Contents

List of Contributors *XIX*
Preface *XXV*
A Personal Foreword *XXVII*

Part I

1 **Process Logistics, Testing Strategies and Automation Aspects** *3*
Hansjoerg Haas, Robert S. DeWitte, Robert Dunn-Dufault, and Andreas Stelzer
1.1 Introduction *3*
1.2 The Process from Raw Ingredients to Data *3*
1.2.1 Compound Management *5*
1.2.2 Cell Biology *6*
1.2.3 Lead Profiling *7*
1.2.4 Liquid Chromatography/Mass Spectrometry *7*
1.3 DMPK Testing Strategies: the Process from Data to Decisions *8*
1.4 New Questions, New Assays and New Technologies Challenge the Process *10*
1.5 Organizational Models to Scale Up the Process *11*
1.5.1 Food Court *11*
1.5.1.1 The Fast Food Restaurant *12*
1.5.1.2 The Family Restaurant Chain *12*
1.6 Critical Factors to Improve the Process *13*
1.7 Materials in ADME/Tox Screening *14*
1.8 Machines and Equipment in ADME/Tox Screening *17*
1.8.1 Liquid Handlers *17*
1.8.2 Detection and Analysis *17*
1.9 Software, Data Retrieval, Analysis, Manipulation and Interpretation *18*
1.10 Environment and Management = Organizational Structure in ADME/Tox Screening *19*

Bibliografische Informationen
http://d-nb.info/992627141

digitalisiert durch DEUTSCHE NATIONAL BIBLIOTHEK

1.11 Methods in ADME/Tox Screening *20*
1.11.1 Examples of Whole-Process Approaches *20*
1.11.1.1 Automation Islands with Manual Data Upload to a LIMS System *21*
1.11.1.2 Complete Physical Integration and Automation *21*
1.11.1.3 Federated Physical Automation with Software Integration *22*
1.12 Conclusions *22*
References *23*

2 Prediction of Drug-Likeness and its Integration into the Drug Discovery Process *25*
Ansgar Schuffenhauer and Meir Glick
2.1 Introduction *25*
2.2 Computational Prediction of Drug-Likeness *26*
2.2.1 Machine Learning *26*
2.2.2 Empirical Rules and Their Basis *30*
2.2.3 Drug-Likeness of Natural Products *32*
2.2.4 Do Ligands of Different Target Classes Differ in Their Drug-Like Properties? *34*
2.2.5 Unwanted Structural Elements *34*
2.3 What is the Best Practice in Utilizing Drug-Likeness in Drug Discovery? *35*
2.4 Concluding Discussions *37*
References *38*

3 Integrative Risk Assessment *41*
Bernard Faller and Laszlo Urban
3.1 The Target Compound Profile *41*
3.1.1 Introduction *41*
3.1.2 The Importance of the Projected Clinical Compound Profile in Early Drug Discovery *42*
3.1.3 The Impact of Delivery On the Design of the Drug Discovery Process *43*
3.2 The Concept of Hierarchical Testing in Primary and Follow-Up Assays *45*
3.2.1 Impact of Turn-Around Time *47*
3.2.2 Assay Validation and Reference Compounds *47*
3.2.3 Requirements of Profiling Assay Quality *48*
3.2.4 The Importance of Follow-Up Assays *48*
3.3 Exposure Assays *49*
3.3.1 Basic Absorption Assays *49*
3.3.1.1 Solubility Assays *50*
3.3.1.2 Permeability Assays *50*
3.3.2 Active Transports and Efflux *51*
3.3.3 Metabolism *51*
3.3.4 Distribution and Elimination *51*
3.3.5 Drug–Drug Interactions *53*

3.3.6 iviv Correlations *53*
3.4 Iterative Assays: Link Between Assays *54*
3.5 Specific Safety Profiling Assays *56*
3.5.1 Sensitivity and Specificity of Safety Assays should be Adjusted to the Phase of Drug Discovery *58*
3.5.2 Addressing Species Specificity in Early *In Vitro* Assays *58*
3.6 Data Reporting and Data Mining *59*
3.6.1 Decision Making: Trend Analysis, Go/No Go Decisions *60*
3.7 Integrative Risk Assessment *61*
References *64*

