

# Journal Pre-proof

Aloe-emodin, a hydroxyanthracene derivative, is not genotoxic in an *in vivo* comet test

Corrado L. Galli, Serena Cinelli, Paola Ciliutti, Gloria Melzi, Marina Marinovich



PII: S0273-2300(21)00107-0

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.yrtph.2021.104967>

Reference: YRTPH 104967

To appear in: *Regulatory Toxicology and Pharmacology*

Received Date: 3 February 2021

Revised Date: 28 April 2021

Accepted Date: 26 May 2021

Please cite this article as: Galli, C.L., Cinelli, S., Ciliutti, P., Melzi, G., Marinovich, M., Aloe-emodin, a hydroxyanthracene derivative, is not genotoxic in an *in vivo* comet test, *Regulatory Toxicology and Pharmacology*, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.yrtph.2021.104967>.

This is a PDF file of an article that has undergone enhancements after acceptance, such as the addition of a cover page and metadata, and formatting for readability, but it is not yet the definitive version of record. This version will undergo additional copyediting, typesetting and review before it is published in its final form, but we are providing this version to give early visibility of the article. Please note that, during the production process, errors may be discovered which could affect the content, and all legal disclaimers that apply to the journal pertain.

© 2021 Elsevier Inc. All rights reserved.

## CREDIT AUTHORSHIP CONTRIBUTION STATEMENT

Corrado Galli: study concept, methodology, writing, including preparation of the original draft. Serena Cinelli: resources, data management, investigation. Paola Ciliutti: resources, data management, investigation, formal analysis. Gloria Melzi: project administration. Marina Marinovich: supervision, writing, reviewing and editing,

Journal Pre-proof

1 **TITLE: Aloe-emodin, a hydroxyanthracene derivative, is not genotoxic in an *in vivo* comet**  
2 **test**

3

4 **Corrado L. Galli<sup>a</sup>, Serena Cinelli<sup>b</sup>, Paola Ciliutti<sup>b</sup>, Gloria Melzi<sup>a</sup> and Marina Marinovich<sup>a</sup>**

5

6 <sup>a</sup> Department of Pharmacological and Biomolecular Sciences (DISFeB), Section of Toxicology and  
7 Risk Assessment, University of Milan, Milan, Italy

8 <sup>b</sup> European Research Biology Center ERBC, Pomezia, Rome, Italy

9

10 **Keywords:**

11 Aloe-emodin

12 Hydroxyanthracene

13 In vivo rodent Comet assay

14 Kidney

15 Colon

16

17 **Highlights:**

18 **Aloe-emodin hazard identification**

19 **Aloe-emodin is not genotoxic in vivo Comet rodent assay**

20 **Aloe-emodin is safe in food supplements and herbal medicinal products**

21

22

23 Corresponding author

24 E-mail address: corrado.galli@unimi.it (Corrado L. Galli).

25

26

1

**2 ABSTRACT**

3 Aloe-emodin, one of the molecules belonging to the group of hydroxyanthracene derivatives, was  
4 recently described as genotoxic *in vivo*. Indeed, the EFSA judged that aloe-emodin, together with  
5 other similar molecules (emodin and danthron) and extracts from the leaf of *Aloe* species containing  
6 hydroxyanthracene derivatives, could represent a risk factor for colorectal cancer mediated by a  
7 genotoxic effect.

8 Given the marked uncertainty regarding the conclusions in the opinion of the EFSA ANS Panel and  
9 conflicts in the epidemiological data on which the opinion is based, a new *in vivo* study (*in vivo*  
10 alkaline comet assay in mice - OECD 489) was conducted to test the potential genotoxicity of aloe-  
11 emodin at doses of 250, 500, 1000 and 2000 mg/kg bw/day on preparations of single cells from the  
12 kidney and colon of treated male mice. Following treatment with the test item, no clinical signs  
13 were observed in animals in any treatment group. Slight body-weight loss was randomly observed  
14 in all groups treated with the test item and was more evident in the groups dosed at 1000 and 2000  
15 mg/kg bw/day.

16 Under these experimental conditions, aloe-emodin showed no genotoxic activity. Possible oxidative  
17 damage to colon tissues could not be excluded based on the results obtained after repair enzyme  
18 treatment.

19

**20 INTRODUCTION**

21

22 Plants containing hydroxyanthracene derivatives are extensively used in food supplements and  
23 herbal medicinal products for their laxative effect. Anthracene derivatives are widely distributed in  
24 the plant kingdom, especially in botanicals such as the *Hypericum*, *Rheum*, *Rhamnus* and *Aloe*  
25 genera (Thomson, 1986).

1 Aloe-emodin (1,8-dihydroxy-3-(hydroxymethyl) anthraquinone) is a dihydroxyanthraquinone  
2 belonging to the family of hydroxyanthracene derivatives. It is present in the pericyclic tubules of  
3 *Aloe latex*, an exudate from the *Aloe* plant, and also in *Cassia occidentalis*, *Rheum genus*. and  
4 *Polygonum multiflorum* Thunb.

5 It has been shown in animal experiments that at least 20-25% of an oral dose of aloe-emodin will be  
6 absorbed. However, the bioavailability of aloe-emodin is much lower than the absorption, because  
7 the compound is quickly oxidized to rhein and conjugated. Maximum plasma values of aloe-emodin  
8 were reached 1.5-3 hours after oral administration (Dong et al., 2020; Lang, 1993). Anthranoid  
9 metabolites are eliminated mainly via faeces, but also renally as glucuronides and sulphates  
10 (Teuscher and Lindequist, 2012).

