

OECD GUIDELINES FOR THE TESTING OF CHEMICALS

Transgenic Rodent Somatic and Germ Cell Gene Mutation Assays

INTRODUCTION

1. OECD Test Guidelines (TGs) are available for a wide range of *in vitro* mutation assays that are able to detect chromosomal and/or gene mutations. There are Test Guidelines for *in vivo* endpoints (*i.e.* chromosomal aberrations and unscheduled DNA synthesis); however, these do not measure gene mutations. Transgenic Rodent (TGR) mutation assays fulfil the need for practical and widely available *in vivo* tests for gene mutations.
2. The TGR mutation assays have been reviewed extensively (24) (33). They use transgenic rats and mice that contain multiple copies of chromosomally integrated plasmid or phage shuttle vectors. The transgenes contain reporter genes for the detection of various types of mutations induced *in vivo* by test chemicals.
3. Mutations arising in a rodent are scored by recovering the transgene and analysing the phenotype of the reporter gene in a bacterial host deficient for the reporter gene. TGR gene mutation assays measure mutations induced in genetically neutral genes recovered from virtually any tissue of the rodent. These assays, therefore, circumvent many of the existing limitations associated with the study of *in vivo* gene mutation in endogenous genes (e.g. limited tissues suitable for analysis, negative/positive selection against mutations).
4. The weight of evidence suggests that transgenes respond to mutagens in a similar manner to endogenous genes, especially with regard to the detection of base pair substitutions, frameshift mutations, and small deletions and insertions (24).
5. The International Workshops on Genotoxicity Testing (IWGT) have endorsed the inclusion of TGR gene mutation assays for *in vivo* detection of gene mutations, and have recommended a protocol for their implementation (15) (29). This TG is based on these recommendations. Further analysis supporting the use of this protocol can be found in (16).
6. It is anticipated that in the future it may be possible to combine a TGR gene mutation assay with a repeat dose toxicity study (TG 407). However, data are required to ensure that the sensitivity of TGR gene mutation assays is unaffected by the shorter one day period of time between the end of the administration period and the sampling time, as used in the repeat dose toxicology study, compared to three days used in TGR gene mutation assays. Data are also required to indicate that the performance of the repeat dose assay is not adversely affected by using a transgenic rodent strain rather than traditional rodent strains. When these data are available, this TG will be updated.
7. Definitions of key terms are set out in the Annex.

INITIAL CONSIDERATIONS

8. TGR gene mutation assays for which sufficient data are available to support their use in this TG are: *lacZ* bacteriophage mouse (Muta™Mouse); *lacZ* plasmid mouse; *gpt* delta (*gpt* and Spi^-) mouse and rat; *lacI* mouse and rat (Big Blue®), as performed under standard conditions. In addition, the *cII* positive selection assay can be used for evaluating mutations in the Big Blue® and Muta™Mouse models. Mutagenesis in the TGR models is normally assessed as mutant frequency; if required, however, molecular analysis of the mutations can provide additional information (see Paragraph 24).

9. These rodent *in vivo* gene mutation tests are especially relevant to assessing mutagenic hazard in that the assays' responses are dependent upon *in vivo* metabolism, pharmacokinetics, DNA repair processes, and translesion DNA synthesis, although these may vary among species, among tissues and among the types of DNA damage. An *in vivo* assay for gene mutations is useful for further investigation of a mutagenic effect detected by an *in vitro* system, and for following up results of tests using other *in vivo* endpoints (24). In addition to being causally associated with the induction of cancer, gene mutation is a relevant endpoint for the prediction of mutation-based non-cancer diseases in somatic tissues (12) (13) as well as diseases transmitted through the germline.

10. If there is evidence that the test chemical, or a relevant metabolite, will not reach any of the tissues of interest, it is not appropriate to perform a TGR gene mutation assay.

PRINCIPLE OF THE TEST METHOD

11. In the assays described in paragraph 8, the target gene is bacterial or bacteriophage in origin, and the means of recovery from the rodent genomic DNA is by incorporation of the transgene into a λ bacteriophage or plasmid shuttle vector. The procedure involves the extraction of genomic DNA from the rodent tissue of interest, *in vitro* processing of the genomic DNA (i.e. packaging of λ vectors, or ligation and electroporation of plasmids to recover the shuttle vector), and subsequent detection of mutations in bacterial hosts under suitable conditions. The assays employ neutral transgenes that are readily recoverable from most tissues.

12. The basic TGR gene mutation experiment involves treatment of the rodent with a chemical over a period of time. Agents may be administered by any appropriate route, including implantation (e.g. medical device testing). The total period during which an animal is dosed is referred to as the administration period. Administration is usually followed by a period of time, prior to sacrifice, during which the agent is not administered and during which unrepaired DNA lesions are fixed into stable mutations. In the literature, this period has been variously referred to as the manifestation time, fixation time or expression time; the end of this period is the sampling time (15) (29). After the animal is sacrificed, genomic DNA is isolated from the tissue(s) of interest and purified.

