or whether a conclusion on mutagenic hazard can be derived for test chemicals where no in vivo genotoxicity testing is permitted. An outline of Stage 0 and Stage 1 (in vitro genotoxicity testing) is given in [Figure 2](#) and a description of the assays recommended is provided in the following paragraphs.



## Discussion of Stage 1 tests: general aspects

43. The conduct of genotoxicity assays has improved over time and the overall sensitivity of in vitro testing strategies regarding prediction of rodent carcinogens is very high ([126, 22](#)).
44. Kirkland and others assessed the sensitivity of a combination of the Ames test and MNvit test to detect rodent carcinogens and in vivo genotoxicants ([83](#)). The authors stated that it is difficult to draw precise conclusions from the available sensitivity and specificity data since the databases of chemicals used vary. However, this data shows that mammalian cell genotoxicity tests can have low specificity and that combinations of in vitro genotoxicity tests result in high sensitivity for rodent carcinogens and in vivo genotoxicants. High sensitivity has always been a priority of genotoxicity testing strategies recommended by the COM ([31, 32](#)). [COM evaluated](#) the use of in vitro genotoxicity tests to predict rodent carcinogens and in vivo genotoxicants in June 2010 and concluded that there is no convincing evidence that any [relevant or DNA reactive] rodent carcinogen or in vivo genotoxicant would fail to be detected by using an in vitro genotoxicity test battery consisting of Ames and MNvit tests.
45. It is most likely that one of the few occasions where in vitro test strategies fail to detect mutagenic activity (that is, misleading negative results) could be explained by the absence of appropriate metabolic activity in vitro ([12](#)) or that the test chemical does not reach the cells. Approaches to resolving potential inadequacies in metabolic activation include structure based metabolism predictions, use of genetically modified target organisms (for example, CYP2E1 in Salmonella YG7108pin3ERb<sub>5</sub>) ([42](#)), the use of exogenous metabolic activation systems derived from human sources, or recombinant human cytochrome P450 systems as an external activation system ([88](#)). Testing of isolated or synthesised metabolites may also be considered.
46. There are a number of MoAs by which a chemical may demonstrate an in vitro genotoxic effect that is either not relevant for humans (for example, a rat specific metabolite) or has

a threshold. The COM has reviewed the evidence for a number of threshold MoAs and published a [general guidance statement](#) in 2010.

47. Threshold MoAs can generally be attributable to non-DNA interactions or an overload of normal cellular physiology. In such cases a No Observed Effect Concentration (NOEC) can be determined and may be useful in evaluating risk. Investigations of a threshold-based MoA need to be designed on a case-by-case basis and can be complex to interpret ([78](#)).
48. There has been considerable debate regarding the highest concentration that should be used routinely in mammalian cell assays. The ICH has stated the maximum concentration tested for human pharmaceuticals should be 1 mM (or 500 µg/mL; whichever is lower) in mammalian cell genotoxicity assays when not limited by solubility in solvent or culture medium or by cytotoxicity. ([72](#)) This would have the effect of reducing the number of misleading positive results by avoiding the excessive concentrations where the cellular defence mechanisms might be overwhelmed ([72](#)). However, a reduction to 1 mM is not consistent with the OECD recommendation for a top concentration of 10 mM (or 2000 µg/mL, whichever is lowest) in mammalian cell genotoxicity assays, when not limited by solubility in solvent or culture medium or by cytotoxicity ([109](#), [111](#), [112](#), [113](#)). Morita and others (2014) showed that the reduction in the top concentration from 5000 to 2000 µg/mL for mammalian cell tests had no impact on sensitivity or specificity of in vitro chromosomal aberration tests. Another analysis of published data for the top concentration in mammalian cell genotoxicity tests identified a small number of carcinogens that (according to the publications) would not be detected in any part of a 3 test in vitro genotoxicity test battery (consisting of the Ames, mouse lymphoma and in vitro chromosomal aberration (CA) tests) if the testing concentration limit for mammalian cell assays were reduced from 10 mM to 1 mM ([123](#)). A further investigation of these carcinogens found that some positive results at concentrations above 1 mM were not reproducible (that is, they were not genotoxic in mammalian cells under current OECD guideline protocols) and others were positive at concentrations below 1 mM, particularly when continuous treatments in the absence of S-9 (not included in the original publications) were conducted. An upper limit for mammalian cells tests of

1 mM or 500 µg/ml (whichever is lower) has been proposed as sufficient to detect all genotoxic carcinogens that are negative in the Ames test (82). Several international organisations have updated their guidance regarding upper limit selection (for example, 72, 115, 54) although currently no international consensus has been reached.

Precipitation of the chemical in the medium can also be used to define a maximal concentration or upper limit for testing. On balance, COM agreed that care should be taken to follow the appropriate guidance, depending on the chemical of interest.

49. There has also been considerable investigation of the role of excessive cytotoxicity in mammalian cells and choice of cell type as possible causes of misleading positive results (10, 43, 124, 126). The method used to assess cytotoxicity may affect the selection of the highest concentration tested and potentially the results obtained using mammalian cell genotoxicity assays (52, 80) and recommendations have been made to use cytotoxicity measures based on cell proliferation (53). However, it is important to note that although excessive cytotoxicity may lead to misleading positive results, it may also result in misleading negative results when pronounced cell cycle delay occurs. A similar conclusion was reached at an international symposium on regulatory aspects of genotoxicity testing (10).
50. Most cell lines used for genotoxicity testing lack appropriate metabolism leading to reliance on exogenous metabolic activation systems. These cell lines may often have impaired p53 function and altered DNA repair capacity (80). There is some evidence that human lymphocytes are less susceptible to misleading positives than the rodent cell lines currently used (for example, Chinese Hamster Ovary (CHO), V79, Chinese hamster lung (CHL)). The use of human cell lines HepG2, TK6 and MCL5 cells and the reconstructed human skin models and HepaRG have been evaluated (51, 80, 90). A brief summary of 3D models currently used for genotoxicity testing and those under development and/or validation has been prepared by COM (33).
51. The COM agrees that it is not necessary to undertake independent confirmatory in vitro tests when clear negative or positive results have been obtained provided the following criteria are satisfied:

- there is no doubt as to the quality of the study design and the conduct of the test
  - the spacing and range of test chemical concentrations rule out missing a positive response
  - sufficient treatment conditions and sampling times have been used
52. It is recognised that it can be difficult to provide convincing evidence for absence of genotoxic effects. The investigator should consider the power of the study design and the past performance of the test system when formulating a protocol in order to optimise the chances of obtaining an unequivocal result from a single experiment and to ensure that any potential genotoxic effect is not missed.
53. There is a need to undertake further in vitro genotoxicity testing when an equivocal result is obtained (that is, neither clearly negative nor clearly positive by appropriate biological or statistical criteria). In the case of the MNvit and CAvit assays an equivocal result may be resolved by scoring more cells from the existing study (paragraph 87) and this should be assessed in the first instance. Additional genotoxicity tests need to be planned on a case-by-case basis and need not necessarily be undertaken in an identical fashion to the initial experiment(s). Indeed, it may be preferable to alter certain aspects of the study (for example, concentration levels investigated, treatment and sampling times, concentration of metabolic activation mix) to obtain supplementary data. It may also be appropriate to use a different genotoxicity test system, for example, a chromosomal aberration (CA) test, if there is equivocal evidence of clastogenicity from an in vitro micronucleus test, or an in vitro cell mutation assay (for example, TK or [HPRT](#) mutation assays) if there is equivocal evidence of gene mutations from an Ames test.
54. The use of historical negative control data to aid in the interpretation of genotoxicity test results has been considered particularly in relation to equivocal and small magnitude genotoxic effects ([64](#)). Advice has been published on approaches to collecting historical control data. Ideally data should be reported in terms of means and confidence intervals for the distribution of baseline genotoxic effects rather than observed ranges where outliers can have a disproportionate effect. The data set should be updated regularly and should be as large as possible. In addition, it is important that negative historical control data should have been generated using consistent methodology unless it can be

demonstrated that changes in protocol do not impact on the range of values reported in studies (64). In their most recent guidance OECD places an increased emphasis on the use of historical concurrent negative control data in the assessment of genotoxicity test results, including recommendations on how to build an historical control database (115).

55. If a chemical is considered on the basis of Stage 1 genotoxicity test results to have in vitro genotoxic potential but has not been tested in vivo, the COM considers it prudent to assume that the chemical may have in vivo genotoxic potential.

## Discussion of Stage 1 strategy: specific core tests

### In vitro bacterial tests for gene mutations

56. The most widely used in vitro mutagenicity test is the bacterial reverse mutation assay for gene mutations developed by Ames and his colleagues using *Salmonella typhimurium* (56) which forms the basis of OECD TG 471 (bacterial reverse mutation test). The very extensive database available for this assay justifies its inclusion in any initial genotoxicity testing for mutagenic hazard. Several strains of bacteria capable of detecting both base-pair and frame-shift mutations must be included, the validated strains being TA1535, TA1537 (or TA97 or TA97a), TA98 and TA100. These strains detect effects at G-C-rich sites. To detect certain oxidising mutagens or hydrazines, that produce effects at A-T-rich sites, an additional strain such as TA102 or a repair-deficient *Escherichia coli* strain (WP2uvrA or WP2uvrA (pKM101)) should be included. To detect cross-linking agents, it may be preferable to include TA102 or to add a repair proficient *Escherichia coli* strain (WP2 or WP2 (pKM101)). Testing should be carried out both in the presence and absence of an appropriate exogenous metabolic activation system such as induced rat liver S-9. Both plate-incorporation and pre-incubation methods are widely used, and either is acceptable in all test guidelines. There is ongoing consideration of the bacterial strains used. For example, the sensitivity and selectivity of the bacterial strains specified in OECD TG471 have been assessed (164) and the

current criteria for a valid Ames test and interpretation of test results have been evaluated ([91](#)).

57. Developments to the Ames test have been suggested to automate and minimise the amount of test chemical required; for example the Spiral Salmonella mutagenicity assay ([20](#)), Ames II™ test ([49](#)) and Ames MPF ([50](#), [149](#)). Whilst discussions at the OECD around assay developments are ongoing, the committee considers that these methods have not currently been developed to a point where they can be routinely used for regulatory submissions.

## **In vitro mammalian cell micronucleus assay (MNvit) for clastogenicity and aneuploidy**

58. The COM recommends that equivalent information on clastogenicity could be obtained from the MNvit compared with CA testing in mammalian cells (metaphase analysis) but that aneuploidy could be more easily detected by MNvit. There have been extensive and authoritative investigations of the utility of the MNvit which have concluded that the MNvit is reliable and can be used as an alternative to the in vitro CA for the assessment of clastogenicity and has the benefit of more easily detecting aneuploidy ([21](#)). The MNvit is available as OECD TG 487 (In Vitro Mammalian Cell Micronucleus Test) ([109](#)).
59. The MNvit can be carried out in the absence or presence of cytochalasin B, which is used to block cytoplasmic division and generate binucleate cells (cytokinesis block methodology (CBMN)). The advantage of using cytochalasin B is that it allows clear identification that treated and control cells have divided in vitro during or after treatment and provides a simple assessment of cell proliferation. Moreover, a defined population of binucleate cells is available for scoring. In general, the use of cytochalasin B has no impact on the sensitivity of the test results ([55](#), [94](#), [120](#), [162](#)), however this is not the case for nanoparticles ([34](#)). In the absence of cytochalasin B, where all cells will be mononucleate, it is essential to have evidence that cells have divided.
60. MNvit protocol development and assay performance have been previously described ([32](#), [51](#), [52](#)). A flow cytometric approach to the micronucleus assay has also been

developed (14). MNvit assay can be performed using most mammalian cell lines used in genotoxicity testing however there is evidence that rodent cell lines with compromised p53 activity such as V79, CHO and CHL cells can give more misleading positive results than cell lines proficient for p53 activity such as TK6 and human lymphocytes (51). Overall, the COM's preference is for human lymphocytes which have a number of advantages over cell lines (for example, normal diploid primary human cells with some protection against oxidative damage when whole blood cultures are used). If cell lines are used, it is important that the cells have defined provenance (93) and that the impact of potential genetic drift of the cells cultured is understood (80). One particular area of protocol development that has been under considerable investigation is the most appropriate method(s) for estimating cytotoxicity. It has been suggested that using relative cell counts (RCC) may underestimate cytotoxicity, as proliferation is not measured, and lead to potentially misleading positive results (52). In addition, it should also be recognised that cytotoxicity may be underestimated when using vital stains as these also do not measure proliferation. In the absence of cytokinesis block, the relative increase in cell count (RICC) or relative population doubling (RPD) are comparable with replication index (RI) used with the cytokinesis block assay and are the most appropriate methods of cytotoxicity estimation. Consensus recommendations embedded in the OECD guideline 487 indicate that the target range for cytotoxicity in the MNvit is  $55 \pm 5\%$ .