Part II

4 **Solubility and Aggregation** *71*
William H. Streng
4.1 Importance of Solubility *71*
4.2 Factors Influencing Solubility *72*
4.3 Methods Used to Determine Solubility *74*
4.4 Approaches to Solubility *76*
4.5 Solubility in Non-Aqueous Solvents and Co-Solvents *78*
4.6 Solubility as a Function of pH *79*
4.7 Effect of Aggregation Upon Solubility *83*
4.8 Dependence of Dissolution upon Solubility *86*
4.9 Partitioning and the Effect of Aggregation *87*
4.10 Solubility in Simulated Biological Fluids *89*
References *90*

5 ***In Silico* Tools and *In Vitro* HTS Approaches to Determine Lipophilicity During the Drug Discovery Process** *91*
Sophie Martel, Vincent Gasparik, and Pierre-Alain Carrupt
5.1 Introduction *91*
5.2 Virtual Filtering: *In Silico* Prediction of log P and log D *92*
5.2.1 Lipophilicity of Neutral Substances: *In Silico* Methods to Predict log P^{N}_{oct} *92*
5.2.1.1 2D Fragmental Approaches *92*
5.2.1.2 Prediction Methods Based on 3-D Molecular Structure *95*
5.2.1.3 General Comments on the Prediction of log P_{oct} *96*
5.2.2 Prediction Models for log P in Other Solvent/Water Systems of Neutral Compounds *97*
5.2.3 Prediction Models for log P of Ionic Species (log P^{I}) *97*
5.3 Experimental Filtering: the ADMET Characterization of a Hit Collection *98*
5.3.1 HTS log P/log D Determination Based on Microtiterplate Format *98*
5.3.2 Chromatographic Methods *100*

5.3.2.1 Reverse-Phase Liquid Chromatography *100*
5.3.2.2 Immobilized Artificial Membranes *102*
5.3.2.3 Hydrophilic Interaction Chromatography *103*
5.3.2.4 Capillary Electrophoresis *104*
5.3.3 A Global View On *In Vitro* HTS Methods to Measure log P/log D *104*
5.4 Concluding Remarks: Efficacy or Accuracy Dilemma *105*
References *107*

6 Membrane Permeability – Measurement and Prediction in Drug Discovery *117*
Kiyohiko Sugano, Lourdes Cucurull-Sanchez, and Joanne Bennett
6.1 Overview of Membrane Permeation *117*
6.1.1 Structure, Physiology and Chemistry of the Membrane *117*
6.1.2 Passive Transcellular Pathway: pH Partition Theory as the Basis of Understanding Membrane Permeability *118*
6.1.3 Paracellular Pathway *119*
6.1.4 Active Transporters *119*
6.1.5 *In Vitro–In Vivo* Extrapolation *119*
6.2 *In Vitro* Cell Models *121*
6.2.1 Intestinal Cell Culture Models *121*
6.2.2 BBB Cell Culture Models *122*
6.2.3 Cell Models to Study Active Transporters *123*
6.2.4 Correlation of *in Vitro* Models to Human P_{eff} and Fraction Absorbed Data *124*
6.2.5 Correlation of Cell Culture Models with *In Vivo* Brain Penetration *124*
6.3 Artificial Membranes *125*
6.3.1 Partition and Permeation *125*
6.3.2 Parallel Artificial Membrane Permeation Assay: Recent Progress *126*
6.3.2.1 Understanding PAMPA *126*
6.3.2.2 Variation of PAMPA: Recent Progress *127*
6.3.2.3 Phospholipid Vesicle PAMPA *127*
6.3.2.4 Phospholipid–Octanol PAMPA *127*
6.3.2.5 Tri-Layer PAMPA *127*
6.3.2.6 Mucus Layer Adhered PAMPA *127*
6.3.3 Application of PAMPA for Drug Discovery *128*
6.4 Limitation of *In Vitro* Assays *128*
6.4.1 Impact of UWL on Permeability *128*
6.4.2 Membrane Binding *129*
6.4.3 Low Solubility *129*
6.4.4 Difference of the Paracellular Pathway *129*
6.4.5 Interlaboratory Variability *129*
6.5 Computational Approaches/*In Silico* Modeling *130*