11 The Food Additives and Nutrient Sources added to Food (ANS) Panel of the European  
12 Food Safety Authority (EFSA) recently deliberated that hydroxyanthracene derivatives should be  
13 “*considered as genotoxic and carcinogenic unless there are specific data to the contrary, [.....] and*  
14 *that there is a safety concern for extracts containing hydroxyanthracene derivatives although*  
15 *uncertainty persists*” (EFSA ANS Panel, 2018).

16 The present research aims to characterize the relationship between the development of neoplasms in  
17 rodents and whether the cause of this phenomenon may be due to a genotoxic or possibly epigenetic  
18 mechanism. The genotoxic potential of aloe-emodin was investigated in a number of *in vitro* assays,  
19 including mutation and micronucleus assays in mouse L5178Y cells, by kinetochore analysis, and  
20 through topoisomerase II and comet assays. Aloe-emodin reduced the amount of monomer DNA  
21 generated by topoisomerase II, indicating that it was capable of inhibiting topoisomerase II-  
22 mediated decatenation, and increased the fraction of DNA moving into comet tails at concentrations  
23 of 50  $\mu\text{M}$  in single-cell gel-electrophoresis assays. The results of these assays indicate that aloe-  
24 emodin is genotoxic *in vitro* (Mueller and Stopper, 1999; Müller et al., 1996).

25 Four *in vivo* studies were conducted to investigate the genotoxicity of aloe-emodin and emodin. In  
26 these studies, rats or mice were administered aloe-emodin or emodin orally for periods from 4 hours

1 to 9 days. Analyses were conducted on bone marrow cells by micronucleus testing or in mouse  
2 foetal melanoblasts with the mouse spot test. The results showed no evidence of compound-induced  
3 increases of micronuclei, mutation induction or clastogenicity, although blood concentrations of  
4 aloe-emodin in the animals reached levels in the range of genetically active concentrations *in vitro*  
5 (Brusick and Mengs, 1997). The EFSA ANS Panel, however, considered these studies insufficiently  
6 reliable for methodological reasons (EFSA ANS Panel, 2018).

7 The only study deemed reliable and done with a protocol “*essentially compliant with the current*  
8 *OECD Guideline 489: in vivo mammalian alkaline comet assay*” was performed on both isolated  
9 kidney cells and colon cells from male OF1 mice, in which aloe-emodin induced DNA primary  
10 damage as observed between 3 and 6 h after two oral doses of 500, 1000 or 2000 mg/kg bw  
11 (Nesslany et al., 2009).

12 In relation to the marked uncertainty reported in the conclusions in the opinion of the EFSA ANS  
13 Panel, a new *in vivo* genotoxicity study (*in vivo* alkaline comet assay in male mice - OECD 489)  
14 was conducted to test the potential toxicity of aloe-emodin (purity 97.12%), at dose levels of 250,  
15 500, 1000 and 2000 mg/kg bw/day selecting the two target organs, kidney and colon, of the rodent  
16 neoplastic developments. The choice of doses was based on the possible dose-effect relationship  
17 down to the lowest dose and mice were preferred to rats to avoid creating major discrepancies from  
18 the protocol followed in the paper published by Nesslany (Nesslany et al., 2009).

19

## 20 **MATERIALS AND METHODS**

### 21 ***Source***

22 Aloe-emodin (kindly supplied by Zhengzhou Yuanli Biological Technology Co., Ltd.) suspensions  
23 with a purity 97.12 % (as determined by high performance liquid chromatography).

24

### 25 **Solubility trial**

1 A solubility trial of the test item was performed using 0.5% carboxymethylcellulose. A  
2 homogeneous suspension, feasible for dosing, was obtained at 200 mg/mL after 15 minutes of  
3 magnetic stirring. Based on this result, the maximum dose level of 2000 mg/kg bw/day was selected  
4 for administration of the test item using a dose volume of 10 mL/kg.

5

#### 6 ***Test material preparation***

7 Aloe-emodin suspensions were freshly prepared for each day's work in 0.5%  
8 carboxymethylcellulose (batch SLBT7528, obtained from Sigma) in deionized water (Sigma,  
9 Germany). Ethyl methanesulfonate (EMS; batch BCBV9352, Sigma) was used as a positive control  
10 and prepared in water of injectable grade (batch 20D0703, obtained from Eurospital).

#### 11 ***Animals and treatments***

12 Thirty-three male Hsd:ICR (CD-1) mice were supplied by Envigo RMS srl (San Pietro al Natisone,  
13 Italy) and allowed five days for acclimatisation and quarantine. During this period the health status  
14 of the animals was assessed by daily observations.

15 The animals were housed up to 5 animals/cage, in polysulphone H-temp solid bottomed cages with  
16 nesting material provided in suitable bedding bags. Animal room controls were set to maintain  
17 temperature and relative humidity at  $22^{\circ}\text{C} \pm 2^{\circ}\text{C}$  and  $55\% \pm 15\%$ , respectively. The animals were  
18 kept on a 12 hour light/dark cycle.