13. Data for a single tissue per animal from multiple packaging/ligations are usually aggregated, and mutant frequency is generally evaluated using a total of between 10^5 and 10^7 plaque-forming or colony-forming units. When using positive selection methods, total plaque-forming units are determined with a separate set of non-selective plates.

14. Positive selection methods have been developed to facilitate the detection of mutations in both the *gpt* gene [*gpt* delta mouse and rat, *gpt*⁻ phenotype (20) (22) (28)] and the *lacZ* gene [Muta™Mouse or *lacZ* plasmid mouse (3) (10) (11) (30)]; whereas, *lacI* gene mutations in Big Blue® animals are detected through a non-selective method that identifies mutants through the generation of coloured (blue) plaques. Positive selection methodology is also in place to detect point mutations arising in the *cII* gene of the λ bacteriophage shuttle vector [Big Blue® mouse or rat, and Muta™Mouse (17)] and deletion mutations in

the λ *red* and *gam* genes [Spi^- selection in *gpt* delta mouse and rat (21) (22) (28)]. Mutant frequency is calculated by dividing the number of plaques/plasmids containing mutations in the transgene by the total number of plaques/plasmids recovered from the same DNA sample. In TGR gene mutation studies, the mutant frequency is the reported parameter. In addition, a mutation frequency can be determined as the fraction of cells carrying independent mutations; this calculation requires correction for clonal expansion by sequencing the recovered mutants (24).

15. The mutations scored in the *lacI*, *lacZ*, *cII* and *gpt* point mutation assays consist primarily of base pair substitution mutations, frameshift mutations and small insertions/deletions. The relative proportion of these mutation types among spontaneous mutations is similar to that seen in the endogenous *Hprt* gene. Large deletions are detected only with the Spi^- selection and the *lacZ* plasmid assays (24). Mutations of interest are *in vivo* mutations that arise in the mouse or rat. *In vitro* and *ex vivo* mutations, which may arise during phage/plasmid recovery, replication or repair, are relatively rare, and in some systems can be specifically identified, or excluded by the bacterial host/positive selection system.

DESCRIPTION OF THE METHOD

Preparations

Selection of animal species

16. A variety of transgenic mouse gene mutation detection models are currently available, and these systems have been more widely used than transgenic rat models. If the rat is clearly a more appropriate model than the mouse (e.g. when investigating the mechanism of carcinogenesis for a tumour seen only in rats, to correlate with a rat toxicity study, or if rat metabolism is known to be more representative of human metabolism) the use of transgenic rat models should be considered.

Housing and feeding conditions

17. The temperature in the experimental animal room ideally should be 22°C (\pm 3°C). Although the relative humidity should be at least 30% and preferably not exceed 70% other than during room cleaning, the goal should be to maintain a relative humidity of 50-60%. Lighting should be artificial, with a daily sequence of 12 hours light, followed by 12 hours dark. For feeding, conventional laboratory diets may be used with an unlimited supply of drinking water. The choice of diet may be influenced by the need to ensure a suitable admixture of a test chemical when administered by this route. Animals should be housed in small groups (no more than five) of the same sex if no aggressive behaviour is expected. Animals may be housed individually if scientifically justified.

Preparation of the animals

18. Healthy young sexually mature adult animals (8-12 weeks old at start of treatment) are randomly assigned to the control and treatment groups. The animals are identified uniquely. The animals are acclimated to the laboratory conditions for at least five days. Cages should be arranged in such a way that possible effects due to cage placement are minimized. At the commencement of the study, the weight variation of animals should be minimal and not exceed \pm 20% of the mean weight of each sex.

Preparation of doses

19. Solid test chemicals should be dissolved or suspended in appropriate solvents or vehicles or admixed in diet or drinking water prior to dosing of the animals. Liquid test chemicals may be dosed directly or diluted prior to dosing. For inhalation exposures, test materials can be administered as gas,

vapour, or a solid/liquid aerosol, depending on their physicochemical properties. Fresh preparations of the test chemical should be employed unless stability data demonstrate the acceptability of storage.

Test Conditions

Solvent/vehicle

20. The solvent/vehicle should not produce toxic effects at the dose volumes used, and should not be suspected of chemical reaction with the test chemical. If other than well-known solvents/vehicles are used, their inclusion should be supported with reference data indicating their compatibility. It is recommended that wherever possible, the use of an aqueous solvent/vehicle should be considered first.

Positive Controls

21. Concurrent positive control animals should normally be used. However, for laboratories that have demonstrated competency (see Paragraph 23) and routinely use these assays, DNA from previous positive control treated animals may be included with each study to confirm the success of the method. Such DNA from previous experiments should be obtained from the same species and tissues of interest, and properly stored (see Paragraph 36). When concurrent positive controls are used, it is not necessary to administer them by the same route as the test chemical; however, the positive controls should be known to induce mutations in one or more tissues of interest for the test chemical. The doses of the positive control chemicals should be selected so as to produce weak or moderate effects that critically assess the performance and sensitivity of the assay. Examples of positive control substances and some of their target tissues are included in Table 1.