6.5.1 *In Vivo* Systems *130*
6.5.2 *In Vitro* Cellular Membrane Systems *132*
6.5.3 Artificial Membranes *134*
6.5.4 Perspectives *135*
6.6 Outlook *135*
References *136*

7 Drug Metabolism and Reactive Metabolites *145*
Alan P. Watt
7.1 Introduction to Drug Metabolism *145*
7.1.1 Historical Perspective *145*
7.1.2 *In Vitro* Metabolism *146*
7.1.3 Cytochrome P450 *148*
7.1.4 Prediction of Drug Metabolism *149*
7.2 Adverse Drug Reactions *149*
7.2.1 ADR Classification *150*
7.2.2 Idiosyncratic Drug Reactions *150*
7.3 Bioactivation *151*
7.3.1 Definition *151*
7.3.2 Reactions of Electrophilic Metabolites *151*
7.3.3 Glutathione *151*
7.3.4 Detection of GSH Conjugates *151*
7.3.5 Acyl Glucuronides *152*
7.3.6 Free Radicals and Oxidative Stress *152*
7.4 Reactive Metabolites and Idiosyncratic Toxicity *153*
7.4.1 The Hapten Hypothesis *153*
7.4.1.1 Immune-Mediated Cutaneous Reactions *153*
7.4.2 The Danger Hypothesis *153*
7.4.3 Alternate Perspectives to Covalent Binding *154*
7.4.3.1 Non-Toxicological Covalent Binding *154*
7.4.3.2 Covalent Binding as Detoxification *154*
7.5 Measurement of Reactive Metabolites *155*
7.5.1 Trapping Assays *155*
7.5.1.1 Soft Nucleophiles *155*
7.5.1.2 Hard Nucleophiles *155*
7.5.2 Mass Spectrometric Detection of GSH Conjugates and Mercapturic Acids *155*
7.5.3 Radiometric Assays *156*
7.5.3.1 Covalent Binding to Liver Microsomes *157*
7.5.3.2 *Ex Vivo* Covalent Binding *157*
7.5.3.3 ^{14}C Cyanide Trapping *157*
7.5.3.4 Radiolabeled Soft Nucleophile Trapping *158*
7.5.4 Alternate Approaches *158*
7.6 Strategies for Minimizing Reactive Metabolite Risk *159*
7.6.1 Dose and Exposure *159*

7.6.2 Structural Alerts *159*
7.6.3 Cascade for Radiolabeled Covalent Binding Experiments *160*
7.6.4 Criteria for Progression *160*
7.7 Conclusions *160*
References *161*

8 Drug–Drug Interactions: Screening for Liability and Assessment of Risk *165*
Ruth Hyland, R. Scott Obach, Chad Stoner, Michael West, Michael R. Wester, Kuresh Youdim, and Michael Zientek
8.1 Introduction *165*
8.2 *In Silico* Approaches *167*
8.3 Perpetrators of Drug–Drug Interactions: Enzyme Inhibition *169*
8.3.1 Competitive Inhibition *169*
8.3.2 Conventional CYP Inhibition Screen *170*
8.3.3 Fluorescent Inhibition Screen *172*
8.3.4 DDI Single Point versus IC_{50} Determinations *172*
8.3.5 DDI Cocktail Assay *173*
8.3.6 Mechanism-Based Inhibition *174*
8.4 Perpetrators of Drug–Drug Interactions: Enzyme Induction *176*
8.4.1 Ligand Binding Assay *177*
8.4.2 Reporter Gene (Transactivation) Assays *178*
8.4.3 Overall Evaluation of High-Throughput Induction Assays *179*
8.5 Drug–Drug Interactions; Victims of Interaction; Reaction Phenotyping *179*
8.5.1 Chemical Inhibition *180*
8.5.2 Recombinant Human CYP Enzymes *181*
8.6 Predictions of Drug–Drug Interactions *182*
8.6.1 New Compounds as Potential DDI Perpetrators *183*
8.6.2 New Compounds as Potential DDI Victims *184*
8.7 Summary *187*
References *188*