19 Food and drinking water were supplied ad libitum. The animals were maintained on a commercially  
20 available laboratory rodent diet (4 RF 21, Mucedola S.r.l., Settimo Milanese, Italy).

21 At 9 to 10 weeks old the animals were treated with the test substance (five animals/group), the  
22 vehicle (0.5% carboxymethylcellulose) or the positive control (EMS).

23

24 Five animals were dosed twice by oral gavage with the vehicle alone or with the extract at the dose  
25 levels of 250, 500, 1000, and 2000 mg/kg/day at 0 hours and 24 hours. Three animals were treated  
26 with EMS, as a positive control, at a dose of 150 mg/kg/day. The amount of aloe-emodin to

1 administer was calculated for each animal according to its body weight. Treatments were  
2 administered by oral gavage. Animals were killed by asphyxiation with carbon dioxide 3 to 6 hours  
3 after the last dose.

4

#### 5 ***Colon preparation***

6 For each animal, a section of colon was removed and washed in ice-cold mincing solution  
7 consisting of phosphate buffered saline (PBS) with 20 mM ethylenediaminetetraacetic acid (EDTA)  
8 and 10% dimethyl sulfoxide (DMSO). The specimens were incubated in mincing solution for about  
9 40 minutes and then washed and minced using scissors to release cells. The cells were poured into a  
10 Falcon tube and filtered through a cell strainer filter. Samples were centrifuged at 4°C, resuspended  
11 in cold PBS without Ca<sup>2+</sup> or Mg<sup>2+</sup> to a final concentration of 1×10<sup>5</sup> cells/mL and kept on ice until  
12 slide preparation.

13

#### 14 ***Kidney preparation***

15 Kidneys were removed from each animal. One of the organs was fixed in 10% neutral buffered  
16 formalin with part of the colon section in order to evaluate histopathological changes related to  
17 cytotoxicity that could induce increases of DNA migration. The other kidney was placed in an ice-  
18 cold Petri dish with mincing solution. The tissue was minced using scissors to release cells. Cells  
19 were poured into a Falcon tube and filtered through a cell strainer filter. After centrifugation at 4°C,  
20 cells were resuspended in cold PBS without Ca<sup>2+</sup> or Mg<sup>2+</sup> to reach a concentration of 1×10<sup>5</sup>  
21 cells/mL. Samples were kept on ice until slide preparation.

22

#### 23 ***Alkaline comet assay and slide analysis***

24 Slides were prepared with the Trevigen<sup>®</sup> Comet Assay Kit (Bio Techne, Italy). A suspension of 50  
25 µL for each sample of cells was added to 500 µL of Low Melting Agarose. An aliquot of 50 µL of  
26 this suspension was placed onto a glass microscope slide. At least three slides were prepared for



1 each sample. Every slide was put in a pre-cooled lysis solution overnight at 4°C in the dark. DNA  
2 unwinding was achieved by incubation for 20 minutes in an alkaline electrophoresis buffer (pH  
3 >13). Electrophoresis was performed for 25 minutes at 30V and 300 mA with a Bio-Rad power  
4 supply, on ice. The slides were immersed in 0.3 M sodium acetate in ethanol for 30 minutes, then  
5 dehydrated in absolute ethanol for 2 hours and immersed in 70% ethanol for 5 minutes.

6 Slides were stained with 12 µg/mL ethidium bromide. A total of 150 cells for each animal were  
7 examined with the Comet Assay IV system (Perceptive Instruments, UK) connected to a  
8 fluorescence microscope (Nikon Eclipse E400). DNA damage was evaluated as the extent of DNA  
9 migration via the parameter of % tail intensity and tail moment (the product of the proportion of tail  
10 intensity and the displacement of tail centre of mass relative to the centre of the head).

11 Tissue damage and cytotoxicity were evaluated on the basis of the number of necrotic and apoptotic  
12 cells (“clouds” and “hedgehogs”) scored out of 150 cells examined for each animal.

13

#### 14 **Modified comet assay**

15 After incubation with lysis solution, additional slides were incubated at 37°C with the enzyme  
16 hOGG1 for 35 minutes in order to evaluate DNA oxidative lesions. Results that provide a measure  
17 of strand breaks and oxidized bases (SB + OX) were compared with those obtained using the  
18 standard procedure which gives an estimate of the background DNA strand breaks (SB) (Smith  
19 C.C. et al., 2006).

20

#### 21 ***Statistical analysis***

22 All analyses were based on the responses of individual animals. The median % tail intensity and the  
23 median tail moment for each slide were determined and the median values were calculated for each  
24 animal. Differences between control and treated groups were assessed using Dunnett’s test for  
25 variance analysis. The homogeneity of the data was verified by Barlett’s test before the Dunnett’s

1 test. If the variance of data was not homogeneous, a modified *t* test (Cochran and Cox) was applied.  
 2 The criteria for statistical significance were  $p < 0.05$ ,  $p < 0.01$  and  $p < 0.001$ .  
 3 The statistical significance of differences among groups in the modified comet assay was assessed  
 4 as for the standard assay, using the absolute values of tail moment and tail intensity. In addition, a  
 5 two-way analysis of variance was performed in which enzymatic treatment (factor 1) and dose  
 6 levels (factor 2) were fitted as categorical variables and the statistical significance of their  
 7 interaction was calculated.