Table 1: Examples of positive control substances and some of their target tissues

Chemical and CAS No.	Characteristics	Mutation Target Tissue	
		Rat	Mouse
N-Ethyl-N-nitrosourea [CAS no. 759-73-9]	Direct acting mutagen	Liver, lung	Bone marrow, colon, colonic epithelium, intestine, liver, lung, spleen, kidney, ovarian granulosa cells, male germ cells
Ethyl carbamate (urethane) [CAS no. 51-79-6]	Mutagen, requires metabolism but produces only weak effects		Bone marrow, forestomach, small intestine, liver, lung, spleen
2,4-Diaminotoluene [CAS no. 95-80-7]	Mutagen, requires metabolism, also positive in the Spi ⁺ assay	Liver	Liver
Benzo[a]pyrene [CAS no. 50-32-8]	Mutagen, requires metabolism	Liver, omenta	Bone marrow, breast, colon, forestomach, glandular stomach, heart, liver, lung, male germ cells

Negative controls

22. Negative controls, treated with solvent or vehicle alone, and otherwise treated in the same way as the treatment groups, should be included for every sampling time. In the absence of historical or published control data showing that no deleterious or mutagenic effects are induced by the chosen solvent/vehicle,

untreated controls should also be included for every sampling time in order to establish acceptability of the vehicle control.

Verification of laboratory proficiency

23. Competency in these assays should be established by demonstrating the ability to reproduce expected results from published data (24) for: 1) mutant frequencies with positive control substances (including weak responses) such as those listed in Table 1, non-mutagens, and vehicle controls; and 2) transgene recovery from genomic DNA (*e.g.* packaging efficiency).

Sequencing of mutants

24. For regulatory applications, DNA sequencing of mutants is not required, particularly where a clear positive or negative result is obtained. However, sequencing data may be useful when high inter-individual variation is observed. In these cases, sequencing can be used to rule out the possibility of jackpots or clonal events by identifying the proportion of unique mutants from a particular tissue. Sequencing approximately 10 mutants per tissue per animal should be sufficient for simply determining if clonal mutants contribute to the mutant frequency; sequencing as many as 25 mutants may be necessary to correct mutant frequency mathematically for clonality. Sequencing of mutants also may be considered when small increases in mutant frequency (*i.e.* just exceeding the untreated control values) are found. Differences in the mutant spectrum between the mutant colonies from treated and untreated animals may lend support to a mutagenic effect (29). Also, mutation spectra may be useful for developing mechanistic hypotheses. When sequencing is to be included as part of the study protocol, special care should be taken in the design of such studies, in particular with respect to the number of mutants sequenced per sample, to achieve adequate power according to the statistical model used (see Paragraph 43).

PROCEDURE

Number and Sex of Animals

25. The number of animals per group should be predetermined to be sufficient to provide statistical power necessary to detect at least a doubling in mutant frequency. Group sizes will consist of a minimum of five animals; however, if the statistical power is insufficient, the number of animals should be increased as required. Male animals should normally be used. There may be cases where testing females alone would be justified; for example, when testing human female-specific drugs, or when investigating female-specific metabolism. If there are significant differences between the sexes in terms of toxicity or metabolism, then both males and females will be required.

Administration Period

26. Based on observations that mutations accumulate with each treatment, a repeated-dose regimen is necessary, with daily treatments for a period of 28 days. This is generally considered acceptable both for producing a sufficient accumulation of mutations by weak mutagens, and for providing an exposure time adequate for detecting mutations in slowly proliferating organs. Alternative treatment regimens may be appropriate for some evaluations, and these alternative dosing schedules should be scientifically justified in the protocol. Treatments should not be shorter than the time required for the complete induction of all the relevant metabolising enzymes, and shorter treatments may necessitate the use of multiple sampling times that are suitable for organs with different proliferation rates. In any case, all available information (*e.g.* on general toxicity or metabolism and pharmacokinetics) should be used when justifying a protocol, especially when deviating from the above standard recommendations. While it may increase sensitivity,

treatment times longer than 8 weeks should be explained clearly and justified, since long treatment times may produce an apparent increase in mutant frequency through clonal expansion (29).

Dose Levels

27. Dose levels should be based on the results of a dose range-finding study measuring general toxicity that was conducted by the same route of exposure, or on the results of pre-existing sub-acute toxicity studies. Non-transgenic animals of the same rodent strain may be used for determining dose ranges. In the main test, in order to obtain dose response information, a complete study should include a negative control group (see Paragraph 22) and a minimum of three, appropriately-spaced dose levels, except where the limit dose has been used (see Paragraph 28). The top dose should be the Maximum Tolerated Dose (MTD). The MTD is defined as the dose producing signs of toxicity such that higher dose levels, based on the same dosing regimen, would be expected to produce lethality. Chemicals with specific biological activities at low non-toxic doses (such as hormones and mitogens), and chemicals which exhibit saturation of toxicokinetic properties may be exceptions to the dose-setting criteria and should be evaluated on a case-by-case basis. The dose levels used should cover a range from the maximum to little or no toxicity.

