

# Environmental monitoring by surface sampling for cytotoxics: a review

Marie Petit, Christophe Curti, Manon Roche, Marc Montana, Charleric Bornet, Patrice Vanelle

## ► To cite this version:

Marie Petit, Christophe Curti, Manon Roche, Marc Montana, Charleric Bornet, et al.. Environmental monitoring by surface sampling for cytotoxics: a review. Environmental Monitoring and Assessment, 2017, 189 (2), pp.52. 10.1007/s10661-016-5762-9. hal-01433551

## HAL Id: hal-01433551 https://hal.science/hal-01433551

Submitted on 17 Jan2017

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers. L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

1	Environmental monitoring by surface sampling for cytotoxics:
2	a review
3	
4	Petit Marie, <sup>1</sup> Curti Christophe, <sup>1,2</sup> Roche Manon, <sup>2,3</sup> Montana Marc, <sup>2,4</sup> Bornet Charleric, <sup>5</sup> Vanelle Patrice <sup>1,2</sup>
5	
6	<sup>1</sup> Assistance Publique - Hôpitaux de Marseille (AP-HM), Service Central de la Qualité et de l'Information
7	Pharmaceutiques (SCQIP), Hôpital de la Conception, 147 Boulevard Baille, 13005 Marseille, France.
8	<sup>2</sup> Aix-Marseille Université, CNRS, ICR, UMR 7273, Laboratoire de Pharmaco-Chimie Radicalaire, Faculté de
9	Pharmacie, 27 Boulevard Jean Moulin – CS30064, 13385 Marseille cedex 05, France.
10	<sup>3</sup> Assistance Publique - Hôpitaux de Marseille (AP-HM), Service Central des Opérations Pharmaceutiques
11	(SCOP), Administration centrale, rue Brochier, 13005 Marseille, France.
12	<sup>4</sup> Assistance Publique - Hôpitaux de Marseille (AP-HM), Oncopharma, Hôpital Nord, Chemin des Bourrely.
13	13915. Marseille cedex 20, France
14	<sup>5</sup> Assistance Publique - Hôpitaux de Marseille (AP-HM), Pharmacie Usage Intérieur Hôpital de la Conception,
15	Hôpital de la Conception, 147 Boulevard Baille, 13005 Marseille, France.
16	
17	
18	Keywords: cytotoxic drugs, surface sampling, chromatography, hospital.
19	
20	Corresponding author:
21	*Corresponding author: Manon ROCHE, Assistance Publique - Hôpitaux de Marseille (AP-HM),
22	Service Central des Opérations Pharmaceutiques (SCOP); Aix Marseille Université, ICR, UMR 7273
23	CNRS, Marseille, France. E-mail: manon.roche@univ-amu.fr. tel: +33-(0)4 91 83 55 25; fax: +33-
24	(0)4 91 79 46 77
25	
26	
27	
28	

29	Abstract
	120002000

30 Object:Environmental monitoring is usually conducted by surface sampling to detect and quantify the presence 31 of cytotoxic drugs after their reconstitution and administration. This technique reveals the origins of residual 32 contamination and is an important component in order toprotect healthcare workers from the potential risk of 33 occupational exposure. The aim of this work is to compare various techniques and results of surface sampling 34 for cytotoxics.

35 Materials and methods: For each technique, sample processing methods and their analysis werecompared from 36 literature data. Sampling is often performed by the wiping technique. After treatment, various single or multi-37 compound technicalanalyses are used, in particular liquid or gas chromatography involving different detection 38 methods: ultraviolet, mass spectrometry, plasma torch, voltammetry. Some methods are validated to ensure 39 reliability.

40 Results: Despite published guidelinesand the use of isolator technology for the preparation of cytotoxic drugs, 41 workplace contamination persists, leading tochemotherapeutic agents' exposure of healthcare workers. Efforts 42 need to be maintained with particular emphasis on harmonization and on determining alert level for cytotoxic 43 contamination.

44

#### 45 Introduction

46 47

In recent decades, cancer survival has improved due to advances in cancer treatment by 48 chemotherapy.Unfortunately, treated patients suffer from significant side effects, because the cytotoxic activity 49 of anticancer drugs also extends tonormal cells. Healthcare workers'occupational exposure to cytotoxic drugs 50 has been recognized as a potential health hazard since the 1970s (Ng and Jaffe 1970; Donner 1978). Hospital 51 personnel involved in the preparation or administration of cytotoxic agents is exposed to a wide variety of 52 antineoplastic substances. The precautionary principle requires that exposure should be as low as possible (Turci 53 and Minoia 2006), and minimizing exposure appears to be a real challenge. Numerous published guidelines exist, 54 like the Good Manufacturing Practices in France (ANSM 2007) or those of several other countries (OSHA 1999; 55 Schierl et al. 2009; Randolph 2012; Easty et al. 2015). Several good occupational hygiene practices were also 56 published worldwide, as World Health Organization regional office for European Union countries (WHO Europe 57 2002). Following the US National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH) publication, many 58 healthcare organizations (American Society of Health-System Pharmacists 2006; International Society of Oncology Pharmacy Practitioners 2007; USP <797> 2004; Working Committee on the Safe Handling of
 Hazardous Drugs 2008) revised their guidelines, policies and procedures in order to enhance safety for care
 workers (National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health 2004). However, despite compliance with safety
 directives contamination can occur.