61. The MNvit assay in combination with the CB methodology and with pancentromeric or chromosome specific centromeric probes fluorescence in situ hybridisation (FISH) provides a sensitive assessment of cell proliferation and allows discrimination between chromosome breaks, chromosome loss (using pan-centromeric or anti-kinetochore antibodies) and chromosome non-disjunction and polyploidy (using chromosome-specific centromere probes) (86). It is therefore a useful model for assessing mode of action (122).
62. Binucleate cells obtained with the CBMN will usually be needed for determination of non-disjunction of chromosomes between daughter nuclei. Fenech has proposed that the CBMN assay can be further modified to provide comprehensive information on

- nucleoplasmic bridges (NPBs). This may provide information on chromosome rearrangements or telomere end fusions, and nuclear buds (NBUDs) which may provide information on gene amplification ([45](#), [46](#)). Fenech proposed that the comprehensive CBMN assay should be considered as a 'cytome' method for measuring chromosomal instability and altered cellular viability ([45](#)). The 'cytome' method is complex and requires large amounts of blood and considerable technical skill. It is currently not suitable for routine testing of chemicals for genotoxicity but may provide useful information on MoA.
63. The flow-cytometry-based micronucleus assay (FCMMN) was developed to increase reproducibility and decrease turnaround time for the micronucleus test ([89](#), [8](#)). However, the modified assay did not overcome the potential issue of misleading positive results. A number of approaches were undertaken to overcome this and have been previously described ([32](#)). A separate approach to automation of the CBMN assay involves automated image analysis ([27](#), [8](#), [139](#), [18](#), [95](#), [171](#), [17](#)). This does provide some advantages over the FCMMN assay as the cells are not destroyed in the analysis and it can be applied to the cytokinesis blocked micronucleus assay. Thus, micronuclei can be scored in binucleated cells, cells containing multiple micronuclei can be easily identified and scored as a single event, and the image galleries and slides can be stored, allowing the experiment to be re-visited at a later date.
64. An interlaboratory evaluation of the MultiFlow DNA Damage kit— p53, gamma H2AX, Phospho-Histone H3 and polyploidy has been described by Bryce and others ([16](#)). This is a multiplexed in vitro genotoxicity assay based on flow cytometric analysis in which detergent-liberated nuclei are simultaneously stained with propidium iodide and labelled with fluorescent antibodies against p53, gH2AX, and phospho-histone H3. Polyploidy can be quantified as the proportion of 8n-positive events relative to the number of total events with 2n and greater DNA content.
65. From 7 laboratories assessing chemicals representing clastogens, aneugens and non-genotoxicants, with analysis based on global evaluation factors and using a multinomial logistic regression, assay sensitivity, specificity and concordance in relation to a priori MoA grouping were 92%. The authors suggest that the 2 distinct analysis strategies



utilised can be used to rapidly and reliably predict a genotoxic MoA for new chemicals (16).

## Discussion stage 1: non-core tests

### In vitro chromosomal aberration assay in mammalian cells (metaphase analysis) for clastogenicity and aneuploidy

66. The in vitro CA assay in mammalian cells has been widely used in genotoxicity testing for many decades and provides information on chromatid and chromosome breaks, deletions and re-arrangements that are indicative of damage associated with adverse health outcomes. Only limited information can be obtained on potential aneugenicity by recording the incidence of polyploidy and/or modification of mitotic index (1). The COM notes that polyploidy may not be a reliable indicator for aneugenicity and may result from a number of different genetic changes (53, 102). It is possible to adapt the chromosome aberration assay to include the use of chromosome specific centromeric probes with fluorescence in situ hybridisation (FISH) to assess the potential for aneuploidy (99). An IWGT report (53) concluded that the preferred measure of cytotoxicity in the CA test should be one based on cell proliferation (for example, relative population doubling or relative increase in cell counts) compared to negative control cultures rather than simple cell counts. On balance it is considered preferable to use the in vitro micronucleus test for the initial assessment of clastogenic and aneugenic potential. The latest revision of the OECD test guideline (111) utilises a maximum test concentration corresponding to 10 mM (or 2 mg/mL) which is in-line with the revised MNvit assay (109).

### In vitro mouse lymphoma assay for gene mutation and clastogenicity

67. The COM reaffirms the view stated in the 1989, 2000 and 2011 guidance, that the most appropriate in vitro mammalian cell gene mutation test is the mouse lymphoma assay.

Protocol development and test data interpretation strategies were discussed previously ([32](#)).

68. A re-evaluation of published studies, many of which were undertaken by the US NTP, showed that a large number of these were uninterpretable or the outcomes equivocal ([142](#)). This assay is now described in a separate OECD TG ('Test 490: in vitro mammalian cell gene mutation test using the thymidine kinase gene') which was published in 2016 ([112](#)). Some authors have reported that the mouse lymphoma assay can detect, in addition to gene mutations and clastogenicity, information on recombination, deletion and aneuploidy ([119](#), [145](#), [163](#)). However, this has been contested from results showing that none of 7 reference aneugens were reliably detected at acceptable levels of cytotoxicity ([54](#)). It is possible that aneuploidy in these cells could be a secondary effect of chromosomal rearrangement. However, the COM considers that this assay does not reliably detect aneugens.

## In vitro HPRT assays for gene mutation

69. An in vitro cell mutation assay which uses forward mutation in the hypoxanthine guanine phosphoribosyl transferase (HPRT) gene to assess mutations has been developed in several cell lines, principally CHO cells and is described in the revised OECD 476 guideline ([113](#)). TG476 recommends that the minimum number of cells required for the assay should allow for at least 10 spontaneous mutants being present in all phases of the test. The COM have previously considered the power of this assay and [it was concluded](#) that  $10^7$  surviving cells are required for a valid test, providing sufficient numbers of cells to maintain between 10 and 100 spontaneous mutations.
70. As discussed in paragraph 43, a number of research groups have developed genotoxicity assays based on MN measurement using commercial sources of human reconstructed skin (such as Episkin® and EpiDerm™) ([18](#), [23](#), [48](#), [170](#), [107](#), [137](#), [128](#), [129](#)) or a co-culture technique involving reconstructed skin and mouse lymphoma L5178Y cells ([48](#)). Measurement of DNA damage using the comet assay in reconstructed skin has also been reported ([126](#), [134](#), [129](#)) and is considered to be sufficiently validated to start the OECD Test Guideline development process ([129](#)). The

primary purpose in developing genotoxicity tests using reconstructed skin has been to supplement genotoxicity data-packages for cosmetic chemicals where no in vivo genotoxicity tests are permitted.

## **In vitro alkaline Comet assay for DNA damage**

71. The in vitro alkaline comet assay for DNA damage has been proposed as an alternative to clastogenicity assessment in mammalian cells since cell proliferation is not needed, therefore any cell type can be used ([62](#), [165](#)). The alkaline comet assay detects a wide range of genetic damage including single and double strand breaks, repair induced breaks, alkali labile lesions and abasic sites. There is evidence that the in vitro comet assay can be modified to detect DNA cross-linking agents ([147](#)). The comet-FISH assay has been developed to provide information on site specific DNA strand breaks ([57](#), [133](#), [140](#)). There is evidence that the in vivo comet assay can detect chemicals that induce gene mutations in vitro and in vivo ([28](#), [81](#), [84](#), [85](#)). Extrapolation from this suggests that the in vitro comet assay can also detect chemicals that induce gene mutations and this capability has been demonstrated ([28](#)). However, it is not recommended as a routine replacement for gene mutation tests in vitro. Thus, the comet assay measures DNA damage irrespective of genotoxic endpoint, with the exception of aneuploidy. A positive comet assay result may be due to repairable DNA damage or lesions which lead to cell death and not necessarily lead to mutations or MN. Negative results from an Ames test and MNvit would reduce the level of concern associated with positive results from an in vitro comet assay. Thus, the in vitro comet assay can serve as a useful adjunct to the recommended core-tests, especially in instances where in vivo testing is not permitted such as in cosmetics testing. Pfuhler and others ([129](#)) has reviewed the status of the development of the 3D organ-based models for genotoxicity testing. The authors concluded that the 3D skin comet assay was sufficiently validated to start the process of OECD test guideline development.

## Summary stage 1 (in vitro genotoxicity testing)

72. The COM recommendations for Stage 1 testing remain the same as in the 2011 guidelines, namely that the 3 key endpoints of gene mutation, clastogenicity and aneuploidy can be detected by using 2 core in vitro tests. These should be undertaken according to the best international guidance available to avoid misleading positive or negative results. Data should be interpreted using appropriate statistical analysis and use of historical negative control data. It is important to note that the in vitro tests should be undertaken prior to any in vivo testing.
73. The COM confirms the need to understand MoA in order to derive conclusions regarding the biological importance of results. Data on MoA is important in elucidating whether genotoxicity tests give misleading negative or positive results, and also understanding of the MoA can help decisions with regard to devising a strategy for Stage 2 in vivo genotoxicity testing. There is a particular need to understand MoA for chemicals which cannot be subjected to in vivo genotoxicity tests (for example, cosmetics). In this particular instance, some useful additional information on genotoxicity may be provided by undertaking further testing, for example using in vitro mammalian cell gene mutation assays or in vitro MN and comet tests using reconstructed human skin.
74. The recommended 2 core genotoxicity tests in Stage 1 are the Ames test and MNvit. These recommended assays, when combined, provide sufficient information for the genotoxicity assessment of most chemicals and provide high sensitivity for the identification of rodent carcinogens and in vivo genotoxicants, and reduce the risk of misleading positive results when compared with a battery containing more than one mammalian cell test.
75. Results from non-core tests described in this document may provide useful additional information on in vitro mutagenic hazards on a case-by-case basis. In most instances misleading negative in vitro results are due to inadequate exogenous metabolic activation ([88](#)).

76. Some regulatory authorities may require an in vivo genotoxicity test where high, or moderate and prolonged, levels of exposure are expected (for example, most human medicines) in order to provide additional reassurance even when Stage 1 tests have given negative results. If a chemical is considered on the basis of Stage 1 test results to have in vitro mutagenic potential but has not been tested in vivo, the COM considers it prudent to assume that the chemical may have in vivo mutagenic potential.

## Stage 2: in vivo genotoxicity tests

### Overview of strategy

77. Stage 2 of the testing strategy involves an assessment of genotoxic activity in vivo in somatic tissues and in germ cells (when there is a need for the assessment of heritable effects and/or information on hazard classification of mutagens) (see [Figure 3](#)). The in vivo genotoxicity testing strategy has to be designed on a case-by-case basis and can be used to investigate aspects of in vivo mutagenicity, for example:

- key end point(s) identified in Stage 1
- genotoxicity in tumour target tissue(s)
- potential for germ cell genotoxicity
- in vivo genotoxic potential for chemicals which were negative in Stage 1 but where there is high or moderate and prolonged exposure
- genotoxicity in site of contact tissues

78. It is thus possible for there to be one or more separate Stage 2 strategies designed to assess the above objectives for a particular test chemical. A revised in vivo Stage 2 strategy was presented in the previous COM guidance document ([32](#)) based on the selection of tests to provide information on one or more specific aspects such as species and/or tissue genotoxicity combined with investigation of particular genotoxic end points and modes of genotoxic action. This approach does not necessarily lead to the selection of the rodent BMMN test as the first assay. Furthermore, the rat liver UDS assay is no

longer recommended as a second assay ([40](#) - discussed in paragraph 104). A table of in vivo genotoxicity tests and endpoints is provided in [Annex 1](#).

79. Other factors that should be considered when determining an in vivo genotoxicity testing strategy include whether the testing strategy can be integrated into other regulatory toxicity tests (such as subacute or subchronic toxicity studies). Consideration needs to be given to the nature of the chemical (including physico-chemical properties), the results obtained from in vitro genotoxicity tests and the available information on the toxicokinetic and metabolic profile of the chemical (for example when selecting most appropriate species, tissue and end point). The routes of exposure in animal studies should be appropriate to ensure that the chemical reaches the target tissue. Routes unlikely to give rise to significant absorption in the test animal should therefore be avoided. Unless systemic exposure can be confirmed from other toxicological studies, or evident toxicity in the target organ is seen, or the intravenous route is used, confirmatory toxicokinetic studies to measure blood or tissue exposure as appropriate should be undertaken to accompany all in vivo genotoxicity studies to assess the adequacy of any negative results obtained ([40](#)).
80. The design of in vivo genotoxicity tests should incorporate appropriate approaches to reduce the number of animals used in tests, such as the integration of genotoxicity endpoints into repeat-dose studies, in line with the [3R's principle](#) of Replacement, Reduction, Refinement. Options for reduction in animal usage include:
- use of one sex only (if supported by metabolism data or other data indicating equivalence)
  - reduced numbers of sampling times for micronucleus and CA assays when repeat dosing is performed
  - combining micronucleus and comet assays into a single acute test employing repeated administrations of test chemical; integration of micronucleus and comet end points into repeat-dose toxicity (including transgenic mutation) studies, although it should be noted that the comet assay is difficult to integrate without using satellite groups ([11](#), [127](#), [161](#)).

It should also be possible to omit the concurrent positive control administrations in micronucleus, CA and transgenic rodent mutation assays (but not for the comet assay) where the test facility has appropriate historical positive control data (127) as long as positive control slides or tissues from positive control treated rodents 'banked' from previous treatments and coded in with the experimental samples, are included to demonstrate technical proficiency.

81. The toxic properties of test chemicals (such as acute toxicity, subchronic toxicity (including target organ effects), irritancy/corrosivity in contact with skin or mucous membranes), toxicokinetic and metabolism data will influence the choice of route of administration and the highest dose level achievable in in vivo mutagenicity tests. Dose selection for in vivo genotoxicity testing requires confirmation of the limit dose (LD) or estimation of the [maximum tolerated dose](#) (MTD), consideration of tissue-specific effects and in some instances (as discussed in paragraph 78), appropriate toxicokinetic data or toxicity data in the target tissue from other studies, to support tissue exposure to the chemicals and/or metabolites (40). OECD recommend the use of the LD in circumstances where "toxicity and solubility are not limiting factors, and if genetic toxicity is not expected based on data from structurally related substances". A LD of 2000 mg/kg bw/day for a treatment period of less than 14 days and 1000 mg/kg bw/day for a treatment period greater than 14 days are stated. In circumstances where toxicity is the limiting factor, OECD recommend use of the which is defined by OECD as "the highest dose that will be tolerated without evidence of study-limiting toxicity such that higher dose levels, based on the same dosing regimen, would be expected to produce lethality or evidence of pain, suffering or distress necessitating humane euthanasia" (108). It is possible that for some chemicals, the maximum dose may not be achievable (for example, due to solubility issues) and, in this case, the maximum feasible dose (MFD) may be applied.
82. The approach outlined for Stage 2 in [Figure 3](#) takes account of evidence to suggest that in vivo comet and rodent transgenic mutation assays have better sensitivity and specificity for the identification of rodent carcinogens compared with the rat liver UDS test, particularly for carcinogens that are negative in the in vivo micronucleus test (81).