Limit Test

28. If dose range-finding experiments, or existing data from related rodent strains, indicate that a treatment regime of at least the limit dose (see below) produces no observable toxic effects, and if genotoxicity would not be expected based upon data from structurally related substances, then a full study using three dose levels may not be considered necessary. For an administration period of 28 days (*i.e.* 28 daily treatments), the limit dose is 1000 mg/kg body weight/day. For administration periods of 14 days or less, the limit dose is 2000 mg/kg/body weight/day (dosing schedules differing from 28 daily treatments should be scientifically justified in the protocol; see Paragraph 26).

Administration of Doses

29. The test chemical is usually administered by gavage using a stomach tube or a suitable intubation cannula. In general, the anticipated route of human exposure should be considered when designing an assay. Therefore, other routes of exposure (such as, drinking water, subcutaneous, intravenous, topical, inhalation, intratracheal, dietary, or implantation) may be acceptable where they can be justified. Intraperitoneal injection is not recommended since it is not a physiologically relevant route of human exposure. The maximum volume of liquid that can be administered by gavage or injection at one time depends on the size of the test animal. The volume should not exceed 2 mL/100g body weight. The use of volumes greater than this should be justified. Except for irritating or corrosive chemicals, which will normally reveal exacerbated effects at higher concentrations, variability in test volume should be minimized by adjusting the concentration to ensure a constant volume at all dose levels.

Sampling Time

Somatic Cells

30. The sampling time is a critical variable because it is determined by the period needed for mutations to be fixed. This period is tissue-specific and appears to be related to the turnover time of the cell population, with bone marrow and intestine being rapid responders and the liver being much slower. A suitable compromise for the measurement of mutant frequencies in both rapidly and slowly proliferating tissues is 28 consecutive daily treatments (as indicated in Paragraph 26) and sampling three days after the final treatment; although the maximum mutant frequency may not manifest itself in slowly proliferating

tissues under these conditions. If slowly proliferating tissues are of particular importance, then a later sampling time of 28 days following the 28 day administration period may be more appropriate (16) (29). In such cases, the later sampling time would replace the 3-day sampling time, and would require scientific justification.

Germ Cells

31. TGR assays are well-suited for the study of gene mutation induction in male germ cells (7) (8) (27), in which the timing and kinetics of spermatogenesis have been well-defined (27). The low numbers of ova available for analysis, even after super-ovulation, and the fact that there is no DNA synthesis in the oocyte, preclude the determination of mutation in female germ cells using transgenic assays (31).

32. The sampling times for male germ cells should be selected so that the range of exposed cell types throughout germ cell development is sampled, and so that the stage targeted in the sampling has received sufficient exposure. The time for the progression of developing germ cells from spermatogonial stem cells to mature sperm reaching the vas deferens/cauda epididymis is ~49 days for the mouse (36) and ~70 days for the rat (34) (35). Following a 28-day exposure with a subsequent three day sampling period, accumulated sperm collected from the vas deferens/cauda epididymis (7) (8) will represent a population of cells exposed during approximately the latter half of spermatogenesis, which includes the meiotic and postmeiotic period, but not the spermatogonial or stem cell period. In order to adequately sample cells in the vas deferens/cauda epididymis that were spermatogonial stem cells during the exposure period, an additional sampling time at a minimum of 7 weeks (mice), or 10 weeks (rat), after the end of treatment is required.

33. Cells extruded from seminiferous tubules after a 28 + 3 day regimen comprise a mixed population enriched for all stages of developing germ cells (7) (8). Sampling these cells for gene mutation detection does not provide as precise an assessment of the stages at which germ cell mutations are induced as can be obtained from sampling spermatozoa from the vas deferens/cauda epididymis (since there is a range of germ cell types sampled from the tubules, and there will be some somatic cells contaminating this cell population). However, sampling cells from seminiferous tubules in addition to spermatozoa from the vas deferens/cauda epididymis following only a 28 + 3 day sampling regimen would provide some coverage of cells exposed across the majority of phases of germ cell development, and may be useful for detecting some germ cell mutagens.

Observations

34. General clinical observations should be made at least once a day, preferably at the same time(s) each day and considering the peak period of anticipated effects after dosing. The health condition of the animals should be recorded. At least twice daily, all animals should be observed for morbidity and mortality. All animals should be weighed at least once a week, and at sacrifice. Measurements of food consumption should be made at least weekly. If the test chemical is administered via the drinking water, water consumption should be measured at each change of water and at least weekly. Animals exhibiting non-lethal indicators of excess toxicity should be euthanized prior to completion of the test period (23).