8

## 9 **RESULTS**

### 10 **General observations**

11 Following treatment with the test item, no clinical signs were observed in animals in any treatment  
 12 group. As a result of the excretion of the test item, orange spots were observed in the litter of treated  
 13 animals. Slight body-weight loss was randomly observed in all groups treated with the test item and  
 14 was more evident in individual animals dosed at 1000 and 2000 mg/kg bw/day (Table 1).

15

16 **Table 1:** Body weight of animals after treatment with aloe-emodin.

Treatment/dose mg/kg/day	Body weight (g) – Group mean		
	Allocation	Day 1	Day 2
<b>Vehicle</b>	37	37	37
<b>Aloe-emodin</b>			
250	37	37	37
500	38	38	38
1000	38	39	38
2000	39	40	39
<b>EMS</b>			
150	37	38	37

17

18

### 19 **Tissue damage and cytotoxicity assessment**

20 The percentages of highly damaged cells (% clouds and hedgehogs) in kidney and colon in the  
 21 comet slides are shown in Table 2. There was no tissue damage (i.e., less than 30% clouds or

1 hedgehogs) in the group administered the vehicle, indicating the correct preparation of the cell  
 2 suspensions. Treatment with the test item did not cause DNA damage which could have interfered  
 3 with the comet analysis.

4

5 **Table 2:** Tissue damage and cytotoxicity of aloe-emodin in colon and kidney cells

Treatment/dose mg/kg/day	% highly damaged cells/group Tissue	
	Colon	Kidney
<b>Vehicle</b>	4.53	1.92
<b>Aloe-emodin</b>		
250	3.60	4.39
500	2.24	1.81
1000	2.45	1.30
2000	2.34	0.70
<b>EMS</b>		
150	4.73	4.04

6

7

8 ***In vivo* comet assay in mice**

9 **Table 3:** Evaluation of genotoxic damage by the alkaline comet test (pH >13) in colon cells of mice  
 10 treated orally with different doses of aloe-emodin.

11

Treatment mg/kg	Tail moment (arbitrary units)	Tail intensity (%)
<b>Vehicle</b>	0.0476±0.0509	0.810±0.792
<b>Aloe-emodin</b>		
250	0.0514±0.0422	0.868±0.562
500	0.111±0.1041	1.688±1.339
1000	0.0850±0.0634	1.204±0.838
2000	0.0502±0.0518	0.896±0.826
<b>EMS</b>		
150	0.340±0.203**	4.50±2.43**

12

13 Mean ± standard deviation of median values from three slides for each animal

14 For all groups treated with aloe, not significant for analysis of variance; not significant for

1 Bartlett's test. \*\*  $p < 0.01$  vs vehicle, Student's  $t$ -test

2

3 **Table 4:** Evaluation of genotoxic damage by the alkaline comet test ( $pH > 13$ ) in kidney cells of

4 mice treated orally with different doses of aloe-emodin.

Treatment mg/kg	Tail moment (arbitrary units)	Tail intensity (%)
<b>Vehicle</b>	0.0598±0.0078	0.940±0.148
<b>Aloe-emodin</b>		
250	0.0380±0.0283	0.708±0.402
500	0.0528±0.0388	0.778±0.450
1000	0.0272±0.0205	0.470±0.256
2000	0.0406±0.0298	0.696±0.390
<b>EMS</b>		
150	0.393±0.1850**	5.467±2.175**

5 Mean ± standard deviation of median values from three slides for each animal

6 For all groups treated with aloe, not significant for analysis of variance; not significant for

7 Bartlett's test. \*\*  $p < 0.01$  vs vehicle, Student's  $t$ -test.

8

9 Analysis of variance of both comet parameters, i.e., tail moment and tail intensity, did not show any  
10 statistically significant differences among groups in the preparations of single cells from the colon  
11 and kidneys (Tables 3 and 4, respectively). Variances of data were found to be homogeneous using  
12 Bartlett's test, hence differences between each treated group and the control group were assessed by  
13 Dunnett's  $t$  test, which indicated that there was no statistically significant increase in DNA  
14 migration over that of the negative control in colon and kidneys of any treatment group.

15

16 **Table 5:** Evaluation of genotoxic damage by the alkaline comet test ( $pH > 13$ ) in colon cells of mice  
17 treated orally with aloe-emodin at different doses after enzymatic treatment.

Treatment mg/kg	Tail moment (arbitrary units)	Tail intensity (%)
--------------------	----------------------------------	-----------------------

<b>Vehicle</b>	0.09±0.027	1.53±1.55
<b>Aloe-emodin</b>		
250	0.12±0.067	1.86±0.87
500	0.24±0.068**	3.71±1.15
1000	0.29±0.098***	4.49±1.34
2000	0.24±0.060**	3.54±0.81

1 Mean ± standard deviation of median values from three slides for each animal

2 For all groups treated with aloe, not significant for analysis of variance; not significant for  
3 Bartlett's test. \*\*p < 0.05, \*\*\*p < 0.001 vs vehicle, Dunnett's test

4  
5 For colon tissue after enzyme treatment, no statistically significant dose-related increases in tail  
6 moment were observed starting from 500 mg/kg bw/day (Table 5) that might suggest oxidative  
7 damage. The two-way analysis of variance showed that the enzymatic treatment had a statistically  
8 significant effect and both comet parameters were generally higher following treatment with  
9 hOGG1.

