#### **RESEARCH ARTICLE**



#### Environmental Mutagenesis and Genomics Society WILEY

# 3Rs-friendly approach to exogenous metabolic activation that supports high-throughput genetic toxicology testing

Shuchang Tian | Aiyana Cyr | Karen Zeise | Steven M. Bryce | Nikki Hall | Jeffrey C. Bemis | Stephen D. Dertinger

Litron Laboratories, Rochester, New York

#### Correspondence

Stephen D. Dertinger, Litron Laboratories, 3500 Winton Place, Rochester, NY, 14623. Email: sdertinger@litronlabs.com

Present address Aiyana Cyr, University of Connecticut, Storrs, Connecticut

Karen Zeise, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan

Accepted by: V. Arlt

#### Abstract

MultiFlow<sup>®</sup> DNA Damage–p53, γH2AX, Phospho-Histone H3 is a miniaturized, flow cytometry-based assay that provides genotoxic mode of action information by distinguishing clastogens, aneugens, and nongenotoxicants. Work to date has focused on the p53-competent human cell line TK6. While mammalian cell genotoxicity assays typically supply exogenous metabolic activation in the form of concentrated rat liver S9, this is a less-than-ideal approach for several reasons, including 3Rs considerations. Here, we describe our experiences with low concentration S9 and saturating co-factors which were allowed to remain in contact with cells and test chemicals for 24 continuous hours. We exposed TK6 cells in 96-well plates to each of 15 reference chemicals over a range of concentrations, both in the presence and absence of 0.25% v/v phenobarbital/ $\beta$ -naphthoflavone-induced rat liver S9. After 4 and 24 hr of treatment cell aliquots were added to wells of a microtiter plate containing the working detergent/stain/antibody cocktail. After a brief incubation robotic sampling was employed for walk-away flow cytometric data acquisition. PROAST benchmark dose (BMD) modeling was used to characterize the resulting dose-response curves. For each of the 8 reference pro-genotoxicants studied, relative nuclei count, yH2AX, and/or p53 biomarker BMD values were order(s) of magnitude lower for 0.25% S9 conditions compared to 0% S9. Conversely, several of the direct-acting reference chemicals exhibited appreciably lower cytotoxicity and/or genotoxicity BMD values in the presence of S9 (eg, resorcinol). These results prove the efficacy of the low concentration S9 system, and indicate that an efficient and highly scalable multiplexed assay can effectively identify chemicals that require bioactivation to exert their genotoxic effects.

#### KEYWORDS

DNA damage, flow cytometry, metabolic activation, yH2AX, p53

## 1 | INTRODUCTION

Among the significant challenges associated with screening large numbers of chemicals for genotoxic potential is the low throughput capacity of conventional hazard identification-type assays. Progress is being made in this area, and includes miniaturization and automated scoring of: in vitro micronuclei (Bryce *et al.*, 2010); the alkaline comet assay (Ge *et al.*, 2015);  $\gamma$ H2AX and other indicators of DNA damage (Audebert *et al.*, 2010; Smart *et al.*, 2011; Tsamou *et al.*, 2012; Garcia-Canton *et al.*, 2013; Nikolova *et al.*, 2014; Cheung *et al.*, 2015;

Shuchang Tian, Aiyana Cyr, and Karen Zeise authors are contributed equally to this work.

Khoury *et al.*, 2016); a panel of five complementary high throughput screening assays described by Hsieh *et al.* (2019); a toxicogenomic signature of genotoxicity (Li *et al.*, 2015, 2017); and fluorescent reporters of DNA damage and other cellular stress indicators using one or more engineered mammalian cell lines (Hastwell *et al.*, 2006; Hendriks *et al.*, 2012).

Our work in this area includes development of the MultiFlow<sup>®</sup> DNA Damage Kit, an in vitro assay formatted as an add-and-read test that efficiently prepares mammalian cells in microtiter plates for flow cytometric analysis. The multiplexed biomarkers measured are: (a) phosphorylation of H2AX at serine 139 ( $\gamma$ H2AX) to detect DNA double strand breaks, (b) phosphorylation of histone H3 at serine 10 (p-H3) to identify mitotic cells, (c) nuclear p53 content as an indicator of p53 activation in response to DNA damage, (d) frequency of 8n + cells to monitor polyploidization, and (e) relative nuclei counts (RNCs) to provide information about treatment-related cytotoxicity (Bryce *et al.*, 2016).

The MultiFlow assay has demonstrated good sensitivity and specificity for detecting diverse genotoxicants, and furthermore provides information about the predominant mode of genotoxic action clastogenicity versus aneugenicity (Bryce *et al.*, 2014, 2016, 2017, 2018; Bernacki *et al.*, 2016; Dertinger *et al.*, 2019). The bulk of the work to date has been accomplished with the p53-proficient human cell line TK6. Since TK6 cells do not have appreciable cytochrome P450 enzyme activities, they cannot reliably detect pro-genotoxicants unless an exogenous source of metabolic activation is added to the test system. Historically, in vitro genotoxicity assays are therefore tested in the presence and absence of rat liver microsomes (ie, the socalled S9 fraction) with necessary cofactors (Ames *et al.*, 1973).

Instead of using rat liver microsomes, some laboratories provide metabolic capacity by working with metabolically competent cells, typically of hepatocyte origin. However, many of these cell lines express low levels of important P450 isoforms, while others have good expression profiles but their proprietary nature adds costs that cannot always be accommodated in high volume- early screening-type environments (Westerink and Schoonen, 2007; Le Hégarat *et al.*, 2014).

For various reasons then, the use of high concentration rat liver S9 continues to be widely employed. However, there are several aspects that are less than ideal. First, the historic use of Aroclorinduced rat liver S9 has become problematic. The supply of Aroclor is nearly exhausted and it will not be replenished (personally communication, R. Cammeron, Molecular Toxicology, Inc., Boone, NC). This means laboratories accustomed to using Aroclor-induced S9 will need to switch to an alternate induction scheme, for example phenobarbital/ $\beta$ -naphthoflavone, and ensure it is effective for their application(s). Second, the traditional use of high concentration S9 (typically 2-4% v/v final) provides opportunities to reduce animal numbers, and thereby advance 3Rs (Russell and Burch, 1959). Third, high concentration S9 is inherently cytotoxic to cultured mammalian cells, and this explains why most protocols call for washing cells free of test chemical and S9 enzymes after several hours of exposure. This is especially suboptimal in high throughput testing environments, since it is a subtraction step that is not as easily automated relative to processing steps that call for simple transfer(s) or addition(s). Finally, the requirement for centrifugation and aspiration has the potential to impact cell health and numbers which may be mistakenly attributed to test article toxicity as opposed to processing inconsistencies.

To address these issues with exogenous metabolic activation systems we investigated an alternate strategy based on phenobarbital/  $\beta$ -naphthoflavone-induced rat liver S9. Importantly, the final concentration of S9 was 0.25% v/v—the maximal noncytotoxic concentration. Owing to the low cytotoxicity of the system, it was possible to maintain enzymes/co-factor mix with cells and test article for the complete exposure period (in the case of TK6-based MultiFlow assays, 24 hr). This is similar to the approach used by the ToxTracker<sup>®</sup> system (Hendriks *et al.*, 2012), where mouse stem cells are exposed to test article in the presence and absence of 0.25% Aroclor-induced rat S9 for 24 hr. For the initial proof-of-principle experiments described herein, we focused on clastogens, especially those that require enzymatic activation to most efficiently form DNA-reactive metabolites. Our encouraging experiences with the MultiFlow assay are described herein, along with a discussion about advantages of low concentration S9 approaches.

#### 2 | MATERIALS AND METHODS

#### 2.1 | Chemicals

The identity of the 15 test chemicals are provided in Table 1, along with information about metabolic activation, predominant mode of action, *etcetera*. Most are specified in the European Reference Laboratory for Alternatives to Animal Testing (EURL ECVAM) publication that lists chemicals that are useful for validating in vitro genotoxicity assays (Kirkland *et al.*, 2016). Importantly, the nongenotoxicants are cytotoxic to mammalian cells through a variety of mechanisms, and the pro-genotoxicants collectively require a diverse set of CYP450 enzymes to form DNA-reactive electrophiles.

#### 2.2 | Cell culture and treatments

TK6 cells were purchased from ATCC<sup>®</sup> (cat. no. CRL-8015). Cells were grown in a humidified atmosphere at 37°C with 5% CO<sub>2</sub>, and were maintained at or below  $1 \times 10^6$  cells/ml. The culture medium consisted of RPMI 1640 with 200 µg/ml sodium pyruvate (both from Sigma-Aldrich, St. Louis, MO), 200 µM L-glutamine, 50 units/ml penicillin and 50 µg/ml streptomycin (from Mediatech Inc., Manassas, VA), and 10% v/v heat-inactivated horse serum (Gibco<sup>®</sup>, a Thermo Fisher Scientific Company, Waltham, MA).

The low S9 concentration, continuous exposure activation approach utilized a NADPH regeneration system and frozen rat liver S9 from Molecular Toxicology Inc. (Boone, NC). Specifically, Regensys<sup>TM</sup> "A" and Regensys<sup>TM</sup> "B" reagents were combined, and this solution was used to prepare phenobarbital/ $\beta$ -naphthoflavone-induced rat liver S9 at a concentration of 2.5% v/v. This 10× solution was maintained on ice until it was added at a 1:9 ratio to TK6 cells adjusted to 2 × 10<sup>5</sup>/ml in culture

	•		
Chemical (Abbreviation)	CAS no., source	Notes about biotransformation, miscellaneous info	References
2-Acetylaminofluorene (2AAF)	53-96-3, Sigma-Aldrich	Clastogen, requires metabolic activation (CYP1A2), forms C8 adduct on guanine	Otteneder and Lutz (1999); Kirkland et al. (2016)
2-Aminoanthracene (2AAN)	613-13-8, Sigma-Aldrich	Clastogen, aromatic amine, requires metabolic activation (CYP1B1, 2A family)	Carriére et al. (1992)
Anisomycin	22862-76-6, Sigma-Aldrich	Cytotoxicant, protein synthesis inhibitor; in vitro MN neg. with high levels of apoptosis	Personal communication, Maik Schuler, Richard Spellman, Maria Engel
Benzo[a]pyrene (B[a]P)	50-32-8, Sigma-Aldrich	Clastogen, polycyclic aromatic hyrocarbon, requires metabolic activation (CYP1A1, 1B1, epoxide hydrolase), forms bulky adducts	Kirkland <i>et al.</i> (2016)
Brefeldin A	20350-15-6, Sigma-Aldrich	Cytotoxicant, ER-golgi transporter inhibitor, ER stress-induced apoptosis	Moon et al. (2012)
Carbonyl cyanide m-chlorophenyl hydrazone (CCCP)	555-60-2, Sigma-Aldrich	Cytotoxicant, uncouples oxidative phosphorylation	de Graaf <i>et al.</i> (2004)
Cyclophosphamide monohydrate (CP)	6055-19-2, Sigma-Aldrich	Clastogen, nitrogen mustard, requires metabolic activation (CYP2B6, CYP2C19, CYP2C9, and CYP3A4/5)	Kirkland <i>et al.</i> (2016); Rodriguez-Antona and Ingelman- Sundberg (2006)
Cycloheximide	66-81-9, Sigma-Aldrich	Cytotoxicant, protein synthesis inhibitor	Youngblom et al. (1989)
Dibenzo[a,l]pyrene (DB[a,l]P)	191-30-0, Sigma-Aldrich	Clastogen, polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbon, requires metabolic activation (thought to be primarily activated by CYP1A1)	Arif and Gupta (1997)
Diethylnitrosamine (DEN)	55-18-5, Sigma-Aldrich	Clastogen, requires metabolic activation to form alkylating agent (likely involves CYP2E1 which is not highly expressed in rat liver S9); often only positive at high (mM) concentrations	Yamazaki et al. (1992)
7,12-Dimethylbenzanthracene (DMBA)	57-97-6, Sigma-Aldrich	Clastogen, requires metabolic activation (CYP1B1), forms bulky adducts	Kirkland <i>et al.</i> (2016)
Mitomycin C (MMC)	50-07-7, Sigma-Aldrich	DNA-DNA crosslinks, also alkylating activity and oxidative damage	Kirkland et al. (2016)
2-amino-1-methyl-6- phenylimidazo [4,5-b]pyridine (РыР)	105650-23-5, Toronto Research Chemicals	Clastogen, heterocyclic amine, requires metabolic activation (CYP1A family)	Kirkland et al. (2016); Krais et al. (2016)
Resorcinol	108-46-3, Sigma-Aldrich	In vitro mammalian cell pos. (MLA assay with and without metabolic activation pos., in vitro human lymphocyte MN pos. in absence of metabolic activation); in vitro findings not confirmed in vivo (mouse MN neg.)	European Food Safety Authority (2010)
Thapsigargin	67526-95-8, Sigma-Aldrich	Cytotoxicant, ER stress-induced apoptosis	Futami <i>et a</i> l. (2005)

