

PREDICTIONS ON GENES THAT CONTRIBUTE TO RESISTANCE
OF 2,3,7,8-TETRACHLORODIBENZO-*p*-DIOXIN (TCDD) TOXICITY IN
MICE AND RATS

Harald J. Geyer¹, **Irene Scheunert**², **Klaus Schughart**³, **Wolfgang Wurst**³,
Helmut Greim⁴, **Antonius Kettrup**¹, **Burra Madhukar**⁵, **James R. Olson**⁶,
Michael A. Gallo⁷, and **Karl Rozman**⁴

GSF-Forschungszentrum für Umwelt und Gesundheit, ¹ Institute of Ecological Chemistry;
² Institute of Soil Ecology; ³ Institute of Genetics; ⁴ Institute of Toxicology, Neuherberg, PO
Box 1129, D-85758 Oberschleißheim Germany; ⁵ Michigan State University, Department of
Pediatrics and Human Development, B 240 Life Science Building, East Lansing, Michigan
48824, USA; ⁶ University at Buffalo, State University of New York, Toxicological Research
Center, 102 Farber Hall, Buffalo, New York 14214, USA; ⁷ University of Medicine and
Dentistry of New Jersey, Robert Wood Johnson Medical School, Piscataway, N.J., USA.

1. INTRODUCTION

TCDD is a chemical extremely toxic in some animal species¹⁾. However, there are marked differences in the sensitivity of various mammalian species and strains with respect to toxicity of TCDD. Male **young** guinea pigs with an 30-d LD₅₀ of ca. 1 µg/kg b.wt and **adult** Han Wistar (Kupio) rats with an LD₅₀ of more than 9600 µg/kg represent the two extremes^{2,3)}. The question of species differences is one of the central issues of the controversy that emerged on the validity of risk assessment strategies for TCDD and related compounds.

One of the most challenging issues facing toxicologists today is the identification of genes that contribute or are responsible for increased sensitivity or resistance to TCDD and related environmental chemicals⁴⁾. It is assumed that most, if not all, toxic effects of TCDD are mediated through binding to the Ah receptor^{5,6)}. Recently GONZALEZ and his team produced an Ah receptor-deficient mouse by „knocking out“ the gene that encodes the Ah receptor⁷⁾. This mouse strain is relatively resistant to toxic effects of TCDD, such as enzyme induction and lethality⁷⁾. It was found that the C57BL/6J mice, which possess the Ah^{b-1} receptor⁸⁾, have a high binding affinity (e.g. low K_d value) to TCDD and are very sensitive to toxicity of TCDD. The DBA/2J mice belong to a mouse strain which is relatively resistant to the toxicity of TCDD. They bear the Ah^d receptor⁹⁾ which has a low binding affinity (high K_d value) for TCDD⁹⁾. However, recently DEVITO et al.⁵⁾ came to the conclusion that there is no obvious correlation between the binding affinity of TCDD to the Ah receptor and the species sensitivity to the lethal or other toxic effects of TCDD. Therefore, it was concluded by ROZMAN^{10a)}, SAFE^{10b)}, and DEVITO and BIRNBAUM^{10c)} that other factors may contribute to the resistance or sensitivity of mammals to TCDD toxicity.

One important factor which, beside the Ah receptor and pharmacokinetics^{10c, 17)}, may modulate the TCDD toxicity seems to be total body fat (lipid) content of the animals³⁾, since a correlation has been found between toxicity (LD₅₀) of TCDD in different animals and their total body fat content¹¹⁾. That means that animals with a high fat content (e.g. **adult** hamsters)

TOX (po)

are relatively resistant to the toxicity of TCDD, e.g. they have a high LD₅₀. Therefore, in this respect genes, such as obese (*ob*), diabetes (*db*), yellow (*A^y*), and fatty (*fa*), which are responsible for obesity of mice and/or rats, are of great interest. The objective of this study was to look for genes using congenic mice and rat strains that affect the resistance or sensitivity of these mammals to TCDD toxicity and to make predictions regarding LD₅₀ values.