Tissue Collection

35. The rationale for tissue collection should be defined clearly. Since it is possible to study mutation induction in virtually any tissue, the selection of tissues to be collected should be based upon the reason for conducting the study and any existing mutagenicity, carcinogenicity or toxicity data for the chemical under investigation. Important factors for consideration should include the route of administration (based on likely human exposure route(s)), the predicted tissue distribution, and the possible mechanism of action. In

the absence of any background information, several somatic tissues as may be of interest should be collected. These should represent rapidly proliferating, slowly proliferating and site of contact tissues. In addition, spermatozoa from the vas deferens/cauda epididymis and developing germ cells from the seminiferous tubules (as described in Paragraphs 32 and 33) should be collected and stored in case future analysis of germ cell mutagenicity is required. Organ weights should be obtained, and for larger organs, the same area should be collected from all animals.

Storage of Tissues and DNA

36. Tissues (or tissue homogenates) should be stored at or below -70°C and be used for DNA isolation within 5 years. Isolated DNA, stored refrigerated at 4°C in appropriate buffer, should be used optimally for mutation analysis within 1 year.

Selection of Tissues for Mutant Analysis

37. The choice of tissues should be based on considerations such as: 1) the route of administration or site of first contact (*e.g.* glandular stomach if administration is oral, lung if administration is through inhalation, or skin if topical application has been used); and 2) pharmacokinetic parameters observed in general toxicity studies, which indicate tissue disposition, retention or accumulation, or target organs for toxicity. If studies are conducted to follow up carcinogenicity studies, target tissues for carcinogenicity should be considered. The choice of tissues for analysis should maximize the detection of chemicals that are direct-acting *in vitro* mutagens, rapidly metabolized, highly reactive or poorly absorbed, or those for which the target tissue is determined by route of administration (6).

38. In the absence of background information and taking into consideration the site of contact due to route of administration, the liver and at least one rapidly dividing tissue (*e.g.* glandular stomach, bone marrow) should be evaluated for mutagenicity. In most cases, the above requirements can be achieved from analyses of two carefully selected tissues, but in some cases, three or more would be needed. If there are reasons to be specifically concerned about germ cell effects, including positive responses in somatic cells, germ cell tissues should be evaluated for mutations.

Methods of Measurement

39. Standard laboratory or published methods for the detection of mutants are available for the recommended transgenic models: *lacZ* lambda bacteriophage and plasmid (30); *lacI* mouse (2) (18); *gpt* delta mouse (22); *gpt* delta rat (28); *cII* (17). Modifications should be justified and properly documented. Data from multiple packagings can be aggregated and used to reach an adequate number of plaques or colonies. However, the need for a large number of packaging reactions to reach the appropriate number of plaques may be an indication of poor DNA quality. In such cases, data should be considered cautiously because they may be unreliable. The optimal total number of plaques or colonies per DNA sample is governed by the statistical probability of detecting sufficient numbers of mutants at a given spontaneous mutant frequency. In general, a minimum of 125,000 to 300,000 plaques is required if the spontaneous mutant frequency is in the order of 3×10^{-5} (15). For the Big Blue[®] *lacI* assay, it is important to demonstrate that the whole range of mutant colour phenotypes can be detected by inclusion of appropriate colour controls concurrent with each plating. Tissues and the resulting samples (items) should be processed and analysed using a block design, where items from the vehicle/solvent control group, the positive control group (if used) or positive control DNA (where appropriate), and each treatment group are processed together.

DATA AND REPORTING

Treatment of Results

40. Individual animal data should be presented in tabular form. The experimental unit is the animal. The report should include the total number of plaque-forming units (pfu) or colony-forming units (cfu), the number of mutants, and the mutant frequency for each tissue from each animal. If there are multiple packaging/rescue reactions, the number of reactions per DNA sample should be reported. While data for each individual reaction should be retained, only the total pfu or cfu need be reported. Data on toxicity and clinical signs as per paragraph 34 should be reported. Any sequencing results should be presented for each mutant analyzed, and resulting mutation frequency calculations for each animal and tissue should be shown.

Statistical Evaluation and Interpretation of Results

41. There are several criteria for determining a positive result, such as a dose-related increase in the mutant frequency, or a clear increase in the mutant frequency in a single dose group compared to the solvent/vehicle control group. At least three treated dose groups should be analysed in order to provide sufficient data for dose-response analysis. While biological relevance of the results should be the primary consideration, appropriate statistical methods may be used as an aid in evaluating the test results (4) (14) (15) (25) (26). Statistical tests used should consider the animal as the experimental unit.

42. A test chemical for which the results do not meet the above criteria in any tissue is considered non-mutagenic in this assay. For biological relevance of a negative result, tissue exposure should be confirmed.

43. For DNA sequencing analyses, a number of statistical approaches are available to assist in interpreting the results (1) (5) (9) (19).

44. Consideration of whether the observed values are within or outside of the historical control range can provide guidance when evaluating the biological significance of the response (32).