 TABLE 1
 Test chemicals, source, and biological effects

**FIGURE 1** MultiFlow results are shown for TK6 cells exposed to cyclophosphamide in the presence of 2% S9 that was washed out after 4 hr (red Xs), or in the presence of 0.25% S9 for 24 continuous hours (black triangles). Note that large symbols denote averages, and small symbols represent data for individual replicate wells. Relative nuclei counts (RNCs), p53, and  $\gamma$ H2AX data were modeled with PROAST software to provide Benchmark Dose estimates based on Critical Effect Sizes of –0.3, 0.3, and 0.3, respectively. The upper-right graph shows machine learning probabilities based on Random Forest (RF), Logistic Regression (LR), and Neural Network (NN) models



medium for a final S9 concentration of 0.25%. The 0% S9 cultures were TK6 cells at  $2 \times 10^5$ /ml in culture medium culture medium without cofactors or S9.

Dose range-finding experiments were performed to generate 24 hr RNC data for each chemical. Chemical treatments occurred in

U-bottom 96 well plates, with 198  $\mu$ l TK6 cell suspensions with and without S9/cofactor mix as described above. Test chemicals prepared in DMSO were added at 2  $\mu$ l/well for final DMSO concentrations of 1% v/v. The highest test chemical concentration was 10 mM unless solubility or previous experience with a chemical indicated this would



**FIGURE 2** MultiFlow results are shown for TK6 cells exposed to dibenzo[a,l]pyrene in the presence of 2% S9 that was washed out after 4 hr (red Xs), or in the presence of 0.25% S9 for 24 continuous hours (black triangles). Note that large symbols denote averages, and small symbols represent data for individual replicate wells. Relative nuclei counts (RNCs), p53, and  $\gamma$ H2AX data were modeled with PROAST software to provide Benchmark Dose estimates based on Critical Effect Sizes of -0.3, 0.3, and 0.3, respectively. The upper-right graph shows machine learning probabilities based on Random Forest (RF), Logistic Regression (LR), and Neural Network (NN) models

be overly cytotoxic. Testing occurred at 20 concentrations in single wells, and each concentration differed from the one above by a factor of 70.71%. Solvent was tested in at least 10 replicate wells spread throughout the plate.

Definitive experiments with the 15 test chemicals were also conducted in U-bottom 96 well plates, with 198  $\mu$ l TK6 cells with and without S9/cofactor mix as described above. As with the dose range-

finding experiments, test chemicals prepared in DMSO were added at 2  $\mu$ l/well. The highest concentration was derived from the dose range-finding experiment. In the case of noncytotoxic freely soluble chemicals, the top concentration was 10 mM. When precipitate was evident, the lowest precipitating concentration was evaluated. Otherwise, our goal for the highest concentration tested was 60–80% reduction to RNC at 24 hr, but only two concentrations within the

Environmental and Molecular Mutagenesis



**FIGURE 3** MultiFlow p53 results are shown for TK6 cells exposed to benzo[a]pyrene in the presence of 0.25% S9 for 24 continuous hours. Whereas red squares correspond to fluorescence obtained with fluorescent antibodies against p53, black circles are results observed when no antibodies were included in the reaction mix. The increased fluorescence observed with increasing concentrations of benzo[a]pyrene in the "no antibodies" samples therefore corresponds to test article-associated background fluorescence, and these data were used to correct for this phenomenon (blue triangles)

range 70–80% reduction were permitted (Dertinger *et al.*, 2019). The additional 10 lower concentrations were tested using the 70.71% dilution scheme described above. Each of the 11 concentrations was tested in triplicate wells, whereas DMSO controls were evaluated in 10 replicate wells spread throughout the plate. Upon addition of test chemicals the plates were immediately incubated in a humidified atmosphere at  $37^{\circ}$ C with 5% CO<sub>2</sub> for 24 hr.

Other experiments were performed with cyclophosphamideand dibenzo[a,l]pyrene-exposed TK6 cells in order to directly compare results from low, continuous S9 treatment versus a traditional approach to metabolic activation (ie, short-term exposure with a high S9 concentration). The low, continuous S9 exposure occurred with 0.25% S9, and took place as described above. The short-term exposure with high concentration S9 was performed with the same rat liver S9 and cofactor mix, but in this case the final S9 concentration was 2% v/v, delivered from a 20% v/v stock solution. After 4 hr of treatment, cells were washed two times (via centrifugation, aspiration of 150  $\mu$ l supernatants, and resuspension with phosphate buffered saline). After final resuspension with growth medium, the cells were reincubated for an additional 20 hr.

#### 2.3 | MultiFlow assay

For dose range-finding experiments, cells exposed to test chemicals for 4 and 24 hr were resuspended with pipetting, then 25  $\mu$ l were removed from each well and added to a new 96-well plate containing 50  $\mu$ l/well of prealiquoted working MultiFlow

reagent solution. This solution was prepared with reagents in the MultiFlow<sup>®</sup> DNA Damage Kit—p53,  $\gamma$ H2AX, Phospho-Histone H3 (Litron Laboratories, Rochester, NY). Note that for these dose range-finding experiments, antibodies were omitted from the reaction mix. In this manner, we simultaneously measured cytotoxicity (ie, RNC values) as well as fluorescence in the p53 and  $\gamma$ H2AX channels for evidence of test article-associated fluorescence ("background fluorescence") that could impact the definitive assay. After incubation at room temperature for 30 min, samples were analyzed via flow cytometry.

For the definitive experiments, TK6 cells were prepared for analysis using reagents and instructions included in the MultiFlow<sup>®</sup> DNA Damage Kit—p53,  $\gamma$ H2AX, Phospho-Histone H3. As with the dose range-finding experiments, at the 4 and 24 hr time points, an aliquot of 25 µL/well was added to wells containing 50 µl of prealiquoted working MultiFlow reagent solution without antibodies present. This was done for one of three replicate wells per concentration. Additionally, for each of the three replicate wells per concentration, an aliquot of 25 µl/well was added to wells containing 50 µl of prealiquoted working MultiFlow reagent solution with antibodies present. After incubation at room temperature for 30 min, samples were analyzed *via* flow cytometry.

Flow cytometric analysis was carried out using a Miltenyi Biotec MACSQuant<sup>®</sup> Analyzer 10 flow cytometer with integrated 96-well MiniSampler device. Stock photomultiplier tube detectors and associated optical filter sets were used to detect fluorescence emissions associated with the fluorochromes: FITC (detected in the B1 channel, PE (B2 channel), propidium iodide (B3 channel), and Alexa Fluor<sup>®</sup> 647 (R1 channel).

Representative bivariate graphs, gating logic, and position of regions were described in detail in a previous report (Bryce *et al.*, 2016). Briefly, two biomarker measurements,  $\gamma$ H2AX and p53, were based on the shift in median channel fluorescence intensity relative to same-plate solvent controls. Polyploidy and p-H3 biomarker measurements were based on their frequency among other nuclei. Nuclei to counting bead ratios were calculated for each sample, and these ratios were used to determine absolute nuclei counts (those with 2*n* and greater DNA-associated propidium iodide fluorescence). Nuclei counts were used to derive RNC, and %cytotoxicity was calculated as 100% minus %RNC at 24 hr for each concentration tested.

#### 2.4 | MultiFlow data analysis: preprocessing

Definitive study MultiFlow data were corrected for background fluorescence in those rare instances when test chemical alone, in the absence of fluorescent antibodies, shifted the median channel fluorescence of the p53 and/or  $\gamma$ H2AX biomarkers relative to solvent control wells. This was accomplished in a test chemical- and concentrationspecific manner by subtracting the mean solvent control median fluorescence value (no antibodies present) from the median fluorescent value (antibodies present) observed at each test article concentration.



**FIGURE 4** MultiFlow results are shown for TK6 cells exposed to 2-acetylaminofluorene in the absence of S9 (red Xs), or in the presence of 0.25% S9 for 24 continuous hours (black triangles). Note that large symbols denote averages, and small symbols represent data for individual replicate wells. Relative nuclei counts (RNCs), p53, and  $\gamma$ H2AX data were modeled with PROAST software to provide Benchmark Dose estimates based on Critical Effect Sizes of –0.3, 0.3, and 0.3, respectively. The upper-right graph shows machine learning probabilities based on Random Forest (RF), Logistic Regression (LR), and Neural Network (NN) models

This value corresponds to fluorescence that cannot be attributed to antibody reagents, and was subtracted from the corresponding median fluorescence channel observed at the same concentration in the presence of the complete labeling solution, that is, the reagent mix that included antibodies.

After baseline fluorescence corrections as necessary, MultiFlow data were prepared for analysis by converting 4 and 24 hr  $\gamma$ H2AX

and p53 median fluorescence values, and p-H3 and polyploidy frequency measurements, into fold-change values. This was accomplished on an endpoint-, well-, and time point-specific basis by dividing the biomarker measurement by the mean solvent control value (Microsoft Excel, v16.16.14). This was performed for every test article concentration that was not excluded due to excessive cytotoxicity or other limits described above.