10  
11 **Table 6:** Evaluation of genotoxic damage by the alkaline comet test (pH >13) in kidney cells of  
12 mice treated orally with aloe-emodin at different doses after enzymatic treatment.

<b>Treatment</b> mg/kg	<b>Tail moment</b> (arbitrary units)	<b>Tail intensity</b> (%)
<b>Vehicle</b>	0.18±0.07	2.55±0.93
<b>Aloe-emodin</b>		
250	0.11±0.06	1.83±0.67
500	0.18±0.03	2.73±0.52
1000	0.29±0.12	4.00±1.55
2000	0.16±0.06	2.34±0.82

13 Mean ± standard deviation of median values from three slides for each animal

14 For all groups treated with aloe, not significant for analysis of variance; not significant for  
15 Bartlett's test.

16  
17 For kidney cells, enzymatic treatment was a significant factor (p < 0.001) in explaining the  
18 observed variation in the data (Table 6). Tail intensity and tail moment were generally higher in the

1 presence of hOGG1 and the interaction between enzymatic treatment and dose levels was  
2 significant for both comet parameters. However, when differences between each treated group and  
3 the negative control group were assessed by Dunnett's *t* test, no statistically significant increase in  
4 DNA migration was observed at any dose level.

5 In conclusion, it can be stated that under the experimental conditions reported, aloe-emodin does  
6 not induce DNA strand breakage in single cell preparations of kidney and colon from male mice  
7 following oral gavage when tested up to the highest required concentration of 2000 mg/kg bw/day.  
8 Based on the overall experimental evidence aloe-emodin can be considered as having no genotoxic  
9 potential.

10  
11

## 12 **DISCUSSION**

13 Hydroxyanthracene derivatives are a class of chemical substances naturally present in different  
14 botanical species and used in food to improve bowel function.

15 The EFSA ANS Panel recently deliberated that hydroxyanthracene derivatives should be considered  
16 as genotoxic and carcinogens "unless there are specific data on the contrary" (EFSA ANS Panel,  
17 2018).

18 Since hydroxyanthracene derivatives, such as aloe-emodin, are essential components of many  
19 herbal preparations, based on the possible harmful effect on health identified by the EFSA, the  
20 European Commission decided to place aloe-emodin and all the extracts in which this substance is  
21 present in Part A (ban on the use in food) of Annex III of Regulation (EC) no. 1925/2006 of the  
22 European Parliament and of the Council to ensure a high level of health protection in accordance  
23 with the precautionary principle provided for in Article 7 of Regulation (EC) 178/2002  
24 (Commission Regulation (EU) 2021/468 of 18 March 2021).

25 Most of the experiments conducted with aloe-emodin *in vitro* with bacteria and mammalian cells  
26 have shown a genotoxic effect (Chen et al., 2010; Heidemann et al., 1996; Mueller and Stopper,

1 1999), with a reduction of the amount of monomer DNA generated by topoisomerase II, indicating  
2 that the compound is capable of inhibiting topoisomerase II-mediated decatenation.

3 On the other hand, most of the *in vivo* genotoxicity experiments, in which animals received doses  
4 up to 2000 mg/kg bw, showed negative results, even if the data were considered by the ANS Panel  
5 to be insufficiently reliable since a validated protocol was not strictly followed (Heidemann et al.,  
6 1993, 1996; Mengs et al., 1997).

7 In the *in vivo* micronucleus test in rats given single oral doses of up to 1500 mg/kg bw, aloe-emodin  
8 failed to induce any genotoxic activity at both sampling times of 24 and 48 h after treatment. In the  
9 *in vivo* chromosome aberration assay in rat bone marrow, aloe-emodin demonstrated no clastogenic  
10 potential when tested at doses up to 2000 mg/kg bw by the oral route with two sampling times, 24  
11 and 48 h after treatment. In a mouse spot-test, results showed that aloe-emodin was not mutagenic  
12 when given orally at doses of 20, 200 and 2000 mg/kg bw on Day 9 of pregnancy. Finally, in the *ex*  
13 *vivo* unscheduled DNA synthesis test, no primary DNA damage was observed in hepatocytes from  
14 male Wistar rats, treated orally once with 100 and 1000 mg/kg bw aloe-emodin and sampled either  
15 4 or 16 h after treatment (Heidemann et al., 1996). No emodin genotoxicity was documented in a  
16 mouse bone marrow assay (Menges et al., 1997).

17 The only study judged reliable by the ANS Panel was the one in which aloe-emodin was  
18 administered by the oral route to male (OF1) mice at doses of 500, 1000 and 2000 mg/kg bw in an  
19 *in vivo* rodent comet assay conducted in accordance with unspecified international  
20 recommendations (Nesslany et al., 2009). The authors claimed that there was a linear dose-related  
21 increase in DNA strand breaks in both tissues studied. In the kidney, this increase was statistically  
22 significant, but using a two-sample *t*-test, only at the highest dose tested, with average tail moments  
23 of the individual animals per group of 3.78, 4.77 and 4.92 at 500, 1000 and 2000 mg/kg/day,  
24 respectively vs. a value of 3.01 in the respective control group. The authors noted a dose-response  
25 relationship in colon cells, since the average tail moments for the three or four animals per group

1 were 9.36, 8.85 and 10.06 at doses of 500, 1000 and 2000 mg/kg/day aloe-emodin, respectively vs.  
2 a value of 4.28 in the control group.