Test report

45. The test report should include the following information:

Test chemical:

- identification data and CAS n^o, if known;
- source, lot number if available;
- physical nature and purity;
- physiochemical properties relevant to the conduct of the study;
- stability of the testchemical, if known;

Solvent/vehicle:

- justification for choice of vehicle;
- solubility and stability of the test chemical in the solvent/vehicle, if known;
- preparation of dietary, drinking water or inhalation formulations;
- analytical determinations on formulations (e.g., stability, homogeneity, nominal concentrations);

Test animals:

- species/strain used and justification for the choice;

- number, age and sex of animals;
- source, housing conditions, diet, etc.;
- individual weight of the animals at the start of the test, including body weight range, mean and standard deviation for each group;

Test conditions:

- positive and negative (vehicle/solvent) control data;
- data from the range-finding study;
- rationale for dose level selection;
- details of test chemical preparation;
- details of the administration of the test chemical;
- rationale for route of administration;
- methods for measurement of animal toxicity, including, where available, histopathological or hematological analyses and the frequency with which animal observations and body weights were taken;
- methods for verifying that the test chemical reached the target tissue, or general circulation, if negative results are obtained;
- actual dose (mg/kg body weight/day) calculated from diet/drinking water test chemical concentration (ppm) and consumption, if applicable;
- details of food and water quality;
- detailed description of treatment and sampling schedules and justifications for the choices;
- method of euthanasia;
- procedures for isolating and preserving tissues;
- methods for isolation of rodent genomic DNA, rescuing the transgene from genomic DNA, and transferring transgenic DNA to a bacterial host;
- source and lot numbers of all cells, kits and reagents (where applicable);
- methods for enumeration of mutants;
- methods for molecular analysis of mutants and use in correcting for clonality and/or calculating mutation frequencies, if applicable;

Results:

- animal condition prior to and throughout the test period, including signs of toxicity;
- body and organ weights at sacrifice;
- for each tissue/animal, the number of mutants, number of plaques or colonies evaluated, mutant frequency;
- for each tissue/animal group, number of packaging reactions per DNA sample, total number of mutants, mean mutant frequency, standard deviation;
- dose-response relationship, where possible;
- for each tissue/animal, the number of independent mutants and mean mutation frequency, where molecular analysis of mutations was performed;
- concurrent and historical negative control data with ranges, means and standard deviations;
- concurrent positive control (or non-concurrent DNA positive control) data;
- analytical determinations, if available (e.g. DNA concentrations used in packaging, DNA sequencing data);
- statistical analyses and methods applied;

Discussion of the results;

Conclusion.

LITERATURE

- (1) Adams, W.T. and T.R. Skopek (1987), “Statistical Test for the Comparison of Samples from Mutational Spectra”, *J. Mol. Biol.*, 194: 391-396.
- (2) Bielas, J.H. (2002), “A more Efficient Big Blue[®] Protocol Improves Transgene Rescue and Accuracy in an Adduct and Mutation Measurement”, *Mutation Res.*, 518: 107-112.
- (3) Boerrigter, M.E., M.E. Dollé, H.-J. Martus, J.A. Gossen and J. Vijg (1995), “Plasmid-based Transgenic Mouse Model for Studying *in vivo* Mutations” *Nature*, 377(6550): 657-659
- (4) Carr, G.J. and N.J. Gorelick (1995), “Statistical Design and Analysis of Mutation Studies in Transgenic Mice”, *Environ. Mol. Mutagen*, 25(3): 246-255.
- (5) Carr, G.J. and N.J. Gorelick (1996), “Mutational Spectra in Transgenic Animal Research: Data Analysis and Study Design Based upon the Mutant or Mutation Frequency”, *Environ. Mol. Mutagen*, 28: 405-413.
- (6) Dean, S.W., T.M. Brooks, B. Burlinson, J. Mirsalis, B. Myhr, L. Recio and V. Thybaud (1999), “Transgenic Mouse Mutation Assay Systems can Play an important Role in Regulatory Mutagenicity Testing *in vivo* for the Detection of Site-of-contact Mutagens”, *Mutagenesis*, 14(1): 141-151.
- (7) Douglas, G.R., J. Jiao, J.D. Gingerich, J.A. Gossen and L.M. Soper (1995), “Temporal and Molecular Characteristics of Mutations Induced by Ethylnitrosourea in Germ Cells Isolated from Seminiferous Tubules and in Spermatozoa of *lacZ* Transgenic Mice”, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA*, 92: 7485-7489.
- (8) Douglas, G.R., J.D. Gingerich, L.M. Soper and J. Jiao (1997), “Toward an Understanding of the Use of Transgenic Mice for the Detection of Gene Mutations in Germ Cells”, *Mutation Res.*, 388(2-3): 197-212.
- (9) Dunson, D.B. and K.R. Tindall (2000), “Bayesian Analysis of Mutational Spectra”, *Genetics*, 156: 1411-1418.
- (10) Gossen, J.A., W.J. de Leeuw, C.H. Tan, E.C. Zwarthoff, F. Berends, P.H. Lohman, D.L. Knook and J. Vijg (1989), “Efficient Rescue of Integrated Shuttle Vectors from Transgenic Mice: a Model for Studying Mutations *in vivo*”, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA*, 86(20): 7971-7975.
- (11) Gossen, J.A. and J. Vijg (1993), “A Selective System for *lacZ*-Phage using a Galactose-sensitive *E. coli* Host”, *Biotechniques*, 14(3): 326, 330.
- (12) Erikson, R.P. (2003), “Somatic Gene Mutation and Human Disease other than Cancer”, *Mutation Res.*, 543: 125-136.
- (13) Erikson, R.P. (2010), “Somatic Gene Mutation and Human Disease other than Cancer: an Update”, *Mutation Res.*, 705: 96-106.
- (14) Fung, K.Y., G.R. Douglas and D. Krewski (1998), “Statistical Analysis of *lacZ* Mutant Frequency Data from MutaTM Mouse Mutagenicity Assays”, *Mutagenesis*, 13(3): 249-255.
- (15) Heddle, J.A., S. Dean, T. Nohmi, M. Boerrigter, D. Casciano, G.R. Douglas, B.W. Glickman, N.J. Gorelick, J.C. Mirsalis, H.-J. Martus, T.R. Skopek, V. Thybaud, K.R. Tindall and N. Yajima (2000), “*In vivo* Transgenic Mutation Assays”, *Environ. Mol. Mutagen.*, 35: 253-259.
- (16) Heddle, J.A., H.-J. Martus and G.R. Douglas (2003), “Treatment and Sampling Protocols for Transgenic Mutation Assays”, *Environ. Mol. Mutagen.*, 41: 1-6.