The initial in vivo genotoxicity testing strategy should therefore involve selection of one or more of the core Stage 2 tests in rodents; namely, micronucleus tests (accompanied by specific modifications for aneuploidy if necessary), the transgenic gene mutation tests, or comet DNA damage assays in rodents. It is acceptable to undertake one in vivo genotoxicity test to investigate a specific end point identified from Stage 1 in vitro genotoxicity tests. In some instances, there may be a need to investigate more than one end point before reaching a full conclusion on in vivo genotoxic potential.

83. Stage 2 in vivo genotoxicity tests should be undertaken for test chemicals that are positive in any of the in vitro Stage 1 genotoxicity tests where there is a need to ascertain whether genotoxic activity can be expressed in vivo. There are many reasons why activity shown in vitro may not be observed in vivo (for example, lack of absorption, inability of the active metabolite to reach DNA, rapid detoxication and elimination). Data from in vivo genotoxicity tests is, therefore, essential before any definite conclusions can be drawn regarding the potential mutagenic or genotoxic hazard to humans from test chemicals which have given positive results in one or more in vitro genotoxicity tests. However, conclusions on mutagenic or genotoxic hazard and MoA may have to be derived from in vitro genotoxicity data for test chemicals when no in vivo genotoxicity testing is permitted.
84. In addition, an in vivo genotoxicity test may give positive results for chemicals which only act in vivo; experience though, has shown that such chemicals are rare ([157](#), [158](#)). Such agents include some kinase inhibitors, glucocorticoid receptor antagonists ([65](#)) and long-acting beta-2-agonists ([132](#)). In some instances positive results might be obtained from in vitro genotoxicity tests that are adapted to evaluate specific characteristics of the test chemical; for example, by the use of modified or non-standard exogenous metabolising fractions ([106](#)).
85. Positive results in any Stage 2 genotoxicity test should be assessed for an indication of a MoA and for evidence which may suggest a threshold of effect or irrelevant positive responses. The COM has [previously discussed](#) the relevance of high-dose only positives and recognises that these results may be secondary to non-genotoxic effects rather than being a genotoxic effect of the compound.



86. Examples of MoAs that may lead to irrelevant positive responses in micronucleus tests, include hypothermia or hyperthermia in rodents and compound induced increases in cell division of bone marrow erythroblasts ([10](#), [143](#), [157](#)). If the conclusion is reached that a relevant MoA occurs, then the chemical should be considered as an in vivo mutagen. MoA data will be important in considering whether a threshold or non-threshold approach to risk assessment can be used. The COM has published [guidance on possible threshold modes of genotoxicity](#) which can include:
- i) involvement of non-DNA targets, (for example, aneugen inhibition of microtubules)
  - ii) the contribution of protective mechanisms (for example, repair of DNA adducts formed from many low molecular weight alkylating agents)
  - iii) overload of detoxication pathways (for example, paracetamol)
87. Equivocal results may be resolved in some assays such as MNvit or CAVit by scoring more cells. In the absence of equivocal results or if there is a need to investigate specific mutagenic endpoints, tumour target organs, or the potential for heritable effects, supplementary in vivo genotoxicity tests should be undertaken ([Figure 3](#)). This may involve repeating all or aspects of the initial Stage 2 testing strategy, or performing supplementary investigations (for example, mode of action investigations, such as DNA adducts or more specific germ cell testing) to investigate aspects of the genotoxicity of the test chemical which have not been resolved. There is a need to select the most appropriate test(s) on a case-by-case basis. All relevant factors, such as results from previous tests, and available information on toxicokinetics, toxicological effects and metabolism of the chemical, should be considered.
88. The development of testing strategies for germ cell mutagens is a rapidly evolving field. A summary of test methodologies that are currently under development and/or validation are outlined in the COM document 'G7 Test Strategies for Germ Cell Mutagens' ([36](#)).
89. One aspect of the approach to testing outlined in [Figure 3](#) is that hazard characterisation of germ cell genotoxicity can be included in the initial in vivo genotoxicity testing strategy if considered necessary. This is because there are multi tissue in vivo genotoxicity

assays (for example, transgenic rodent mutation assays and comet assay, though it should be noted that the standard comet assay has not been validated using mature sperm) which can also be used if a need to evaluate germ cell genotoxicity has been established. Additionally, germ cell mutation assays might be valuable on a case-by-case basis to provide information on heritable mutagenic effects, but these would form part of a supplementary in vivo genotoxicity testing strategy, if considered appropriate.

90. The COM reaffirms that a chemical considered a positive in vivo somatic cell mutagen should also be considered as a possible germ cell mutagen unless data can be provided to the contrary. The position held previously, that most if not all germ cell mutagens are also genotoxic in somatic cells, still holds true. It has been noted that some rare examples (for example, sodium orthovanadate, [\(7\)](#) where the mouse bone marrow micronucleus assay does not predict germ cell genotoxicity have been reported. However, the data on such compounds is conflicting and it is not known, for example, whether somatic mutations or DNA strand breaks would have been identified if other test systems (for example, transgenic assays and the comet assay) had been used and other tissues sampled ([7](#), [19](#), [166](#)).
91. It is plausible that other targets during the process of meiotic cell division may be unique to germ cells but not necessarily identical in both sexes ([41](#)). The COM evaluated advances in germ cell mutagenicity testing and some theories and hypotheses regarding human germ cell mutagenesis. It was concluded that it is not known whether unique germ cell mutagens exist (that is, chemicals that are germ cell mutagens but not somatic cell mutagens), but that this is partially because of the underutilisation of the currently accepted tests for assessing germ cell mutagenicity and a lack of investigations examining this. Recommended regimes for the analysis of mutations in germ cells are discussed fully in the COM document 'G7 test strategies for germ cell mutagens' ([36](#)).

## Discussion of Stage 2 initial testing strategy: general aspects

92. There are many publications debating in vivo genotoxicity testing strategies. These include those developed by the GUM (German speaking section of the European Environmental Mutagen Society) which recommended a single study using a combined analysis for MN and comet induction in selected tissues ([125](#)), and those from the World Health Organization / International Programme on Chemical Safety (WHO / IPCS) which recommended cytogenetics (bone marrow) or gene mutation or alternative tests as defined by genotoxic endpoint, chemical class and reactivity (with consideration of factors such as bioavailability and metabolism) ([37](#)). ICH (2011), EFSA (2017) and ECHA (2017) have also proposed similar strategies to these. The in vivo genotoxicity testing strategy recommended by the COM acknowledges there can be a variety of reasons for undertaking in vivo genotoxicity tests and it is important to identify clearly the objective of the study and the critical aspects of in vivo genotoxicity to be addressed (as set out in the Overview of Stage 2 strategy) in order to develop a strategy accordingly, rather than simply specify preferred first and second tests. There is less data on the performance of in vivo genotoxicity assays for prediction of rodent carcinogenicity compared with data on the performance of in vitro genotoxicity tests. Transgenic rodent mutation assays and the in vivo micronucleus assay have been shown to exhibit complementarity regarding prediction of rodent carcinogenicity, consistent with the assessment of different mutagenic endpoints by these 2 assays ([105](#)). The IWGT has reported that an evaluation of 91 chemicals showed that TGR and in vivo comet assays have a similar ability to detect in vivo genotoxicity when tested with bacterial mutagens and Ames-positive carcinogens ([85](#)). Thus, genotoxic endpoint and MoA analysis of in vitro mutagenic activity is of considerable importance in helping to develop an initial in vivo genotoxicity testing strategy. The COM recommends that the initial in vivo genotoxicity testing strategy should be based on one or more tests selected from a relatively limited number of in vivo genotoxicity tests that have been specifically designed to provide the optimum amount of information on in vivo mutagenic potential of the test

chemical. Where possible, consideration should be given to integrating in vivo genotoxicity testing into repeat-dose toxicity studies.

## Discussion of Stage 2: recommended in vivo genotoxicity tests

93. Three recommended in vivo genotoxicity tests are outlined below and in [Figure 2](#). Information from one or more of these recommended core tests should provide sufficient in vivo genotoxicity data for most chemicals.

### Rodent bone marrow and peripheral blood MN assay for clastogenicity and aneuploidy or rodent bone marrow CA assay for clastogenicity

94. The in vivo bone marrow or blood micronucleus (MN<sub>viv</sub>) assay is still the most widely used in vivo genotoxicity test (OECD TG 474: Mammalian Erythrocyte Micronucleus Test) ([114](#)). Most of the available in vivo data on the mutagenicity of chemicals have been obtained from studies using the MN<sub>viv</sub> test in bone marrow of mice. The bone marrow is readily accessible to chemicals that are present in the blood and a wide range of structurally diverse clastogens and aneugens has been detected using these methods. The use of peripheral blood is an alternative approach for both mice and rats (when the youngest fraction of reticulocytes are sampled) which provides equivalent data to the bone marrow assay and is technically less demanding. High throughput approaches to the peripheral blood MN<sub>viv</sub> utilising flow cytometry have been published ([24](#), [155](#), [29](#)) and the assay is well validated. The MN<sub>viv</sub> assay detects clastogenicity by measuring MN formed from acentric chromosome fragments in young (polychromatic) erythrocytes in the bone marrow or in reticulocytes of peripheral blood. It may also be used to identify the induction of chromosome loss. MN containing whole chromosomes (as opposed to fragments) can be identified with molecular kinetochore or centromeric labelling techniques. It should be noted that only aneuploidy produced by chromosome loss can be measured in the MN<sub>viv</sub> assay. The MN<sub>viv</sub> can be used in the initial in vivo

genotoxicity strategy for generic testing for in vivo genotoxic potential and for assessment of clastogenicity and aneuploidy. Clastogenicity may be measured by metaphase analysis of CA in bone marrow of rodents as an alternative approach to the use of the micronucleus assay.

95. Proposals have been published to incorporate micronucleus assays into routine rodent 28 day subacute toxicity studies following demonstration of the feasibility of such an approach ([60](#), [87](#), [98](#)). The evidence from one evaluation of micronucleus tests conducted on samples from short-term, subchronic and from a few chronic studies in mice has been published ([167](#)). In mice, MN in polychromatic erythrocytes represent DNA damage occurring in the last 72 hours, whilst MN in normochromatic erythrocytes represent average damage during the 30 day period prior to sampling ([167](#)).
96. The development of a simultaneous liver and peripheral blood micronucleus assay in adult rats has also been reported ([150](#)). A correlation between micronucleus induction in hepatocytes and hepatocarcinogenicity was shown and the authors proposed that the assay could detect micronucleus-inducing chemicals that require metabolic activation. Takasawa and others (2007), Suzuki and others (2009), and Hamada and others (2015) have also reported developments of an in vivo liver micronucleus assay, which has been discussed by IWGT ([159](#), [160](#), [85](#)), and it has been recommended that an OECD guideline should be developed.

## Transgenic rodent (TGR) mutation assay for gene mutations

97. The transgenic rodent somatic and germ cell gene mutation assays (OECD TG 488, [116](#)) can be used to assess gene mutations in a wide range of rodent tissues (including germ cells) using all routes of administration and is particularly valuable when investigating gene mutation as the genotoxic endpoint ([84](#), [85](#)). There is sufficient data to support the use of the Muta<sup>TM</sup> mouse, BigBlue<sup>®</sup> mouse and rat (including use of  $\lambda$  cII transgene), LacZ plasmid mouse, and the gpt delta models in TG 488.
98. Molecular sequencing of induced mutations in transgenic targets can aid in interpretation of study results (particularly equivocal responses) and also provide mechanistic

information. The OECD published a Detailed Review Paper (DRP) on Transgenic Rodent Gene Mutation Assays which led to the development of an OECD guideline that was adopted in July 2011, with revision in 2013 ([169](#)) and in 2020 ([116](#)). The latest version focuses on updating recommended regimes for the analysis of mutations in germ cells (discussed fully in the COM document ‘Test Strategies for Germ Cell Mutagens’ ([36](#))). TG488 states that “when both somatic and germ cells need to be collected and/or tested, based on regulatory requirements, or toxicological information, a 28+28d regimen [that is, 28 days treatment with sampling 28 days following administration of the final dose] permits the testing of mutations in somatic tissues and tubule germ cells from the same animals” ([100](#)).

## Rodent alkaline Comet assay for DNA damage

99. The in vivo comet assay (OECD TG 489: In Vivo Mammalian Alkaline Comet Assay) ([110](#)) detects a wide spectrum of DNA damage including repairable DNA damage. A report of an international validation of the in vivo alkaline comet assay has been published ([159](#)) and formed the basis for the OECD guideline. An overview of the types of genetic lesions detected is given above in paragraph 71. The in vivo comet assay can detect chemicals that induce gene mutations and has produced positive results for nearly 90% of rodent carcinogens not detected by the rodent BMMN assay ([81](#)). It also shows high sensitivity when compared with TGR results in liver and the GI tract, and high sensitivity at detecting bacterial mutagens and mutagenic carcinogens ([84](#), [85](#)). Developments regarding the conduct of the in vivo alkaline comet assay were detailed in the previous COM guidance ([168](#)). This assay can be used for elucidating positive in vitro genotoxicity findings and to evaluate genotoxicity in target organs of toxicity ([63](#)), however, it would not be an appropriate follow-up for a chemical causing aneuploidy in vitro. The comet assay can be applied to a wide range of species and in many tissues including site-of-contact tissues. In the absence of data indicating particular tissues of interest (for example, toxic findings or tissue accumulation seen in other studies), the IWGT concluded that comet analysis of the liver combined with the bone marrow or

peripheral blood micronucleus assay will be sufficient in most cases. However, if systemic exposure is expected, or found, to be low then site-of-contact-effects in GI tract are effective (85). Validation of a protocol for a germ cell comet assay is ongoing.