Environmental monitoring is essential to assess the risk of contamination in order to take measuresto improve working conditions through effective cleaning or protection of cytostatic drugs handlerespecially. Even though hospital personnelmay be exposed to antineoplastic agents by inhalation or by inadvertent ingestion (hand-to-mouth contamination for example), direct skin contact appears to be the primary path of exposure.

To ensure accurate risk assessment, a monitoring strategy is recommended, with the following conditions (Turci et al. 2003): sources of contamination in working areas must be identified. The efficacy of personal protective equipment and biological safety cabinets (BSC) must be verified. Contamination of other areas adjacent to the area of preparation and administration rooms must be monitored and controlled. Information on work activities should be compiled to allow different periods to be compared.

72 Rapid, reliable and validated analytical methods are needed to ensure safe handling of these dangerous 73 drugs by reducing healthcare workersexposure to the lowest possible level. While the literature covers numerous 74 analytical methods of environmental monitoring, few authors in the past carried out a formalized validation on 75 their assay. Most of them were reviewed in 2003 (Turciet al. 2003). Only more recent studies include validation 76 procedures using quality controls (QCs). Several techniques were developed for the detection of a single 77 compound, but assay techniques have since tended towards simultaneous detection of several compounds (multi-78 compound technology). Since workers are usually exposed to a large number of drugs, studies focusedon the 79 most toxic (Group 1 IARC) and the most frequently prescribed drugs.

80

Biological and environmental monitorings are essential to identify the potential paths of exposure and to 81 improveprocedures. Moreover, generalization and standardization of environmental monitoring allows 82 theestablishment of guidance values, useful tool for occupational safety. Considering the current scientific 83 knowledge limitation on toxicity of chronic exposure to nanomolar quantities of cytotoxic drugs, these guidance 84 values are actually based on comparison of results of environmental monitoring. This risk assessment requires 85 specific standardized sampling techniques and analytical methods. In this review, a critical overview of the main 86 methods of environmental monitoring available in the literature is presented. In addition, the procedures that 87 have been validated as ensuring reliability are highlighted. The results of the largest surveys in hospital 88 departments are also cited with a view to improving both monitoring strategies and working conditions.

#### Cytotoxic drugs covered by environmental sampling

90

91 Cytotoxic chemotherapeutic agents can be divided into several classes (OSHA 1999; Turci et al. 2003).

Alkylating agents forming covalent bonds with DNA and RNA and leading to the formation of adducts.
They include nitrogen mustards (such as cyclophosphamide (CP), and ifosfamide (IF)), derivatives of platinum
(such as cisplatin (Pt)) and nitrosoureas (such as the carmustine).

Antimetabolites are nucleotide structural analogs and are incorporated into cellular components, inhibiting nucleic acids synthesisand leading to cell death. They include antifolates (such as methotrexate (MTX)), pyrimidine analogues (such as cytarabine (Cyt), gemcitabine (Gem) and 5-fluorouracil (5FU)) and purine analogs (such as fludarabine).

99 Topoisomerase inhibitors are designed to be insertedbetween the pairs of bases of DNA and to disrupt 100 the synthesis and / or function of nucleic acids. Topoisomerase I inhibitors are derived from camptothecins (such 101 as topotecan(Top) and irinotecan (Iri)) and topoisomerase II inhibitorscontain anthracyclines (such as 102 doxorubicin (Dox) and epirubicin (Epi)) and epipodophyllotoxin derivatives (such as etoposide (Eto)).

Finally, anti-proliferative agents disrupting mitotic spindle include taxanes (such as paclitaxel(Pac)and
 docetaxel (Doc)) and vinca-alkaloids (such as vincristine (VCR)).

Several cytostatic drugs are classified as carcinogenic to humans (Group 1) by the International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC)(International Agency for Research on Cancer 2016). This classification (Table 1) is based on epidemiological studies showing the development of secondary tumors in cancer patients treated with these drugs and primary tumors in patients treated with medications for other purposes. Several cytotoxic drugs are classified by IARC in group 2A and 2B (probably and possibly carcinogenic to humans, respectively).
Antimetabolites and mitotic spindle agents are not classifiable as carcinogenic to humans (Group 3).

