



#### Pyrogen detection on medical devices

Anja Fritsch

# Pyrogens and their detection



# Pyrogens – definition and possible origins

- Fever inducing substances
- Product / process contaminants
  - Possible origins: bacteria, yeast, viruses
- Inherent characteristics of the product
  - Vaccines / Adjuvants
  - Synthetic Lipopeptides
  - Surfaces
- Endogenous pyrogens





#### In vivo rabbit test – 1995 - 2010

**PYROGEN TESTING** 



Ex vivo Endotoxin test - since 1999



#### MAT – since 2008





# Detection of pyrogens on medical devices

| Method   | Advantage   | Disadvantage  |
|--|---|---|
| Rabbit pyrogen<br>test after<br>extraction of the<br>device      | All pyrogens detectable<br>Mixtures of pyrogens<br>detectable | Extraction dependent on<br>solvent used (polar / non-polar)<br>Extraction conditions may<br>influence test result |
| Bacterial<br>endotoxin test<br>after extraction of<br>the device | Sensitivity limited to endotoxin                              | Solvents for efficient extraction of endotoxin are well defined   |
| Monocyte<br>activation test<br>after extraction                  | All pyrogens detectable<br>Mixtures of pyrogens<br>detectable | Extraction dependent on<br>solvent used (polar / non-polar)<br>Extraction conditions may<br>influence test result |
| Monocyte<br>activation test<br>in direct contact                 | All pyrogens detectable<br>Mixtures of pyrogens<br>detectable | Test conditions reflect in-use situation  |

#### Monocyte activation test



- Test based on the human reaction to pyrogens
- Pyrogens are recognized by monocytic cells, which produce cytokines
- The resulting reaction is measured in ELISA
- Able to detect all substances pyrogenic to humans



# Our experience with different methods

|                                  | - Platelets + Plasma<br>- PBMCs<br>- Ficoll<br>- RBCs | Joger 6                           |
|----------------------------------|---|-----------------------------------|
| Blood based                      | PBMC based  | Cell line based                   |
| Pooled human blood               | Cellular fraction of human blood                      | Origin of the Cell line:<br>human |
| Range 0.2 to 1.0 EU/mL           | Range 0.05 to 5.0 EU/mL                               | Range 0.05 to 5.0 EU/mL           |
| Reaction not standardized        | Reaction not standardized                             | Reaction standardized             |
| Limited quantity of raw material | Limited quantity of raw material                      | Unlimited quantity of cells       |

confarma

#### Assay layout



Hands on time : ~5 hours Total time to result : 1,5 days



# Reaction of Mono Mac 6 to pyrogens



#### High level of Pyrogen





# Reaction of Mono Mac 6 to pyrogens





### Stable reaction of cells to endotoxin



confarma

## Stable reaction of cells to various pyrogens





# Stable reaction of cells to combinations of pyrogens





# Example 1 – Testing of syringes



## Test item and assay description

- Injection needles for insulin pens
  - Composite devices with metal needle glued into plastic support
  - Contaminant limit concentration at 20 EEU/device
- Test 1:
  - Spiking of the test item with 0.32 EU/mL standard endotoxin directly onto the needle, with 1h at 37°C for drying (simulation of a real contamination, spike level chosen to be in the standard curve range)
  - MAT assay run according to the 12-well protocol with incubation with Mono Mac 6 cells for 22h and IL-6 ELISA
- Test 2:
  - Spiking of the test item with 20 EU/mL standard endotoxin directly onto the needle, with 1h at 37°C for drying
  - Extraction of the complete material in 10 mL of water, followed by dilution 1/20 (dilution chosen to bring spike level into the standard curve range)
  - MAT assay run according to the 96-well protocol with incubation with Mono Mac 6 cells for 22h and IL-6 ELISA
  - Each sample run with contamination after extraction to evaluate interference of the extract with the assay



| Method                        | Test item           | Qualitative<br>Result                                     | Quantitative<br>Result | Recovery of<br>conta-<br>mination |
|-------------------------------|---------------------|---|------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Test 1<br>-<br>direct contact | Injection<br>needle | Contamination<br>detected;<br>positive control<br>at 100% | 0.124<br>EEU/needle    | 39%                               |
| Test 2<br>-<br>extraction     | Injection<br>needle | Contamination<br>detected;<br>positive control<br>at 84%  | 24 EEU/needle          | 120%                              |

- The artificial contamination was dectected on the devices
- Quantitative recovery is better with extraction protocol



# Example 2 – Testing of hyaluronic acid syringes



## Test item and assay description

- Hyaluronic acid preparations of 3 qualities
  - Low viscosity gels
  - High viscosity gels
  - Highly reticulated gels
  - Contaminant limit concentration for all qualities : 0.5 EEU/mL
- Test 1:
  - Spiking of the test item with 1 EU/mL standard endotoxin directly into the syringe (simulation of a real contamination)
  - Distribution of the gels to 24-well plates
  - MAT assay run according to the 24-well protocol with incubation with Mono Mac 6 cells for 22h and IL-6 ELISA
- Test 2:
  - Spiking of the test item with 5 EU/mL standard endotoxin directly into the syringe (simulation of a real contamination)
  - Extraction of the complete material in 10 mL of water at 37°C
  - MAT assay run according to the 96-well protocol with incubation with Mono Mac 6 cells for 22h and IL-6 ELISA
  - Each sample run with contamination after extraction to evaluate interference of the extract with the assay



## Example 2 results of test 1

| Method                        | Test item             | Qualitative<br>Result                                      | Quantitative<br>Result | Recovery of<br>conta-<br>mination |
|-------------------------------|-----------------------|--|------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Test 1<br>-<br>direct contact | Low<br>viscosity gel  | Contamination<br>detected<br>positive control<br>at 71.5%  | 0.75 EEU/syringe       | 75%                               |
|                               | High<br>viscosity gel | Contamination<br>detected;<br>positive control<br>at 103%  | 0.25 EEU/syringe       | 25%                               |
|                               | Reticulated<br>gel    | Contamination<br>detected;<br>positive control<br>at 81.5% | 0.26 EEU/syringe       | 26%                               |

- The artificial contamination was detected in all gels
- Quantitative recovery is better with low viscosity gels



## Example 2 results of test 2

| Method                    | Test item             | Qualitative<br>Result                                       | Quantitative<br>Result | Recovery of<br>conta-<br>mination |
|---------------------------|-----------------------|---|------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Test 2<br>-<br>extraction | Low<br>viscosity gel  | Contamination<br>detected;<br>positive control<br>at 85%    | 2.2 EEU/syringe        | 44%                               |
|                           | High<br>viscosity gel | Contamination<br>detected<br>Positive control<br>at 81%     | 1.3 EEU/syringe        | 26%                               |
|                           | Reticulated<br>gel    | Contamination<br>not detected<br>Positive<br>control at 83% | N/A                    | N/A                               |

• The contamination of the reticulated gel cannot be detected after extraction, altough the extract does not interfere with the assay





Anja FRITSCH, PhD Head of Cell Biology / Chief Scientific Officer

> CONFARMA FRANCE SAS ZI, rue du canal d'Alsace Direct : +33 (0) 3 89 83 37 18 Mobile : +33 (0) 6 35 36 02 73 E-Mail: <u>afritsch@confarma.fr</u>