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Overview

- Step-wise approach to assessment of adversity for a novel food additive
- Considerations in determining a NOAEL - Sucralose
- Importance of GLP studies and standardized animal testing methodologies
- Susceptible subpopulations
- New research
- Human relevance
Ultimate Goal: Ensure Proposed Uses are Safe for Humans
No Observed Adverse Effect Level (NOAEL)

- For a specific study:
  - the dose determined by empirical study at which no adverse effects induced by test article,
    - i.e., harmful anatomical, biochemical, or functional changes.
  - Some harmful findings may not be statistically significant, while some statistically significant changes may not cause harm.

- For an ingredient or test article:
  - NOAELs from multiple studies are considered together in defining most important adverse responses in most sensitive species.

Kerlin et al., 2015
In the context of a nonclinical toxicity study, an adverse effect is a test item-related change in the morphology, physiology, growth, development, reproduction or life span of the animal model that likely results in an impairment of functional capacity to maintain homeostasis and/or an impairment of the capacity to respond to an additional challenge.

Palazzi et al., 2016
Step-wise Testing and Challenges

Initial Screening

Chemical characterization
*In silico* and *in vitro* methods
Genotoxicity studies
Digestibility
Stability in food matrices

Advantage of identifying significant adversity as early as possible, assists in prioritizing compounds for further product development and testing.

Adapted from Blaauboer *et al.*, 2016
Step-wise Testing and Challenges

High doses needed to increase sensitivity of detection of adverse effects poses challenges for diet formulation and acceptability.

- Palatability
- Diet formulation for nutrient balance
- ADME to identify species most similar to human

It's a bit CHEESY!
Does exposure to compound affect any health parameter throughout life stages? At what dose? Extensive resources and time required.

Subchronic 90-day, Chronic – 1-2 yr for rodents Reproductive -2 generation Carcinogenicity Immunotoxicity Neurotoxicity, Other specialized studies

Adapted from Blaauboer et al., 2016
Step-wise Testing and Challenges

- May be conducted, after establish safety in animal studies.
  - Confirm tolerance of expected human exposure levels
  - Any susceptible subgroups with special considerations?

Adapted from Blaauboer et al., 2016
Sucralose - Case study

- Non-caloric – sweetness potency 600x sucrose; not digested or metabolized for energy.
- Highly stable in food and beverage matrices.
- Does not breakdown during typical heat processing and baking of foods.

Disaccharide (sucrose)
3 Cl replace 3 OH

Grotz and Munro. 2009.
Sucralose: Toxicokinetic Studies

- *In vitro* studies: microbial and plant glycosidases, and mammalian intestinal extracts, no evidence of hydrolysis of sucralose by any enzymes.

- *In vivo*: 5 species tested:
  - Mouse
  - Rat
  - Rabbit
  - Dog
  - Human

Sucralose toxicokinetics in rat most similar to those observed in humans.

Grotz and Munro. 2009.
## Sucralose: Toxicokinetic studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Absorption into blood</th>
<th>Poorly absorbed in all species. ~15% in humans. Remainder unchanged in feces</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Digestive enzymes, gut microflora</td>
<td>No digestion into monosaccharides No metabolism by gut microflora</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metabolism</td>
<td>Majority: not metabolized. ~2% glucuronidated by liver.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sucralose Toxicology Studies: Multiple Species, Multiple Endpoints

- NOAEL used to establish ADI

- Mice chronic, carcinogen 2 yr
- Dog chronic 1 yr
- Reproductive Rabbits and 2 generations of rats
- Rats chronic 2 yr plus in utero
- Neurotoxicity Mice, monkeys
- Reproductive Rabbits and 2 generations of rats
- Immunotoxicity Rats

- Toxicokinetics mice, rats, dogs, rabbits, humans

ADI = Acceptable Daily Intake
Considerations When Effect Observed

Is effect due to test article?

Yes

No, other factors identified

Adapted from Kerlin et al., 2015
Regulatory Guidelines for Studies Increase Ability to Assess if Effect Due to Test Article

- Multiple doses needed
  - Does response increase with dose?
  - Relationship between effect and dose?
  - Range of dose that has no adverse effect

- Is response different from control group?
  - Range of natural variation? Historical control data?
  - Biological plausibility?

- Consistently observed?
  - In multiple studies? More than one species? Both sexes?

- Conduct using Good Laboratory Practices (GLP)
Sucralose Example: Due to Test Article?

- Consistent effect: rats and mice fed sucralose in diet had **significantly reduced body weight and food consumption**, greatest effect at highest level (3%).
- Due to reduced palatability, reduced food intake? Or due to sucralose itself?
- Subsequent studies conducted:
  - Same doses of sucralose administered by *gavage*,
  - *Pair-feeding* study to assess effect of reduced food consumption on growth.
Different Interpretation & Conclusions

- **WHO Joint Expert Committee on Food Additives** –
  - due to poor palatability and low food consumption.
  - Conclude chronic rat study NOAEL = 1500 mg/kg/d.

- **US FDA**
  - reduction in food consumption accounts for reduced body weight at 1% of diet, but not at 3%.
  - Conclude for same study NOAEL = 500 mg/kg/d.