**Table 1:** Classification of anticancer drugs according to IARC monographs

Cytotoxicchemotherapeutic agents	Groups	Group definition
CP, etoposide	Group 1	Carcinogenic to humans
Pt, Dox, daunorubicine	Group 2A	Probablycarcinogenic to humans
Bleomycin, dacarbazine	Group 2B	Possibly carcinogenic to humans
IF, 5FU, MTX, vincristine, vinblastine	Group 3	Not classifiable as carcinogenic to humans
Pac, Doc, Top, Iri, Epi, Cyt, Gem		Actually not classified in IARC monographs

113 CP: cyclophosphamide; Pt: cisplatin; Dox: doxorubicin; IF: ifosfamide; 5FU: 5-fluorouracil; MTX: methotrexate; Pac: paclitaxel; Doc:

docetaxel; Top: topotecan; Iri: irinotecan; Epi: epirubicin; Cyt: cytarabine; Gem: gemcitabine.

A wide variety of these drugs were analyzed for environmental monitoring (National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health 2014), primarilycyclophosphamide (CP), ifosfamide (IF), methotrexate (MTX), 5-fluorouracil (5FU), cisplatin(Pt), paclitaxel (Pac), vinca alkaloids and anthracyclines. These substances are among the most frequently used and the most important from a toxicological point of view. In addition, they are commercially available as analytical standard products.

Any choice of marker cytotoxic drugs should be based on a thorough knowledge of hospital activities and specialties. For example, hospitals carrying out the Heated Intraperitoneal Perioperative Chemotherapy Procedure (HIPEC) should evaluate environmental contamination for platinum derivatives(Konate et al. 2011).

123

#### 124 Environmental sampling dosing methods

125

126 The range of drugs monitored depends on currently available analytical techniques. High performance 127 liquid chromatography – tandem mass spectrometry (LC/MS/MS) can be used to monitor a wide variety of drugs 128 via previously described multi-compound techniques. Inductively coupled plasma mass spectrometry (ICP-MS) 129 or voltammetry can be used for environmental monitoring of platinum salts. High performance liquid 130 chromatography - UV detection (LC-UV) imposes a choice of marker cytotoxic drugs, such as CP (Siderov et 131 al. 2010) or 5FU(Tkaczuk et al. 2010; Lee et al. 2007). Gaz chromatography – mass spectrometry (GC/MS) was 132 also used for the environmental monitoring of CP, IF and 5FU (Sessink et al. 1992; Castiglia et al. 2008; Kosjek 133 et al. 2013).

134

- 135 Wipe sampling method and extraction
- 136

In several investigations, wipe sampling was performed on different surfaces and objects. Thiswas the most common practice to monitor residual contamination in reconstitution and care areas, administrative units, equipment, and to test the effectiveness of decontamination techniques (Sottani et al. 2007). A variety of materials, of sampling areas, of types of solution and volumes of desorption solution were addressed. Major wipe sampling and extraction methods are detailed in Table 2.

Cytotoxic exposure should be as low as possible. Environmental samples often need to be concentrated
to increase sensitivity, in particular when samples are analyzed by LC-UV. In contrast, the sensitivity of
LC/MS/MS means that preconcentration is not always necessary (Sabatini et al. 2005).

Sample concentration should be performed by solid phase extraction (SPE) or liquid-liquid extraction (LLE). SPE is often described as faster than LLE, but also more expensive and it does not always allow to increase the Limit of Detection (LOD) and the Lowest Limit of Quantitation (LLQ) (Juhascik and Fenkins 2009).

149

Several methods of environmental sample extraction were described and compared (Table 2).

150

151	<b>Table 2:</b> Sampling and extraction techniques for cytotoxic drugs environmental monitoring.
101	<b>Tuble 1</b> building and extraction teeningdes for cytotoxic arags environmental monitoring.

Drug quantified (Reference)	Sampling technique	Extraction technique	Extraction yields	
Pac (Sottani et al. 2000)	Cotton / methanol	LLE (water pH 7.0/ethyl acetate)	> 90%	
5FU (Gilles et al. 2009)	Filter paper (Whatman®)	LLE (water/ethylacetate/isopropanol)	71%	
5FU (Micoli et al. 2001)	Cotton / acetate buffer (pH 4.7)	SPE Isolute <sup>®</sup> ENV+ columns (200 mg/6 mL)	Mean = 94.1%	
5FU (Kosjek et al. 2013)	100 mL water samples	SPE Isolute® ENV+ columns (500 mg/6 mL)	Wastewater = $53 \pm 28\%$	
			Surface water = $93 \pm 2\%$	
MTX (Turci et al. 2000)	Cotton	SPE Isolute® C18 (500 mg/10 mL)	Mean = 78.4%	
CP (Hedmer et al. 2004)	Nonwoven swab /NaOH 0.03M	LLE (water/ethyl acetate)	> 78%	
Pt (Brouwers et al. 2007)	Kimtech <sup>®</sup> Science precision	Ultrasonic desorption (1% HCl) and	50.4% to 81.4%	
	wipes / water	filtration		
5FU, CP, MTX (Sabatini et	Kleenex <sup>®</sup> / ammonium acetate	none	5FU MTX: ≈ 78%	
al. 2005)	solution (pH 6.9)		CP: 100%	
5FU, IF, CP (Castiglia et al.	TNT gauzes / NaOH 0.03M	Ultrasonicdesorption, SPE	NR	
2008)		diatomaceousearth (elutiondiethylether)		
CP, IF, Pac, Gem (Sottani et	Ashless filter paper	OASIS® HLB cartridges (200 mg/ 6 mL)	Gem: 62-81%	
al. 2007)	(Whatman <sup>®</sup> ) / water	SPE	Pac: 55-81%	
			CP, IF: 63-81%	
CP, Cyt, Dox, Epi, Eto, Gem,	Blotting paper (Whatman®)	Ultrasonic desorption (water/formic acid)	From 20% (VCR) to 89%	
IF, Iri, MTX, VCR			(Cyt) on stainless steel	
(Nussbaumer et al. 2010)			surfaces.	
CP, Cyt, Dox, Epi, Eto, Gem,	Filter paper (Whatman®)	Ultrasonic desorption (water/ACN/formic	From 45% (Eto) to 86% (CP)	
IF, Iri, MTX, VCR		acid) and centrifugation	on stainless steel surfaces	
(Nussbaumer et al. 2012)				