- (17) Jakubczak, J.L., G. Merlino, J.E. French, W.J. Muller, B. Paul, S. Adhya and S. Garges (1996), “Analysis of Genetic Instability during Mammary Tumor Progression using a novel Selection-based Assay for *in vivo* Mutations in a Bacteriophage λ Transgene Target”, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA*, 93(17): 9073–9078.
- (18) Kohler, S.W., G.S. Provost, P.L. Kretz, A. Fieck, J.A. Sorge and J.M. Short (1990), “The Use of Transgenic Mice for Short-term, *in vivo* Mutagenicity Testing”, *Genet. Anal. Tech. Appl.*, 7(8): 212–218.
- (19) Lewis P.D., B. Manshian, M.N. Routledge, G.B. Scott and P.A. Burns (2008), “Comparison of Induced and Cancer-associated Mutational Spectra using Multivariate Data Analysis”, *Carcinogenesis*, 29(4): 772-778.
- (20) Nohmi, T., M. Katoh, H. Suzuki, M. Matsui, M. Yamada, M. Watanabe, M. Suzuki, N. Horiya, O. Ueda, T. Shibuya, H. Ikeda and T. Sofuni (1996), “A new Transgenic Mouse Mutagenesis Test System using Spi^- and 6-thioguanine Selections”, *Environ. Mol. Mutagen.*, 28(4): 465–470.
- (21) Nohmi, T., M. Suzuki, K. Masumura, M. Yamada, K. Matsui, O. Ueda, H. Suzuki, M. Katoh, H. Ikeda and T. Sofuni (1999), “ Spi^- Selection: an Efficient Method to Detect γ -ray-induced Deletions in Transgenic Mice”, *Environ. Mol. Mutagen.*, 34(1): 9–15.
- (22) Nohmi, T., T. Suzuki and K.I. Masumura (2000), “Recent Advances in the Protocols of Transgenic Mouse Mutation Assays”, *Mutation Res.*, 455(1–2): 191–215.
- (23) 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](#), OECD, Paris.
- (24) OECD (2009), *Detailed Review Paper on Transgenic Rodent Mutation Assays*, Series on Testing and Assessment, N° 103, [ENV/JM/MONO\(2009\)7](#), OECD, Paris.
- (25) Piegorsch, W.W., B.H. Margolin, M.D. Shelby, A. Johnson, J.E. French, R.W. Tennant and K.R. Tindall (1995), “Study Design and Sample Sizes for a *lacI* Transgenic Mouse Mutation Assay”, *Environ. Mol. Mutagen.*, 25(3): 231–245.
- (26) Piegorsch, W.W., A.C. Lockhart, G.J. Carr, B.H. Margolin, T. Brooks, G.R. Douglas, U.M. Liegibel, T. Suzuki, V. Thybaud, J.H. van Delft and N.J. Gorelick (1997), “Sources of Variability in Data from a Positive Selection *lacZ* Transgenic Mouse Mutation Assay: an Interlaboratory Study”, *Mutation. Res.*, 388(2–3): 249–289.
- (27) Singer, T.M., I.B. Lambert, A. Williams, G.R. Douglas and C.L. Yauk (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. Res.*, 598: 164-193.
- (28) Toyoda-Hokaiwado, N., T. Inoue, K. Masumura, H. Hayashi, Y. Kawamura, Y. Kurata, M. Takamune, M. Yamada, H. Sanada, T. Umemura, A. Nishikawa and T. Nohmi (2010), “Integration of *in vivo* Genotoxicity and Short-term Carcinogenicity Assays using F344 *gpt* delta Transgenic Rats: *in vivo* Mutagenicity of 2,4-diaminotoluene and 2,6-diaminotoluene Structural Isomers”, *Toxicol. Sci.*, 114(1): 71-78.
- (29) Thybaud, V., S. Dean, T. Nohmi, J. de Boer, G.R. Douglas, B.W. Glickman, N.J. Gorelick, J.A. Heddle, R.H. Heflich, I. Lambert, H.-J. Martus, J.C. Mirsalis, T. Suzuki and N. Yajima (2003), “*In vivo* Transgenic Mutation Assays”, *Mutation Res.*, 540: 141-151.
- (30) Vijg, J. and G.R. Douglas (1996), “Bacteriophage λ and Plasmid *lacZ* Transgenic Mice for studying Mutations *in vivo*” in: G. Pfeifer (ed.), *Technologies for Detection of DNA Damage and Mutations, Part II*, Plenum Press, New York, NY, USA, pp. 391–410.

