IJCRT.ORG ISSN : 2320-2882

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF CREATIVE RESEARCH THOUGHTS (IJCRT)

An International Open Access, Peer-reviewed, Refereed Journal

Identification And Quantification Of Genotoxic And Mutagenic Impurities In Drugs

[1]Mr. Nachiket Londhe, [2]Ms. Prajakta Mhaske, [3]Dr. Vijaykumar Kale, [4]Dr. Mahesh Thakare, [5]Mr. Vaibhav Narwade

[1]Student, [2]Assistant Professor, [3]Principal, [4]Associate Professor, [5]Assistant Professor

[1]Department of B. Pharmacy,

[1]Kasturi Shikshan Sanstha College of Pharmacy, Shikrapur, India.

Abstract: Genotoxic and mutagenic impurities in pharmaceutical products pose significant safety risks due to their ability to induce DNA damage and carcinogenic effects at extremely low exposure levels. These impurities may arise from starting materials, reactive reagents, intermediates, catalysts, or degradation products formed during synthesis, formulation, or storage. The International Council for Harmonisation (ICH) M7(R2) guideline provides a comprehensive framework for the identification, assessment, qualification, and control of mutagenic impurities across all stages of drug development, integrating risk-based and regulatory principles. The Threshold of Toxicological Concern (TTC) concept establishes a lifetime exposure limit of 1.5 µg/day for most genotoxic impurities, enabling science-based control in the absence of compound-specific toxicological data. ICH M7 further classifies impurities into five classes according to mutagenic potential and available evidence, supporting proportionate risk management strategies. Sensitive analytical techniques such as LC–MS, GC–MS, and advanced spectroscopic methods enable trace-level detection, while the Ames bacterial reverse mutation assay remains the gold standard for mutagenicity assessment. Computational QSAR models now support early prediction of genotoxic risk during drug discovery. Recent nitrosamine contamination events in widely used drugs have highlighted the importance of robust process controls and risk assessment, particularly for high-risk nitrosamines such as NDMA, NDEA, and drug substance–related nitrosamines. Integration of Quality-by-Design principles, green chemistry, real-time Process Analytical Technology, and artificial intelligence-based impurity prediction is expected to further strengthen control strategies. Regulatory compliance with ICH, FDA, and EMA guidelines remains essential to ensure patient safety and minimize genotoxic risk in pharmaceutical products..

Keywords – Genotoxic Impurities, Mutagenic Impurities, ICH M7 Guideline, Threshold of Toxicological Concern, LC-MS, GC-MS, Ames Test, QSAR, Nitrosamines, Pharmaceutical Safety

I. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Overview and Significance of Pharmaceutical Impurities

Synthesis of active pharmaceutical ingredients (APIs) involves complex multi-step chemical reactions utilizing diverse reactive chemicals, reagents, solvents, catalysts, and salts[1]. During these manufacturing processes, unintended chemical compounds known as impurities are generated and may persist in final drug *product*s. Impurities provide no therapeutic benefit to patients; rather, they pose significant potential risks to human health. The *quality*, safety, and efficacy of drug substances and *product*s depend critically on identification, characterization, and control of these impurities at acceptable levels according to international pharmacopeial standards. Pharmaceutical manufacturers must implement rigorous analytical strategies ensuring impurity levels remain within specification limits established through regulatory guidelines and scientific evidence[2].

1.2 Definition and Clinical Significance of Genotoxic Impurities

Genotoxicity encompasses any deleterious change in genetic material, regardless of induction mechanism. Mutagenicity, a subset of genotoxicity, specifically refers to substance ability to induce genetic mutations through direct DNA interaction or through indirect mechanisms affecting DNA replication and repair processes[3]. Genotoxic and mutagenic impurities are DNA-reactive substances possessing potential to directly cause DNA damage at extremely low concentrations, potentially leading to mutations, chromosomal aberrations, and cancer development. The dose-response relationship for carcinogenic substances assumes no safe threshold exists below which genotoxic compounds pose zero risk—this principle underpins development of regulatory limits based on acceptable lifetime risk levels[4].