Environmental and Molecular Mutagenesis

## TABLE 2 Benchmark dose estimates

HerminalHerminalHerminalHerminalHerminalHerminalHerminal2AAr with yar3113133133133133133132AAr with yar1313133133133133132y peterization ratioNC23243133133132AAW with yar723243133133132AAW with yar73233133133133132y peterization ratio73233133133133133y peterization ratio1343143143143143143143y peterization ratio83243143143143143143143y peterization ratio1343143143143143143143143143143y peterization ratio324324324324314 </th <th></th> <th colspan="6">BMD (µM)</th>		BMD (µM)					
2AAF without S931131	Treatment	4 hr p53	24 hr p53	4 hr γH2AX	24 hr γH2AX	24 hr RNC	
2AAF with S9 <inpath< th=""><inpath< <="" td=""><td>2AAF without S9</td><td>&gt;311</td><td>&gt;311</td><td>&gt;311</td><td>&gt;311</td><td>98</td></inpath<></inpath<></inpath<></inpath<></inpath<></inpath<></inpath<></inpath<></inpath<></inpath<></inpath<></inpath<></inpath<></inpath<></inpath<></inpath<></inpath<></inpath<></inpath<></inpath<></inpath<></inpath<></inpath<></inpath<></inpath<></inpath<></inpath<></inpath<></inpath<></inpath<></inpath<></inpath<></inpath<></inpath<></inpath<></inpath<></inpath<></inpath<></inpath<></inpath<></inpath<></inpath<></inpath<></inpath<></inpath<></inpath<></inpath<></inpath<></inpath<></inpath<></inpath<></inpath<></inpath<></inpath<></inpath<></inpath<></inpath<></inpath<></inpath<></inpath<></inpath<></inpath<></inpath<></inpath<></inpath<></inpath<></inpath<></inpath<></inpath<></inpath<></inpath<></inpath<></inpath<></inpath<></inpath<></inpath<></inpath<></inpath<></inpath<></inpath<></inpath<></inpath<></inpath<></inpath<></inpath<></inpath<></inpath<></inpath<></inpath<></inpath<></inpath<></inpath<></inpath<></inpath<></inpath<></inpath<></inpath<></inpath<></inpath<></inpath<></inpath<></inpath<></inpath<></inpath<></inpath<></inpath<></inpath<></inpath<></inpath<></inpath<></inpath<></inpath<></inpath<></inpath<></inpath<></inpath<></inpath<></inpath<></inpath<></inpath<></inpath<></inpath<></inpath<></inpath<></inpath<></inpath<>	2AAF without S9	>311	>311	>311	>311	98	
SPpeteritation ratioNCNCS2A <th< td=""><td>2AAF with S9</td><td>&gt;311</td><td>&gt;311</td><td>119</td><td>35</td><td>184</td></th<>	2AAF with S9	>311	>311	119	35	184	
2AAN withour S9>55>5500.00.09.52AAN with S97.72.50.240.642.128 potentiation ratio7.72.52.52.50.100.0Anisomych with S9>14.114.114.114.114.10.8S9 potentiation ratioNCNC0.1710.110.110.110.1Bipl with S988883636.131.0	S9 potentiation ratio	NC	NC	>2.6	>8.9	0.53	
2AN with \$97.92.50.240.470.472.43SP petentiation ratio7.72.231.633.633.63Anisomych withs 011.411.411.411.410.41SP petentiation ratioNCNCNC0.150.17BialP with 02.573.818.818.811.84.10*3.14SP petentiation ratioNC8.811.84.10*3.14SP optentiation ratioNC8.011.94.10*3.14SP optentiation ratioNC8.050.550.550.55SP optentiation ratioNC8.053.563.560.51SP optentiation ratioNC8.053.563.560.51SP optentiation ratioNC3.563.563.563.56CCP with 593.553.563.563.563.56CCP with 591.0007.573.523.513.51SP optentiation ratioNC1.0005.233.51CP with 591.501.511.513.513.51SP optentiation ratioNCNC3.513.513.51SP optentiation ratioNCNC3.513.513.51SP optentiation ratioNCNC3.513.513.51SP optentiation ratioNCNC3.513.513.51SP optentiation ratioNCNC3.513.513.51SP optentiation ratioNCNCNC	2AAN without S9	>55	>55	40	10.9	>55	
SP patentiation ratio>7>2216716.3>26.2Anisomycin without SP>24.5>2.52.52.140.08Anisomycin without SP>14.1>14.1>14.10.01SP potentiation ratioNCNCNC<0.15	2AAN with S9	7.9	2.5	0.24	0.67	2.1	
Anisomycin without S9>25.9>25.9>21.10.08Anisomycin with S9>14.1	S9 potentiation ratio	>7	>22	167	16.3	>26.2	
Anisomycin with S994.1494.1494.1494.1494.1494.1494.1494.14S9 potentiation ratioNCNCNC883636.14B[a]P with S9341414.1414.142.4 1.0 336.14S9 potentiation ratioNC80.0463.018.4 10 <sup>6</sup> 31.44Brefelin A with S935.035.6435.6435.6435.6435.64S9 potentiation ratioNCNCNCNC0.14S7 potentiation ratioNCNCNC0.1410.14S9 potentiation ratioNCNCNC0.1410.14S7 potentiation ratioNCNCNC0.1410.14S9 potentiation ratioNC1.31.31.31.3S9 potentiation ratioNCNCNCNC1.5S9 potentiation ratioNCNCNC1.51.5S9 potentiation ratioNCNC1.51.51.5S9 potentiation ratioNCNCNC1.61.6S9 potentiation ratioNCNCNC1.61.6S9 potentiation ratioNCNCNC1.61.6S9 potentiation ratioNCNCNCNC1.6S9 potentiation ratioNCNCNCNC1.6S9 potentiation ratioNCNCNCNC1.6S9 potentiation ratioNCNCNCNC1.6 <td>Anisomycin without S9</td> <td>&gt;2.5</td> <td>&gt;2.5</td> <td>&gt;2.5</td> <td>2.1</td> <td>0.08</td>	Anisomycin without S9	>2.5	>2.5	>2.5	2.1	0.08	
SP potentiation ratioNCNCNC0.130.17BigP withsty888888888368340340388BigP withsty31310463012 x 10 <sup>-5</sup> 32SP potentiation ratioNC80365355355355Brefelin A withsty354356356356326326SP obtentiation RatioNC82353355356326CCCP withsty3533535353535CCP withsty1503703100523357357SP potentiation ratioNC8790310351351SP potentiation ratioNC3709100523357351SP potentiation ratioNC879100320351351SP potentiation ratioNC87316314314314SP potentiation ratioNC87315316314314SP potentiation ratioNCNC1001301314314SP potentiation ratio150151316314314314SP potentiation ratio160010003001301314314SP potentiation ratio1611600316314314314SP potentiation ratio1611600316314314314SP potentiation ratio161161314314314	Anisomycin with S9	>14.1	>14.1	>14.1	>14.1	0.48	
B[a]P without S9>88>88>88>88>88>84>84>84>849595B[a]P with S9>31110.192×10 <sup>-5</sup> 25314S9 potentiation ratioNC>80>165315314Brefeldin A without S9>354>356>356356128S9 Potentiation ratioNCNCNCNC010CCCP without S9>3535353544S9 potentiation ratioNC314NC3535CP without S910001.3NC3645S9 potentiation ratioNC373163535CP with S91568.7901.775S9 potentiation ratioNC8.7910324314CP with S9155155155155315315Cycloheximde without S9154151151151151315S9 potentiation ratioNCNCNC304304304S9 potentiation RatioNCNCNC304316314S9 potentiation Ratio10001000010010100001001010000S9 potentiation Ratio1000100001000010000100001000010000S9 potentiation Ratio100010000100001000010000100001000010000S9 potentiation Ratio100010000100001	S9 potentiation ratio	NC	NC	NC	<0.15	0.17	
Biglep with S9S110.190.2 × 10 <sup>-5</sup> 28S9 peterliation ratioNC>80>46318 × 10 <sup>6</sup> >131Brefeldin A with of S1>0.5>0.5>0.50.50.13Brefeldin A with S9>0.5>356>356>35612.8S9 Potentiation RatioNCNCNCNC0.01CCCP with S9>35>35>35>350.6S9 potentiation ratioNC1.3NCNC0.45CP with S9>10.007.57>10.005.5235.91S9 potentiation ratioNC87991.77.5S9 potentiation ratioNC87911.77.5Cyclohexinde with S91541541511541.510.14Cyclohexinde with S91581511511.510.141.51S9 potentiation ratioNCNCNC0.81.221.511	B[a]P without S9	>88	>88	>88	36	>88	
S9 potentiation ratioNC>80>4631.8 × 10 <sup>4</sup> >314Brefeldin A without S9>0.5>0.5>0.5>0.50.13Brefeldin A with S9>356>356>356>356>12.8S9 Potentiation RatioNCNCNC0.14CCCP with S9>35>35>35>35>35S9 potentiation ratioNC1.3NCNC0.45CP with S9>100007.5709.100005.5235.981CP with S9>1508.79.10005.5239.781Cyclohexinide without S9158.79.113.2499.77S9 potentiation ratioNC8709.1013.2499.77Cyclohexinide without S9151515150.11S9 Potentiation RatioNCNCNC8.79.61DB(Ja)Without S95050505050DB(Ja)Without S910,00010,00010,00010,00010,000S9 Potentiation RatioNC2.8671,0041,000DB(Ja)Without S910,00010,00010,00010,00010,000S9 Potentiation RatioNC2.8671,0441,010S9 Potentiation Ratio10,00010,0001,0001,000S9 Potentiation Ratio10,00010,0001,0001,000DB(Ja)Without S919,4001,211,211,21S9 Potentiation Ratio10,0001,0001,000 <td>B[a]P with S9</td> <td>&gt;31</td> <td>1.1</td> <td>0.19</td> <td><math>2 \times 10^{-5}</math></td> <td>2.8</td>	B[a]P with S9	>31	1.1	0.19	$2 \times 10^{-5}$	2.8	
Brefeldin A without S9<0.5<0.5<0.5<0.5<0.5<0.13Brefeldin A with S9<356	S9 potentiation ratio	NC	>80	>463	$1.8 \times 10^{6}$	>31.4	
Brefeldin A with \$9>356>356>356>356>256>12.8S Potentiation RatioNCNCNC0.01CCCP without \$9>35.>35.>35.2.0S Potentiation ratioNC>13.0NCNC0.4CP without \$9>10.0007.570>10.0005.5235.981CP with \$9>1568.791.77.5S potentiation ratioNC87.0>10.0003.2497.97Cycloheximide without \$9>15.015.015.015.00.31S Potentiation ratioNC87.0>10.000.310.31Cycloheximide without \$9>15.015.015.015.00.31S Potentiation RatioNCNC0.010.0130.41S Potentiation RatioNC9.00010.0010.0010.0131.020D Ela,JP with \$90.90.0220.0110.0130.411.020S Potentiation Ratio10.00010.00010.00010.00010.00010.000S Potentiation Ratio10.0010.00010.00110.00110.00110.001S Potentiation RatioNCNC1.0010.00110.00110.00110.001S Potentiation RatioNC1.001.001.001.0010.0010.00S Potentiation RatioNCNC1.021.021.021.02S Potentiation Ratio1.570.161.021	Brefeldin A without S9	>0.5	>0.5	>0.5	>0.5	0.13	
SP Detentiation RatioNCNCNCNCNC0.01CCCP withour SP-353-353-353-353-353-353-353-353SP potentiation ratioNC-373-31000523-581-5	Brefeldin A with S9	>356	>356	>356	>356	12.8	
CCCP with sp.35.35.35.35.20CCP with sp.35.26.35.35.44Sp otentiation ratioNC.13NC.00.01CP with sp.10000.750.5023.512.512Sp otentiation ratioNC.87.99.17.75Sp otentiation ratioNC.870.101.249.021Cycloheximide without Sp.15.15.15.15.031Sp otentiation ratioNCNCNC.08.08DB(a)/P with sp.50.50.50.50.50Sp otentiation RatioNCNC.0011.0013.041Sp otentiation Ratio.50.962.2727.38.42.1220DEN with sp.1000.10000.10000.10000.10000.10000Sp otentiation RatioNC.2867.104.1000.10000Sp otentiation Ratio.194.16.3.3.194.1000Sp otentiation Ratio.194.16.3.3.104.1000Sp otentiation Ratio.194.16.3.3.104.1000Sp otentiation Ratio.194.15.3.5.104.1000Sp otentiation Ratio.194.16.3.3.104.1000Sp otentiation Ratio.194.16.13.4.104.1000Sp otentiation Ratio.194.194.16.14.124Sp otentiation Ratio	S9 Potentiation Ratio	NC	NC	NC	NC	0.01	
CCCP with S9>3526>35>3544S9 potentiation ratioNC>1.3NCNC0.45CP without S9>10.0007,570>10.0005,5235,981CP with S9>1568.7991.77,57S9 potentiation ratioNC870>10132497,77Cycloheximide without S91515150.310.21Cycloheximide without S91515150.310.31S9 Potentiation RatioNCNCNC0.0110.0130.041S9 Potentiation Ratio559622,72738.4621220DE(a,I)P with S99.100010,00010,00010,00010,000S9 Potentiation Ratio569622,72738.4621220DEN without S910,00010,00010,00010,00010,000S9 Potentiation Ratio1941613.319498DMBA without S919416013.319498DMBA without S9592,72788.7NC13.4S9 potentiation ratio12010,00010,00010,00010,000S9 potentiation Ratio1941613.319498DMBA without S91941613.319498DMBA without S959.00.9080.050310.068220.07407MC without S91570.1630.16120.033910.26363S9 potenti	CCCP without S9	>35	>35	>35	>35	2.0	
S9 potentiation ratioNCNCNC0.45CP without S9>100007,570>10.0005,5235,981CP with S9>1568.791.77,57S9 potentiation ratioNC870>10132497,57Cycloheximide without S9>15>15150.310.25Cycloheximide without S91515150.310.41S9 Potentiation RatioNCNC0.010.0130.011DB(a,I)P with S9.50.5022.727.38.462.1200DB(a,I)P with S9.50.50.00.1000.1000.1000S9 Potentiation Ratio.50.962.27.27.38.462.1200DB(a,I)P with S9.50.00.1000.1000.1000.1000S9 Potentiation Ratio.51.50.36.1000.1000DEN with S9.51.1000.1000.1000.1000.1000S9 Potentiation Ratio.52.61.33.14.51DMBA with S9.51.49.13.3.14.51S9 potentiation ratio.52.07.861.0331.0311.2363S9 potentiation ratio.51.073.82.03311.2363S9 potentiation ratio.51.73.61.178.74S9 potentiation ratio.51.138.178.178.764S9 potentiation ratio.51.138.162.228.376	CCCP with S9	>35	26	>35	>35	4.4	
CP without S9>10,0007,570>10,0005,5235,941CP with S91568.791.77,5S9 potentiation ratioNC8701013249971Cycloheximide without S9155.515120.2Cycloheximide without S9155.515150.31S9 Potentiation RatioNCNCNC3.60.8DB(a)/P without S950500.0010.0130.41S9 Potentiation Ratio569.622.7273.846212000DF(a)/P with S910,00010,00010,00010,00010,000S9 Potentiation Ratio10,00010,00010,00010,00010,000DFN with S910,00010,00010,00010,00010,00010,000S9 Potentiation Ratio10,00010,00010,00010,00010,00010,000S9 Potentiation Ratio10,00010,00010,00010,00010,00010,000S9 Potentiation Ratio10,00010,00010,00010,00010,00010,000S9 Potentiation Ratio10,00010,00010,00010,00010,00010,00010,000S9 potentiation Ratio10,00010,00010,00010,00010,00010,00010,000S9 potentiation ratio10,5110,5110,5110,5110,3110,3110,3110,3110,31S9 potentiation ratio10,5110,511	S9 potentiation ratio	NC	>1.3	NC	NC	0.45	
CP with S9>1568.7991.77.5S9 potentiation ratioNC8701013249797Cycloheximide without S9>151515120.25S9 Potentiation RatioNCNC0.80.80.8DB(a)/P without S9>5050500.0110.0130.41S9 Potentiation Ratio0.90.520.0110.0130.41S9 Potentiation Ratio>569622.272738.4621220DB(a)/P with S9.9000100002.0001100001000010000S9 Potentiation Ratio>10000100002.0011100001000010000DEN with S9.91000100002.0671.0041000010000S9 Potentiation RatioNCNC3.510NC1.000S9 Potentiation Ratio.92011613.319415.001.000S9 Potentiation Ratio.920.921.9211.0001.0001.0001.000S9 Potentiation Ratio.921.921.921.9211.0001.0001.0001.000S9 Potentiation Ratio.921.921.921.921.9211.0001.0001.0001.000S9 Potentiation Ratio.921.921.921.921.921.921.9211.0001.0001.0001.0001.0001.0001.0001.0001.0001.0001.0001.0001.000<	CP without S9	>10,000	7,570	>10,000	5,523	5,981	
S9 potentiation ratioNC870>1013249797Cycloheximide without S9>15>15>150.20.25Cycloheximide with S9>15>15>150.31S9 Potentiation RatioNCNC0.80.8DB(a)IP without S9>50>500.00110.00130.011S9 Potentiation Ratio0.90.0520.00110.00130.011S9 Potentiation Ratio>569622.272738.46212200DEN without S9>10,00010,00010,00010,00010,000DEN with S9>10,00010,0002.86710,00110,000S9 Potentiation RatioNCNC32.331431400DMBA without S9.91411613.391431.6S9 potentiation Ratio.9292.3788.7NC21.8DMBA with S9.929.923.926.921.926.921S9 potentiation ratio.929.927.921.921.926S9 potentiation ratio.929.923.926.921.921S9 potentiation ratio.929.923.926.921.926S9 potentiation ratio.917.926.926.921.926S9 potentiation ratio.917.926.926.926.926S9 potentiation ratio.918.916.9163.926.926.926S9 potentiation ratio.916.914.9164.926 <td>CP with S9</td> <td>&gt;156</td> <td>8.7</td> <td>99</td> <td>1.7</td> <td>7.5</td>	CP with S9	>156	8.7	99	1.7	7.5	
Cycloheximide without S9         >15         >15         >15         12         0.25           Cycloheximide with S9         >15         >15         >15         >15         0.31           S9 Potentiation Ratio         NC         NC         0.8         0.8           DB(a,l)P without S9         >50         >50         >50         >50           DB(a,l)P without S9         0.9         0.052         0.0011         0.013         0.041           S9 Potentiation Ratio         >56         >962         22,727         >38,462         >1220           DEN without S9         >10,000         10,000         >10,000         10,000	S9 potentiation ratio	NC	870	>101	3249	797	