- (31) Yauk, C.L., J.D. Gingerich, L. Soper, A. MacMahon, W.G. Foster and G.R. Douglas (2005), “A *lacZ* Transgenic Mouse Assay for the Detection of Mutations in Follicular Granulosa Cells”, *Mutation Res.*, 578(1-2): 117-123.
- (32) Hayashi, M., K. Dearfield, P. Kasper, D. Lovell, H.-J. Martus, V. Thybaud (2011), “Compilation and Use of Genetic Toxicity Historical Control Data”, *Mutation Res.*, doi:10.1016/j.mrgentox.2010.09.007.
- (33) OECD (2011), *Retrospective Performance Assessment of OECD Test Guideline on Transgenic Rodent Somatic and Germ Cell Gene Mutation Assays*, Series on Testing and Assessment, N° 145, OECD, Paris.
- (34) Clermont, Y. (1972), “Kinetics of spermatogenesis in mammals seminiferous epithelium cycle and spermatogonial renewal”. *Physiol. Rev.* 52: 198-236.
- (35) Robaire, B., Hinton, B.T., and Oregbin-Crist, M.-C. (2006), “The Epididymis”, in Neil, J.D., Pfaff, D.W., Chalis, J.R.G., de Kretser, D.M., Richards, J.S., and P. M, Wassarman (eds.), *Physiology of Reproduction*, Elsevier, the Netherlands, pp. 1071-1148.
- (36) Russell, L.B. (2004), “Effects of male germ-cell stage on the frequency, nature, and spectrum of induced specific-locus mutations in the mouse”, *Genetica*, 122: 25–36.

ANNEX

DEFINITIONS

Administration period: the total period during which an animal is dosed.

Base pair substitution: a type of mutation that causes the replacement of a single DNA nucleotide base with another DNA nucleotide base.

Capsid: the protein shell that surrounds a virus particle.

Clonal expansion: the production of many cells from a single (mutant) cell.

Colony-forming unit (cfu): a measure of viable bacterial numbers.

Concatamer: a long continuous biomolecule composed of multiple identical copies linked in series.

Cos site: a 12-nucleotide segment of single-stranded DNA that exists at both ends of the bacteriophage lambda's double-stranded genome.

Deletion: a mutation in which one or more (sequential) nucleotides is lost by the genome.

Electroporation: the application of electric pulses to increase the permeability of cell membranes.

Endogenous gene: a gene native to the genome.

Extrabinomial variation: greater variability in repeat estimates of a population proportion than would be expected if the population had a binomial distribution.

Frameshift mutation: a genetic mutation caused by insertions or deletions of a number of nucleotides that is not evenly divisible by three within a DNA sequence that codes for a protein/peptide.

Insertion: the addition of one or more nucleotide base pairs into a DNA sequence.

Jackpot: a large number of mutants that arose through clonal expansion from a single mutation.

Large deletions: deletions in DNA of more than several kilobases (which are effectively detected with the Spi⁻ selection and the lacZ plasmid assays).

Ligation: the covalent linking of two ends of DNA molecules using DNA ligase.

Mitogen: a chemical that stimulates a cell to commence cell division, triggering mitosis (i.e. cell division).

Neutral gene: a gene that is not affected by positive or negative selective pressures.

Packaging: the synthesis of infective phage particles from a preparation of phage *capsid* and tail proteins and a *concatamer* of phage DNA molecules. Commonly used to package DNA cloned onto a lambda vector (separated by *cos sites*) into infectious lambda particles.

Packaging efficiency: the efficiency with which packaged bacteriophages are recovered in host bacteria.

Plaque forming unit (pfu): a measure of viable bacteriophage numbers.

Point mutation: a general term for a mutation affecting only a small sequence of DNA including small insertions, deletions, and base pair substitutions.

Positive selection: a method that permits only mutants to survive.

Reporter gene: a gene whose mutant gene product is easily detected.

Sampling time: the end of the period of time, prior to sacrifice, during which the agent is not administered and during which unprocessed DNA lesions are fixed into stable mutations.

Shuttle vector: a vector constructed so that it can propagate in two different host species; accordingly, DNA inserted into a shuttle vector can be tested or manipulated in two different cell types or two different organisms.

Transgenic: of, relating to, or being an organism whose genome has been altered by the transfer of a gene or genes from another species.