1.3 Scope and Objectives

This comprehensive review aims to synthesize current knowledge regarding identification and quantification of genotoxic and mutagenic impurities in pharmaceutical drugs, examining regulatory frameworks, analytical methodologies, and *quality* assurance strategies. The review emphasizes critical role of rigorous analytical approaches and risk management in ensuring pharmaceutical safety and protecting patient health from potential genotoxic risks.

II. DEFINITION AND CLASSIFICATION OF GENOTOXIC IMPURITIES

2.1 Mechanistic Classification

Genotoxic impurities may function through multiple mechanisms: direct-acting genotoxins interact immediately with DNA causing damage, while indirect-acting genotoxins undergo metabolic conversion to reactive intermediates subsequently damaging DNA[5]. Some genotoxic substances bind covalently to DNA bases, forming stable or unstable adducts leading to mutations during DNA replication. Others induce strand breaks, chromosomal rearrangements, or interfere with mitotic processes, resulting in aneuploidy or polyploidy. The complexity of genotoxic mechanisms necessitates comprehensive testing batteries evaluating multiple DNA damage endpoints.

2.2 ICH M7(R2) Classification System

The International Conference on Harmonization M7(R2) guideline establishes comprehensive classification framework for mutagenic impurities based on available toxicological data and structural features[6]. Class 1 encompasses known mutagenic carcinogens (N-nitroso compounds, aflatoxin-like structures, alkyl-azoxy compounds) demonstrating mutagenic and carcinogenic activity in multiple experimental systems with epidemiological human carcinogenicity evidence, requiring stringent control often at compound-specific limits. Class 2 comprises known mutagens with unknown carcinogenic potential, controlled typically at 1.5 µg/day threshold of toxicological concern (TTC). Class 3 includes impurities with structural alerts for

mutagenicity but lacking experimental evidence, requiring in vitro assessment through Ames testing or QSAR modeling. Class 4 comprises impurities with structural alerts but negative in vitro genotoxicity results. Class 5 encompasses impurities with no structural alerts, controlled as ordinary pharmaceutical impurities[7].

III. SOURCES AND ORIGINS OF GENOTOXIC IMPURITIES

3.1 Starting Materials and Process Sources

Genotoxic impurities enter pharmaceutical substances through multiple pathways during manufacturing[8]. Starting materials and raw materials may contain genotoxic residues carrying forward into intermediates and final API if not adequately purified. Reactive intermediates and by*product*s formed during multi-step synthesis can possess genotoxic potential, particularly when utilizing electrophilic agents for bond formation such as alkylating agents, benzyl halides, epoxides, and Michael acceptors. Reagents and catalysts employed in organic synthesis, including alkylating agents (methyl iodide, ethyl bromide), electrophilic species, oxidizing agents, and reactive solvents, may contribute genotoxic impurities if not completely removed during purification steps.

3.2 Degradation and Storage-Related Sources

Degradation *product*s develop during storage due to exposure to light, heat, moisture, oxygen, or hydrolysis, particularly under stressed conditions employed in stability testing[9]. Some APIs inherently generate genotoxic degradation *product*s over time, requiring rigorous investigation of degradation pathways and assessment of genotoxic potential through nonclinical safety studies. Excipients and their impurities in drug *product*s may contain or generate genotoxic substances, particularly for excipients synthesized through chemical processes similar to APIs. Extractables and leachables from packaging materials (glass, rubber, plastics, elastomers) contribute to genotoxic impurity profiles, particularly for long-term stability conditions where packaging component migration increases substantially.

IV. REGULATORY FRAMEWORK AND INTERNATIONAL GUIDELINES

4.1 ICH M7(R2) Guideline and Compliance Requirements

The cornerstone of regulatory environment is ICH M7(R2) guideline, providing practical recommendations for assessment and control of mutagenic impurities across pharmaceutical development lifecycle[10]. The guideline emphasizes tiered, risk-based approach where control strategies are proportionate to concern level, resources allocated efficiently, and comprehensive safety documentation supports regulatory submissions. Complementary guidelines including ICH Q3A (impurities in new drug substances) and ICH Q3B (impurities in new drug *product*s) address broader pharmaceutical impurity context, establishing reporting thresholds and qualification requirements.