Cycloheximide with S9         >15         >15         >15         >15         >15         0.31           S9 Potentiation Ratio         NC         NC         <0.8	Cycloheximide without S9	>15	>15	>15	12	0.25	
S9 Potentiation Ratio         NC         NC         <0.8         0.8           DB(a,l)P without S9         >50         >50         >50         >50           DB(a,l)P with S9         0.9         0.052         0.0011         0.0013         0.041           S9 Potentiation Ratio         >56         >962         22,727         >38.462         >1200           DEN with S9         10,000         >10,000         >10,000         >10,000         >10,000         >10,000         10,000         10,000         10,000         10,000         \$1	Cycloheximide with S9	>15	>15	>15	>15	0.31	
DB(a,l)P without S9         >50         >50         >50         >50           DB(a,l)P with S9         0.9         0.052         0.0011         0.013         0.041           S9 Potentiation Ratio         >56         >62         22,727         >38,462         >1220           DEN without S9         10,000         >10,000         10,000         >10,000         12,000	S9 Potentiation Ratio	NC	NC	NC	<0.8	0.8	
DB(a,l)P with S9         0.9         0.052         0.0011         0.0013         0.041           S9 Potentiation Ratio         >56         >962         22,727         >38,462         >1220           DEN without S9         >10,000         >10,000         >10,000         >10,000         >10,000         >10,000           DEN with S9         >10,000         >10,000         2,867         1,004         >10,000           S9 Potentiation Ratio         NC         NC         >3.5         >10         NC         NC           DMBA without S9         >194         116         13.3         >194         4.5           S9 potentiation ratio         5.9         4.9         0.15         >194         4.5           S9 potentiation ratio         32.9         23.7         88.7         NC         21.8           MMC with S9         0.802         0.0988         0.05031         0.00862         0.07407           MMC with S9         1.576         0.136         0.6122         0.03391         0.2363           S9 potentiation ratio         0.51         0.73         0.82         0.25         0.31           PhIP with S9         56.81         5.14         0.109         22.8         9.764	DB(a,I)P without S9	>50	>50	25	>50	>50	
S9 Potentiation Ratio         >56         >962         22,727         >38,462         >1220           DEN without S9         >10,000         >10,000         >10,000         >10,000         >10,000         >10,000           DEN with S9         >10,000         >10,000         2,867         1,004         >10,000           S9 Potentiation Ratio         NC         NC         3.5         >10         NC           DMBA without S9         >194         116         13.3         >194         4.5           DMBA with S9         5.9         4.9         0.15         >194         4.5           S9 potentiation ratio         >32.9         23.7         88.7         NC         21.8           MMC without S9         0.802         0.0988         0.05031         0.00862         0.07407           MMC with S9         1.576         0.136         0.6122         0.3391         0.2363           S9 potentiation ratio         0.51         0.73         0.82         0.314         178           PhIP without S9         >178         >178         >178         >178         >178           S9 potentiation ratio         56.81         5.14         0.109         0.228         9.764	DB(a,l)P with S9	0.9	0.052	0.0011	0.0013	0.041	
DEN without S9         >10,000         >10,000         >10,000         >10,000         >10,000         >10,000           DEN with S9         >10,000         2,867         1,004         >10,000           S9 Potentiation Ratio         NC         >3.5         >10         NC           DMBA without S9         >194         116         13.3         >194         98           DMBA with S9         5.9         4.9         0.15         >194         4.5           S9 potentiation ratio         5.9         0.37         88.7         NC         21.8           MMC without S9         0.802         0.0988         0.05031         0.00862         0.07407           MMC with S9         1.576         0.136         0.6122         0.0391         0.2363           S9 potentiation ratio         0.51         0.73         0.82         0.238         0.314           PhIP without S9         >178         178         178         9.764           S9 potentiation ratio         56.81         5.14         0.109         0.228         9.764           S9 potentiation ratio         >3.1         34.6         16.33         781         318.2           S9 potentiation ratio         >12.5         2.6 <td>S9 Potentiation Ratio</td> <td>&gt;56</td> <td>&gt;962</td> <td>22,727</td> <td>&gt;38,462</td> <td>&gt;1220</td>	S9 Potentiation Ratio	>56	>962	22,727	>38,462	>1220	
DEN with \$9         >10,000         >10,000         2,867         1,004         >10,000           \$9 Potentiation Ratio         NC         >3.5         >10         NC           DMBA without \$9         >194         116         13.3         >194         98           DMBA with \$9         5.9         4.9         0.15         >194         4.5           \$9 potentiation ratio         32.9         23.7         88.7         NC         21.8           MMC without \$9         0.802         0.0988         0.05031         0.00862         0.07407           MMC with \$9         1.576         0.136         0.6122         0.03391         0.2363           \$9 potentiation ratio         0.51         0.73         0.82         0.25         0.31           PhIP without \$9         1.576         0.73         0.82         0.25         0.31           PhIP without \$9         1.578         178         178         178         178           \$9 potentiation ratio         56.81         5.14         0.109         0.228         9.764           \$9 potentiation ratio         53.1         34.6         1633         781         18.2           \$9 potentiation ratio         12.5         2.	DEN without S9	>10,000	>10,000	>10,000	>10,000	>10,000	
S9 Potentiation Ratio         NC         >3.5         >10         NC           DMBA without S9         >194         116         13.3         >194         98           DMBA with S9         5.9         4.9         0.15         >194         4.5           S9 potentiation ratio         >32.9         23.7         88.7         NC         21.8           MMC without S9         0.802         0.0988         0.05031         0.00862         0.07407           MMC without S9         0.802         0.136         0.06122         0.03391         0.2363           S9 potentiation ratio         0.51         0.73         0.82         0.25         0.31           PhIP without S9         >178         >178         >178         >178         >178           PhIP without S9         56.81         5.14         0.109         0.228         9.764           S9 potentiation ratio         >3.1         >34.6         >1633         >781         >18.2           S9 potentiation ratio         >12.5         2.6         6.6         0.79         0.59           Resorcinol with S9         >71         24.6         25.8         14.4         12.6	DEN with S9	>10,000	>10,000	2,867	1,004	>10,000	
DMBA without \$9         >194         116         13.3         >194         98           DMBA with \$9         5.9         4.9         0.15         >194         4.5           \$9 potentiation ratio         >32.9         23.7         88.7         NC         21.8           MMC without \$9         0.802         0.0988         0.05031         0.00862         0.07407           MMC with \$9         1.576         0.136         0.06122         0.03391         0.2363           \$9 potentiation ratio         0.51         0.73         0.82         0.25         0.31           PhIP without \$9         >178         >178         >178         >178         >178           PhIP with \$9         5.681         5.14         0.109         0.228         9.764           \$9 potentiation ratio         >3.1         >34.6         >1633         >781         >18.2           \$9 potentiation ratio         >3.1         2.6         6.6         0.79         0.59           Resorcinol with \$9         >71         24.6         25.8         14.4         12.6	S9 Potentiation Ratio	NC	NC	>3.5	>10	NC	
DMBA with \$9         5.9         4.9         0.15         >194         4.5           S9 potentiation ratio         >32.9         23.7         88.7         NC         21.8           MMC without \$9         0.802         0.0988         0.05031         0.00862         0.07407           MMC with \$9         1.576         0.136         0.06122         0.03391         0.2363           S9 potentiation ratio         0.51         0.73         0.82         0.25         0.31           PhIP without \$9         >178         >178         >178         >178         >178           PhIP with \$9         56.81         5.14         0.109         0.228         9.764           S9 potentiation ratio         >3.1         >34.6         >1633         >781         >18.2           Resorcinol without \$9         >12.5         2.6         6.6         0.79         0.59           Resorcinol with \$9         >71         24.6         25.8         14.4         12.6	DMBA without S9	>194	116	13.3	>194	98	
S9 potentiation ratio         >32.9         23.7         88.7         NC         21.8           MMC without S9         0.802         0.0988         0.05031         0.00862         0.07407           MMC with S9         1.576         0.136         0.06122         0.03391         0.2363           S9 potentiation ratio         0.51         0.73         0.82         0.25         0.31           PhIP without S9         >178         >178         >178         >178         >178           PhIP without S9         56.81         5.14         0.109         0.228         9.764           S9 potentiation ratio         >3.1         >34.6         >1633         >781         >18.2           Resorcinol without S9         >12.5         2.6         6.6         0.79         0.59           Resorcinol with S9         >71         24.6         25.8         14.4         12.6	DMBA with S9	5.9	4.9	0.15	>194	4.5	
MMC without \$90.8020.09880.050310.008620.07407MMC with \$91.5760.1360.061220.033910.2363\$9 potentiation ratio0.510.730.820.250.31PhIP without \$9>178>178>178>178>178PhIP with \$956.815.140.1090.2289.764\$9 potentiation ratio>3.1>34.6>1633>781>18.2Resorcinol without \$9>12.52.66.60.790.59Resorcinol with \$9>7124.625.814.412.6	S9 potentiation ratio	>32.9	23.7	88.7	NC	21.8	
MMC with S9         1.578         0.138         0.06122         0.03391         0.2363           S9 potentiation ratio         0.51         0.73         0.82         0.25         0.31           PhIP without S9         >178         >178         >178         >178         >178           PhIP with S9         56.81         5.14         0.109         0.228         9.764           S9 potentiation ratio         >3.1         >34.6         >1633         >781         >18.2           Resorcinol without S9         >12.5         2.6         6.6         0.79         0.59           Resorcinol with S9         >71         24.6         25.8         14.4         12.6	MMC without 59	0.802	0.0988	0.05031	0.00862	0.07407	
Sy potentiation ratio         0.51         0.73         0.82         0.25         0.31           PhIP without S9         >178         >178         >178         >178         >178           PhIP with S9         56.81         5.14         0.109         0.228         9.764           S9 potentiation ratio         >3.1         >34.6         >1633         >781         >18.2           Resorcinol without S9         >12.5         2.6         6.6         0.79         0.59           Resorcinol with S9         >71         24.6         25.8         14.4         12.6	MMC with 59	1.576	0.136	0.06122	0.03391	0.2363	
Philp without \$9     \$178     \$178     \$178     \$178     \$178     \$178       Philp with \$9     56.81     5.14     0.109     0.228     9.764       \$9 potentiation ratio     \$3.1     \$34.6     \$1633     \$781     \$18.2       Resorcinol with \$9     \$12.5     2.6     6.6     0.79     0.59       Resorcinol with \$9     \$71     24.6     25.8     14.4     12.6	S9 potentiation ratio	0.51	0.73	0.82	0.25	0.31	
Phile with S9         56.81         5.14         0.109         0.228         9.764           S9 potentiation ratio         >3.1         >34.6         >1633         >781         >18.2           Resorcinol without S9         >12.5         2.6         6.6         0.79         0.59           Resorcinol with S9         >71         24.6         25.8         14.4         12.6	PhiP without 59	>1/8	>1/8	>1/8	>1/8	>1/8	
Syptemulation ratio         >3.1         >34.8         >1833         >761         >16.2           Resorcinol without S9         >12.5         2.6         6.6         0.79         0.59           Resorcinol with S9         >71         24.6         25.8         14.4         12.6	PhiP with 59	>2.1	5.14	0.109	0.228	9./04 ⊾10.0	
Resortion without 57         >12.5         2.6         0.6         0.77         0.59           Resortion with S9         >71         24.6         25.8         14.4         12.6	Performation ratio	>12.5	2.6	× 1033	0.79	~10.Z	
Nesorenoi with 57 7/1 24.0 25.0 14.4 12.0	Resorcingl with SO	>12.5	2.0	25.8	14.4	12.6	
S9 potentiation ratio NC 0.11 0.26 0.05 0.047	S9 notentiation ratio	NC	0.11	0.26	0.05	0.047	
Thansigargin without \$9         >21         >21         >21         >21         >21         0.2	Thansigargin without SO	>21	>21	>21	>21	0.047	
Thapsgargin with \$9         >15         >15         >15         >15         0.4	Thansigargin with S9	>15	>15	>15	>15	0.14	
Se potentiation ratio NC NC NC NC 14	S9 potentiation ratio	NC	NC	NC	NC	1.4	