9 Plasma Protein Binding and Volume of Distribution: Determination, Prediction and Use in Early Drug Discovery *197*
Franco Lombardo, R. Scott Obach, and Nigel J. Waters
9.1 Introduction: Importance of Plasma Protein Binding *197*
9.2 Impact of Plasma Protein Binding on PK, Exposure, Safety Margins, Potency Screens and Drug–Drug Interaction *197*
9.3 Methodologies for Measuring Plasma Protein Binding *201*
9.4 Physicochemical Determinants and *In Silico* Prediction of Plasma Protein Binding *206*
9.5 Volume of Distribution: General Considerations and Applications to Experimental Pharmacokinetics and Drug Design *208*
9.5.1 Prediction of Human Volume of Distribution *210*

9.5.1.1 Prediction of Human Volume of Distribution from Animal Pharmacokinetic Data *210*
9.5.1.2 Prediction of Human Volume of Distribution from *In Vitro* Data *212*
9.5.1.3 Prediction of Human Volume of Distribution from *In Silico* Methods *213*
9.6 Relationship Between Clearance, VDss and Plasma Protein Binding *213*
9.7 Summary and Conclusions *214*
References *215*

10 Putting It All Together *221*
Pamela Berry, Neil Parrott, Micaela Reddy, Pascale David-Pierson, and Thierry Lavé
10.1 Challenges in Drug Discovery *221*
10.2 Methodological Aspects *222*
10.2.1 PBPK *222*
10.2.2 PK/PD *225*
10.3 Strategic Use of PBPK During Drug Discovery *226*
10.4 Strategic Use of PK/PD During Drug Discovery *227*
10.5 Application During Lead Identification *227*
10.6 Application During Lead Optimization *232*
10.7 Application During Clinical Lead Selection *235*
10.8 Limitations with Current Methodology and Approaches *236*
10.9 Conclusions *238*
References *238*

Part III

11 Genetic Toxicity: *In Vitro* Approaches for Hit and Lead Profiling *243*
Richard M Walmsley and Nicholas Billinton
11.1 Introduction *243*
11.2 Definitions *245*
11.3 Major Challenges for Early, Predictive Genotoxicity Testing *246*
11.4 Practical Issues for Genotoxicity Profiling: Vehicle, Dose, Dilution Range and Impurity *248*
11.4.1 Vehicle and Dose *248*
11.4.2 Dilution Range *249*
11.4.3 Purity *249*
11.5 Computational Approaches to Genotoxicity Assessment: "*In Silico*" Assessment *250*
11.5.1 How Should *In Silico* Methods be Applied in Hit and Lead Profiling? *252*
11.6 Genotoxicity Assays for Screening *253*
11.6.1 Gene Mutation Assays *254*

11.6.2 The Ames Test and Variants *255*
11.6.3 Mammalian Cell Mutation Assays *256*
11.6.4 *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* ("Yeast") Mutation Assays *256*
11.7 Chromosome Damage and Aberration Assays *256*
11.7.1 Aberrations *256*
11.7.2 Micronuclei *257*
11.7.3 "Comet" Assay *258*
11.7.4 DNA Adduct Assessment *258*
11.7.5 Gene Expression Assays *259*
11.7.5.1 Prokaryotic *259*
11.7.5.2 Eukaryotic *259*
11.8 Using Data from *In Vitro* Profiling: Confirmatory Tests, Follow-Up Tests, and the Link to Safety Assessment and *In Vivo* Models *260*
11.8.1 Annotations from Screening Data *261*
11.8.2 Annotations from Positive Screening Data *262*
11.8.2.1 Gene Mutation Assays *262*
11.8.2.2 Chromosome Damage Assays *262*
11.8.2.3 Reporter Assays *263*
11.9 Can a Genetic Toxicity Profile Inform *In Vivo* Testing Strategies? *263*
11.9.1 Prospects for *In Vivo* Profiling of Hits and Leads for Genotoxicity *264*
11.10 What to Test, When and How? *265*
11.10.1 Profiling Entire Libraries: >100 000 Compounds/Year *265*
11.10.2 Profiling Hits: 10 000–100 000 Compounds/Year *265*
11.10.3 Profiling in Lead Optimization: 2000–10 000 Compounds/Year *266*
11.11 Summary *267*
References *267*