2. MATERIAL AND METHODS

The total body fat content of congenic strains of mice and rats **with single gene mutations** were taken from the literature. Their acute toxicity (30-d LD₅₀ in µg/kg b.wt.) was calculated from their total body fat content (TBF %) by equation (1)^{3,11)}:

$$\log \text{LD}_{50} = 5.30 * \log (\text{TBF}) - 3.22 \quad (1)$$

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The predicted acute toxicity (30-d LD₅₀) of genetically obese C57BL/6J-*ob/ob* mice, yellow C57BL/6J-*A^{y/a}* mice, and diabetic C57BL/KsJ-*db/db* mice were calculated and compared to lean wild type mice. These data with their body fat content, age, and the resistance factors are compiled in Tables 1-3. In Table 4 the predicted acute toxicity of TCDD

TABLE 1: PREDICTED ACUTE TOXICITY (ORAL 30-DAYS LD ₅₀) OF TCDD IN OBESE C57 BL/6J- <i>ob/ob</i> MICE IN COMPARISON TO LEAN C57 BL/6J-+/+ MICE				
Mouse C 57 BL / 6J (Mutant)	Age (days)	Mean fat content ^{a)} (%)	Predicted 30-d LD ₅₀ ^{b)} (µg/kg body wt.)	Resistance factor ^{c)}
obese (<i>ob/ob</i>)	6-16	15.2	1110	3
lean (+/+)	6-16	12.3	360	
obese (<i>ob/ob</i>)	18-22	16.5	1710	25
lean (+/+)	18-22	9.0	69	
obese (<i>ob/ob</i>)	28-32	18.9	3510	117
lean (+/+)	28-32	7.7	30	
obese (<i>ob/ob</i>)	45-55	29.3	35,840 ^{d)}	1710
lean (+/+)	45-55	7.2	20	
obese (<i>ob/ob</i>)	>1 year	59.1	1,480,000 ^{d)}	3060
lean (+/+)	>1 year	13.0	480	

a) The mean total body fat content data of the obese and lean mice are from HERBERG¹²⁾.

b) Calculated from equation (1).

c) Resistance factor = $\frac{\text{LD}_{50} \text{ of obese C 57 BL/6 J mouse}}{\text{LD}_{50} \text{ of lean C 57 BL/6 J mouse}}$

d) It is unlikely that this 30-day LD₅₀ value of TCDD can be determined.

is presented in obese (*fa/fa*) Zucker rats in comparison to lean (*Fa/Fa*) Zucker rats. It was calculated that the C57BL/6J-*ob/ob* mice are between 3 and 3060 times more resistant (see Table 1), the genetically obese yellow C57BL/6J-*A^y/a* mice are between 5 and 118 times more resistant (see Table 2), and the diabetic C57BL/KsJ-*db/db* mice are between 9 and 7526 times more resistant to acute toxicity of TCDD in comparison to the congenic wild-type mouse strain.

TABLE 2: PREDICTED 30-DAYS LD₅₀ OF TCDD IN MALE AND FEMALE GENETICALLY OBESE YELLOW (*A^y/a*) AND LEAN NON-YELLOW (*a/a*) MICE

Mouse strain	Sex (m/f)	Body weight (g) mean ± SEM	Age (days)	Total body fat ^{a)} (%)	Reference	Predicted 30-days LD ₅₀ ^{b)} (µg/kg b.wt.)	Resistance Factor ^{c)}
C57BL/6J							
<i>A^y/a</i> ^{d)}	m	32.4 ± 0.6	135-140	36.4	PLOCHER & POWLEY (1976)	113,200 ⁰⁾	5
<i>a/a</i> ^{d)}	m	25.1 ± 2.3	135-140	26.7		21,900 ⁰⁾	
<i>A^y/a</i> ^{d)}	f	33.7 ± 0.6	135-140	49.9	PLOCHER & POWLEY (1976)	602,500 ⁰⁾	21
<i>a/a</i> ^{d)}	f	21.3 ± 1.1	135-140	28.2		29,260 ⁰⁾	
<i>A^y/a</i> ^{e)}	m	50.7	180	33.0	FENTON & CHASE (1951)	67,320 ⁰⁾	42
<i>a/a</i> ^{e)}	m	34.0	180	16.3		1,600	
<i>A^y/a</i> ^{e)}	f	49.0	180	35.9	FENTON & CHASE (1951)	105,200 ⁰⁾	118
<i>a/a</i> ^{e)}	f	27.7	180	14.6		890	

a) Fat (%) was calculated from the fat-amount data given by PLOCHER and POWLEY (1976)¹³⁾ or taken from FENTON & CHASE (1951)¹⁴⁾

b) Calculated from equation (1).

c) Resistance Factor = $\frac{\text{LD}_{50} \text{ of obese yellow } (A^y/a) \text{ mice of the same sex and age}}{\text{LD}_{50} \text{ of lean non-yellow } (a/a) \text{ mice of the same sex and age}}$

d) Genetically obese yellow (*A^y/a*) and non-yellow (*a/a*) mice were bred by mating C57 BL/6J-*A^y/a* females with *a/a* males¹³⁾.

e) Mice received diet No. 226 (30% casein, 17.5% sucrose, 5% corn oil, 42.5% hydrogenated cotton seed oil and 5% salt mixture; for more information see¹⁴⁾).

f) It is unlikely that this 30-day LD₅₀ value of TCDD can be determined.