152 CP: cyclophosphamide; Pt: cisplatin; Dox: doxorubicin; IF: ifosfamide; 5FU: 5-fluorouracil; MTX: methotrexate; Pac: paclitaxel; Doc:
153 docetaxel; Top: topotecan; Iri: irinotecan; Epi: epirubicin; Cyt: cytarabine; Gem: gemcitabine; VCR: vincristine; SPE: solid phase extraction;
154 LLE: liquid-liquid extraction.
155

When analyzed by LC-UV, 5FU always needs to be concentrated by LLE or SPE. 5FU is very difficult to extract
byreverse phase (RP)SPE because it is an extremely polar weak acid (Kosjek et al. 2013).5FU extraction yields

were evaluated for several SPE columns, with highly varying recovery results, from 0.2% to more than 90%.Isolute<sup>®</sup> ENV+ SPE appears to be the most suitable column,(Micoli et al. 2001; Kosjek et al. 2013)providing effective extraction regardless of both 5FU concentration and applied volume (Micoli et al. 2001).

162 LC-UV sensitivity appears to be inadequate for environmental monitoring of CP without 163 preconcentration. A sufficiently sensitive method, for example with SPE as in biological sample 164 treatment(Baumann and Freiss 2001), needs to be developed. Currently, samples can be analyzed with either 165 LC/MS/MS or Gas chromatography - mass spectrometry (GC/MS). Six different types of wipe tissue were 166 evaluated for their recovery potential: Easi-Tex Master® Plus, Care Facial® tissues, nonwoven swabs, sterile 167 compresses, Kimcare<sup>®</sup> medical wipes and Swedish filter papers (Hedmer et al. 2004). Nonwoven swabs had the 168 best and the highest CP absorption capacity. Size of sampling area was also evaluated (100 or 400 cm<sup>2</sup>) and a 169 large sample area was generally preferable.

SPE should be avoided for Pac because the vehicle formulation (Cremophor EL<sup>®</sup>) can affect the effectiveness of the extraction technique. Instead of SPE, LLE with ethyl acetate can be used (Sottani et al. 2007).For MTX, however, SPE is necessary with LC-UV analysis and withLC/MS/MS for smaller areas, such as gloves. LLE is not recommended because of the low aqueous solubility of MTX (Turci et al. 2000).

For platinum environmental monitoring (Brouwers et al. 2007), wipe materials (Kimtech<sup>®</sup> wipes, Whatman<sup>®</sup> filters and Klinion<sup>®</sup> gauzes) were evaluated for platinum contamination and for their ability to release platinum from stainless steel surfaces. Wipe solvents (water, 1% HCl, 80% ethanol) and desorption solvents (1% HNO<sub>3</sub>, 5% HNO<sub>3</sub>, 1% HCl) were also evaluated. Best experimental conditions were reported (Entry 7).

More generally, the variability of cytotoxic drugs' recovery (Gem, Pac, CP and IF) has been demonstrated to be more than 20% according to surface type (for example, stainless steel hood work tray, linoleum flooring, laminated bench top) (Sottani et al. 2007).

181 Recently developed multi-compound methods allow quantification by LC/MS/MS of a set of 10 182 cytotoxicdrugs simultaneously. Initially, this elegant method involved wipe sampling with blotting paper 183 (Whatman 903<sup>®</sup>) followed by ultrasonic desorptionfrom the paper with water/formic acid (0.1%)(Nussbaumer et 184 al. 2010). The major limitation of this method was the wide variation in percentagerecovered among the 10 185 cytotoxic drugs, from  $18\pm12\%$  (VCR) to  $94\pm10\%$  (Cyt). High standard deviations were also reported, for 186 example  $34\pm18\%$  for Iri. Several modifications were consequently realized to improve this technique and 187 extraction procedure (Nussbaumer et al. 2012).First, 20% acetonitrile (ACN) was added to the desorption