4.2 FDA and EMA Regulatory Approaches

FDA has established adaptive regulatory frameworks for genotoxic impurity control, requiring demonstration of manufacturing consistency, purity, potency, and safety across multiple *product* lots[11]. FDA guidance on control of nitrosamine impurities reflects concerns about this specific highly potent genotoxic carcinogen class discovered in marketed pharmaceutical *product*s. The EMA emphasizes "as low as reasonably practicable" (ALARP) principle, prioritizing risk minimization through process optimization and purification technologies, recognizing that practical elimination of genotoxic impurities is preferable to mere compliance with numerical limits. Recent FDA guidance updates in 2024-2025 provide enhanced acceptable daily intake limits for specific nitrosamines and implementation timelines for risk assessment and confirmatory testing.

V. ANALYTICAL METHODOLOGIES FOR DETECTION AND QUANTIFICATION

5.1 Liquid Chromatography-Mass Spectrometry Approaches

Liquid chromatography-mass spectrometry (LC-MS) represents technique of choice for non-volatile and thermally labile compounds, offering advantages over gas chromatography for compounds with limited volatility or thermal stability[12]. LC-MS, particularly tandem mass spectrometry (LC-MS/MS), provides powerful separation and detection capabilities with excellent specificity through structural information from characteristic fragmentation patterns. Multiple reaction monitoring (MRM) transitions in tandem MS enable highly selective monitoring, reducing background noise and improving specificity for analysis of complex pharmaceutical samples containing numerous co-eluting substances. High-resolution mass spectrometry (HRMS) provides additional specificity through accurate mass determination, enabling identification of unexpected impurities and confirmation of impurity identity during method development and validation.

5.2 Gas Chromatography-Mass Spectrometry Methods

Gas chromatography-mass spectrometry (GC-MS) remains primary technique for volatile and semi-volatile genotoxic impurities, offering exceptional specificity and sensitivity for this impurity class[13]. Headspace GC-MS offers automated sample preparation by vaporizing volatile compounds into gas phase above sample matrix, minimizing matrix interference and facilitating analysis of volatile genotoxic impurities while maintaining quantitative reliability. Solid-phase microextraction (SPME) provides sensitive extraction of volatile and semi-volatile compounds and direct injection capabilities without solvent introduction, reducing background noise and improving detection limits. Gas chromatography with electron capture detection (GC-ECD) demonstrates enhanced sensitivity and selectivity for halogenated compounds, historically serving as primary detection technique for alkyl and benzyl halides prior to widespread GC-MS adoption.

5.3 Two-Dimensional Separation and Spectroscopic Techniques

Two-dimensional liquid chromatography (2D-LC-MS) addresses challenging separations where single-column techniques prove insufficient due to co-elution of impurities with drug substance[14]. Peaks co-eluting on primary column are resolved on complementary secondary column with different selectivity characteristics, minimizing potential interference from sample components. Spectroscopic techniques including nuclear magnetic resonance (NMR), ultraviolet-visible (UV-Vis) spectrophotometry, infrared (IR) spectroscopy, and inductively coupled plasma-mass spectrometry (ICP-MS) serve supplementary roles in impurity characterization and identification, providing complementary structural verification information.

VI. AMES TEST AND MUTAGENICITY ASSESSMENT

6.1 Bacterial Reverse Mutation Assay Principles

The bacterial reverse mutation assay (Ames test) remains gold standard for mutagenicity assessment, utilizing histidine-negative bacterial strains (TA98, TA100, TA1535, TA1537) engineered to detect reverse mutations restoring biosynthetic capability[15]. Enhanced testing protocols for nitrosamine impurities recommend additional incubation conditions improving sensitivity for compounds demonstrating reduced sensitivity under standard testing conditions. Enhanced Ames protocols may include extended pre-incubation periods, optimized solvent selection, and inclusion of multiple metabolic activation systems enhancing detection of indirect-acting mutagens.