TOX (po)

TABLE 3: PREDICTED ACUTE TOXICITY (ORAL 30-DAY LD₅₀) OF TCDD IN DIABETIC (C57 BL/KsJ-*db/db*) MICE IN COMPARISON TO LEAN (C57 BL/KsJ-*+/+*) MICE

Mouse C57 BL/KsJ (Mutant)	Age (days)	Mean fat content ^{a)} (%)	Predicted 30-d LD ₅₀ ^{b)} (µg/kg b.wt.)	Resistance factor ^{c)}
KsJ- <i>db/db</i>	6-16	16.2	1550	9
KsJ- <i>+/+</i>	6-16	10.8	180	
KsJ- <i>db/db</i>	18-22	17.9	2630	23
KsJ- <i>+/+</i>	18-22	9.9	114	
KsJ- <i>db/db</i>	28-32	16.7	1820	433
KsJ- <i>+/+</i>	28-32	5.3	4.2	
KsJ- <i>db/db</i>	45-55	32.7	64,140 ^{d)}	4823
KsJ- <i>+/+</i>	45-55	6.6	13.3	
KsJ- <i>db/db</i>	>1 year	52.8	812,756 ^{d)}	7526
KsJ- <i>+/+</i>	>1 year	9.8	108	

- a) The mean total body fat content data of diabetic C57 BL/KsJ-*db/db* and lean mice were taken from HERBERG (1991)¹²⁾.
- b) Calculated from equation (1).
- c) Resistance Factor = $\frac{\text{LD}_{50} \text{ of diabetic C57 BL/KsJ-}db/db \text{ mice}}{\text{LD}_{50} \text{ of lean C57 BL/KsJ-}+/+ \text{ mice}}$
- d) It is unlikely that a 30-d LD₅₀ of TCDD can be determined with such a high dose of TCDD.

Tabelle 4: PREDICTED ACUTE TOXICITY (30-DAY LD₅₀) OF TCDD IN FATTY (*fa/fa*) ZUCKER RATS IN COMPARISON TO LEAN (*Fa/Fa*) ZUCKER RATS

Rat strain (mutant)	Age (days)	Body weight (g)	Mean fat content (TBF %)	30-d LD ₅₀ (µg/kg)	Resistance factor
Zucker rat (<i>fa/fa</i>)	31	70	17.5 ^{a)}	2230	56
Zucker rat (<i>Fa/Fa</i>)	31	62	6.1 ^{a)}	40	
Zucker rat (<i>fa/fa</i>)	150	543	39.9 ^{b)}	184,140 ^{c)}	2250
Zucker rat (<i>Fa/Fa</i>)	150	396	9.3 ^{b)}	82	

- a) BELL and STERN (1977)¹⁵⁾.
- b) TRIMBLE et al. (1980)¹⁶⁾.
- c) It is unlikely that a 30-d LD₅₀ value can be determined experimentally.

4. CONCLUSIONS

From the genetic background it is known that the C57BL/6J and the C57BL/KsJ mice carry the Ah^{b1} receptor which binds TCDD with high affinity. In case the *Ahr* gene alone would be responsible for the sensitivity or resistance to toxic effects of TCDD, the congenic mouse strains presented in Table 1, 2, and 3 should have the same sensitivity regarding to the toxicity of TCDD. However, according to our predictions the mouse strains homozygous for *ob* and *db* gene, or heterozygous for the *A^y* gene, respectively, should be more resistant to the toxicity of TCDD in comparison to congenic lean wild-type mouse strain.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors are indebted to Drs. LINDA BIRNBAUM, FRANK J. GONZALEZ, MICHAEL DEVITO, ALLAN B. OKEY, RAIMO POHJANVIRTA, RUDI BALLING, JOUKO TUOMISTO, FRIEDRICH WIEBEL, and ALVARO PUGA for helpful discussions and for literature