100. The Committee considers that the in vivo comet assay has appropriate sensitivity to detect chemicals which induce both gene mutations and/or clastogenicity. Thus the in vivo comet assay is recommended as a core test in the initial in vivo genotoxicity testing strategy to assess DNA damage in multiple somatic tissues in a single study. It is possible to include the comet assay within other in vivo genotoxicity tests (161) or within standard subacute or subchronic regulatory toxicity tests (136), although the logistics of achieving the correct sampling time in relation to the final doses must be carefully considered (148).

## **Non-core in vivo test: rat liver UDS assay for DNA damage**

101. The rodent liver UDS assay is an established approach for investigating genotoxic activity in the liver with the endpoint measured being indicative of DNA damage and subsequent repair in liver cells. The COM consideration of this assay and published evaluations now suggest it is less sensitive than the in vivo comet assay with regard to identification of genotoxicity in the liver. An analysis of the prediction of rodent carcinogens not identified by the micronucleus tests indicated that the comet assay was considerably better than the rat liver UDS assay at identifying rodent carcinogens (81, 148) Based on these analyses, EFSA concluded that the UDS assay was of limited usefulness in genotoxicity testing strategies, being only suitable for the detection of chemicals causing damage in the liver, and with a lower predictive value than the TGR and comet assays in detecting chemicals which cause gene mutations. For existing data sets, where the UDS assay has been used as a follow up to positive in vitro gene mutation findings, a UDS study is considered adequate only for positive results (40). The COM agree with this opinion and recommend use of the comet assay rather than rodent liver UDS in order to assess potential for DNA damage in vivo.

102. Another non-core test which is receiving increasing attention involves the detection of gene mutations at the endogenous phosphatidylinositol glycan complementation group A gene ([Pig-A](#)), a reporter gene in which mutations are currently detected in peripheral red blood cells of mammals ([15](#), [29](#), [103](#)). This assay has the potential advantage of being integrated into regulatory toxicity tests ([28](#), [76](#)) and it is noted that Pig-A mutations increase with duration of dosing ([103](#)). The development of the assay was discussed by the IGWT ([59](#)) and it has since undergone validation in support of the development of an OECD TG ([30](#), [117](#), [118](#)).

## Discussion of Stage 2: supplementary tests

103. Supplementary in vivo genotoxicity tests need to be considered on a case-by-case basis taking into account all relevant information. It is considered that for most chemicals, supplementary in vivo genotoxicity data should be unnecessary but on a case-by-case basis, specific aspects of MoA (for example, nature of DNA adducts) and further characterisation of germ cell genotoxicity (for example, characterisation of male and/or female germ cell clastogenicity including use of FISH, and the evaluation of heritable effects) may be required. DNA adduct studies can provide valuable information on potential genotoxicity as a follow up for in vitro mutagens which have yielded negative results in in vivo genotoxicity assays ([130](#)). DNA adduct data (including type of adduct, frequency, persistence, repair process) can be used to inform on MoA and its relationship to carcinogenesis, and should be considered in conjunction with other relevant data such as dosimetry, toxicity, genotoxicity and tumour data ([73](#)).

104. A brief outline of these additional Stage 2 methods is given in [Table 1](#) below. Reference is also made in [Table 1](#) to a number of tests for heritable genotoxic effects but it is noted that these tests, which involve the use of many animals and demand a high level of expertise, are comparatively rarely used. The COM is aware that there is the possibility that gender differences in germ cell mutagenesis may exist and this aspect may need to be considered on a case-by-case basis ([41](#)). The conclusions of COM's evaluation of germ cell testing methods are provided in a separate document (DOH, 2021).



**Table 1. Supplementary in vivo genotoxicity tests**

Assay	Endpoint	Guidance	Main attributes	Comments
<u>Investigations of DNA Adducts</u>				
<sup>32</sup> P-postlabelling	DNA adducts	IWGT	Can be highly sensitive particularly with bulky adducts and if appropriate enrichment technique used.	Interpretation of results can be complex. Involves handling high-activity <sup>32</sup> P. ( <a href="#">131</a> )
Covalent binding to DNA A variety of methods can be used such as those involving radioactive decay measurements (for example, <sup>14</sup> C-) or isotope measurements (for example, Accelerator Mass Spectrometry AMS)	DNA Adducts	IWGT	Some methods (AMS) are potentially very sensitive and can provide data on DNA binding at levels of exposure similar to low level environmental exposures	Uses radiolabelled compound (very small amounts (for example, nanograms) in the case of AMS). Interpretation of results can be complicated (for example, by non-specific binding). ( <a href="#">68</a> )
<b>Supplementary investigations of germ cell mutagenicity</b>				
Analysis for clastogenicity/aneuploidy	Structural and numerical changes in spermatogonia, spermatocytes or oocytes	OECD	Can provide information on nature of effects in spermatogonia, spermatocytes and/or oocytes of mice or rats	Can provide useful information on MoA. ( <a href="#">138</a> )
Spermatid micronucleus assay	Chromosomal aberrations and or lagging chromosomes	None available	Provides information of clastogenic and/or aneugenic effects in spermatocytes.	( <a href="#">5</a> )

<b>Assay</b>	<b>Endpoint</b>	<b>Guidance</b>	<b>Main attributes</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Dominant lethal assay	Chromosomal/gene mutations	OECD	Provides information on unstable chromosomal changes in gametes that lead to fetal death after fertilization and can determine stage(s) of gametogenesis affected	Little used. needs relatively large numbers of animals (4)
Mouse specific locus test	Gene mutations	EPA	Provides information on genetic changes transmitted to the first generation progeny as basis for estimation of induced mutation frequency in humans	Very rarely used. Needs large numbers of animals (3)
Mouse heritable translocation test	Chromosomal changes	EPA	Provides information on chromosomal changes transmitted to the first generation progeny as basis for estimation of induced translocation frequency in humans	Very rarely used. Needs large numbers of animals (3)
Sperm Comet assay	Double strand breaks and/or apurinic sites in sperm head DNA	None available	Provides information on genetic instability in sperm	(156)
Spermatid UDS assay	Repair DNA synthesis in spermatocytes	EPA	Provides information on induction of DNA lesions	(146)

## Summary stage 2 (in vivo genotoxicity testing)

105. The in vivo genotoxicity testing strategy has to be designed on a case-by-case basis and can be used to investigate aspects of in vivo mutagenicity, for example:

- key end point(s) identified in Stage 1
- genotoxicity in tumour target tissue(s)
- potential for germ cell genotoxicity
- in vivo genotoxic potential for chemicals which were negative in Stage 1 but where there is high or moderate and prolonged exposure
- genotoxicity in site of contact tissues

106. The recommended in vivo genotoxicity test(s) include micronucleus assay, bone marrow cytogenetics, alkaline comet assay in rodents and transgenic rodent mutation assay. In some instances there may be a need to undertake more than one in vivo test to perform an initial assessment of in vivo genotoxic potential (for example, where endpoints cannot be assessed in one study and there is a need to investigate multiple endpoints before reaching conclusions on in vivo mutagenic potential). Multiple endpoints may be combined in a single study. If positive results are obtained it is important to consider the evidence for MoA and check the data for evidence of irrelevant positive results. Usually negative results obtained in a carefully selected in vivo test (possibly studying more than one endpoint and tissue) will be sufficient to address positive results found in vitro, provided that target tissue exposure is sufficient. However, a further test(s) may be needed if some of the genotoxic effects seen in Stage 1 in vitro tests have not been adequately studied in vivo (for example, the chemical affects multiple mutagenic endpoints), or other aspects of the genotoxic potential of the chemical had not been fully resolved (for example, in the case where an investigation of heritable effects was required). If equivocal results are obtained, then supplementary testing (including scoring of additional cells in the case of the comet and MN assays) may be needed. This may involve repeating some aspects of the recommended in vitro and/or in vivo genotoxicity tests or performing additional investigations (for example, MoA investigations, such as


DNA adducts and/or more detailed consideration of heritable effects). The supplementary in vivo genotoxicity testing strategy and selection of the most appropriate assays should be undertaken on a case-by-case basis. All relevant factors such as results from previous tests, structural alerts and available information on toxicokinetics, tissue toxicity and metabolism of the chemical, should be considered. In the absence of appropriate germ cell genotoxicity data, the COM considers it is reasonable to assume that all somatic cell mutagens have the potential to be germ cell mutagens.

## Possible future developments

107. The COM is aware that new assays and toxicogenomic approaches are under development which might be of value within genotoxicity testing. The ToxTracker assay uses a series of reporter cell lines expressing biomarker genes selected to detect chemically induced DNA damage and oxidative stress ([66](#), [67](#), [13](#)). Whilst the assay presents an interesting approach to identifying MoA, it is not currently considered to be a reliable genotoxicity test and is more suitable as a biomarker assay or in MoA investigations.
108. Other potential tests include investigation of instability in expanded simple tandem repeats in male gametes and offspring to evaluate heritable mutations ([144](#)). The development of new high throughput assays for the assessment of germ line mutations and the quantification of risk from such data may provide opportunities to protect future generations from mutated DNA sequences. Developments within the field of toxicogenomics are also likely to provide new methods for investigating genotoxic mechanisms and informing on MoA. The COM have reviewed data generated in this field several times up to the drafting of this guidance statement but currently conclude that the evidence does not support the routine use of toxicogenomic approaches as an adjunct to genotoxicity testing.
109. HESI-GTTC has considered 'next generation' testing strategies for genotoxicity including the use of QSAR modelling, MoA assessments and their human relevance. The concept of quantitative assessment of genotoxicity data was also discussed ([58](#), [74](#), [139](#), [26](#)). Quantitative approaches to the assessment of genotoxicity data was considered by COM

in 2017 to 2018. Their conclusions were published in a [statement](#). IWGT have also published guidance on quantitative approaches to genotoxicity risk assessment ([96](#), [97](#)).

**Figure 1. Overview of strategy for testing chemical substances for genotoxicity**



## **Accessible text version of Figure 1. Overview of strategy for testing chemical substances for genotoxicity**

### **Stage 0:**

Structure Activity Relationships (SAR), screening tests and physio-chemical properties (of substances and impurities)

### **Stage 1:**

1. Bacterial gene mutation test (Ames test)
2. Clastogenicity and aneugenicity (in vitro micronucleus test)

### **Path 1: Negative results in all test**

If negative after full assessment, substance is **not mutagenic**.

### **Path 2: Equivocal result in any test**

Stage 2: Consider rationale for in vivo study selection. This may include:

- mutagenic endpoints identified in Stage 1 in vitro tests
- tumour target issues in carcinogenicity studies
- potential for germ cell genotoxicity
- negative in Stage 1 but where exposure is high, or moderate and prolonged
- site of contact tissues

Undertake one or more of the following recommended assays:

- micronucleus assay
- transgenic rodent mutation assay
- Comet assay

If negative after full assessment, substance is **not mutagenic**.

OR

Stage 2: Consider rationale for in vivo study selection. This may include:

- mutagenic endpoints identified in Stage 1 in vitro tests
- tumour target issues in carcinogenicity studies
- potential for germ cell genotoxicity
- negative in Stage 1 but where exposure is high, or moderate and prolonged
- site of contact tissues

Undertake one or more of the following recommended assays:

- micronucleus assay
- transgenic rodent mutation assay
- Comet assay

Insufficient evidence to assess the mutagenicity of the substance. Review available data and make pragmatic conclusions based on weight of evidence.

**Path 3: Positive result in any test**

Stage 2: Consider rationale for in vivo study selection. This may include:

- mutagenic endpoints identified in Stage 1 in vitro tests
- tumour target issues in carcinogenicity studies
- potential for germ cell genotoxicity
- negative in Stage 1 but where exposure is high, or moderate and prolonged
- site of contact tissues


Undertake one or more of the following recommended assays:

- micronucleus assay
- transgenic rodent mutation assay
- Comet assay

If data are robust, consider substance to be in vivo somatic cell mutagen.



**Figure 2. Screening (Stage 0) and in vitro tests (Stage 1)**



## **Accessible text version of Figure 2. Screening (Stage 0) and in vitro tests (Stage 1)**

### **Stage 0:**

Structure Activity Relationships (SAR), screening tests and physio-chemical properties (of substances and impurities).

### **Stage 1:**

1. Bacterial gene mutation test (Ames test)
2. Clastogenicity and aneugenicity (in vitro micronucleus test)

### **Path 1: Negative results in all Stage 1 tests**

Consider other factors that indicate additional evaluation is required:

- structural alerts,
- results of other tests (for example, rodent tumours)

Substance is not mutagenic. If high, or moderate and prolonged exposure, consider proceeding to Stage 2 only where in vivo testing is permitted (in situations where in vivo testing is prohibited, further in vitro testing should be considered)

OR

Consider other factors that indicate additional evaluation is required:

- structural alerts,
- results of other tests (for example, rodent tumours)

Consider:

- reproducibility
- historical control data
- mode of Genotoxic Action (MoGA)
- results of stage 0
- additional in vitro tests (for example, mammalian cell mutation, mammalian cytogenetics, Comet assay, or human reconstituted skin)

Insufficient evidence to assess the mutagenicity of the substance.

Proceed to Stage 2 only where in vivo testing is permitted (in situations where in vivo testing is prohibited, further in vitro testing should be considered).