188	solution, thereby increasing the hydrophobic substances recovery, and a centrifugation step was added. Then,
189	several filter papers (Whatman <sup>®</sup> , Ahlstrom <sup>®</sup> , Texwipe <sup>®</sup> ) were compared, and theWhatman <sup>®</sup> filter paper was best
190	for environmental monitoring. Finally, recoveries were assessed on a wide variety of surfaces (stainless steel,
191	polypropylene, polystyrol, glass, latex, computer mouse, paperboard) for each cytotoxic, enabling to determine a
192	correction factor per compound and per surface.
193	
194	LLQs and LODs of environmental analysis
195	
196	GC/MS, LC-UV or LC/MS/MS are the most frequently analytical techniques used for cytotoxic analysis (Sottani
197	et al. 2007). LLQ is often defined as the lowest concentration level with between-day relative error and precision
198	less than or equal to 20% and LOD is the concentration giving signal intensity at least equal to three times the
199	background value (Micoli et al. 2001). LLQ and LOD of several techniques are presented in Table 3. Moreover,
200	these methods were validated with determination of linearity and accuracy in most of the cases.
201	There is not yet any standardization of units of measurement for LOD and LLQ determination. Authors
202	use ng/mL(sample concentration) or ng/cm <sup>2</sup> (surface of the area sampled), or ng (per sample). Where possible,
203	the units described by authors were harmonized here, in order to facilitate comparison. We believe that
204	expressing LOD, LLQ and surface contamination results in ng/cm <sup>2</sup> should be standardized,facilitating
205	comparison of results from different studies, this unit of measurement is also more readily comprehensible to
206	clinicians.
207	
208	
209	
210	
211	
212	
213	
214	
215	

- 217 Table 3: LLQs and LODs of analytical techniques for environmental monitoring

Reference	Analytes	Technique	LOD	LLQ	LOD	LLQ	LOD	LLQ
			(ng/mL)	(ng/mL)	(ng/cm <sup>2</sup> )	$(ng/cm^2)$	(ng/sample)	(ng/samp
								le)
Huizing et al. 1995 <sup>p</sup>	Pac <sup>n</sup>	LC-UV		SPE: 10				
				LLE: 250				
Sotani et al. 2007	Pac	LC/MS/MS						10
Sessink et al. 1992°	MTX	LC-UV	60		0.4 - 1		3 - 6	
Turci et al. 2000	MTX	LC-UV						150
Turci et al. 2000	MTX	LC/MS/MS						5
Micoli et al. 2001	5FU	LC-UV					50	150
Gilles et al. 2009	5FU	LC-UV	5	15				
Sessink et al. 1992°	5FU	LC-UV	7		0.04 - 0.1		0.3 - 0.7	
Kosjek et al. 2013	5FU	GC/MS/MS	0.16-0.48	0.54-1.6 10-3				
			10-3					
Hedmer et al. 2004	СР	LC/MS/MS			0.05 10-3		0.02	
McDevitt et al. 1993°	СР	LC-UV			3-25			
Sessink et al. 1992°	СР	GC/MS	0.1		0.01-0.02		0.06 - 0.1	
Minoia et al. 1998 <sup>p</sup>	CP, IF	LC/MS/MS			0.01		20	
Castiglia et al. 2008	3 <sup>a,b,d</sup>	GC/MS/MS <sup>a,d</sup>			0.12, <sup>a</sup> 0.6, <sup>d</sup>	0.2, <sup>a</sup> 1, <sup>d</sup> 7.4 <sup>b</sup>		
		LC-UV <sup>b</sup>			4.4 <sup>b</sup>			
Sabatini et al. 2005	3 <sup>a,b,c</sup>	µLC/MS/MS	1.1 <sup>a,c</sup> 33.3 <sup>b</sup>		0.01 <sup>a,c</sup>			
					0.33 <sup>b</sup>			
Sottani et al. 2007	$4^{a,d,e,f}$	LC/MS/MS			0.125 <sup>e,f</sup>	0.25 <sup>e,f</sup>	12.5e,f	25 <sup>e,f</sup>
					0.0625 <sup>a,d</sup>	1.25 <sup>a,d</sup>	6.25 <sup>a,d</sup>	12.5 <sup>a,d</sup>
Connor et al. 2010	5 <sup>a,b,d,e,g</sup>	LC/MS/MS			0.13, <sup>g</sup> 0.1 <sup>a,d</sup>			
					0.07,°0.06 <sup>b</sup>			
Nussbaumer et al.	10 <sup>a,c,d,f,g,h,i,j,k,l</sup>	LC/MS/MS	≤0.5	0.25 - 2				
2010								
Nussbaumer et al.	10 <sup>a,c,d,f,g,h,i,j,k,l</sup>	LC/MS/MS				0.1		10
2012								
Kiffmeyer et al. 2013	8 <sup>a,b,c,d,e,f,l,m</sup>	LC/MS/MS	0.07 - 0.35	0.1 - 1		$(3.7^{a,c,d,l}, 7.3^{f},$		3.3 <sup>a,c,d,1</sup>
						11 <sup>b</sup> , 18 <sup>e</sup> , 37 <sup>m</sup> )		6.6-9.9 <sup>b,f</sup>
						10-3		17-33 <sup>e,m</sup>
Schmaus et al. 2002	Platinum	Voltammetry			10-5		5 10-3	
Ensslin et al. 1994°	Platinum <sup>n</sup>	Voltammetry	1.8 10-3					
Brouwers et al. 2007	Platinum	ICP-MS		0.5 10 <sup>-3</sup>		0.05 10-3		5 10 <sup>-3</sup>