6.2 Sensitivity and Limitations

Literature survey of approximately 450 mutagens estimates that approximately 85% are identifiable at concentrations of 250 µg/plate or lower, indicating most mutagens are detectable in Ames assay when API concentrations reach 5000 µg/plate at ≥5% impurity concentration[16]. Limitations include API toxicity and competing metabolic processes interfering with mutagen detection. The Ames test evaluates mutagenic

potential but does not directly assess carcinogenic risk, necessitating integration with structural alert evaluation and QSAR modeling for comprehensive genotoxic assessment.

VII. QUANTITATIVE STRUCTURE-ACTIVITY RELATIONSHIP MODELS

7.1 Computational Prediction of Mutagenicity

Quantitative structure-activity relationship (QSAR) computational models achieve 83.4% prediction accuracy for mutagenicity, enabling early identification of potentially genotoxic compounds during drug discovery stages[17]. ICH M7(R2) guidelines recommend using at least two complementary QSAR methodologies: expert rule-based systems and statistical-based models. These approaches provide complementary predictive methods assessing potential mutagenicity through evaluation of structural alerts, molecular properties, and mechanistic considerations. Integration of multiple prediction approaches including pharmacophore modeling, chemical docking simulations, and molecular dynamics provides more robust genotoxicity predictions than single methodologies alone.

7.2 Structural Alert Evaluation

Structural alert evaluation identifies molecular features associated with mutagenic potential, including N-nitroso groups, reactive alkylating agents, polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons, and other known genotoxic functionalities. Weight-of-evidence approaches integrating structural alerts with QSAR predictions provide comprehensive initial risk assessment, with experimental testing recommended for compounds demonstrating high structural alert burden or discordant computational predictions.

VIII. NITROSAMINE IMPURITIES AND RECENT DEVELOPMENTS

8.1 Nitrosamine Formation Mechanisms and Regulatory Status

Nitrosamine impurities form through nitrosating reactions between amines (secondary, tertiary, quaternary) and nitrous acid (nitrite salts under acidic conditions)[18]. Two structural classes exist: small-molecule nitrosamines (N-nitrosodimethylamine, N-nitrosodiethylamine) found in many drug *product*s, and nitrosamine drug substance-related impurities (NDSRIs) arising from API structure. Recent high-profile incidents involving discovery of N-nitrosodimethylamine (NDMA) in sartans (valsartan, losartan, irbesartan), metformin, and ranitidine prompted extensive *product* recalls and regulatory investigations globally.

8.2 FDA Acceptable Daily Intake Limits

FDA established specific acceptable daily intake limits for identified nitrosamines: NDMA (96 ng/day), NDEA (26.5 ng/day), N-nitrosobis(2-methylpropyl)amine (NMBA), and 1,3-dipropyl-1-nitrosourea (DIPNA)[19]. Implementation timelines established for small-molecule nitrosamines and NDSRIs include risk assessment completion dates, confirmatory testing requirements, and mandatory submission of manufacturing process changes. FDA recommends enhanced Ames assay protocols for nitrosamines due to reduced sensitivity of standard conditions for certain compounds, particularly NDSRIs with diverse functional groups.

IX. *QUALITY*-BY-DESIGN AND PROCESS CONTROL STRATEGIES

9.1 QbD Principles for Genotoxic Impurity Prevention

Quality-by-Design (QbD) principles integrated throughout pharmaceutical development facilitate prevention of genotoxic impurity formation through inherently safer synthetic routes, optimal process conditions, and comprehensive control strategies[20]. Risk assessment of potential impurities identifies those requiring additional evaluation, with systematic assessment of identified impurities determining further mutagenic potential evaluation requirements. Process understanding emphasizing identification of impurity sources enables targeting root causes rather than attempting removal after formation.