5. REFERENCES

- 1) BIRNBAUM, L.S. (1994). The mechanism of dioxin toxicity: Relationship to risk assessment. *Environ. Health Perspect.* 102, Supplement 9, 157-167.
- 2) POHJANVIRTA, R. and TUOMISTO, J. (1994). Short-term toxicity of 2,3,7,8-tetrachlorodibenzo-*p*-dioxin (TCDD) in laboratory animals: effects, mechanisms, and animal models. *Pharmacol. Rev.* 46 (4), 483-549.
- 3) GEYER, H., SCHEUNERT, I., RAPP, K., GEBEFÜGI, I., STEINBERG, C., and KETTRUP, A. (1993). The relevance of fat content in toxicity of lipophilic chemicals to terrestrial animals with special reference to dieldrin and 2,3,7,8-tetrachlorodibenzo-*p*-dioxin (TCDD). *Eco-toxicol. Environ. Saf.* 26, 45-60.
- 4) PUGA, A., MICKA, J., CHANG, C.-Y., LIANG, H.-C., and NEBERT, D.W. (1995). Role of molecular biology in risk assessment. In: "Biological Reactive Intermediates V: Basic Mechanistic Research in Toxicology and Human Risk Assessment." Plenum Publishing Corp., New York, N.Y. (in press).
- 5) DEVITO, M.J., BIRNBAUM, L.S., FARLAND, W.H. and GASIEWICZ, T.A. (1995). Comparisons of estimated human body burdens of dioxinlike chemicals and TCDD body burdens in experimentally exposed animals. *Environ. Health Perspect.* 103, 820-831.
- 6) GALLO, M.J., SCHEUPLEIN, R.J., VAN DER HEIDEN, K.A. (Eds.) (1991). "Biological Basis for Risk Assessment of Dioxins and Related Compounds." Banbury Report No. 35. Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory Press, Cold Spring Harbor, N.Y.
- 7) FERNANDEZ-SALGUERO, P., PINEAU, T., HILBERT, M., MCPHAIL, T., LEE, S.S.T., KIMURA, S., NEBERT, D.W., RUDIFKOFF, S., WARD, M., and GONZALEZ, F.J. (1995). Immune system impairment and hepatic fibrosis in mice lacking the dioxin-binding Ah receptor. *Science* 268, 722-726.

TOX (po)

- 8) POLAND, A., PALEN, D., and GLOVER, E. (1994). Analysis of the four alleles of the murine Ah receptor. *Mol. Pharmacol.* 46, 915-921.
- 9) OKEY, A.B., RIDDICK, D.S., and HARPER, A. (1994). The Ah receptor: Mediator of the toxicity of 2,3,7,8-tetrachlorodibenzo-*p*-dioxin (TCDD) and related compounds. *Toxicol. Lett.* 70, 1-22.
- 10a) ROZMAN, K. (1989). A critical view of the mechanism(s) of toxicity of 2,3,7,8-tetrachlorodibenzo-*p*-dioxin: Implications for human safety assessment. *Dermatosen Beruf Umwelt* 37, 81-92.
- 10b) SAFE, S.H. (1990). Polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs), dibenzo-*p*-dioxins (PCDDs), dibenzofurans (PCDFs), and related compounds: Environmental and mechanistic considerations which support the development of toxic equivalency factors (TEFs). *Crit. Rev. Toxicol.* 21, 51-88.
- 10c) DEVITO, M.J. and BIRNBAUM L.S. (1995). The importance of pharmacokinetics when estimating the relative potency of 2,3,7,8-tetrachlorodibenzo-*p*-dioxin and 2,3,7,8-tetrachlorodibenzoluran. *Fund. Appl. Toxicol.* 24, 145-148.
- 11) GEYER, H.J., SCHEUNERT, I., RAPP, K., KETTRUP, A., KORTE, F., GREIM, H. and ROZMAN, K. (1990). Correlation between acute toxicity of 2,3,7,8-tetrachlorodibenzo-*p*-dioxin (TCDD) and total body fat content in mammals. *Toxicology* 65, 97-107.
- 12) HERBERG, L. (1991). Interrelationships between obesity and diabetes. „*Proceedings of the Nutrition Society*“. *Symposium on 'Dietary Factors and Therapy of Diabetes'*. 19-21 June 1991 at The University of Ulster at Coleraine, Northern Ireland. 50, 605-617.
- 13) PLOCHER, T.A., and POWLEY, T. (1976). Effect of hypophysectomy on weight gain and body composition in the genetically obese yellow (A^y/a) mouse. *Metabolism* 25, 593-602.
- 14) FENTON, R.F., and CHASE, H.B. (1951). Effect of diet on obesity of yellow mice in inbred lines. *Proc. Soc. Exp. Biol. Med.* 77, 420-422.
- 15) BELL, G.E., and STERN, J.S. (1977). Evaluation of body composition of young obese and lean Zucker rats. *Growth* 41, 63-80.
- 16) TRIMBLE, E.R., HERBERG, L., and RENOLD, A.E. (1980). Hypersecretion of pancreatic somatostatin in the obese Zucker rat. Effect of food restriction and age. *Diabetes* 29, 889-894.
- 17) VAN DEN BERG, M., DE JONGH, J. POIGER, H., and OLSON, J. R. (1994). The toxicokinetics and metabolism of polychlorinated dibenzo-*p*-dioxins (PCDDs) and dibenzofurans (PCDFs) and their relevance for toxicity. *Crit. Rev. Toxicol.* 24(1) 1-74.