## **Path 2: Equivocal result in any Stage 1 test**

Consider:

- reproducibility
- historical control data
- mode of Genotoxic Action (MoGA)
- results of stage 0
- additional in vitro tests (for example, mammalian cell mutation, mammalian cytogenetics, Comet assay, or human reconstituted skin)

Consider other factors that indicate additional evaluation is required:

- structural alerts,
- results of other tests (for example, rodent tumours)

Substance is not mutagenic. If high, or moderate and prolonged exposure, consider proceeding to Stage 2 only where in vivo testing is permitted (in situations where in vivo testing is prohibited, further in vitro testing should be considered)

OR

Consider:

- reproducibility
- historical control data
- mode of Genotoxic Action (MoGA)
- results of stage 0
- additional in vitro tests (for example, mammalian cell mutation, mammalian cytogenetics, Comet assay, or human reconstituted skin)

Insufficient evidence to assess the mutagenicity of the substance.

Proceed to Stage 2 only where in vivo testing is permitted (in situations where in vivo testing is prohibited, further in vitro testing should be considered).

OR

Consider:

- reproducibility
- historical control data
- mode of Genotoxic Action (MoGA)

- results of stage 0
- additional in vitro tests (for example, Mammalian cell mutation, mammalian cytogenetics, Comet assay, or human reconstituted skin)

Consider:

- mode of Genotoxic Action (MoGA)
- results of stage 0
- misleading positive results (for example, bacterial specific metabolism, or excessive mammalian cell cytotoxicity)

Substance should be considered to be an in vitro mutagen.

Proceed to Stage 2 only where in vivo testing is permitted (in situations where in vivo testing is prohibited, further in vitro testing should be considered).

### **Path 3: Positive result in any Stage 1 test**


Consider

- mode of Genotoxic Action (MoGA)
- results of stage 0
- misleading positive results (for example, bacterial specific metabolism, or excessive mammalian cell cytotoxicity)

Substance should be considered to be an in vitro mutagen.

Proceed to Stage 2 only where in vivo testing is permitted (in situations where in vivo testing is prohibited, further in vitro testing should be considered).

**Figure 3. Testing for in vivo mutagenic potential (Stage 2)**



## **Accessible text version of Figure 3. Testing for in vivo mutagenic potential (Stage 2)**

### **Stage 2:**

Rationale for in vivo study selection may include:

- mutagenic endpoints identified in Stage 1 in vitro tests
- tumour target tissues in carcinogenicity studies
- potential for germ cell genotoxicity
- negative Stage 1 but where exposure is high, or moderate and prolonged
- site of contact tissues

Devise and justify initial testing strategy which may incorporate one of the following recommended assays:

- micronucleus assay
- transgenic rodent mutation assay
- Comet assay

### **Path 1: Negative results in all Stage 2 tests**

Substance is not mutagenic in vivo.

### **Path 2: Equivocal result in any Stage 2 test**

Consider:

- reproducibility
- historic control data
- mode of genotoxic Action (MoGa)
- results of stage 0, 1 and 2 tests
- toxicokinetic and metabolic information

If further in vitro or in vivo testing is warranted. Select appropriate tests on a case-by-case basis (for example, DNA adducts).

Substance is not mutagenic in vivo.

OR

Consider:

- reproducibility
- historic control data
- mode of genotoxic Action (MoGa)
- results of stage 0, 1 and 2 tests

- toxicokinetic and metabolic information

If further in vitro or in vivo testing is warranted. Select appropriate tests on a case-by-case basis (for example, DNA adducts).

Insufficient evidence to assess the mutagenicity of the substance. Review available data and make pragmatic conclusions based on weight of evidence.

OR

Consider:

- reproducibility
- historical control data
- mode of genotoxic Action (MoGA)
- results of stage 0, 1 and 2 tests
- toxicokinetic and metabolic information

If further in vitro or in vivo testing is warranted. Select appropriate tests on a case-by-case basis (for example, DNA adducts).

Consider:

- historical control data
- mode of genotoxic Action (MoGA)
- results of stage 0, 1 and 2 tests
- misleading positive results

Substance should be considered to be in vivo somatic cell mutagen and possible germ cell mutagens.

### **Path 3: Positive results in any Stage 2 tests**

Consider:

- historical control data
- mode of genotoxic Action (MoGA)
- results of stage 0, 1 and 2 tests
- misleading positive results

Consider:

- reproducibility
- historical control data
- mode of genotoxic Action (MoGA)
- results of stage 0, 1 and 2 tests

- toxicokinetic and metabolic information

If further in vitro or in vivo testing is warranted. Select appropriate tests on a case-by-case basis (for example, DNA adducts).

Insufficient evidence to assess the mutagenicity of the substance. Review available data and make pragmatic conclusions based on weight of evidence.

OR

Consider:

- historical control data
- mode of genotoxic Action (MoGA)
- results of stage 0, 1 and 2 tests
- misleading positive results

Substance should be considered to be in vivo somatic cell mutagen and possible germ cell mutagens.



## References

1. Aardema M, Albertini S, Arni P, Henderson L, Kirsch-Volders M, Mackay J, Sarrif D, Stringer D and Taalman R (1998). 'Aneuploidy: a report of an ECETOC task force.' *Mutation Research*: 410, pages 3-79
2. Aardema MJ, Barnett BB, Mun GC, Dahl EL, Curren RD, Hewitt NJ and Pfuhrer S. 'Evaluation of chemicals requiring metabolic activation in the EpiDerm™ 3D human reconstructed skin micronucleus (RSMN) assay.' *Mutation Research* 2013: issue 750, pages 40-49
3. Adler I-D (2008). 'Mutagenicity Tests in vivo.' In *Toxicology and Risk Assessment*, edited by Grein H, Snyder R (Wiley and Sons, UK) pages 371-384
4. Adler I, Shelby M, Bootman J, Favor J, Generoso W, Pacchierotti F, Shibuya T and Tanaka N. 'Summary report of the Working Group on Mammalian Germ Cell Tests.' *Mutation Research* 1994: issue 312, pages 313-318
5. Allen JW, Collins BW, Lan A, Afshari AJ, George MH, DeAngelo AB and Fuscoe JC (2000). 'Erythrocyte and spermatid micronucleus analyses in mice chronically exposed to potassium bromate in drinking water.' *Environmental and Molecular Mutagenesis* 36, pages 250-252
6. Andres E, Molinari J, Remoué N, Sá-Rocha VM, Barrichello C and Hurtado SP (2012). 'Successful micronucleus testing with the EPI/001 3D reconstructed epidermis model: preliminary findings.' *Mutation Research*: volume 743, issues 1-2, pages 36–41
7. Attia S, Badary O, Hamada S, de Angelis M and Adler I (2005). 'Othovanadate increased the frequency of aneuploid mouse sperm without micronucleus induction in mouse bone marrow erythrocytes at the same dose level.' *Mutation Research* 583, pages 158-167
8. Avlasevich S, Bryce S, De Boeck M, Elhajouji A, Van Goethem F, Lynch A, Nicolette J, Shi J, Dertinger S (2011). 'Flow cytometric analysis of micronuclei in mammalian cell cultures: past, present and future.' *Mutagenesis* volume 26, issue 1, pages 147-52
9. Barcham R, Orsini N, Andres E, Hundt A and Luzy AP. 'Successful proof of concept of a micronucleus genotoxicity assay on reconstructed epidermis exhibiting intrinsic metabolic activity.' *Mutation Research Genetic toxicology and environmental mutagenesis* 2018: issue 829-830, pages 75–86
10. Blakey D, Galloway S, Kirkland D and MacGregor J (2008). 'Regulatory aspects of genotoxicity testing: from hazard identification to risk assessment.' *Mutation Research*: issue 657, pages 84-90
11. Bowen D, Whitwell JH, Lillford L, Henderson D, Kidd D, McGarry S, Pearce G and Beevers C, Kirkland, DJ (2011). 'Evaluation of a multi-endpoint assay in rats, combining the bone-marrow micronucleus test, the Comet assay and the flow-cytometric peripheral blood micronucleus test.' *Mutation Research* 722, pages 7-19

12. Brambilla G and Martelli A. 'Failure of the standard battery of short-term tests in detecting some rodent and human genotoxic carcinogens.' *Toxicology* 2004: volume 196, pages 1-19
13. Brandsma I, Moelijker N, Derr R, Hendriks G. 'Aneugen versus clastogen evaluation and oxidative stress-related mode-of-action assessment of genotoxic compounds using the ToxTracker reporter assay.' *Toxicological Sciences* 2020: issue 177, pages 202–213
14. Bryce S, Avlasevich S, Bemis J, Lukamowicz M, Elhajouji A, Van Goethem F, De Boeck M, Beerens D, Aerts H, van Gompel J and others (2008a). 'Interlaboratory evaluation of a flow cytometric, high content in vitro micronucleus assay.' *Mutation Research* issue 650, pages 181-195
15. Bryce S, Bemis J and Dertinger S (2008b). 'In vivo mutation assay based on the endogenous pig-a locus.' *Environmental and Molecular Mutagenesis* issue 49, pages 256-264
16. Bryce SM, Bernacki DT, Bemis JC, Spellman RA, Engel ME, Schuler M, Lorge E, Heikkinen PT, Hemmann U, Thybaud V, Wilde S, Queisser N, Sutter A, Zeller A, Guérard M, Kirkland D, Dertinger SD (2017). 'Interlaboratory evaluation of a multiplexed high information content in vitro genotoxicity assay.' *Environmental and Molecular Mutagenesis*: volume 58, issue 3, pages 146-161
17. Buick JK, Williams A, Gagné R, Swartz CD, Recio L, Ferguson SS, Yauk CL (2020). 'Flow cytometric micronucleus assay and TGx-DDI transcriptomic biomarker analysis of 10 genotoxic and non-genotoxic chemicals in human HepaRG™ cells.' *Genes and Environment*: volume 4, issue 42:5
18. Chapman K, Thomas A, Wills J, Pfuhler S, Doak S, Jenkins G (2014) 'Automation and validation of micronucleus detection in the 3D EpiDerm™ human reconstructed skin assay and correlation with 2D dose responses.' *Mutagenesis* 29, pages 165-175
19. Ciranni R, Antonetti M, and Miglore L (1995). 'Vanadium salts induce cytogenetic effects in in vivo treated mice.' *Mutation Research* 343, pages 53-60
20. Claxton L, Stewart-Hook V and Warren S (2001). 'Methods for the spiral salmonella mutagenicity assay including specialised applications.' *Mutation Research* 488, pages 241-257
21. Corvi R, Albertini S, Hartung T, Hoffman S, Muaurici D, Pfuhler S, van Benthem J and Vanparys P (2008). 'ECVAM retrospective validation of the in vitro micronucleus test (MNT).' *Mutagenesis* 23, pages 271-283
22. Corvi R, Madia F (2017). 'In vitro genotoxicity testing – can the performance be enhanced?' *Food and Chemical Toxicology*: 106, Part B, pages 600-608
23. Curren R, Mun G, Gibson D and Aardema M (2006). 'Development of a method for assessing micronucleus induction in a 3D human skin model (EpiDerm™).' *Mutation Research* 607, pages 192-204

24. De Boeck M, van der Leede B, Van Goethem F, De Smedt A, Steemans M, A, L and Vanparys P (2005). 'Flow cytometric analysis of micronucleated reticulocytes: time- and dose-dependent response of known mutagens in mice, using multiple blood sampling.' *Environmental Molecular Mutagenesis* 46, pages 30-42
25. Dearfield K, Thybaud V, Cimino M, Custer L, Czich A, Harvey J, Hester S, Kim J, Kirkland D, Levy D and others (2011). 'Follow-up actions from positive results of in vitro genetic toxicology testing.' *Environmental and Molecular Mutagenesis* volume 52, issue 3, pages 177-204
26. Dearfield KL, Gollapudi BB, Bemis JC, Benz RD, Douglas GR, Elespuru RK, Johnson GE, Kirkland DJ, LeBaron MJ, Li AP and others (2017). 'Next generation testing strategy for assessment of genomic damage: A conceptual framework and considerations.' *Environmental and Molecular Mutagenesis* 58, pages 264-283
27. Decordier I, Papine A, Plas G, Roesems S, Vande Loock K, Moreno-Palomo J, Cemeli E, Anderson D, Fucic A, Marcos R and others (2009). 'Automated image analysis of cytokinesis-blocked micronuclei: an adapted protocol and a validated scoring procedure for biomonitoring.' *Mutagenesis* 24, pages 85-93
28. Dertinger S, Phonethepswath S, Franklin D, Weller P, Torous D, Bryce S, Avlasevich S, Bemis J, Hyrien O, Palis J and others (2010). 'Integration of mutation and chromosomal damage endpoints into 28-day repeat dose toxicology studies.' *Toxicological Sciences* 115, pages 401-411
29. Dertinger, Stephen and Torous, Dorothea and Hayashi, Makoto and MacGregor, James (2011a). 'Flow cytometric scoring of micronucleated erythrocytes: An efficient platform for assessing in vivo cytogenetic damage.' *Mutagenesis*, 26, pages 139-45
30. Dertinger SD, Avlasevich SL, Torous DK and others (2020). 'Intra- and inter-laboratory reproducibility of the rat blood Pig-a gene mutation assay.' *Environmental and Molecular Mutagenesis* June 2020: volume 61, issue 5, pages 500-507. doi: 10.1002/em.22367. Epub 2020 27 March
31. Department of Health (DOH) (2000). 'Guidance for the testing of chemicals for Mutagenicity.' Committee on Mutagenicity of Chemicals in Food, Consumer Products and the Environment
32. DOH (2011). [Guidance on a strategy for genotoxicity testing of chemicals](#). Committee on Mutagenicity of Chemicals in Food, Consumer Products and the Environment (accessed March 2021)
33. DOH (2021a). 'G-S, G1, G2 and G3 guidance on a strategy for genotoxicity testing of chemicals.' Committee on Mutagenicity of Chemicals in Food, Consumer Products and the Environment
34. DOH (2021b). 'G9 test guidance strategies for genotoxicity testing of manufactured nanomaterials.' Committee on Mutagenicity of Chemicals in Food, Consumer Products and the Environment. Awaiting publication.