3 For these reasons, the EFSA ANS Panel issued its opinion that there is a safety concern for extracts  
4 containing hydroxyanthracene derivatives “although uncertainty persists” (EFSA ANS Panel,  
5 2018).

6 In order to address the uncertainties identified by the EFSA ANS Panel, we conducted an *in vivo*  
7 alkaline comet assay of aloe-emodin in mice, with the same experimental design as that used by  
8 Nessler *et al.* (2009), but following standard guidelines i.e., the OECD Guideline for the Testing  
9 of Chemicals No. 489, utilizing Hsd: ICR (CD -1) male mice and adding a further dose of 250  
10 mg/kg bw.

11 Samples were added to the standard OECD protocol in order to measure DNA strand breaks and  
12 oxidative DNA damage by enzymatic treatment. The enzyme-treated slides provide a measure of  
13 strand breaks and oxidized bases (SB + OX), while the reference slides, treated with enzyme buffer  
14 alone, provide an estimate of the background DNA strand breaks (SB). Assuming a linear dose  
15 response for tail % intensity as a function of DNA damage, subtraction of SB from (SB + OX)  
16 gives an estimate of DNA strand breaks from oxidized pyrimidines/altered purines (Ding *et al.*,  
17 2016).

18 As can be seen from Tables 2 and 3, aloe-emodin did not induce DNA damage in preparation of  
19 single cells from colon and kidneys following oral gavage at doses of 250, 500, 1000, and 2000  
20 mg/kg/day under the standard reported experimental conditions. Furthermore, no statistically  
21 significant increases in tail moment and tail intensity were observed over those in the vehicle-  
22 treated control group at any dose level.

23 As expected (Smith *et al.*, 2006), tail intensity and tail moment were generally higher in the  
24 presence of hOGG1 in both tissues in the vehicle and aloe-emodin-treated groups.

25 When differences between each treated group and the negative control group were assessed by  
26 Dunnett’s *t* test, no statistically significant increase in DNA migration was observed at any dose



1 level in kidney cells, indicating that there was no induction of DNA strand breaks or oxidative DNA  
2 damage, invalidating even more strongly the hypothesis that the alleged genotoxicity of aloe-  
3 emodin is due to the formation of reactive oxygen species which in turn have a genotoxic effect.  
4 For colon tissue, following the enzymatic treatment, statistically significant increases in break sites  
5 were observed above 500 mg/kg bw/day, although no dose-response relationship was identified,  
6 suggesting possible oxidative damage for colon tissue based on results obtained after repair enzyme  
7 treatment. This outcome is unlikely to be associated with the treatment as it is not dependent on the  
8 dose of aloe-emodin administered, hence its interpretation requires further study. It is concluded  
9 that high-titre aloe-emodin does not induce DNA strand breakage in single cell preparations of  
10 colon and kidney from male mice following oral gavage at doses of 250, 500, 1000 and 2000 mg/kg  
11 bw/day although possible oxidative damage can be hypothesised for colon tissue based on results  
12 obtained after repair enzyme treatment.

13

#### 14 CONCLUSION

15 Repeated orally administration of some, but not all, hydroxyanthracene derivatives shows that the  
16 toxic effects are clearly linked to the initially damaged intestinal mucosa caused by lasting  
17 diarrhoea that occurs during the early phase of treatment. The continuous phenomenon is followed  
18 by lymphoid and Goblet cell hyperplasia of the mesenteric lymph nodes associated in rodents with  
19 inflammation, necrosis, renal toxicity, hyperplastic changes in the intestine, colon and caecum  
20 (Matsuda et al., 2008). At high doses (1.5% aloe vera non-decolourised whole leaf extract), long  
21 term treatments in rats may result in adenomas and carcinomas confined within the mucosa wall but  
22 not metastasizing (NTP, 2013; Boudreau et al., 2013). The Mechanism of Action (MoA) is likely  
23 due to a tumour promoting effect at a diarrheagenic doses (Yokohira et al., 2009), rather than a  
24 mechanism mediated by a genotoxic effect (Nesslany et al. 2007).

25 The potential genotoxic-event-mediated carcinogenic risk of long-term use of hydroxyanthracene  
26 derivatives with laxative effect is still very weak and more experimental data on characterized

1 materials are needed together with more reliable, relevant and consistent epidemiological studies  
2 (Nusko et al. 2000; Dukas et al. 2000; Watanabe et al. 2004; Kojima et al. 2004; Park et al. 2009;  
3 Zhang et al. 2013; Citronberg et al. 2014).

4

#### 5 FUNDING BODY INFORMATION

6 This work was supported by the Italian Society of Toxicology (SITOX).

7

#### 8 ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

9 We thank Rachel Stenner and Robert Burns of Language Consulting Congressi, Milan, for English  
10 proofreading

11

#### 12 CREDIT AUTHORSHIP CONTRIBUTION STATEMENT

13 Corrado Galli: study concept, methodology, writing, including preparation of the original draft.  
14 Serena Cinelli: resources, data management, investigation. Paola Ciliutti: resources, data  
15 management, investigation, formal analysis. Gloria Melzi: project administration. Marina  
16 Marinovich: supervision, writing, reviewing and editing,

17

#### 18 DECLARATION OF COMPETING INTERESTS

19 The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal relationships  
20 that could appear to influence the work reported in this paper.