12 *In Vitro* Safety Pharmacology Profiling: an Important Tool to Decrease Attrition *273*
Jacques Hamon and Steven Whitebread
12.1 What is "*In Vitro* Safety Pharmacology Profiling?" *273*
12.2 Examples of Drug Failures Due to Secondary Pharmacology *274*
12.2.1 Components *275*
12.2.1.1 Target Selection *275*
12.2.1.2 Target Annotation *276*
12.2.1.3 Examples of *In Vitro* Safety Pharmacology Profiling Panels *277*
12.3 Processes *280*
12.3.1 Assay Requirements and Technologies *280*
12.3.2 Binding and/or Functional Assays *284*
12.3.3 Processes and Logistics *286*
12.4 Application to Drug Discovery *287*
12.4.1 How and When to Use *In Vitro* Safety Pharmacology Profiling *287*
12.4.2 Pharmacological Promiscuity and Its Clinical Interpretation *288*
12.4.3 Relevance of Potency and Therapeutic Index (TI) *290*

12.4.4 Possible Benefits of Off-Target Effects *291*
12.5 Conclusions and Outlook *291*
References *292*

13 Knowledge-Based and Computational Approaches to *In Vitro* Safety Pharmacology *297*
Josef Scheiber, Andreas Bender, Kamal Azzaoui, and Jeremy Jenkins
13.1 Introduction *297*
13.1.1 The Value of Safety Pharmacology Data: the Value and Relevance of Complete, Standardized Data Matrices for *In Silico* Prediction of Adverse Events *298*
13.2 "Meta Analysis" of Safety Pharmacology Data: Predicting Compound Promiscuity *304*
13.2.1 Introduction *304*
13.2.2 Data Analysis *305*
13.2.2.1 Hit Rate Parameter and Chemical Profiling *305*
13.2.2.2 Computational Efforts: Generation of Hypotheses *307*
13.2.2.3 Promiscuity and Attrition Rate *308*
13.2.2.4 Conclusion on Promiscuity Prediction *310*
13.3 Prediction of Off-Target Effects of Molecules Based on Chemical Structure *310*
13.3.1 Introduction *310*
13.3.2 Available Databases and Desired Format *311*
13.3.3 The Best Established Technologies for *In Silico* Target Fishing *313*
13.3.3.1 Similarity Searching in Databases *313*
13.3.3.2 Data Mining in Annotated Chemical Databases *314*
13.3.3.3 Data Mining on Bioactivity Spectra *314*
13.4 Future Directions *316*
References *317*

Part IV

14 Discovery Toxicology Screening: Predictive, *In Vitro* Cytotoxicity *325*
Peter J. O'Brien
14.1 Introduction *325*
14.2 Basis of Need for Discovery Toxicology Screening *326*
14.2.1 High Attrition at High Cost *326*
14.2.2 High Proportion of Attrition Due to Adverse Safety *326*
14.2.3 Discovery Screening Reduces Attrition by An Order of Magnitude *326*
14.3 Obstacles to Discovery Toxicology Screening *327*
14.4 Need to Coordinate Cytotoxicity Screening with Other Discovery Safety Assessments *327*
14.5 Discovery Cytotoxicology *329*
14.5.1 Biomarkers for Safety versus Efficacy for Screening *329*

14.5.2 Past Failure of Cytotoxicity Assessments *329*
14.5.2.1 Insufficient Exposure *329*
14.5.2.2 Measurement of Cell Death *330*
14.5.3 Effective Cell-Based Assays for Marked and Acute Cytotoxicity *331*
14.5.4 Characteristics of an Optimally Effective Cell Model of Toxicity *331*
14.5.4.1 Need for Morphological and Functional Parameters *333*
14.5.4.2 Need for Multiple and Mechanistic Parameters *333*
14.5.4.3 Need for Single-Cell Monitoring *333*
14.5.4.4 Need for Effective Parameters *334*
14.5.4.5 Need for Validation with Human Toxicity Data *336*
14.6 High Effectiveness of an HCA Cell Model in Predictive Toxicology *337*
14.6.1 Background on HCA *337*
14.6.2 Idiosyncratic Hepatotoxicity *337*
14.6.3 Characteristic Pattern and Sequence of Cytotoxic Changes *338*
14.6.4 Safety Margin *338*
14.6.5 Hormesis *338*
14.6.6 Implementation of HCA Cytotoxicity Testing in Drug Discovery *339*
14.6.7 Limitations of HCA Cytotoxicity Testing in Drug Discovery *340*
14.7 Future Impact of Cytotoxicity Testing *340*
References *341*