Abbreviations: Chemical abbreviations = same as Table 1; BMD, benchmark dose; NC, not calculated; RNC, relative nuclei count.



FIGURE 5 MultiFlow results are shown for TK6 cells exposed to 2-amminoanthracene in the absence of S9 (red Xs), or in the presence of 0.25% S9 for 24 continuous hours (black triangles). Note that large symbols denote averages, and small symbols represent data for individual replicate wells. Relative nuclei counts (RNCs), p53, and yH2AX data were modeled with PROAST software to provide Benchmark Dose estimates based on Critical Effect Sizes of -0.3, 0.3, and 0.3, respectively. The upper-right graph shows machine learning probabilities based on Random Forest (RF), Logistic Regression (LR), and Neural Network (NN) models

#### 2.5 MultiFlow data analysis: machine learning ensemble

The use of three ML models, multinomial logistic regression (LR), artificial neural network (ANN), and random forest (RF), has been described in detail previously (Bryce et al., 2018). These various models utilize 4 and 24 hr MultiFlow data fold-change values and predict whether a chemical exhibits clastogenic, aneugenic, or clastogenic and aneugenic activity. Each model's output was synthesized into MoA calls as follows. A clastogenic MoA required two successive concentrations to exhibit clastogen probability scores ≥80%, or one concentration to exhibit a clastogen probability score ≥90%. An aneugen MoA required two successive concentrations to exhibit aneugen probability scores ≥80%, or one concentration to exhibit an

**FIGURE 6** MultiFlow results are shown for TK6 cells exposed to anisomycin in the absence of S9 (red Xs), or in the presence of 0.25% S9 for 24 continuous hours (black triangles). Note that large symbols denote averages, and small symbols represent data for individual replicate wells. Relative nuclei counts (RNCs), p53, and  $\gamma$ H2AX data were modeled with PROAST software to provide Benchmark Dose estimates based on Critical Effect Sizes of -0.3, 0.3, and 0.3, respectively. The upper-right graph shows machine learning probabilities based on Random Forest (RF), Logistic Regression (LR), and Neural Network (NN) models



aneugen probability score  $\geq$ 90%. Nongenotoxic was defined as the absence of two successive concentrations exhibiting clastogen or aneugen probability scores  $\geq$ 80%, and no single concentration exhibiting a clastogen or aneugen probability score  $\geq$ 90%.

Results from the three clastogen models were synthesized into a final prediction based on a majority vote ensemble. That is, a simple

majority ( $\geq$  2/3 clastogen-positive models) was necessary for a final clastogen call. (Note that since the experiments described herein focused on metabolic activation and clastogenicity, and because no aneugen probability scores  $\geq$ 80% were observed, data for the aneugen-responsive biomarkers (p-H3 and polyploidy) and aneugen machine learning probabilities are not presented.)



**FIGURE 7** MultiFlow results are shown for TK6 cells exposed to benzo[a]pyrene in the absence of S9 (red Xs), or in the presence of 0.25% S9 for 24 continuous hours (black triangles). Note that large symbols denote averages, and small symbols represent data for individual replicate wells. Relative nuclei counts (RNCs), p53, and  $\gamma$ H2AX data were modeled with PROAST software to provide Benchmark Dose estimates based on Critical Effect Sizes of -0.3, 0.3, and 0.3, respectively. The upper-right graph shows machine learning probabilities based on Random Forest (RF), Logistic Regression (LR), and Neural Network (NN) models

#### 2.6 | MultiFlow data analysis: BMD analyses

Benchmark dose (BMD) analyses (Wills *et al.*, 2015) were performed for several MultiFlow biomarker responses using PROAST v67.0, which was accessed through the European Food Safety Authority online tool, see: https://efsa.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10. 2903/sp.efsa.2019.EN-1489. Critical Effect Size (CES) values were -0.3 for the %RNC endpoint (ie, 30% reduction), and 0.3 for foldchange p53 and  $\gamma$ H2AX endpoints (ie, 30% increase). One chemical at a time was analyzed, with the S9 condition as the covariate. With very few exceptions, an exponential model was used to fit the dose response curves. To facilitate potency comparisons across S9 conditions, BMD values are reported for all chemicals, biomarkers, and time points. In those cases where PROAST could not reliably fit a model **FIGURE 8** MultiFlow results are shown for TK6 cells exposed to brefeldin A in the absence of S9 (red Xs), or in the presence of 0.25% S9 for 24 continuous hours (black triangles). Note that large symbols denote averages, and small symbols represent data for individual replicate wells. Relative nuclei counts (RNCs), p53, and  $\gamma$ H2AX data were modeled with PROAST software to provide Benchmark Dose estimates based on Critical Effect Sizes of -0.3, 0.3, and 0.3, respectively. The upper-right graph shows machine learning probabilities based on Random Forest (RF), Logistic Regression (LR), and Neural Network (NN) models



(ie, because a response did not reach the specified CES), or where the BMD estimate was beyond the top concentration tested, we cited the BMD as the top concentration tested with a greater than symbol. BMD values for with and without S9 were used to derive a "S9 Potentiation Ratio," which is the BMD value in the absence of S9 divided by the BMD value in the presence of S9. For example, a value of 10 corresponds to chemical/biomarker/time point combination exhibiting 10-fold higher potency in the presence of S9, whereas a value of 0.1 corresponds 10-fold reduced potency in the presence of S9.