219 described in this reference <sup>p</sup>Method validation done on biological samples.

220 CP: cyclophosphamide; Dox: doxorubicin; IF: ifosfamide; 5FU: 5-fluorouracil; MTX: methotrexate; Pac: paclitaxel; Doc: docetaxel; Top:

221 topotecan; Iri: irinotecan; Epi: epirubicin; Cyt: cytarabine; Gem: gemcitabine; VCR: vincristine

222

223 When compared with LC/MS/MS, LC-UV analytical techniques for environmental monitoring suffer 224 from a lack of sensitivity, but also from a lower specificity. In particular for environmental samples, because of 225 the presence of many agents on the working surface, LC/MS/MS remains the gold standard.

226 Laboratories equipped with an LC/MS/MS should use multi-compound methods for environmental 227 monitoring(Nussbaumer et al. 2000; Nussbaumer et al. 2002; Connor et al. 2010; Kiffmeyer et al. 2013). If the 228 investment appears too high, mono-compound analyses by LC-UV can be alternately worked out. As these 229 methods are time-consuming and the LLQsare higher, the cytotoxic assessed must be chosen carefully.GC/MS 230 and GC/MS/MS were mainly described for the monitoring of CP and IF (Sessink et al. 1992; Castiglia et al. 231 2008), involving a derivatization step using fluorinated anhydrides. GC/MS/MS can also be used for 5FU 232 monitoring, after derivatization step by silylation with MTBSTFA (N-methyl-N-[tertа 233 butyldimethylsilyl]trifluoroacetamide), described as the better reagent for 5FU(Kosjek et al. 2013). Currently, 234 there are no standardsfor environmental exposure to cytotoxics. USP <797> recently stated that more than 235 1ng/cm<sup>2</sup> of CP was found to cause human uptake. MEWIP, a large-scale investigation, led to a cytotoxicindependent target value of 0.1 ng/cm<sup>2</sup>, based on the 90<sup>th</sup> percentile of the results (Kiffmeyer et al. 2013). 236

237 CP, MTX and 5FU were the main cytotoxic drugs chosen for environmental monitoring from the 1990s 238 by LC-UV(Sessink et al. 1992), and currently by LC/MS/MS. MTX went from an LOD of 0.4 ng/cm<sup>2</sup> to an LLQ 239 of 3.7 10<sup>-3</sup> ng/cm<sup>2</sup>, 5FU from an LOD of 0.04 ng/cm<sup>2</sup> to an LLQ of 11 10<sup>-3</sup> ng/cm<sup>2</sup>, and CP from an LOD of 3 240 ng/cm<sup>2</sup> toan LLQ of 3.7 10<sup>-3</sup> ng/cm<sup>2</sup> (Sessink et al. 1992; Kiffmeyer et al. 2013).In the absence of any consensus, 241 but when compared with the USP values for CP and the MEWIP project target values, the LODs of the methods 242 using LC-UV for MTX and CP do not appear to be sufficient for environmental monitoring. However, the LOD 243 of 5FU evaluated by LC-UV (from 0.04 ng/cm<sup>2</sup>to 0.1 ng/cm<sup>2</sup>)may be low enough for effective monitoring. The 244 assessment of Pacenvironmental monitoring with LC/MS/MS methods alone was assessed (Sottani et al. 2007; 245 Sottani et al. 2000; Connor et al. 2010; Kiffmeyer et al. 2013), led to LLQs ranging from 18.10<sup>-3</sup> to 125.10<sup>-3</sup> 246 ng/cm<sup>2</sup>, depending on the protocol. Nevertheless, it should be possible to develop LC-UV Pac monitoring using 247 protocols described for biological samples, even though the detection limit will be higher (Huizing et al. 1995). 248 Platinum derivative environmental monitoring with both ICP-MS and voltammetrywas assessed, with similar 249 LODs and LLQs (Brouwers et al. 2007; Schmaus et al. 2002; Ensslin et al. 1994). As voltammetry appears to be 250 less expensive than ICP-MS, it should be the preferred platinum environmental monitoring method.

Besides these traditional analytical techniques, the current development of a 5FU monitor, able to detect
cytotoxic surface contamination in near real time, appears very promising, with LODs ranging from 0.1 to 0.25
ng/cm<sup>2</sup> (Smith et al. 2015).