Considerations When Effect Observed

Is effect due to test article?

Yes

Is change adverse?

No, other factors identified

Is change non-adverse?

Adapted from Kerlin et al., 2015
Changes Considered “Nonadverse”

1. No alteration in the function of the test organism or affected organ/tissue is noted;
2. Change represents an adaptive response;
3. Finding is transient;
4. Severity limited, below thresholds of concern;
5. Effect is isolated or independent (No changes in other parameters usually associated with effect);
6. Effect is not a precursor lesion;
7. Result is a secondary consequence; and
8. Effect arises from some inherent biological property of the animal model.  (Lewis et al., 2002)
Sucralose Example: “Nonadverse”

No alteration in the function of organ;

* 26 week study in rats, observed increased kidney weight relative to body weight in high dose group,
* BUT no change in function – no change in kidney tissues morphology and no effect on plasma electrolytes.

Change represents an adaptive response;

- Dose-related enlargement of cecum due to sucralose in several rodent studies.
- This is widely recognized as a normal physiological adaptation to consumption of large amounts of poorly absorbed dietary components.

*Federal Register. Vol. 63, No. 64. April 3, 1998*
Clinical Studies: Diabetic Population

Potential high users, different susceptibility?

Single dose, acute glycemic response
• Type I and Type II diabetic patients

6 month repeated dose, glycemic control
• Type II diabetic patients (n=41)

3 month repeated dose, larger study
• Type II diabetic patients (n=136) managed with either insulin (n=64) or oral hypoglycemic drugs (n=72)

*Federal Register. Vol. 63, No. 64. April 3, 1998*
Most Appropriate Long-Term Study

US FDA NOAEL 500 mg/kg/d

- Mice chronic, carcinogen 2 yr
- Dog chronic 1 yr
- Reproductive Rabbits and 2 generations of rats
- Neurotoxicity
- Immunotox
- Toxicokinetics mice, rats, dogs, rabbits, humans
- Rats chronic 2 yr plus in utero
- Human: Individuals with Diabetes

New Research on Sweet Taste Receptors Raises New Questions

Taste receptors on tongue

Activation by sweet compounds

Signals to brain
Perceive sweetness

Credits: NIH Image gallery
New Research on Sweet Taste Receptors Raises New Questions

Signals to brain
Perceive sweetness

Taste receptors on tongue
Activation by sweet compounds

Taste receptors in gut cells
Activation by glucose and other sugars
Release of gut hormones

-Do non-nutritive sweeteners stimulate these gut receptors? - Functional significance?
Sucralose and Gut Hormones

- **In vitro** studies:
  - Sucralose activates of receptors, release of gut hormones

- Subsequent acute animal and human feeding studies on gut hormones and function:
  - Different designs, healthy and diabetic subjects,
  - Most report no effect on gut hormones,
  - No **adverse effect** on functions related to gut hormones including blood glucose and insulin levels, appetite, and gastric emptying.

- Confirms long-term daily consumption studies:
  - No adverse effects of use in healthy individuals and individuals with diabetes.

Reviewed in Bryant & McLaughlin, 2016; Meyer-Gerspach et al., 2016.
Studies conducted and reviewed by regulators

- **Genotoxicity**
  - *In vitro, In vivo*
  - Non-mutagenic in most, weakly mutagenic in some

- **Mouse study**
  - Guideline-compliant, GLP
  - No treatment-related change in neoplasias

- **Rat, including *in utero***
  - Guideline-compliant, GLP, data reviewed by FDA
  - No treatment-related change in neoplasias
Carcinogenicity of Sucralose – Recent Conflicting Report

Studies conducted and reviewed by regulators

- Genotoxicity
  - *In vitro, In vivo*
  - Non-mutagenic in most, weakly mutagenic in some

- Mouse and Rat studies
  - Guideline-compliant protocol, GLP
  - No treatment-related change in neoplasias

Soffritti *et al.*, 2016 –

- Reported increase in hematopoietic neoplasias in male mice, not in females.

Results carefully reviewed by experts: conclude not reliable due to many factors: study conditions, history of chronic infection in animals, questionable pathology diagnoses and statistical analysis, not GLP, and more.

Relevance to Humans?
Human Relevance Framework

- **Is the weight of evidence** sufficient to establish a Mode of Action (MOA) in animals?
  - Consistent with all data available? Dose-response? Biological plausibility?
- **If yes**: Is animal MOA biologically plausible in humans?
  - Anatomical, physiological, biochemical differences?
- **If yes**: Is the MOA in humans, plausible when consider differences in kinetics/dynamic factors,?

WHO IPCS Mode of Action Framework; and Meek et al., 2014 for examples
Summary: Critical Considerations for Determination of Adversity

From *in silico, in vitro* and animal testing:

- Ensure effect due to test compound.
- Understanding of effect and context,
- Historical controls, severity, incidence, and correlations with other factors.
- Statistical versus biological significance?
- Overall weight of evidence, consistency across studies and biological plausibility.

- And – ultimately relevance to humans!
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At this time, please limit questions to those specific to this presentation, and save general questions for the Roundtable Discussion with all the presenters.