21

22

#### 23 REFERENCES

24

25 Ahlawat, K.S., Khatkar, B.S., 2011. Processing, food applications and safety of aloe vera products:  
26 a review. *J. Food Sci. Technol.* 48, 525–533. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13197-011-0229-z>

- 1 Brusick, D., Mengs, U., 1997. Assessment of the genotoxic risk from laxative senna products.  
2 Environ. Mol. Mutagen. 29, 1–9. [https://doi.org/10.1002/\(sici\)1098-2280\(1997\)29:1<1::aid-  
4 em1>3.0.co;2-j](https://doi.org/10.1002/(sici)1098-2280(1997)29:1<1::aid-<br/>3 em1>3.0.co;2-j)
- 5 Boudreau M.D., Mellick P.W., Olson G.R., Felton R.P., Thorn B.T. Beland F.A, 2013. Clear  
6 evidence of carcinogenic activity by a whole-leaf extract of *Aloe barbadensis miller* (aloe vera)  
7 in F344/N rats. *Tox. Sci.*, 131, 26–39.
- 8 Chen, Y.-Y., Chiang, S.-Y., Lin, J.-G., Yang, J.-S., Ma, Y.-S., Liao, C.-L., Lai, T.-Y., Tang, N.-Y.,  
9 Chung, J.-G., 2010. Emodin, aloe-emodin and rhein induced DNA damage and inhibited DNA  
10 repair gene expression in SCC-4 human tongue cancer cells. *Anticancer Res.* 30, 945–951.
- 11 Ciliutti, P., Cinelli, S., Ricci, R., Marzoli, G.A., Cinti, R., Duca, S., 2021. Aloe-Emodin enzyme-  
12 modified in vivo alkaline Comet assay in mice. ERBC Study no. E0518.
- 13 Citronberg J., Kantor E.D., Potter J.D. White E., 2014. A prospective study of the effect of bowel  
14 movement frequency, constipation, and laxative use on colorectal cancer risk. *Am. J.*  
15 *Gastroent.*, 109, 1640–1649.
- 16 COMMISSION REGULATION (EU) 2021/468 of 18 March 2021 amending Annex III to  
17 Regulation (EC) No 1925/2006 of the European Parliament and of the Council as regards  
18 botanical species containing hydroxyanthracene derivatives.
- 19 Ding, W., Bishop, M.E., Lyn-Cook, L.E., Davis, K.J., Manjanatha, M.G., 2016. In Vivo Alkaline  
20 Comet Assay and Enzyme-modified Alkaline Comet Assay for Measuring DNA Strand  
21 Breaks and Oxidative DNA Damage in Rat Liver. *J. Vis. Exp.* <https://doi.org/10.3791/53833>
- 22 Dong, X., Zeng, Y., Liu, Y., You, L., Yin, X., Fu, J., Ni, J., 2020. Aloe-emodin: A review of its  
23 pharmacology, toxicity, and pharmacokinetics. *Phytother. Res.* 34, 270–281.  
24 <https://doi.org/10.1002/ptr.6532>
- 25 Dukas L., Willett W.C., Colditz G.A., Fuchs C.S., Rosner B. Giovannucci E.L., 2000. Prospective  
26 study of bowel movement, laxative use, and risk of colorectal cancer among women. *Am. J.*  
*Epidemiol.*, 151, 958–964.

- 1 EFSA ANS Panel, Younes, M., Aggett, P., Aguilar, F., Crebelli, R., Filipi, M., Frutos, M.J., Galtier,  
2 P., Gott, D., Gundert-Remy, U., Kuhnle, G.G., Lambré, C., Leblanc, J., Lillegaard, I.T.,  
3 Moldeus, P., Mortensen, A., Oskarsson, A., Stankovic, I., Waalkens-Berendsen, I., Woutersen,  
4 R.A., Andrade, R.J., Fortes, C., Mosesso, P., Restani, P., Pizzo, F., Smeraldi, C., Papaioannou,  
5 A., Wright, M., 2018. Safety of hydroxyanthracene derivatives for use in food. *Sci. Opin. Saf.*  
6 *hydroxyanthracene Deriv. use food. EFSA Journal.* 16, 1–97.  
7 <https://doi.org/10.2903/j.efsa.2018.5090>
- 8 Hattori, M., Kanda, T., Shu, Y.Z., Akao, T., Kobashi, K., Namba, T., 1988. Metabolism of  
9 barbaloin by intestinal bacteria. *Chem. Pharm. Bull. (Tokyo).* 36, 4462–4466.  
10 <https://doi.org/10.1248/cpb.36.4462>
- 11 Heidemann, A., Miltenburger, H.G., Mengs, U., 1993. The genotoxicity status of senna.  
12 *Pharmacology* 47 Suppl 1, 178–186. <https://doi.org/10.1159/000139857>
- 13 Heidemann, A., Völkner, W., Mengs, U., 1996. Genotoxicity of aloe emodin in vitro and in vivo.  
14 *Mutat. Res.* 367, 123–133. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0165-1218\(95\)00084-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/0165-1218(95)00084-4)
- 15 Kojima M., Wakai K., Tokudome S., Tamakoshi K., Toyoshima H., Watanabe Y., Hayakawa N.,  
16 Suzuki K., Hashimoto S., Ito Y. Tamakoshi A. JACC Study Group, 2004. Bowel movement  
17 frequency and risk of colorectal cancer in a large cohort study of Japanese men and women.  
18 *Br. J. Cancer*, 90, 1397–13401.
- 19 Lang, W., 1993. Pharmacokinetic-metabolic studies with <sup>14</sup>C-aloe emodin after oral administration  
20 to male and female rats. *Pharmacology* 47 Suppl 1, 110–119.  
21 <https://doi.org/10.1159/000139849>
- 22 Matsuda Y., Yokohira M., Suzuki S., Hosokawa K., Yamakawa K., Zeng Y., Ninomiya F., Saoo  
23 K., Kuno T., I Maida K. 2008. One-year chronic toxicity study of *Aloe arborescens* Miller var.  
24 *natalensis* Berger in Wistar Hannover rats. A pilot study. *Food Chem. Toxicol.* 46, 733–739.
- 25 Mengs, U., Krumbiegel, G., Völkner, W., 1997. Lack of emodin genotoxicity in the mouse  
26 micronucleus assay. *Mutat. Res.* 393, 289–293. [https://doi.org/10.1016/s1383-5718\(97\)00113-](https://doi.org/10.1016/s1383-5718(97)00113-)