### 255 Applications and discussion

257 Several procedures for cytotoxic drug environmental evaluation were applied in preparation and258 administrationunits. Results for selected cytotoxics are summarized in Table 4.

**Table 4:**Environmental monitoring of selected cytotoxicsin preparation and administrationunits.

Reference Place monitored		number of sample	Positive samples	Results
			Cytotoxic: 5FU	
Micoli et al. 2001	4 preparation/	61	49%	Inside hood = 715 $ng/cm^2$
	administration			Floor in front of the hood = $12 - 1461$ ng/cm <sup>2</sup>
	units			Top of hood = 80 - 2110ng/cm <sup>2</sup> Internal surface of gloves =
				70 - 3770 ng (preparation)120 - 3290 ng (administration)
Connor et al. 2010	3 hospitals	143	26%	Pharmacies, mean values = $0.13-0.53 \text{ ng/cm}^2$
	(7 pharmacies, 10			Nursing/patient areas, mean values = $< 0.06-35.44$ ng/cm <sup>2</sup>
	nursing/patient			
	areas)			
Schierl et al. 2009	102 pharmacies	1237	74.4%	10 sampling sites.
				$90^{th}$ percentile = 0.251 ng/cm <sup>2</sup> 75 <sup>th</sup> percentile = 0.029 ng/cm <sup>2</sup>
Kiffmeyer et al.	130 pharmacies	1269	31%	3 sampling sites: Floor, work top and refrigerator door.
2013				$90^{th}\ percentile = 0.117\ ng/cm^2\ 75^{th}\ percentile = 0.016\ ng/cm^2$
				Highest values = Work top, 24 $ng/cm^2$
			Cytotoxic: CP	
Connor et al. 2010	3 hospitals	143	43%	Pharmacies, mean values = $0.47-16.00 \text{ ng/cm}^2$
	(7 pharmacies, 10			Nursing/patient areas, mean values = $0.01-0.12$ ng/cm <sup>2</sup>
	nursing/patient			
	areas)			
Bussières et al.	25 hospitals	259	52%: 50% in	Highest values = Exterior surface of hazardous drug container,
2012			pharmacies, 54% in	28 ng/cm <sup>2</sup>
			patient care areas	$Median = 0.0035 \text{ ng/cm}^2$
Hedmer et al.	6 hospitals (17	447	80%: 95% on floors,	Highest values = Floors in the patient lavatories, median = $1.1$
2012	outpatient		65% on work areas	ng/cm <sup>2</sup>

	wards/wards)		53% on handles	90 <sup>th</sup> percentile values calculated for different surfaces, ranging
	wards/ wards/		55% of handles	from 4.2 $ng/cm^2$ (floors in the patient lavatory) to $6.10^{-5}$
				ng/cm <sup>2</sup> (handles of transport box).
				Median = $0.0033 \text{ ng/cm}^2$
*****	100 1	10.50	270/	-
Kiffmeyer et al.	130 pharmacies	1269	37%	3 sampling sites: Floor, work top and refrigerator door.
2013			~	90 <sup>th</sup> percentile = $0.048 \text{ ng/cm}^2 75^{\text{th}}$ percentile = $0.007 \text{ ng/cm}^2$
			Cytotoxic: IF	
Connor et al. 2010	3 hospitals	143	24%	Pharmacies, mean values = $0.08-0.65 \text{ ng/cm}^2$
	(7 pharmacies, 10			Nursing/patient areas, mean values = $0.01-0.85 \text{ ng/cm}^2$
	nursing/patient			
	areas)			
Bussières et al.	25 hospitals	259	20%: 25% in	Highest values = Floor in front of the hood, $8.6 \text{ ng/cm}^2$
2012			pharmacies and 14%	$Median < 0.0012 ng/cm^2$
			in patient care areas	
Hedmer et al.	6 hospitals (17	447	73%: 91% on floors,	Highest values = Floors in the patient lavatories, median =
2012	outpatient		59% on work areas	0.26 ng/cm <sup>2</sup>
	wards/wards)		35% on handles	90 <sup>th</sup> percentile values calculated for different surfaces, ranging
				from 4.2 ng/cm <sup>2</sup> (floors in the patient lavatory) to $3.10^{-4}$
				ng/cm <sup>2</sup> (door handles of patient lavatory).
				Median = $0.0042 \text{ ng/cm}^2$
Kiffmeyer et al.	130 pharmacies	1269	21%	3 sampling sites: Floor, work top and refrigerator door.
2013	-			$90^{\text{th}}$ percentile = 0.014 ng/cm <sup>2</sup>
			Cytotoxic: MTX	
Bussières et al.	25 hospitals	259	3% :	Highest values = Front grille inside the hood, $0.58 \text{ ng/cm}^2$
2012			4% in pharmacies	Median $< 0.006$ ng/cm <sup>2</sup>
			and 1% in patient	
			care areas	
Kiffmeyer et al.	130 hospital or	1269	3%	3 sampling sites: Floor, work top and refrigerator door.
2013	community			$90^{\text{th}}$ percentile < 3.7 $10^{-3}$ ng/cm <sup>2</sup>
	pharmacies			Highest values = Work top, $35 \text{ ng/cm}^2$
	pharmacies		Cytotoxic: Gem	ngnost video – Work top, 55 ng om
Viffmanar at al	120 hospital or	1260		2 compliant sites Floor work top and reference to a
Kiffmeyer et al.	130 hospital or	1269	32%	3 sampling sites: Floor, work top and refrigerator door.
2013	community			90 <sup>th</sup> percentile = $0.034 \text{ ng/cm}^2 75^{\text{th}}$ percentile = $0.007 \text{ ng/cm}^2$
	pharmacies			Highest values = Refrigerator door, $1888 \text{ ng/cm}^2$
				Work top, 190 ng/cm <sup>2</sup> and floor 105ng/cm <sup>2</sup>
			Cytotoxic: Pt	
Schierl et al. 2009	102hospital or	1008	99.2%	10 sampling sites.