35. DOH (2021c). 'G8 3D tissue models for genotoxicity testing'. Committee on Mutagenicity of Chemicals in Food, Consumer Products and the Environment. Awaiting publication
36. DOH (2021d). 'G7 test strategies for germ cell mutagens.' Committee on Mutagenicity of Chemicals in Food, Consumer Products and the Environment. Awaiting publication
37. Eastmond DA, Hartwig A, Anderson D, Anwar WA, Cimino MC, Dobre, I, Douglas GR, Nohmi T, Phillips DH, Vickers C (2009). 'Mutagenicity testing for chemical risk assessment: update of the WHO/IPCS Harmonized Scheme.' *Mutagenesis*: volume 24, issue 4, pages 341-9
38. The European Chemicals Agency (ECHA). '[Guidance on Information Requirements and Chemical Safety Assessment Chapter R.7a: Endpoint specific guidance, version 6.](#)' July 2017
39. The European Food Safety Authority (EFSA) (2011). '[Scientific opinion on genotoxicity testing strategies applicable to food and feed safety assessment.](#)' *EFSA Journal* 9, page 2,379
40. EFSA (2017). EFSA Scientific Committee, Hardy A, Benford D, Halldorsson T, Jeger M, Knutsen HK, More S, Naegeli H, Noteborn H, Ockleford C, Ricci A, Rychen G, Silano V, Solecki R, Turck D, Younes M, Aquilina G, Crebelli R, Gurtler R, Hirsch-Ernst KI, Mosesso P, Nielsen E, van Benthem J, Carf M, Georgiadis N, Maurici D, Parra Morte J and Schlatter J, (2017). '[Scientific Opinion on the clarification of some aspects related to genotoxicity assessment.](#)' *EFSA Journal* 2017: volume 15, issue 12: page 5113, 25
41. Eichenlaub-Ritter U, Adler I, Carere A and Pacchierotti F (2007). 'Gender differences in germ cell mutagenesis and genetic risk.' *Environmental Research* 104, pages 22-36
42. Emmert B, Bunger J, Keuch K, Muller M, Emmert S, Hallier E and Westphal G (2006). 'Mutagenicity of cytochrome P450 2E1 substrates in the Ames test with metabolic competent *S. typhimurium* strain YG7108pin3ERb<sub>5</sub>.' *Toxicology* 228, pages 66-76
43. Fellows M, O'Donovan M, Lorge E and Kirkland D (2008). 'Comparison of different methods for an accurate assessment of cytotoxicity in the in vitro micronucleus test II: practical aspects with toxic agents.' *Mutation Research* 655, pages 4-21
44. Fellows MD, Doherty AT, Priestley CC, Howarth V and O'Donovan MR (2011b). 'The ability of the mouse lymphoma TK assay to detect aneugens.' *Mutagenesis* 26, pages 771-781
45. Fenech M (2006). 'Cytokinesis-block micronucleus assay evolves into a "cytome" assay for chromosomal instability, mitotic dysfunction and cell death.' *Mutation Research* 600, pages 58-66
46. Fenech M (2007). 'Cytokinesis-block micronucleus assay.' *Nature Protocols* 2, pages 1084-1104

47. Fischer SJ, Benson LM, Fauq A, Naylor S and Windebank AJ (2008 ). 'Cisplatin and dimethyl sulfoxide react to form an adducted compound with reduced cytotoxicity and neurotoxicity.' *NeuroToxicology* 29, pages 444-452
48. Flamand N, Marrot L, Belaidi J-P, Bourouf L, Dourille E, Feltes M and Meunier J-R (2006). 'Development of genotoxicity test procedures with Episkin® a reconstructed human skin model: towards new tools for in vitro risk assessment of dermally applied compounds?' *Mutation Research* 606, pages 39-51
49. Flückiger-Isler S, Baumeister M, Braun K, Gervais V, Hasler-Nguyen N, Reimann R, Van Gompel J, Wunderlich H-G and Engelhardt G (2004). 'Assessment of the performance of the Ames II™ assay: a collaborative study with 19 coded compounds.' *Mutation Research* 558, pages 181-197
50. Flückiger-Isler S, Kamber M (2012). 'Direct comparison of the Ames microplate format (MPF) test in liquid medium with the standard Ames pre-incubation assay on agar plates by use of equivocal to weakly positive test compounds.' *Mutation Research* volume 747, issue 1, pages 36-45
51. Fowler P, Young J, Jeffrey L, Hand T, Smith K, Kirkland D, Carmichael P and Pfuhler S. (2012a). 'Reduction of misleading ("false") positive results in mammalian cell genotoxicity assays I. Choice of cell type.' *Mutation Research*: volume 742, pages 11-25
52. Fowler P, Young J, Jeffrey L, Hand T, Smith K, Kirkland D, Carmichael P and Pfuhler S. (2012b). 'Reduction of misleading ("false") positive results in mammalian cell genotoxicity assays II. The importance of cytotoxicity measure.' *Mutation Research* volume 747, pages 104-17
53. Galloway S (2000). 'Cytotoxicity and chromosome aberrations in vitro: experience in industry and the case for an upper limit on toxicity in the aberration assay.' *Environmental and Molecular Mutagenesis* 35, pages 191-201
54. Galloway S, Lorge E, Aardema MJ, Eastmond D, Fellows M, Heflich R, Kirkland D and Levy D, Lynch AM, Marzin D, Morita T, Schuler M, Speit G (2011). 'Workshop summary: top concentration for in vitro mammalian cell genotoxicity assays; and report from working group on toxicity measures and top concentration for in vitro cytogenetics assays (chromosome aberrations and micronucleus).' *Mutation Research* 723, pages 77-83
55. Garriott M, Phelps J and Hoffman W (2002). 'A protocol for the in vitro micronucleus test I. Contributions to the development of a protocol suitable for regulatory submissions from an examination of 16 chemicals with different mechanisms of action and different levels of activity.' *Mutation Research* 517, pages 123-134
56. Gatehouse D, Haworth S, Cebula T, Kier L, Matsushima T, Melcion C, Nohmi T, Ohta, T and Venitt S (1994). 'Recommendations for the performance of bacterial mutation assays.' *Mutation Research* 312, pages 217-233
57. Gleib M, Hovhannisyan G and Pool-Zobel B (2009). 'Use of Comet-FISH in the study of DNA damage and repair: review.' *Mutation Research* 681, pages 33-43

58. Gollapudi B, Johnson G, Hernandez L and others (2013). 'Quantitative approaches for assessing dose–response relationships in genetic toxicology studies.' *Environmental and Molecular Mutagenesis* 54, pages 8-18
59. Gollapudi BB, Lynch AM, Heflich RH and others (2015). 'The in vivo Pig-a assay: a report of the International Workshop on Genotoxicity Testing (IWGT) Workgroup.' *Mutation Research* 783: pages 23-35
60. Hamada S, Sutou S, Morita T, Wakata A, Asanami S, Hosoya S, Ozawa S, Kondo K, Nakajima M, Shimada H and others. (2001). 'Evaluation of the rodent micronucleus assay by a 28-day treatment protocol: summary of the 13th collaborative study by the Collaborative Study Group for the Micronucleus Test (CSGMT)/Environmental Mutagen Society of Japan (JEMS) - Mammalian Mutagenicity Study Group (MMS).' *Environmental and Molecular Mutagenesis* 37, pages 93-110
61. Hamada S, Ohyama W, Takashima R, Shimada K, Matsumoto K, Kawakami S, Uno F, Sui H, Shimada Y, Imamura T, Matsumura S, Sanada H, Inoue K, Muto S, Ogawa I, Hayashi A, Takayanagi T, Ogiwara Y, Maeda A, Okada E, Terashima Y, Takasawa H, Narumi K, Wako Y, Kawasako K, Sano M, Ohashi N, Morita T, Kojima H, Honma M and Hayashi M (2015). 'Evaluation of the repeated-dose liver and gastrointestinal tract micronucleus assays with 22 chemicals using young adult rats: summary of the collaborative study by the Collaborative Study Group for the Micronucleus Test (CSGMT)/The Japanese Environmental Mutagen Society (JEMS) - Mammalian Mutagenicity Study Group (MMS).' *Mutation Research – Genetic Toxicology and Environmental Mutagenesis* 780-781, pages 2-17
62. Hartmann A, Kiskinis E, Fjallman A and Suter W (2001). 'Influence of cytotoxicity and compound precipitation on test results in the alkaline comet assay.' *Mutation Research* 497, pages 199-212
63. Hartmann A, Schumacher M, Plappert-Helberg U, Lowe P, Suter W and Muelle L (2004). 'Use of the alkaline in vivo Comet assay for mechanistic genotoxicity investigations.' *Mutagenesis* 19, pages 51-59
64. Hayashi M, Dearfield K, Kasper P, Lovell D, Martus HJ and Thybaud V (2011). 'Compilation and use of genetic toxicity historical control data.' *Mutation Research* 723, pages 87-90
65. Hayes JE, Doherty AT, Coulson M, Foster JR, Cotton PT and O'Donovan MR (2013). 'Micronucleus induction in the bone marrow of rats by pharmacological mechanisms. I: glucocorticoid receptor antagonism.' *Mutagenesis* 28, pages 227-232
66. Hendriks G, Atallah M, Morolli B, Calleja F, Ras-Verloop N, Huijskens I, Raamsman M, van de Water B and Vrieling H (2012). 'The ToxTracker assay: novel GFP reporter systems that provide mechanistic insight into the genotoxic properties of chemicals.' *Toxicological Sciences* 125, pages 285-298

67. Hendriks G, Atallah M, Raamsman M, Morolli B, van der Putten H, Jaadar H, Tijdens I, Esveldt-van Lange R, Mullenders L, van de Water B and others (2011). 'Sensitive DsRed fluorescence-based reporter cell systems for genotoxicity and oxidative stress assessment.' *Mutation Research* 709-710, pages 49-59
68. Himmelstein M, Boogaard P, Cadet J, Farmer P, Kim J, Martin E, Persaud R and Shuker D (2009). 'Creating context for the use of DNA adduct data in cancer risk assessment: II. Overview of methods of identification and quantitation of DNA damage.' *Critical Reviews in Toxicology* 39, pages 679-694
69. Hiramoto K, Nasuhara A, Michikoshi K, Kato T and Kikugawa K (1997). 'DNA strand-breaking activity and mutagenicity of 2,3-dihydro-3,5-dihydroxy-6-methyl-4-H-pyran-4-one (DDMP), a Maillard reaction product of glucose and glycine.' *Mutation Research* 395 pages 47-56
70. Hu T, Kaluzhny Y, Mun G, Barnett B, Karetsky V, Wilt N, Klausner M, Curren R and Aardema M (2009). 'Intralaboratory and interlaboratory evaluation of the EpiDerm™ 3D human reconstructed skin micronucleus assay.' *Mutation Research* 673, pages 100-108
71. International Council for Harmonisation of Technical Requirements for Pharmaceuticals for Human Use (ICH) (2011). '[Guidance on genotoxicity testing and data interpretation for pharmaceuticals intended for human use.](#)' S2(R1)
72. ICH (2012). '[ICH guideline S2 \(R1\) on genotoxicity testing and data interpretation for pharmaceuticals intended for human use.](#)'
73. Jarabek A, Pottenger L, Andrews L, Casciano D, Embry M, Kim J, Preston J, Vijayaraj Reddy M, Schoeny R, Shuker D and others (2009). 'Creating context for use of DNA adduct data in cancer risk assessment: I Data organization.' *Critical Reviews in Toxicology* 39, pages 659-678
74. Johnson G, Soeteman-Hernández L, Gollapudi B and others (2014). 'Derivation of point of departure (PoD) estimates in genetic toxicology studies and their potential applications in risk assessment.' *Environmental Molecular Mutagenetics* 55: pages 609-623
75. Kasper P, Uno Y, Mauthe R, Asano N, Douglas G, Matthews E, Moore M, Mueller L, Nakajima M, Singer T and others (2007). 'Follow-up testing of rodent carcinogens not positive in the standard genotoxicity test battery: IWGT workgroup report.' *Mutation Research* 627, pages 106-116
76. Khanal S, Singh P, Avlasevich SL, Torous DK, Bemis JC and Dertinger SD (2018). 'Integration of liver and blood micronucleus and Pig-a gene mutation endpoints into rat 28-day repeat-treatment studies: Proof-of-principle with diethylnitrosamine.' *Mutation Research* 828, pages 30-35
77. Kirkland D, Aardema M, Henderson L and Muller L. 'Evaluation of the ability of a battery of 3 in vitro genotoxicity tests to discriminate rodent carcinogens and non-carcinogens 1. Sensitivity, specificity and relative predictivity.' *Mutation Research* 2005: issue 584, pages 1-256