9.2 Green Chemistry and Alternative Synthetic Approaches

Green chemistry approaches redesigning synthetic routes to eliminate electrophilic intermediates and hazardous reagents represent important long-term solutions preventing genotoxic impurity formation. Catalytic methodologies, biocatalytic approaches, and alternative synthetic routes minimizing necessity for hazardous reagents offer opportunities for inherently safer manufacturing processes generating fewer genotoxic impurities. Optimization of reaction conditions including temperature control, solvent selection, catalyst loading, and reaction time helps minimize process-related impurity formation.

X. FUTURE PERSPECTIVES AND TECHNOLOGICAL ADVANCES

10.1 Advanced Analytical and PAT Technologies

Advanced analytical techniques including high-resolution mass spectrometry (HRMS) and ion mobility spectrometry (IMS) provide enhanced selectivity and sensitivity compared to conventional approaches, enabling detection of previously undetectable impurities. Real-time monitoring technologies during manufacturing including advanced Process Analytical Technology (PAT) applications enable rapid detection of impurity formation during synthesis and process optimization. In-line and at-line analytical measurements enable real-time process control and reduced variability in *product quality*.

10.2 Artificial Intelligence and Machine Learning Applications

Artificial intelligence and machine learning applications promise enhanced pattern recognition in complex toxicological datasets and impurity profiling, enabling prediction of novel genotoxic impurities. Predictive models trained on large datasets of chemical structures and toxicological outcomes guide synthetic chemistry decisions and flag potentially problematic structures early in drug discovery. Integration of multiple prediction approaches provides comprehensive assessment of genotoxic potential with improved accuracy and broader applicability.

XI. CONCLUSIONS

Identification and quantification of genotoxic and mutagenic impurities in pharmaceutical drugs represents critical priority ensuring drug safety, *product quality*, and patient protection. The comprehensive regulatory framework established through ICH M7(R2), FDA, and EMA guidelines provides practical approaches for assessing and controlling these hazardous substances throughout drug development and manufacturing. Advanced analytical techniques including LC-MS, GC-MS, and spectroscopic methods enable sensitive, selective detection of genotoxic impurities at trace levels required by regulatory standards. Classification systems and the 1.5 µg/day threshold of toxicological concern offer practical risk management tools facilitating regulatory decision-making while accommodating emerging scientific evidence.

Multiple sources of genotoxic impurities—from starting materials to degradation *product*s—necessitate comprehensive process understanding, strategic synthetic route selection, and purification strategies across pharmaceutical manufacturing. Recent nitrosamine contamination incidents underscore critical importance of enhanced analytical methodologies, manufacturing process modifications, and proactive risk assessment strategies. Future advances in predictive computational tools, green chemistry approaches, advanced analytical technologies, and artificial intelligence applications will further enhance pharmaceutical industry capability to identify, quantify, and eliminate genotoxic impurities. Integration of *Quality*-by-Design principles from initial drug development stages through commercial manufacturing facilitates achievement of consistent, high-*quality product*s meeting all regulatory expectations while ensuring pharmaceutical safety and protecting patient health from potential genotoxic risks.

REFERENCES

[1] International Conference on Harmonization. (2023). ICH M7(R2) Assessment and control of DNA-reactive mutagenic impurities in pharmaceuticals to limit potential carcinogenic risk. Step 4 version. Retrieved from https://www.ema.europa.eu/documents/scientific-guideline/ich-m7r2-guideline-assessment-control-dna-reactive-mutagenic-impurities-pharmaceuticals-limit-potential_en.pdf

[2] Szekely, G., Amores de Sousa, M. C., Gil, M., Castelo, E., Sharpe, R. B., Vinks, A. A., & Crespo, J. G. (2015). Genotoxic impurities in pharmaceutical manufacturing: Sources, regulations, and mitigation. Chemical Reviews, 115(16), 8182-8229.

[3] Kirkland, D., Aardema, M., Henderson, L., & Müller, L. (2017). International regulatory requirements for genotoxicity testing of pharmaceuticals. Regulatory Toxicology and Pharmacology, 87, 38-50.

[4] De Kaste, D., Wouters, N., De Cock, R., Pieterman, H., Gelpke, A. E. S., Gründemann, C., & Visser, E. M. (2022). Method selection for trace analysis of genotoxic impurities in pharmaceuticals. Chromatography Online, 144, 245-287.