15 Predicting Drug-Induced Hepatotoxicity: *In Vitro*, *In Silico* and *In Vivo* Approaches *345*
Jinghai J. Xu, Amit S. Kalgutkar, Yvonne Will, James Dykens, Elizabeth Tengstrand, and Frank Hsieh
15.1 Introduction *345*
15.2 Reactive Metabolites *346*
15.2.1 Assays and *In Silico* Knowledge to Assess Bioactivation Potential *347*
15.2.1.1 *In Vitro* Reactive Metabolite Trapping Studies *347*
15.2.1.2 Covalent Binding Determinations *348*
15.2.2 Utility of Reactive Metabolite Trapping and Covalent Binding Studies in Drug Discovery *348*
15.2.3 Are Reactive Metabolite Trapping and Covalent Binding Studies Reliable Predictors of Hepatotoxic Potential of Drug Candidates? *348*
15.2.4 Mitigating Factors Against Hepatotoxicity Risks Due to Bioactivation – a Balanced Approach Towards Candidate Selection in Drug Discovery *351*
15.2.5 Future Directions *355*
15.3 Mitochondrial Toxicity *356*
15.3.1 Uncouplers of Mitochondrial Respiration *358*
15.3.2 Drugs that Inhibit OXPHOS Complexes *358*
15.3.3 Drugs that Induce the Mitochondrial Permeability Transition Pore (MPT) *359*
15.3.4 Drugs Inhibiting mtDNA Synthesis and Mitochondrial Protein Synthesis *359*
15.3.5 Inhibition of Fatty Acid β-Oxidation or Depletion of CoA *360*

15.3.6 *In Vitro* and *In Vivo* Assessment of Drug-Induced Mitochondrial Dysfunction *360*
15.4 Oxidative Stress *363*
15.4.1 Sources of Oxidative Stress *363*
15.4.2 Measurements of Oxidative Stress *363*
15.4.3 Critical Review: Is There Sufficient Clinical, Pre-Clinical and *In Vitro* Data to Substantiate the Link Between Oxidative Stress and Idiosyncratic Liver Injury? *364*
15.5 Inhibition of Bile Salt Efflux Protein and Drug-Induced Cholestasis *365*
15.5.1 *In Vitro* and *In Vivo* Assays to Measure BSEP Inhibition *365*
15.5.2 Critical Review: Is There a Link between BSEP Inhibition, Drug-Induced Cholestasis and Idiosyncratic Liver Injury? *368*
15.6 Biomarkers *369*
15.6.1 Hepatocellular Injury *370*
15.6.2 Cholestatic Injury *370*
15.6.3 Application of Serum Chemistry Markers *370*
15.6.4 Need for New Biomarkers *371*
15.6.5 Biomarker Discovery Efforts *372*
15.6.6 Approaches for Biomarker Discovery *372*
15.6.6.1 Development of *In Vivo* Biomarkers *373*
15.6.6.2 Development of *In Vitro* Biomarkers *373*
15.6.6.3 Biomarker Validation *374*
15.6.7 Future Biomarker Directions *374*
15.7 Conclusions *375*
References *376*

16 Should Cardiosafety be Ruled by hERG Inhibition? Early Testing Scenarios and Integrated Risk Assessment *387*
Dimitri Mikhailov, Martin Traebert, Qiang Lu, Steven Whitebread, and William Egan
16.1 Introduction *387*
16.2 Role of Ion Channels in Heart Electrophysiology *389*
16.3 hERG Profiling Assays *391*
16.3.1 Cell-Free Competition Binding Assays *392*
16.3.1.1 Radioligand Binding *393*
16.3.1.2 Fluorescence Polarization *393*
16.3.2 Non-Electrophysiological Functional Cellular Assays *393*
16.3.2.1 Rubidium Efflux and Thallium Influx *393*
16.3.2.2 Membrane Potential-Sensitive Fluorescent Dyes *394*
16.3.3 Higher-Throughput Planar Patch Technologies *394*
16.3.4 Non-hERG Ion Channel Assays Related to Cardiotoxicity *395*
16.3.5 Nonclinical Cardiosafety Assays in Early Drug Development *396*
16.4 Computational Models for hERG *398*
16.4.1 Pharmacophore Models *398*
16.4.2 Docking to Homology Models *399*