78. Kirkland D, Aardema M, Banduhn N, Carmichael P, Fautz R, Meunier J and Pfuhler S (2007a). 'In vitro approaches to develop weight of evidence (WoE) and mode of action (MoA) discussions with positive in vitro genotoxicity results.' *Mutagenesis* 22, pages 161-175
79. Kirkland D, Hayashi M, Jacobson-Kram D, Kasper P, MacGrego, J, Muller L and Uno Y (2007b). 'Summary of major conclusions from the 4th IWGT, San Francisco, 9 to 10 September, 2005.' *Mutation Research* 627, pages 5-9
80. Kirkland D, Pfuhler S, Tweats D, Aardema M, Corvi R, Darroudi F, Elhajouji A, Glatt H, Hastwell P, Hayashi M and others (2007c). 'How to reduce false positive results when undertaking in vitro genotoxicity testing and thus avoid unnecessary follow-up animal tests: Report of an ECVAM Workshop.' *Mutation Research* 628, pages 31-55
81. Kirkland D and Speit G (2008). 'Evaluation of the ability of a battery of 3 in vitro genotoxicity tests to discriminate rodent carcinogens and non-carcinogens III. Appropriate follow-up testing in vivo.' *Mutation Research* 654, pages 114-132
82. Kirkland D and Fowler P (2010). 'Further analysis of Ames-negative rodent carcinogens that are only genotoxic in mammalian cells at concentrations exceeding 1mM including retest of compounds of concern.' *Mutagenesis* 25, pages 539-553
83. Kirkland D, Reeve L, Gatehouse D and Vanparys P (2011). 'A core in vitro genotoxicity battery comprising the Ames test plus the in vitro micronucleus test is sufficient to detect rodent carcinogens and in vivo genotoxins.' *Mutation Research* 721, pages 27-73
84. Kirkland D, Levy DD, LeBaron MJ and others (2019a). 'A comparison of transgenic rodent mutation and in vivo comet assay responses for 91 chemicals.' *Mutation Research* 839, pages 21-35
85. Kirkland D, Uno Y, Luijten M and others (2019b). 'In vivo genotoxicity testing strategies: Report from the Seventh International workshop on genotoxicity testing (IWGT).' *Mutation Research* 847, 403035
86. Kirsch-Volders M, Vanhauwaert A, DeBoeck M and Decordier I (2002). 'Importance of detecting numerical versus structural chromosome aberrations.' *Mutation Research* 504, pages 137-148
87. Krishna G, Urda G and Theiss J (1998). 'Principles and practices of integrating genotoxicity evaluation into routine toxicology studies: a pharmaceutical industry perspective. *Environmental and Molecular Mutagenesis* 32, pages 115-120
88. Ku W, Bigger A, Brambilla G, Glatt H, Gocke E, Guzzie P, Hakura A, Honma M, Martus H, Scott Obach R and others (2007). 'Strategy for genotoxicity testing – metabolic considerations.' *Mutation Research* 627, pages 59-77
89. Laingam S, Froschio S and Humpage A (2008). 'Flow-cytometric analysis of in vitro micronucleus formation: comparative studies with WIL2-NS human lymphoblastoid and L5178Y mouse lymphoma cells.' *Mutation Research* 656, pages 19-26



90. Le Hegarat LD, J, Josse R, Huet S, Lanceleur R, Mourot A, Poul J, Guguen-Guillouzo C, Guillouzo A, Fessard V (2010). 'Assessment of the genotoxic potential of indirect chemical mutagens in HepaRG cells by the comet and the cytokinesis-block micronucleus assays.' *Mutagenesis* 25, pages 555-560
91. Levy DD, Zeiger E, Escobar PA, Hakura A, van der Leede B-J M, Kato M, Moore MM, Sugiyama K-I. (2019). 'Recommended criteria for the evaluation of bacterial mutagenicity data (Ames test).' *Mutation Research/Genetic Toxicology and Environmental Mutagenesis* 848, 403074
92. Long L, Kirkland D, Whitwel, J and Halliwell B (2007). 'Different cytotoxic and clastogenic effects of epigallocatechin gallate in various cell-culture media due to variable rates of oxidation in culture media.' *Mutation Research* 634, pages 177-183
93. Lorge E, Moore MM, Clements J and others (2016). 'Standardized cell sources and recommendations for good cell culture practices in genotoxicity testing.' *Mutation Research/Genetic Toxicology and Environmental Mutagenesis* 809, pages 1-15
94. Lorge E, Thybaud V, Aardema M, Oliver J, Wakata A, Lorenzon G and Marzin D (2006). 'SFTG international collaborative study on the in vitro micronucleus test I. General conditions and overall conclusions of the study.' *Mutation Research* 607, pages 13-36
95. Lyulko OV, Garty G, Randers-Pehrson G, Turner HC, Szolc B, Brenner DJ (2014). 'Fast image analysis for the micronucleus assay in a fully automated high-throughput biodosimetry system.' *Radiation Research* volume 181, issue 2, pages 146-61
96. MacGregor JT, Frötschl R, White PA and others (2015a). 'IWGT report on quantitative approaches to genotoxicity risk assessment I. Methods and metrics for defining exposure–response relationships and points of departure (PoDs).' *Mutation Research/Genetic Toxicology and Environmental Mutagenesis* 783, pages 55-65
97. MacGregor JT, Frötschl R, White PA and others (2015b). 'IWGT report on quantitative approaches to genotoxicity risk assessment II. Use of point-of-departure (PoD) metrics in defining acceptable exposure limits and assessing human risk.' *Mutation Research/Genetic Toxicology and Environmental Mutagenesis* 783, pages 66-78
98. Madrigal-Bujaidar E, Madrigal-Santillan E, Alvarez-Gonzalez I, Baez R and Marquez P (2008). 'Micronuclei induced by imipramine and desipramine in mice: a subchronic study.' *Basic and Clinical Pharmacology and Toxicology* 103, pages 569-573
99. Maierhofer C, Jentsch I, Lederer GF, C and Speicher M. 'Multicolor FISH in 2 and 3 dimensions for clastogenic analysis.' *Mutagenesis* 17 (2002) pages 523-527
100. Marchett, FM, Aardema C, Beevers J and others (2018). 'Identifying germ cell mutagens using OECD test guideline 488 (transgenic rodent somatic and germ cell mutation assay) and integration with somatic cell testing.' *Mutation Research* 832-833, pages 7-18
101. Matthews E, Kruhlak N, Cimino M, Benz R and Contrera J (2006). 'An analysis of genetic toxicology, reproductive and developmental toxicity and carcinogenicity data: II

- Identification of genotoxicants, reprotoxicants, and carcinogens using in silico methods.' Regulatory Toxicology and Pharmacology 44, pages 97-110
102. Mitchell I, Lambert T, Burden M, Sunderland J, Porter R and Carlton J (1995). 'Is polyploidy an important genotoxic lesion?' *Mutagenesis* 10, pages 79-83
103. Miura D, Dobrovolsky V, Kimoto T, Kasahara Y and Heflich R (2009). 'Accumulation and persistence of Pig-A mutant peripheral red blood cells following treatment of rats with a single and split doses of N-ethyl-N-nitrosourea.' *Mutation Research* 677, pages 86-92
104. Morita T, Miyajima A, Hatano A and Honma M (2014). 'Effects of lowering the proposed top-concentration limit in an in vitro chromosomal aberration test on assay sensitivity and on the reduction of the number of false positives.' *Mutation Research* 2014: volume 769, pages 34-49
105. Morita T, Hamada S, Masumura K, Wakata A, Maniwa J, Takasawa H, Yasunaga K, Hashizume T and Honma M (2016). 'Evaluation of the sensitivity and specificity of in vivo erythrocyte micronucleus and transgenic rodent gene mutation tests to detect rodent carcinogens.' *Mutation Research - Genetic Toxicology and Environmental Mutagenesis* 802, pages 1-29
106. Muller L, Blakely D, Dearfield K, Galloway S, Guzzie P, Hayashi M, Kasper P, Kirkland D, MacGregor J, Parry J and others (2003). 'Strategy for genotoxicity and stratification of genotoxicity test results – report of initial activities of the IWGT Expert Group.' *Mutation Research* 540, pages 177-181
107. Mun G, Aardema M, Hu T, Barnett B, Kaluzhny Y, Klausner M, Karetzky V, Dahl E and Curren R (2009). 'Further development of the EpiDerm™ 3D reconstructed human skin micronucleus (RSMN) assay.' *Mutation Research* 673, pages 92-99
108. Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) (2000). 'Guidance document on the recognition, assessment and use of clinical signs as humane endpoints for experimental animals used in safety evaluation, series on testing and assessment, N°19, ENV/JM/MONO(2000)7'. Paris
109. OECD (2016a). [oecd guideline for the testing of chemicals in vitro mammalian cell micronucleus test.](#)
110. OECD (2016b). [OECD guideline for the testing of chemicals in vivo mammalian alkaline Comet assay](#)
111. OECD (2016c). '[Test number 473: in vitro mammalian chromosomal aberration test.](#)' OECD Publishing, Paris
112. OECD (2016d) '[Test number 490: in vitro mammalian cell gene mutation tests using the thymidine kinase gene.](#)' OECD Publishing, Paris
113. OECD (2016e). '[Test number 476: in vitro mammalian cell gene mutation tests using the Hprt and xpvt genes.](#)' OECD Publishing, Paris

114. OECD (2016f). ['Test number 474: mammalian erythrocyte micronucleus test, OECD guidelines for the testing of chemicals, section 4.'](#) OECD Publishing, Paris
115. OECD (2020a). ['OECD Guideline for the testing of chemicals'](#). OECD Publishing, Paris
116. OECD (2020b). ['OECD guidelines for the testing of chemicals transgenic rodent somatic and germ cell gene mutation assays'](#)
117. OECD (2020c). ['The in vivo erythrocyte Pig-a gene mutation assay - Part 1: Detailed review paper and performance analysis'](#) (Publication 315)
118. OECD (2020d). ['The in vivo erythrocyte Pig-a gene mutation assay -Part 2: Validation report'](#) (Publication 316)
119. Ogawa I, Furukawa S, Abe M, Tanaka Y and Hayashi SU, K. 'Multi-endpoint genotoxic assay using L5178Y (Tk<sup>+/</sup>-3.7.2c) cells.' The Journal of Toxicological Sciences 2009: volume 34, pages 547-553
120. Oliver J, Meunier J-R, Awogi T, Elhajouji A, Ouldeldhkim M-C, Bichet N, Thybaud V, Lorenzon G, Marzin D and Lorge E (2006). 'SFTG international collaborative study on in vitro micronucleus test V. Using L5178Y cells.' Mutation Research 607, pages 125-152
121. Pacchierotti F, Adler I-D, Eichenlaub-Ritter U and Mailher JB (2007). 'Gender effects on the incidence of aneuploidy in mammalian germ cells.' Environmental Research 104, pages 46-69
122. Parry J (2006). 'The use of the in vitro micronucleus assay to detect and assess the aneugenic activity of chemicals.' Mutation Research 607, pages 5-8
123. Parr, J, Parry E, Phrakonkham P and Corvi R (2010). 'Analysis of published data for top concentrations in mammalian cell genotoxicity testing.' Mutagenesis 25, pages 531-538
124. Pfuhler S (2009). 'Fifth international workshop on genotoxicity testing, 17 to 19 August 2009. Topic 3: In vitro test approaches with better predictivity.' ICEM, Florence, August 20 to 25, 2009
125. Pfuhler S, Albertini S, Fautz R, Herbold B, Madle S, Utesch D and Poth A (2007). 'Genetic toxicity assessment: employing the best science for human safety evaluation Part IV: recommendation of a working group of the Gesellschaft fuer Umwelt-Mutationsforschung (GUM) for a simple and straightforward approach to genotoxicity testing.' Toxicological Sciences 97, pages 237-240
126. Pfuhler S, Fellows M, van Benthem J, Corvi R, Curren R, Dearfield K, Fowler P, Frotschl R, Elhajouji A, Le Hegarat L and others (2011). 'In vitro genotoxicity test approaches with better predictivity: summary of an IWGT workshop.' Mutation Research 723, pages 101-107
127. Pfuhler S, Kirkland D, Hayashi M, Vanparys P, Carmichael P, Dertinger S, Eastmond D, Elhajouji A, Krul C, Rothfuss A and others (2009). 'Reduction of use of animals in regulatory genotoxicity testing: Identification and implementation opportunities – report from an ECVAM workshop.' Mutation Research 680, pages 31-42

128. Pfuhler S, Pirow R, Downs TR, Haase A, Hewitt N, Luch A, Merkel M, Petrick C, Said A and others (2020a). 'Validation of the 3D reconstructed human skin Comet assay, an animal-free alternative for following-up positive results from standard in vitro genotoxicity assays' [published online ahead of print, 10 March 2020] *Mutagenesis*
129. Pfuhler S, van Benthem J, Curren R, Doak SH, Dusinska M, Hayashi M, Heflich RH, Kidd D, Kirkland D, Luan Y and others (2020b). 'Use of in vitro 3D tissue models in genotoxicity testing: Strategic fit, validation status and way forward. Report of the working group from the Seventh International Workshop on Genotoxicity Testing (IWGT).' *Mutation Research/Genetic Toxicology and Environmental Mutagenesis*: volumes 850 to 851
130. Phillips DH, Farmer PB, Beland FA, Nath RG, Poirier MC, Reddy MV, Turteltaub KW (2000). 'Methods of DNA adduct determination and their application to testing compounds for genotoxicity.' *Environmental and Molecular Mutagenesis* volume 35, issue 3, pages 222-233
131. Phillips DH, Arlt VM (2020) '(32)P-postlabeling analysis of DNA adducts.' *Methods in Molecular Biology* 2102: pages 291-302
132. Ponton I, Mutch P, Nicholls DJ, Saad A, Diaz Pohl C, Young A, Fred C, O'Donovan MR and Aberg P (2013). 'Micronucleus induction in the bone marrow of rats by pharmacological mechanisms. II: long-acting beta-2 agonism.' *Mutagenesis* 28, pages 233-239
133. Rapp A, Bock C, Dittmar H and Greulich K-O (2000). 'UV-A breakage sensitivity of human chromosomes as measured by COMET-FISH depends on gene density and not on chromosome size.' *Journal of Photochemistry and Photobiology B: Biology* 56, pages 109-117
134. Reisinger K, Blatz V, Brinkmann J, Downs T, Fischer A, Henkler F, Hoffmann S, Krul C, Liebsch M, Luch A, Pirow R, Reus A, Schulz M, Pfuhler S (2018). 'Validation of the 3D Skin Comet assay using full thickness skin models: transferability and reproducibility.' *Mutation Research/Genetic Toxicology and Environmental Mutagenesis* 827, pages 27-41
135. Reus AA, Reisinger K, Downs TR, Carr GJ, Zeller A, Corvi R, Krul CA and Pfuhler S (2013). 'Comet assay in reconstructed 3D human epidermal skin models – investigation of intra- and inter-laboratory reproducibility with coded chemicals.' *Mutagenesis*: volume 28, issue 6, pages 709–720
136. Rothfuss A, Honma M, Czich A, Aardema M, Burlinson B, Galloway S, Hamada S, Kirkland D, Heflich R, Howe J and others (2010). 'Improvement of in vitro genotoxicity assessment: combination of acute tests and the link to standard toxicity testing.' *Mutation Research/Genetic Toxicology and Environmental Mutagenesis* 723, pages 108-120
137. Roy S, Kulkarni R, Hewitt NJ and Aardema MJ (2016). 'The EpiDerm™ 3D human reconstructed skin micronucleus (RSMN) assay: Historical control data and proof of