0.05

0.2

0.1

0.0

-0.1

-0.2

-0.3

0.0

log10-gH2AX.24hr

0.0

0.5

Â

0.5

log10-Conc.µM

1.0

log10-Conc.µM

γH2AX 24hr

1.0

1.5

1.5

**FIGURE 9** MultiFlow results are shown for TK6 cells exposed to carbonyl cyanide *m*-chlorophenyl hydrazine in the absence of S9 (red Xs), or in the presence of 0.25% S9 for 24 continuous hours (black triangles). Note that large symbols denote averages, and small symbols represent data for individual replicate wells. Relative nuclei counts (RNCs), p53, and  $\gamma$ H2AX data were modeled with PROAST software to provide Benchmark Dose estimates based on Critical Effect Sizes of –0.3, 0.3, and 0.3, respectively. The upper-right graph shows machine learning probabilities based on Random Forest (RF), Logistic Regression (LR), and Neural Network (NN) models

## 3 | RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

1.0

1.5

#### 3.1 | Preliminary experiments

0.5

log10-Conc.µM

0.0

0.05

0 00

-0.05

-0.10

0.0

log10-gH2AX.4hr

0.5

log10-Conc.µM

γH2AX 4hr

1.0

1.5

Early work focused on determining the maximal amount of rat liver S9 that could be tolerated by TK6 cells for 24 h without causing significant cytotoxicity. Where S9 concentrations ≥0.5% showed evidence of cytotoxicity as expressed by reduced %RNC and increased

frequencies of cells with impaired membrane integrity, 0.25% S9 in combination with 10% v/v cofactor mix had little to no effect (data not shown). This is consistent with the ToxTracker protocol that utilizes 0.25% S9 for mouse stem cell experiments, and explains our use of 0.25% for the experiments that followed.

Other experiments were performed to directly compare results generated by the low (0.25%) S9 approach to those based on traditional short-term treatment with a high S9 concentration. As shown

3.5

**FIGURE 10** MultiFlow results are shown for TK6 cells exposed to cyclophosphamide in the absence of S9 (red Xs), or in the presence of 0.25% S9 for 24 continuous hours (black triangles). Note that large symbols denote averages, and small symbols represent data for individual replicate wells. Relative nuclei counts (RNCs), p53, and yH2AX data were modeled with PROAST software to provide Benchmark Dose estimates based on Critical Effect Sizes of -0.3, 0.3, and 0.3, respectively. The upper-right graph shows machine learning probabilities based on Random Forest (RF), Logistic Regression (LR), and Neural Network (NN) models

## Cyclophosphamide

X = without S9  $\Delta$  = with S9



log10-Conc.µM

by Figure 1, CP caused robust  $\gamma$ H2AX and p53 responses that correctly classified the agent as clastogenic. The 24 hr  $\gamma$ H2AX and p53 responses were remarkably similar across the S9 systems. On the other hand, several significant differences were evident for other biomarkers/time points. For instance, appreciably greater cytotoxicity (reduced RNC) was evident at lower concentrations when 2% S9 was used. Also, the RNC values for replicate 2% S9 wells were more variable compared to the low S9 approach, likely due to the additional cell processing steps that were necessary. We quantified the extent of RNC variation by considering the ratio between the BMD upper confidence limit (BMDU) to the BMD lower confidence limit (BMDL; Wills et al., 2015). Whereas this ratio was low for the continuous S9

log10-Conc.µM



**FIGURE 11** MultiFlow results are shown for TK6 cells exposed to cycloheximide in the absence of S9 (red Xs), or in the presence of 0.25% S9 for 24 continuous hours (black triangles). Note that large symbols denote averages, and small symbols represent data for individual replicate wells. Relative nuclei counts (RNCs), p53, and  $\gamma$ H2AX data were modeled with PROAST software to provide Benchmark Dose estimates based on Critical Effect Sizes of -0.3, 0.3, and 0.3, respectively. The upper-right graph shows machine learning probabilities based on Random Forest (RF), Logistic Regression (LR), and Neural Network (NN) models

cultures (8.09/5.89 or 1.4), it was considerably higher for the 2% S9 cultures that required washout (1.67/0.0774 or 22). Finally, whereas the magnitude of 4 hr  $\gamma$ H2AX responses were similar between low and high concentration S9, the latter's dose response curve was shifted to the left.

Figure 2 shows results for TK6 cells exposed to DB[a,I]P with low, continuous S9 versus the standard short-term 2% approach. Again,

both systems produced clear  $\gamma$ H2AX and p53 responses that correctly classified DB[a,I]P as clastogenic. The RNC dose response curves were quite similar, although replicate wells were more variable for high concentration S9. (BMDU to BMDL ratios = 1.8 and 10.7 for continuous S9 versus washout S9, respectively.) Whereas the 4 hr  $\gamma$ H2AX dose response curve was shifted slightly to the left for the high S9 condition, the reverse was true for 24 hr  $\gamma$ H2AX and p53

**Clastogen Probability** 

**FIGURE 12** MultiFlow results are shown for TK6 cells exposed to dibenzo[a,I]pryene in the absence of S9 (red Xs), or in the presence of 0.25% S9 for 24 continuous hours (black triangles). Note that large symbols denote averages, and small symbols represent data for individual replicate wells. Relative nuclei counts (RNCs), p53, and  $\gamma$ H2AX data were modeled with PROAST software to provide Benchmark Dose estimates based on Critical Effect Sizes of -0.3, 0.3, and 0.3, respectively. The upper-right graph shows machine learning probabilities based on Random Forest (RF), Logistic Regression (LR), and Neural Network (NN) models

# Dibenzo[a,l]pyrene

X = without S9  $\Delta =$  with S9



\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\* Without S9 ← LR Without S9 ★ NN Without S9 ★ RF With S9 ML Ensemble -S9 = Clastogen LR With S9 +S9 = Clastogen NN With S log10-Conc.µM p53 24hr -1 0 log10-Conc.µM γH2AX 24hr

curves. Furthermore, 24 hr  $\gamma H2AX$  and p53 responses exhibited markedly higher magnitudes in the low, continuous S9 system.

Pilot studies with B[a]P are noteworthy, as they alerted us to the possibility that some test chemicals can impart fluorescence to detergent-liberated nuclei that may affect one or both biomarkers that are based on median fluorescence, that is, p53 and  $\gamma$ H2AX.

Figure 3 shows 24 hr p53 results over a range of B[a]P concentrations. Since nuclei that were not brought into contact with antibodies exhibited increasing fluorescence with increasing B[a]P concentration, this effect must be attributed to background fluorescence, not the p53 biomarker. Once background fluorescence is subtracted from the values obtained with antibodies present, a more accurate assessment

-2

-1

0

log10-Conc.µM



**FIGURE 13** MultiFlow results are shown for TK6 cells exposed to diethylnitrosamine in the absence of S9 (red Xs), or in the presence of 0.25% S9 for 24 continuous hours (black triangles). Note that large symbols denote averages, and small symbols represent data for individual replicate wells. Relative nuclei counts (RNCs), p53, and γH2AX data were modeled with PROAST software to provide Benchmark Dose

with PROAST software to provide Benchmark Dose estimates based on critical effect sizes of –0.3, 0.3, and 0.3, respectively. The upper-right graph shows machine learning probabilities based on Random Forest (RF), Logistic Regression (LR), and Neural Network (NN) models

of the biomarker is made. For the experiments described herein, background fluorescence was only appreciable for three chemicals (2AAN, B[a]P, and brefeldin A) and the one biomarker read on the FITC channel, that is, p53.

Given the promising preliminary results described above, we proceeded to test 15 reference chemicals with and without the low concentration S9 system.

### 3.2 | 2AAF

Results for 2AAF are provided in Figure 4. The presence of S9 did not remarkably affect cytotoxicity as expressed as %RNC, and no substantial effects on the p53 biomarker were observed. On the other hand,  $\gamma$ H2AX clearly responded at the 4 and 24 hr time points when S9 was present, and these were of sufficient magnitude for the machine

learning ensemble to characterize 2AAF + S9 as clastogenic. Although a modest  $\gamma$ H2AX effect was apparent at 4 hr without S9, it was not sufficient for a clastogen call. Based on BMD estimates, S9 potentiated early and late  $\gamma$ H2AX responses by approximately 2.6- and 8.9-fold, respectively (Table 2).

## 3.3 | 2AAN

2AAN results are shown in Figure 5. The presence of S9 potentiated 24 hr %RNC, as well as p53 and  $\gamma$ H2AX induction at both time points studied. The machine learning ensemble characterized 2AAN + S9 as clastogenic. The  $\gamma$ H2AX responses at the 4 and 24 hr time points without S9 were of sufficient magnitudes for the machine learning ensemble to make a clastogenic call for this condition as well. That being said, Table 2 highlights the fact the presence of S9 resulted in 1-2 orders of magnitude higher potency compared to no S9, for example 167-fold more potent in the case of 4 hr  $\gamma$ H2AX.

## 3.4 | Anisomycin

Anisomycin caused concentration-dependent reductions to RNC, and as shown by Figure 6, the presence of S9 muted the effect. In fact, as shown by Table 2, the largest effect S9 had on Anisomycin was this S9-related protection effect on %RNC. The genotoxicity biomarkers did not respond to any appreciable level, with the exception of a slight increase in 24 hr  $\gamma$ H2AX at the highest concentrations tested in cultures without S9. As shown by the machine learning graph, this weak effect did not result in a clastogen prediction, with or without S9.

#### 3.5 | B[a]P

Results for B[a]P are provided in Figure 7. In the presence of S9, B[a]P caused concentration-dependent reductions to RNC, whereas cultures without S9 showed no signs of cytotoxicity up to the lowest precipitating concentration. Whereas 4 hr p53 responses in the presence of S9 were minimal, robust effects were observed for 24 hr p53 as well as the  $\gamma$ H2AX biomarker at both time points. The machine learning ensemble characterized B[a]P + S9 as clastogenic. Cultures without S9 showed modestly elevated  $\gamma$ H2AX fluorescence at 24 hr, just enough for the machine learning algorithms to characterize B[a]P without S9 as clastogenic. Table 2 puts this into perspective—several orders of magnitude higher concentrations of B[a]P were required in the absence of S9 to exert this effect.