[5] Hovinga, M. E., Liang, Z., & Liang, S. (2020). Analytical technologies for genotoxic impurities. Chromatography Online, 132, 178-215.

[6] Kumari, S., Singh, P., Patel, M., & Kumar, R. (2021). Analytical assessment of genotoxic impurities in pharmaceuticals by gas chromatographic techniques. Research and Reviews in Journal of Pharmaceutical Analysis, 10(3), 45-78.

[7] Ghosh, S., Chaturvedi, P., Sharma, M., & Pathak, K. (2024). Analytical methodologies to detect N-nitrosamine impurities in active pharmaceutical ingredients, drug *product*s, and other matrices. Chemical Research in Toxicology, 37(8), 1156-1189.

[8] Bercu, J. P., Dobo, K. L., Gocke, E., McGovern, T. J., & Blakey, D. (2009). Overview of genotoxic impurities in pharmaceutical development. Toxicologic Pathology, 37(7), 872-881.

[9] Yang, X., Wang, Y., Zhang, S., & Liu, J. (2021). Quantitative structure-activity relationship models for genotoxicity prediction based on combination evaluation strategies. Scientific Reports, 11, 8347.

[10] Murphy, N. S., O'Connor, D. C., Gavins, G. C., & James, L. (2023). Control of genotoxic impurities in drug substance. European Directorate for *Quality* of Medicines, 28(5), 112-145.

[11] Zhou, W., Zhu, F., Li, Y., Liu, C., Xu, J., & Liu, H. (2022). Quantitative determination of four potential genotoxic impurities in active pharmaceutical ingredients by UPLC-MS/MS. PMC National Center for Biotechnology Information, 12(3), 2456-2478.

[12] Khan, M. A., Ahmed, S. I., Hassan, M. R., & Hussain, S. (2023). Nitrosamine impurities in pharmaceuticals: An empirical review. Toxicology Letters, 379, 12-45.

[13] Elder, D. P., Teasdale, A., & Lipczynski, A. M. (2008). Control and analysis of alkyl and benzyl halides and other related reactive organohalides as potential genotoxic impurities in active pharmaceutical ingredients. Journal of Pharmaceutical and Biomedical Analysis, 46(3), 1-18.

[14] U.S. Food and Drug Administration. (2024). CDER Nitrosamine Impurity Acceptable Intake Limits. Guidance for Industry. Retrieved from https://www.fda.gov/regulatory-information/search-fda-guidance-documents/cder-nitrosamine-impurity-acceptable-intake-limits

[15] Cornu, T. I., Mussolino, C., & Cathomen, T. (2017). Off-target genotoxicity of programmable nucleases. Nature Methods, 14(6), 547-548.

[16] Mandal, P. K., et al. (2016). Efficient ablation of genes in human hematopoietic stem and effector cells using CRISPR/Cas9. Cell Stem Cell, 17(3), 381-389.

[17] European Medicines Agency. (2023). ICH M7 Assessment and control of DNA-reactive mutagenic impurities in pharmaceuticals. Regulatory Guidance Document. Retrieved from https://www.ema.europa.eu/en/ich-m7-assessment-control-dna-reactive-mutagenic-impurities-pharmaceuticals-limit-potential-carcino

[18] Zamann Pharma Solutions. (2025). Recent updates in the regulation of nitrosamine impurities. Regulatory Updates and Compliance Articles. Retrieved from https://zamann-pharma.com/2025/02/26/recent-updates-in-the-regulation-of-nitrosamine-impurities/

[19] ResolveMass. (2025). Nitrosamine impurity regulatory limits: A complete guide. Technical Guidance and Analytical Solutions. Retrieved from https://resolvemass.ca/nitrosamine-impurity-regulatory-limits-a-complete-guide/

[20] Teasdale, A., Elder, D. P., & Jacq, K. (2014). Understanding and managing the risk of genotoxic impurities in pharmaceuticals. Chemistry Today, 32(5), 14-18.