- principle studies for mechanistic assay adaptations.' *Mutation Research* 805, pages 25-37
138. Russo A (2000). 'In vivo cytogenetics in mammalian germ cells.' *Mutation Research* 455, pages 167-189
139. Seager AL, Shah UK, Brüsehafer K, Wills J, Manshian B, Chapman KE, Thomas AD, Scott AD, Doherty AT, Doak SH, Johnson GE, Jenkins GJ (2014). 'Recommendations, evaluation and validation of a semi-automated, fluorescent-based scoring protocol for micronucleus testing in human cells.' *Mutagenesis* 2014: volume 29, issue (3), pages 155-64
140. Santos SJ, Singh NP and Natarajan AT. 'Fluorescence in situ hybridization with comets.' *Experimental Cell Research* 1997: issue 232, pages 407-411
141. The Scientific Committee on Consumer Safety (SCCS) 2016. [The SCCS notes of guidance for the testing of cosmetic ingredients and their safety evaluation](#). (accessed August 2018)
142. Schisler M, Gollupudi B and Moore M (2010). 'Evaluation of the mouse lymphoma mutation assay (MLA) data of the U.S. National Toxicology Program (NTP) using International Workshop on Genotoxicity Tests (IWGT) criteria.' *Environmental Molecular Mutagenesis* 51, P96
143. Shuey DL, Gudi R, Krsmanovic L and Gerson RJ (2007). 'Evidence that oxymorphone-induced increases in micronuclei occur secondary to hyperthermia.' *Toxicological Sciences* 95, pages 369-375
144. Singer T, Lambert I, Williams A, Douglas G and Yauk C (2006). 'Detection of induced male germline mutation: correlations and comparisons between traditional germline mutation assays, transgenic rodent assays and expanded simple tandem repeat instability assays.' *Mutation Research* 598, pages 164-193
145. Sofuni T, Honma M, Hayashi M, Shimada H, Tanaka N, Wakuri S, Awogi T, Yamamoto KI, Nishi Y, Nakadate M (1996). 'Detection of in vitro clastogens and spindle poisons by the mouse lymphoma assay using the microwell method: interim report of an international collaborative study.' *Mutagenesis* 11, pages 349-355
146. Sotomajor RE and Segal GA (2000). 'Unscheduled DNA synthesis assay in mammalian spermatogenic cells: an update.' *Environmental and Molecular Mutagenesis* 36, pages 255-265
147. Spanswick V, Hartley J and Hartley J (2010). 'Methods in Molecular Biology, volume 613, Drug-DNA Interaction Protocols' edited by KR Fox. Chapter 17: Measurement of DNA interstrand crosslinking in individual cells using the single cell gel electrophoresis (Comet) assay. pages 267-282
148. Speit G, Kojima H, Burlinson B, Collins AR, Kasper P, Plappert-Helbig U, Uno Y, Vasquez M, Beevers C, De Boeck M and others (2015). 'Critical issues with the in vivo

- comet assay: A report of the comet assay working group in the Sixth International Workshop on Genotoxicity Testing (IWGT).' *Mutation Research - Genetic Toxicology and Environmental Mutagenesis* 783, pages 6-12
149. Spiliotopoulos D, Koelbert C (2020). 'Assessment of the miniaturized liquid Ames microplate format (MPF™) for a selection of the test items from the recommended list of genotoxic and nongenotoxic chemicals.' *Mutation Research* 856-857, 503218
150. Suzuki H, Ikeda N, Kobayashi K, Terashima Y, Shimada Y, Suzuki T, Hagiwara T, Hatakeyama S, Nagaoka K, Yoshida J and others (2005). 'Evaluation of liver and peripheral blood micronucleus assays with 9 chemicals using young rats – a study by the Collaborative Study group for the Micronucleus Test (CSGMT)/Japanese Environmental Mutagenicity Society (JEMS)-Mammalian Mutagenicity Study Group (MMS).' *Mutation Research* 583, pages 133-145
151. Suzuki H, Takasawa H, Hironao S, Kazuo T, Yukari K, Yashui T, Izumi O, Tanaka J, Imamura T, Miyazaki A and others (2009). 'Evaluation of a liver micronucleus assay with 12 chemicals using young rats (II): a study by the Collaborative Study Group for the Micronucleus Test/Japanese Environmental Mutagen Society-Mammalian Mutagenicity Study Group.' *Mutagenesis* volume 24, issue 1, pages 9-16
152. Takasawa H, Suzuki H, Ogawa I, Shimada K, Kobayashi K, Terashima Y, Matsumoto H, Aruga C, Oshida K, Oht R and others. 'Evaluation of a liver micronucleus assay in young rats (III): a study using 9 hepatotoxicants by the Collaborative Study Group for the Micronucleus Test (CSGMT) / Japanese Environmental Mutagen Society (JEMS)-Mammalian Mutagenicity Study Group (MMS).' *Mutat Res* 2010: volume 698, issues 1-2, pages 30-37
153. Thougard AV, Christiansen J, Mow T, Hornberg JJ (2007). 'Validation of a high throughput flow cytometric in vitro micronucleus assay including assessment of metabolic activation in TK6 cells.' *Environmental Molecular Mutagenesis* volume 55, issue 9, pages 704-18
154. Thybaud V, Aardema M, Clements J, Dearfield K, Galloway S, Hayashi M, Jacobson-Kram D, Kirkland D, MacGregor J, Marzin D and others (2007). 'Strategy for genotoxicity testing: Hazard identification and risk assessment in relation in vitro testing.' *Mutation Research* 627, pages 41-58
155. Torous D, Dertinger S, Hall N and Tometsko C (2000). 'Enumeration of micronucleated reticulocytes in rat peripheral blood: a flow cytometric study.' *Mutation Research* 465, pages 91-99
156. Trivedi PP, Kushwaha S, Tripathu DN and Jena GB (2010). 'Evaluation of male germ cell toxicity in rats: correlation between sperm head morphology and sperm comet assay.' *Mutation Research* 703, pages 115-121
157. Tweats DJ, Blakey D, Heflich RH, Jacobs A, Jacobsen SD, Morita T, Nohmi T, O'Donovan MR, Sasaki YF, Sofuni T and Tice R (2007a). 'Report of the IWGT working

- group on strategies and interpretation of regulatory in vivo tests. I. Increases in micronucleated bone marrow cells in rodents that do not indicate genotoxic hazards.' *Mutation Research* 627, pages 78-91
158. Tweats D, Blakely D, Heflich R, Jacobs A, Jacobsen S, Morita T, Nohmi T, O'Donovan M, Sasaki Y, Sofuni T and others (2007b). 'Report of the IWGT working group on strategy/interpretation for regulatory in vivo tests. II. Identification of in vivo-only positive compounds in the bone marrow micronucleus test.' *Mutation Research* 627, pages 92-105
159. Uno Y, Kojima H and Hayashi M (2015a). 'The JaCVAM-organized international validation study of the in vivo rodent alkaline comet assay.' *Mutation Research - Genetic Toxicology and Environmental Mutagenesis* pages 786-788, 2
160. Uno Y, Morita T, Luijten M, Beevers C, Hamada S, Itoh S, Ohyama W and Takasawa H (2015b). 'Recommended protocols for the liver micronucleus test: Report of the IWGT working group.' *Mutation Research - Genetic Toxicology and Environmental Mutagenesis* 783, pages 13-18
161. Vasquez M (2010). 'Combining the in vivo comet and micronucleus assays: a practical approach to genotoxicity testing and data interpretation.' *Mutagenesis* 25, pages 187-199
162. Wakata A, Matsuoka A, Yamakage K, Yoshida J, Kubo K, Kobayashi K, Senjyu N, Itoh S, Miyajima H, Hamada S and others (2006). 'SFTG international collaborative study on in vitro micronucleus test IV. Using CHL cells.' *Mutation Research* 607, pages 88-124
163. Wang J, Sawyer J, Chen L, Chen T, Honma M, Mei N and Moore M. (2009). 'The mouse lymphoma assay detects recombination, deletion and aneuploidy.' *Toxicological Sciences* 109, pages 96-105
164. Williams R, DeMarini D, Stankowski L Jr, Escobar P, Zeiger, Errol, Howe J, Elespuru R, Cross K. (2019). 'Are all bacterial strains required by OECD mutagenicity test guideline TG471 needed?' *Mutation Research/Genetic Toxicology and Environmental Mutagenesis* 848, 503081
165. Witt I, Plappert U, de Wall H and Hartmann A. (2007). 'Genetic toxicity assessment: employing the best science for human safety evaluation part III. The Comet assay as an alternative to in vitro clastogenicity tests for early drug candidate selection.' *Toxicological Sciences* 97, pages 21-26
166. Witt K, Hughes L, Burka L, McFee A, Mathews J, Black S and Bishop J. 'Mouse bone marrow micronucleus test results do not predict the germ cell mutagenicity of N-hydroxymethylacrylamide in the mouse dominant lethal assay.' *Environmental and Molecular Mutagenesis* 2003: volume 41, pages 111-120
167. Wit, K, Knapton A, Wehr C, Hook G, Mirsalis J, Shelby M and MacGregor J. 'Micronucleated erythrocyte frequency in peripheral blood of B6C3F<sub>1</sub> mice from short-term, prechronic, and chronic studies of the NTP carcinogenesis bioassay program.' *Environmental and Molecular Mutagenesis* 2000: volume 36, pages 163-194

168. Committee on Mutagenicity of Chemicals in Food, Consumer Products and the Environment (2011). '[Guidance on a strategy for genotoxicity testing of chemical substances](#)'
169. OECD Guidelines for the testing of chemicals. '[Transgenic rodent somatic and germ cell gene mutation assays](#)'
170. Hu T, Kaluzhny Y, Mun G, Barnett, Karetsky V, Wilt N, Klausner M, Curren R, Aardema M. 'Intralaboratory and interlaboratory evaluation of the EpiDerm™ 3D human reconstructed skin micronucleus (RSMN) assay.' Mutation Research/Genetic Toxicology and Environmental Mutagenesis, Volume 673, issue 2, 2009, pages 100-108
171. Thougard AV, Christiansen J, Mow T and Hornberg JJ (2014). '[Validation of a high throughput flow cytometric in vitro micronucleus assay including assessment of metabolic activation in TK6 cells.](#)' Environmental and Molecular Mutagenesis 55: pages 704-718



# Annexe 1

## Tabulation of genotoxicity tests (in stages 1 and 2) and mutagenic/genotoxicity endpoints detected

Genotoxicity test	Mutagenic/genotoxicity endpoint detected	Comments
<b>In vitro assays</b>		
Ames	Gene mutation	Responds to wide range of DNA reactive mutagens when full set of <i>S. typhimurium</i> tester strains and <i>E. coli</i> with appropriate exogenous metabolic activation used.
Micronucleus test	Clastogenicity, aneuploidy	Centromere or kinetochore stains, with pancentromeric or chromosome specific centromeric probes using fluorescence in situ hybridisation (FISH) are required to distinguish between aneuploidy and clastogenicity.
Chromosomal aberrations	Clastogenicity, aneuploidy	Indications of aneuploidy from induction of polyploidy or increased mitotic index, but the use of chromosome specific centromeric probes fluorescence in situ hybridisation (FISH) required to assess the potential for aneuploidy. Very similar assay performance compared with micronucleus test
Mouse Lymphoma Assay	Gene mutation, clastogenicity	Distribution of large and small colony mutants can give information on induction of gene mutations versus clastogenicity. No convincing evidence that MLA can detect aneuploidy consistently.
Comet assay	DNA strand breaks and alkali labile sites	Can respond to a wide range of gene mutagens and clastogens but gives no information about modes of mutagenic action.
<b>In vivo assays</b>		
Rodent bone marrow or peripheral blood micronucleus assay	Clastogenicity, aneuploidy	A wide range of structurally diverse clastogens and aneugens have been detected. Distinguishing between clastogenic and aneugenic MoAs can be

<b>Genotoxicity test</b>	<b>Mutagenic/genotoxicity endpoint detected</b>	<b>Comments</b>
		investigated by use of centromere or kinetochores probes.
Rodent transgenic mutation assay	Gene mutations	Valuable for the investigation of gene mutation in a wide range of tissues including germ cells and particularly to confirm gene mutation as a mode of action.
Rodent comet assay	DNA strand breaks, alkali labile sites	Can respond to a wide range of gene mutagens and clastogens but gives no information about modes of mutagenic action. Does not detect aneugens. Valuable for detection of DNA damage in a wide range of tissues, but the standard alkaline assay not validated for mature sperm.
Rodent liver UDS	Unscheduled DNA synthesis	Endpoint measured is indicative of DNA damage and subsequent repair in liver cells, but now considered not as sensitive as other in vivo assays.
Pig-a gene mutation assay	Gene mutations	Endpoint measured is a reporter of gene mutation in rodents, but currently only extensively validated in blood cells.