- 1           7
- 2 Mueller, S.O., Stopper, H., 1999. Characterization of the genotoxicity of anthraquinones in  
3 mammalian cells. *Biochim. Biophys. Acta* 1428, 406–414. <https://doi.org/10.1016/s0304->  
4 4165(99)00064-1
- 5 Müller, S.O., Eckert, I., Lutz, W.K., Stopper, H., 1996. Genotoxicity of the laxative drug  
6 components emodin, aloe-emodin and danthron in mammalian cells: topoisomerase II  
7 mediated? *Mutat. Res.* 371, 165–173. [https://doi.org/10.1016/s0165-1218\(96\)90105-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0165-1218(96)90105-6)
- 8 Nessler, F., Zennouche, N., Simar-Meintières, S., Talahari, I., NKili-Mboui, E-N., Marzin, D.  
9 2007. In vivo Comet assay on isolated kidney cells to distinguish genotoxic carcinogens from  
10 epigenetic carcinogens or cytotoxic compounds. *Mutat. Res.* 630, 28–41.
- 11 Nessler, F., Simar-Meintières, S., Ficheux, H., Marzin, D., 2009. Aloe-emodin-induced DNA  
12 fragmentation in the mouse in vivo Comet assay. *Mutat. Res. Toxicol. Environ. Mutagen.* 678,  
13 13–19. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.mrgentox.2009.06.004>
- 14 Nusko, G., Schneider, B., Schneider, I., Wittekind, Ch., Hahn E.G., 2000. Anthranoid laxative use  
15 is not a risk factor for colorectal neoplasia: results of a prospective case control study. *Gut*,  
16 46:651–655
- 17 NTP, 2013. NTP technical report on the toxicology and carcinogenesis studies of a  
18 nondecolorized whole leaf extract of aloe barbadensis miller (aloe vera) in F344/N rats and  
19 B6C3F1 mice (drinking water studies).
- 20 Park J.Y., Mitrou P.N., Luben R., Khaw K.T., Bingham S.A., 2009. Is bowel habit linked to  
21 colorectal cancer? - Results from the EPIC-Norfolk study. *Eur. J. Canc.*, 45, 139–145.
- 22 Smith C.C. et al. (2006) hOGG1 recognizes oxidative damage using the comet assay with greater  
23 specificity than FPG or ENDOIII. *Mutagenesis*, 21: 185-190
- 24 Teuscher, E., Lindequist, U., 2012. Biogene Gifte - Biologie-Chemie- Pharmakologie-Toxikologie,  
25 3rd ed. St. ed.
- 26 Thomson, R.H., 1986. Naturally Occurring Anthraquinones. III: Recent Advances. London.

- 1 Watanabe T., Nakaya N., Kurashima K., Kuriyama S., Tsubono Y., Tsuji I. 2004. Constipation,  
2 laxative use and risk of colorectal cancer: the Miyagi Cohort Study. *Eur. J. Canc.*, 40, 2109–  
3 2115.
- 4 Yokohira M., Matsuda Y., Suzuki S., Hosokawa K., Yamakawa K., Hashimoto N., Saoo K., Nabae  
5 K., Kuno T., Imaida K., 2009. Equivocal colonic carcinogenicity of *aloe arborescens miller*  
6 *var. natalensis berger* at high-dose level in a wistar Hannover rat 2-y study. *J. food sci.*, 74, 24–  
7 30.
- 8 Zhang X., Wu K., Cho E., Ma J., Chan A.T., Gao X., Willett W.C., Fuchs C.S., Giovannucci E.L,  
9 2013. Prospective cohort studies of bowel movement frequency and laxative use and colorectal  
10 cancer incidence in US women and men. *Cancer Causes & Control*, 24, 1015–1024.  
11

**Highlights:**

Hazard assessment of hydroxyanthracene derivatives

In vivo negative genotoxicity of Aloe-emodin

Critical aspects of botanical hazard assessment

Journal Pre-proof

## FUNDING BODY INFORMATION

This work was supported by the Italian Society of Toxicology (SITOX).

Journal Pre-proof



**Declaration of interests**

The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper.

The authors declare the following financial interests/personal relationships which may be considered as potential competing interests:

Journal Pre-proof