16.4.3 QSAR Models *400*
16.5 Integrated Risk Assessment *401*
16.5.1 Cardiosafety Assessment of Early Discovery Projects *401*
16.5.2 Cardiosafety Assessment of Preclinical Positive Signals *403*
16.6 Summary *405*
References *406*

17 Hematotoxicity: *In Vitro* and *Ex Vivo* Compound Profiling *415*
David Brott and Francois Pognan
17.1 Introduction *415*
17.2 Known Compounds with Hematotoxic Potential *417*
17.3 Tiered Cascade of Testing *419*
17.3.1 Tier 1 Tests *420*
17.3.2 Tier 2 Tests *426*
17.3.3 Tier 3 Tests *428*
17.4 Triggers for Hematotoxicity Testing *430*
17.5 Conclusions *433*
References *433*

18 Profiling Adverse Immune Effects *439*
Wim H. De Jong, Raymond Pieters, Kirsten A Baken, Rob J. Vandebriel, Jan-Willem Van Der Laan, and Henk Van Loveren
18.1 Immunotoxicology *439*
18.1.1 The Immune System and Immunotoxicology *439*
18.1.2 Detection of Immunotoxicity *442*
18.1.3 Evaluation of the Immune System in Toxicity Studies *443*
18.1.4 Testing for Induction of Allergy *445*
18.1.5 Testing for Induction of Autoimmunity *446*
18.1.5.1 Introduction *446*
18.1.5.2 Assays for Testing the Induction of Autoimmunity *446*
18.1.5.3 Alternative Approach for Evaluation of Autoimmunity Potential of Chemicals *447*
18.1.6 Structures Associated with Immunotoxicity *449*
18.1.7 Immunostimulation by Components of the Immune Systems Used as Therapeutics *450*
18.2 Non-Animal Approaches for the Determination of Immunotoxicity *451*
18.2.1 *In Silico* Approaches *451*
18.2.2 *In Vitro* Approaches to Test Various Aspects of Immunotoxicity *451*
18.2.2.1 Introduction *451*
18.2.2.2 Immunosuppression *453*
18.2.2.3 Chemical Sensitization *454*
18.2.2.4 Conclusions *456*
18.2.3 Toxicogenomics *456*
18.2.3.1 Introduction *456*
18.2.3.2 Immunotoxicogenomics *456*

18.2.3.3 Interpretation of Results *457*
18.2.3.4 Toxicogenomics for Prediction of Effects *457*
18.2.3.5 Target Organs and Cells for Immunotoxicity *458*
18.2.3.6 Conclusions *458*
18.3 Summary *459*
References *459*

19 *In Vitro* Phototoxicity Testing: a Procedure Involving Multiple Endpoints *471*
Laurent Marrot and Jean-Roch Meunier
19.1 Introduction *471*
19.2 Optical Considerations: Relevant UV Sources and Sunlight Absorption *472*
19.2.1 Working with the Appropriate Artificial Sunlight Source Determines the Relevance of Phototoxicity Screening *472*
19.2.2 When to Study the Phototoxicity of a Substance? *474*
19.3 *In Silico* Methods for Prediction of Phototoxicity – (Q)SAR Models *474*
19.3.1 Global Models *475*
19.3.2 Local Models *475*
19.4 Photoreactivity *In Tubo*: Prescreening of Compounds Producing ROS Upon Sunlight Exposure *478*
19.4.1. Biochemical Detection of Photoinduced ROS *478*
19.4.2 Photo-Cleavage of Isolated Plasmid DNA *479*
19.4.3 Photo Red Blood Cells Test *479*
19.5 Microbiological Models for Photomutagenesis Assessment *480*
19.5.1 Photo-Ames Test *480*
19.5.2 The Yeast Model *480*
19.6 Photocytotoxicity and Photogenotoxicity in Mammalian Cells: Regulatory Tests and Beyond *482*
19.6.1 The 3T3 NRU Assay: a Validated Test for the Assessment of a Photoirritation Potential *482*
19.6.2 Photogenotoxicity: an Endpoint Without Corresponding *In Vivo* Equivalents *483*
19.7 Reconstructed Skin: a Model for Mimicking Phototoxicity in the Target Organ *486*
19.8 Conclusions *488*
References *489*

Index *495*