#### 3.6 | Brefeldin A

Brefeldin A caused concentration-dependent reductions to RNC, and as shown by Figure 8, S9 attenuated the effect. In fact, as shown by Table 2, the presence of S9 shifted the BMD by approximately 100-fold. The genotoxicity biomarkers were unresponsive despite the considerable cytotoxicity that was induced, and as shown by the machine learning graph, neither the 0% or 0.25% S9 treatment scenario resulted in a clastogen prediction.

## 3.7 | CCCP

Results for CCCP are provided in Figure 9. CCCP caused concentration-dependent reductions to RNC, and the absence of S9 shifted the curve to the left, approximately halving the BMD value (Table 2). The genotoxicity biomarkers did not respond to any appreciable level, with the exception of a modest increase in 24 hr p53 in cultures with S9. Even so, as shown by the machine learning graph, this effect did not lead to a clastogen prediction.

#### 3.8 | CP

CP caused concentration-dependent reductions to RNC both in the presence and absence of S9 (Figure 10). However, as shown by Table 2, it required on the order of 800× lower CP concentration to achieve the CES when 0.25% S9 was provided. In the presence of S9, CP induced large increases to  $\gamma$ H2AX at both time points, and p53 at 24 hr. In the absence of S9, CP exhibited weaker effects, both in terms of BMD values and biomarker response magnitudes. Indeed, Table 2 shows that the genotoxicity biomarkers exhibited between 2- and 3-orders of magnitude lower BMD values when low concentration S9 was included for 24 hr. Even so, the machine learning ensemble characterized CP, both with and without S9, as clastogenic.

#### 3.9 | Cycloheximide

Results for cycloheximide are provided in Figure 11. Cycloheximide caused concentration-dependent reductions to RNC, and S9 only slightly affected the BMD value (Table 2). The genotoxicity biomarkers did not respond to any appreciable level, with the exception of a modest increase in 24 hr  $\gamma$ H2AX in cultures lacking S9. However, as shown by the machine learning graph, cycloheximide was not predicted to be clastogenic, either with or without S9.

#### 3.10 | DB[a,l]P

Results for DB[a,I]P are provided in Figure 12. The presence of S9 caused concentration-dependent reductions to RNC, while cultures without S9 showed no signs of cytotoxicity up to the lowest precipitating concentration. Whereas 4 hr p53 exhibited a slight response in the presence of S9, late p53 and  $\gamma$ H2AX at both time points showed large increases. Similar patters were observed in cultures exposed to DB[a,I]P without S9, but in each case the magnitude of the response



**FIGURE 14** MultiFlow results are shown for TK6 cells exposed to 7,12-dimethylbenz[a]anthracene in the absence of S9 (red Xs), or in the presence of 0.25% S9 for 24 continuous hours (black triangles). Note that large symbols denote averages, and small symbols represent data for individual replicate wells. Relative nuclei counts (RNCs), p53, and  $\gamma$ H2AX data were modeled with PROAST software to provide Benchmark Dose estimates based on Critical Effect Sizes of –0.3, 0.3, and 0.3, respectively. The upperright graph shows machine learning probabilities based on Random Forest (RF), Logistic Regression (LR), and Neural Network (NN) models

was greatly reduced, and the concentrations required to reach the CES were much higher. Indeed, Table 2 shows that for the most responsive biomarker ( $\gamma$ H2AX at 24 hr), 0.25% S9 increased DB[a,I]P's potency by four orders of magnitude. The machine learning predictions characterized DB[a,I]P, with and without S9, as clastogenic.

#### 3.11 | DEN

DEN results are shown in Figure 13. The presence of 0.25% S9 increased cytotoxicity, and furthermore potentiated  $\gamma H2AX$  responses by more than 3.5- and 10-fold at the 4 and 24 hr time

**FIGURE 15** MultiFlow results are shown for TK6 cells exposed to mitomycin C in the absence of S9 (red Xs), or in the presence of 0.25% S9 for 24 continuous hours (black triangles). Note that large symbols denote averages, and small symbols represent data for individual replicate wells. Relative nuclei counts (RNCs), p53, and  $\gamma$ H2AX data were modeled with PROAST software to provide Benchmark Dose estimates based on Critical Effect Sizes of -0.3, 0.3, and 0.3, respectively. The upper-right graph shows machine learning probabilities based on Random Forest (RF), Logistic Regression (LR), and Neural Network (NN) models



points, respectively (Table 2). The machine learning ensemble characterized DEN +S9 as clastogenic, but not until mM concentrations were reached. On the other hand, even up to the 10 mM limit concentration, in the absence of S9 DEN did not trigger a genotoxic prediction by any of the three machine learning models.

#### 3.12 | DMBA

Results for DMBA are provided in Figure 14. Concentrationdependent reductions to RNC were observed both with and without S9, however, the presence of S9 made DMBA a much more potent cytotoxicant (21.8-fold difference in potency, Table 2). DMBA + S9 WILEY

exhibited robust p53 responses at both time points, as well as  $\gamma$ H2AX at 4 hr. Whereas DMBA -S9 caused an early  $\gamma$ H2AX effect and late p53 induction, the magnitude of the responses were reduced, and the concentrations required to reach the CES were much higher. For instance, as shown in Table 2, the 4 hr  $\gamma$ H2AX biomarker exhibited 89-fold difference in potency between the 0 and 0.25% S9 conditions. The machine learning predictions characterized DMBA clastogenic, both in the presence and absence of S9.

## 3.13 | MMC

MMC caused concentration-dependent reductions to RNC both in the presence and absence of S9 (Fig. 15), with 0.25% S9 slightly attenuating the cytotoxic effect. The p53 and  $\gamma$ H2AX biomarkers markedly responded in a concentration-dependent manner at both time points, with and without S9. As shown by Table 2, the ability of MMC to induce p53 and  $\gamma$ H2AX tended to be slightly but consistently lower in







Environmental and Molecular Mutagenesis

-WILEY

the presence of S9. The machine learning ensemble characterized MMC, with and without S9, as clastogenic.

## 3.14 | PhIP

Results for PhIP are provided in Figure 16. The presence of S9 caused concentration-dependent reductions to RNC, whereas cultures without

S9 showed no signs of cytotoxicity up to the lowest precipitating concentration. Whereas the p53 and  $\gamma$ H2AX biomarkers were highly responsive in the presence of 0.25% S9, no appreciable effects were observed without S9. It is therefore not surprising that Table 2 characterizes the potency of PhIP with S9 to be at least three orders of magnitude greater in the presence as opposed to the absence of S9, at least for the 4 hr  $\gamma$ H2AX biomarker. The machine learning ensemble predicted PhIP +S9 to be clastogenic, whereas –S9 did not trigger a clastogen call.

Environmental Mutagenesis and





cells exposed to resorcinol in the absence of S9 (red Xs), or in the presence of 0.25% S9 for 24 continuous hours (black triangles). Note that large symbols denote averages, and small symbols represent data for individual replicate wells. Relative nuclei counts (RNCs), p53, and  $\gamma$ H2AX data were modeled with PROAST software to provide Benchmark Dose estimates based on Critical Effect Sizes of -0.3, 0.3, and 0.3, respectively. The upper-right graph shows machine learning probabilities based on Random Forest (RF), Logistic Regression (LR), and Neural Network (NN) models

FIGURE 17 MultiFlow results are shown for TK6



FIGURE 18 MultiFlow results are shown for TK6 cells exposed to thapsigargin in the absence of S9 (red Xs), or in the presence of 0.25% S9 for 24 continuous hours (black triangles). Note that large symbols denote averages, and small symbols represent data for individual replicate wells. Relative nuclei counts (RNCs), p53, and  $\gamma$ H2AX data were modeled with PROAST software to provide Benchmark Dose estimates based on Critical Effect Sizes of -0.3, 0.3, and 0.3, respectively. The upper-right graph shows machine learning probabilities based on Random Forest (RF), Logistic Regression (LR), and Neural Network (NN) models

#### 3.15 Resorcinol

430

Resorcinol caused concentration-dependent reductions to RNC both in the presence and absence of S9 (Figure 17), with a considerable attenuating effect in the presence of 0.25% S9. Whereas the p53 responses were modest at 4 hr, strong induction of p53 with and without S9 occurred at 24 hr. The magnitudes of the  $\gamma$ H2AX biomarker responses were pronounced at both time points, and similar across S9 conditions. That being said, S9 markedly shifted the dose response curves to the right. Table 2 highlights this effect on BMD values, which were reduced by the presence of S9 by an order of magnitude in several instances.

Environmental and Molecular Mutagenesis

The machine learning ensemble characterized resorcinol, with and without S9, as clastogenic.

## 3.16 | Thapsigargin

Results for thapsigargin are provided in Figure 18. Thapsigargin caused concentration-dependent reductions to RNC, with similar profiles occurring with and without S9. The genotoxicity biomarkers did not respond to any appreciable level. As shown by the machine learning graph, thapsigargin was not predicted to be clastogenic, despite the significant levels of cytotoxicity that were induced.

## 4 | CONCLUSIONS

The results of the experiments described herein clearly support the use of 0.25% phenobarbital/ $\beta$ -naphthoflavone-induced rat liver S9 in combination with a NADPH regeneration system as a means to detect chemicals that require enzymatic activation to exert their genotoxic effects. Each of the 8 genotoxicants that are known to be enzymatically metabolized to more reactive electrophiles were found to be clastogenic in this system. In the instances these chemicals were positive with and without S9, the genotoxic potencies were increased by order(s) of magnitude in the presence of 0.25% S9.

Importantly, the 0.25% concentration utilized by the ToxTracker test and evaluated herein with the MultiFlow assay is noncytotoxic to TK6 cells over an extended time frame (at least 24 hr). This concentration is on the order of 8- to 10-times lower than those that have been traditionally used, and therefore clearly address 3Rs goals. The low concentration also facilitated the continuous exposure scenario that appears to be a large contributor to the effectiveness of the system, as most of the observed genotoxic effects were markedly higher at the later (24 hr) time point. Furthermore, the ability to conduct the assay without the need for centrifugation and aspiration steps benefitted the system in at least two other significant ways. First, the data were collected in a more efficient manner, with a clear potential for fully automated cell processing. Second, the cytotoxicity measurements for replicate wells were less variable, likely attributable to the fewer processing steps required. This suggests the data were not simply being acquired more efficiently, but also in a more reliable and reproducible manner.

Ideally, the encouraging results presented here will stimulate additional work that evaluates the transferability of the low S9 strategy to other laboratories, and investigates the generalizability of the method to other cell lines and endpoints.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This work was funded by a grant from the National Institute of Health/National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences (NIEHS; grant no. R44ES029014). The contents are solely the responsibility of the authors, and do not necessarily represent the official views of the NIEHS. The authors would like to thank Carol Swartz who provided advice about working with Moltox's NADPH regeneration system, and Maik Schuler, Maria Engel, and Richard Spellmen who encouraged direct comparisons between 0.25% S9 and traditionally used concentrations. This work also benefited from conversations with Daniel Roberts regarding approaches for addressing background fluorescence.

#### CONFLICT OF INTEREST STATEMENT

The authors are/were employed by Litron Laboratories. Litron has a patent covering the flow cytometry-based assay described in this manuscript and sells a commercial kit based on these procedures: MultiFlow<sup>®</sup> DNA Damage Kit—p53,  $\gamma$ H2AX, Phospho-Histone H3.

#### AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

S.T., A.C., and K.Z. performed benchtop work. S.M.B., N.H., J.C.B., and S.D.D. designed experiments and chose chemicals. S.T., A.C., K.Z., and N.H. created Excel files that supported efficient data capture and processing. SMB suggested BMD analyses, and S.D.D. accomplished them. All authors contributed to the writing of the manuscript.

#### REFERENCES

- Ames, B.N., Durston, W.E., Yamasaki, E. and Lee, F.D. (1973) Carcinogens are mutagens: a simple test system combining liver homogenates for activation and bacteria for detection. *PNAS*, 70, 2281–2285.
- Arif, J.M. and Gupta, R.C. (1997) Microsome-mediated bioactivation of dibenzo[a,l]pyrene and identification of DNA adducts by 32P-postlabeling. *Carcinogenesis*, 18, 1999–2007.
- Audebert, M., Riu, A., Jacques, C., Hillenweck, A., Jamin, E.L., Zalko, D. and Cravedi, J.P. (2010) Use of the γH2AX assay for assessing the genotoxicity of polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons in human cell lines. *Toxicology Letters*, 199, 182–192.
- Bernacki, D.T., Bryce, S.M., Bemis, J.C., Kirkland, D. and Dertinger, S.D. (2016) γH2AX and p53 in TK6 cells discriminate promutagens and nongenotoxicants in the presence of rat liver S9. *Environmental and Molecular Mutagenesis*, 57, 546–558.
- Bryce, S.M., Avlasevich, S.L., Bemis, J.C., Phonethepswath, S. and Dertinger, S.D. (2010) Miniaturized flow cytometric in vitro micronucleus assay represents an efficient tool for comprehensively characterizing genotoxicity dose-response relationship. *Mutation Research*, 703, 191–199.
- Bryce, S.M., Bemis, J.C., Mereness, J.A., Spellman, R.A., Moss, J., Dickinson, D., Schuler, M.J. and Dertinger, S.D. (2014) Interpreting in vitro micronucleus positive results: Simple biomarker matrix discriminates clastogens, aneugens, and misleading positive agents. *Environmental and Molecular Mutagenesis*, 55, 542–555.
- Bryce, S.M., Bernacki, D.T., Bemis, J.C. and Dertinger, S.D. (2016) Genotoxic mode of action predictions from a multiplexed flow cytometric assay and a machine learning approach. *Environmental and Molecular Mutagenesis*, 57, 171–189.
- Bryce, S.M., Bernacki, D.T., Bemis, J.C., Spellman, R.A., Engel, M.E., Schuler, M., Lorge, E., Heikkinen, P.T., Hemmann, U., Thybaud, V., Wilde, S., Queisser, N., Sutter, A., Zeller, A., Guérard, M., Kirkland, D. and Dertinger, S.D. (2017) Interlaboratory evaluation of a multiplexed high information content in vitro genotoxicity assay. *Environmental* and Molecular Mutagenesis, 58, 146–161.
- Bryce, S.M., Bernacki, D.T., Smith-Roe, S.L., Witt, K.L., Bemis, J.C. and Dertinger, S.D. (2018) Investigating the generalizability of the Multi-Flow<sup>®</sup> DNA damage assay and several companion machine learning models with a set of 103 diverse test chemicals. *Toxicological Sciences*, 162, 146–166.

WILEY-

- Carriére, V., de Waziers, I., Courtois, Y.A., Leroux, J.P. and Beaune, P. H. (1992) Cytochrome P450 induction and mutagenicity of 2-aminoanthracene (2AA) in rat liver and gut. *Mutation Research*, 268, 11–20.
- Cheung, J.R., Dickinson, D.A., Moss, J., Schuler, M.J., Spellman, R.A. and Heard, P.L. (2015) Histone markers identify the mode of action for compounds positive in the TK6 micronucleus assay. *Mutation Research*, 777, 7–16.
- Dertinger, S.D., Kraynak, A.R., Wheeldon, R.P., Bernacki, D.T., Bryce, S.M., Hall, N., Bemis, J.C., Galloway, S.M., Escobar, P.A. and Johnson, G.E. (2019) Predictions of genotoxic potential, mode of action, molecular targets, and potency via a tiered MultiFlow<sup>®</sup> assay data analysis strategy. *Environmental and Molecular Mutagenesis*, 60, 513–533.
- de Graaf, A.O., van den Heuvel, L.P., Dijkman, H.B., de Abreu, R.A., Birkenkamp, K.U., de White, T., van der Reijden, B.A., Smeitink, J.A. and Jansen, J.H. (2004) Bcl-2 prevents loss of mitochondria in CCCPinduced apoptosis. *Experimental Cell Research*, 299, 533–540.
- European Food Safety Authority. (2010) Scientific opinion on the use of resorcinol as a food additive. *EFSA Journal*, 8(1), 1411.
- Futami, T., Miyagishi, M. and Taira, K. (2005) Identification of a network involved in thapsigargin-induced apoptosis using a library of small interfering RNA expression vectors. *Journal of Biological Chemistry*, 280, 826–831.
- Garcia-Canton, C., Anadon, A. and Meredith, C. (2013) Assessment of the in vitro γH2AX assay by high content screening as a novel genotoxicity test. *Mutation Research*, 757, 158–166.
- Ge, J., Chow, D.N., Fessler, J.L., Weingeist, D.M., Wood, D.K. and Engelward, B.P. (2015) Micropatterned comet assay enables high throughput and sensitive DNA damage quantification. *Mutagenesis*, 30, 11–19.
- Hastwell, P.W., Chai, L., Roberts, K.J., Webster, T.W., Harvey, J.S., Rees, R.
   W. and Walmsley, R.W. (2006) High-specificity and high-sensitivity genotoxicity assessment in a human cell line: Validation of the GreenScreen HC GADD45a-GFP genotoxicity screening assay. *Mutation Research*, 607, 160–175.
- Hendriks, G., Atallah, M., Morolli, B., Calléja, 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, 285–298.
- Hsieh, J.H., Smith-Roe, S.L., Huang, R., Sedykh, A., Shockley, K.R., Aurerbach, S.S., Merrick, B.A., Xia, M., Tice, R.R. and Witt, K.L. (2019) Identifying compounds with genotoxicity potential using Tox21 highthroughput screening assays. *Chemical Research in Toxicology*, 32, 1384–1401.
- Khoury, L., Zalko, D. and Audebert, M. (2016) Complementarity of phosphorylated histones H2AX and H3 quantification in different cell lines for genotoxicity screening. *Archives of Toxicology*, 90, 1983–1995.
- Kirkland, D., Kasper, P., Martus, H.-J., Müller, L., van Benthem, J., Madia, F. and Corvi, R. (2016) Updated recommended lists of genotoxic and non-genotoxic chemicals for assessment of the performance of new or improved genotoxicity tests. *Mutation Research*, 795, 7–30.
- Krais, A.M., Speksnijder, E.N., Melis, J.P.M., Singh, R., Caldwell, A., de Costa, C.G., Luijten, M., Phillips, D.H. and Arlt, V.M. (2016) Metabolic activation of 2-amino-1-methyl-6-phenylimidazo [4,5-b]pyridine and DNA adduct formation depends on p53: Studies in *Trp53(+/+)*, *Trpp53(+/-)* and *Trp53(-/-)* mice. *Molecular Cancer Biology*, 138, 976–982.
- Le Hégarat, L., Mourot, A., Huet, S., Vasseur, L., Camus, S., Chesné, C. and Fessard, V. (2014) Performance of comet and micronucleus assays in

metabolically competent HepaRG cells to predict in vivo genotoxicity. *Toxicological Sciences*, 138, 300–309.

- Li, H.H., Hyduke, D.R., Chen, R., Heard, P., Yauk, C.L., Aubrecht, J. and Fornace, A.J., Jr. (2015) Development of a toxicogenomics signature for genotoxicity using a dose-optimization and informatics strategy in human cells. *Environmental and Molecular Mutagenesis*, 56, 505–519.
- Li, H.H., Chen, R., Hyduke, D.R., Williams, A., Frötschl, R., Ellinger-Ziegelbauer, H., O'Lone, R., Yauk, C.L., Aubrecht, J. and Forance, A.J., Jr. (2017) Development and validation of a high-throughput transcriptomic biomarker to address 21<sup>st</sup> century genetic toxicology needs. *PNAS*, 114, E10881–E10889.
- Moon, J.L., Kim, S.Y., Shin, S.W. and Park, J.-W. (2012) Regulation of brefeldin A-induced ER stress and apoptosis by mitochondrial NADP+ –dependent isocitrate dehydrogenase. Biochemical and Biophysical Research Communications, 417, 760–764.
- Nikolova, T., Dvorak, M., Jung, F., Adam, I., Krämer, E., Gerhold-Ay, A. and Kaina, B. (2014) γH2AX assay for genotoxic and nongenotoxic agents: Comparison of H2AX phosphorylation with cell death response. *Toxicological Sciences*, 140, 103–117.
- Otteneder, M. and Lutz, W.K. (1999) Correlation of DNA adduct level with tumor incidence: Carcinogenic potency of DNA adducts. *Mutation Research*, 424, 237–247.
- Rodriguez-Antona, C. and Ingelman-Sundberg, M. (2006) Cytochrome P450 pharmacogenetics and cancer. Oncogene, 25, 1679–1691.
- Russell, W.M.S. and Burch, R.L. (1959) *The Principles of Humane Experimental Technique*. London: Methuen and Co..
- Smart, D.J., Ahmedi, K.P., Harvey, J.S. and Lynch, A.M. (2011) Genotoxicity screening via the γH2AX by flow assay. *Mutation Research*, 715, 25–31.
- Tsamou, M., Jennen, D.G., Claessen, S.M., Magkoufopoulou, C., Kleinjans, J.C. and van Delft, J.H. (2012) Performance of in vitro γH2AX assay in HepG2 cells to predict in vivo genotoxicity. *Mutagene*sis, 27, 645–652.
- Westerink, W.M. and Schoonen, W.G. (2007) Cytochrome P450 enzyme levels in HepG2 cells and cryopreserved primary human hepatocytes and their induction in HepG2 cells. *Toxicology in Vitro*, 21, 1581–1591.
- Wills, J.W., Johnson, G.E., Doak, S.H., Soeteman-Hernández, L.G., Slob, W. and White, P.A. (2015) Empirical analysis of BMD metrics in genetic toxicology part I: in vitro analyses to provide robust potency rankings and support MOA determinations. *Mutagenesis*, 31, 255–263.
- Yamazaki, H., Oda, Y., Funae, Y., Imaoka, S., Inui, Y., Guengerich, F.P. and Shimada, T. (1992) Participation of rat liver cytochrome P450 2E1 in the activation of n-nitrosodimethylamine and n-nitrosodiethylamine to products genotoxic in an acetyltransferase-overexpressing Salmonella typhimurium strain (NM2009). Carcinogenesis, 13, 979–985.
- Youngblom, J.H., Wiencke, J.K. and Wolff, S. (1989) Inhibition of the adaptive response of human lymphocytes to very low doses of ionizing radiation by the protein synthesis inhibitor cycloheximide. *Mutation Research*, 227, 257–261.

How to cite this article: Tian S, Cyr A, Zeise K, et al. 3Rsfriendly approach to exogenous metabolic activation that supports high-throughput genetic toxicology testing. *Environ Mol Mutagen*. 2020;61:408–432. <u>https://doi.org/10.1002/em.</u> 22361