community pharmacies

261

CP: cyclophosphamide; IF: ifosfamide; 5FU: 5-fluorouracil; MTX: methotrexate; Gem: gemcitabine; Pt: cisplatin

262

263 Severalstudies (Connor et al. 2005; Favier et al. 2003; Fleury-Souverain et al. 2014; Gilbar et al. 2005; 264 Naito et al. 2012; Nygren et al. 2002)described surface contamination ofmarketed cytotoxic drug vials, with a 265 possibility of cross-contamination by cytotoxic drugs. No Food and Drug Administration (FDA)requirements

266 exist regarding cleanliness of bottle external surfaces. However, contamination may be reduced by using a 267 decontamination device (Touzin et al. 2008) and protective sleeves (Schierl et al. 2010) during manufacturing. 268 Furthermore, cytotoxic drug contamination of marketed vials could be evaluated and taken into account in the 269 hospital tender procedure.

270 A clear improvement in protection for workers handling cytotoxics has been made in recent years. 271 Where simple laminar flow hoods (Mason et al. 2005) were used in the past, today, they often have been 272 replaced by pressure isolators. In units where isolators are used, while contaminants were often found inside 273 isolators, only a few traces were found outside (Kopp et al. 2013; Crauste-Manciet et al. 2005). Isolators' 274 effectiveness mainly depends on operators' work practices, and contamination from the pass-through could be 275 reduced by surface decontamination. Several studies also demonstrated the efficacy of closed-system drug 276 transfer device (CSTDs) (Wick et al. 2003; Connor et al. 2002), which can reduce contamination by95% 277 (Sessink et al. 2011). Robot assisted preparationswere also developed to reduce residual contamination from 278 70% under classic preparation conditions to 15% with the Apoteca® chemo system (Schierl et al. 2016). 279 Similarly, the CytoCare<sup>®</sup> chemotherapy compounding robot allowed preparation of CP with low environmental 280 contamination levels and no measurable exposure of technicians (Sessink et al. 2015).

281 However, despite subsequentrecommendations and solutions to environmental monitoring, 282 contamination cannotcurrently be totally eliminated and occupational exposures can occur. Adverse effects on 283 workers handling cytotoxic agents were describedsuch as hair loss, rash (Valanis et al. 1993; Krstey et al. 2003) 284 and delayed effects on reproduction (Stücker et al. 1993; Valanis et al. 1999; Fransman et al. 2007). Some 285 antineoplastic drugs are genotoxic (Rombaldi et al. 2009; Cavallo et al. 2005) and are known to cause or 286 suspected of causing cancerous pathologies (Connor 2006; International Agency for Research on Cancer 2016). 287 Therefore, several environmental monitoring studies involved biological assessment of cytotoxic excretion in 288 healthcare-professionals (Turci et al. 2003; Pethran et al. 2003; Schreiber et al. 2003; Sottani et al. 2010). 289 Analysis of chromosomal effects on the DNA of workers exposed to cytotoxic drugs by fluorescent in situ hybridization (FISH) was conducted, seeking the "signature" lesions found in patients with myelodysplastic
syndrome (MDS) or acute myeloid leukemia (AML) (McDiarmid et al. 2014). A dose-related increase
wasdetected, showing that significant biological exposure to genotoxic drugs occurs in oncology workplaces.

Environmental monitoring of cytotoxic drugs should follow two main principles. In order to analyze the exposure of healthcare workers and the safety of the "preparation to administration" process, it is necessary to realize a wide variety of sampling points, including surfaces and objects. On the other hand, to evaluate the impact of monitoring on contamination level, the number of sampling points should be standardized.

297 Larger studies described contamination occurring in hospitals and/or in community pharmacies (Schierl 298 et al. 2006; Kiffmeyer et al. 2013), but environmental monitoring can also be performed in care areas (Connor et 299 al. 2010) or at every step of the cytotoxic drug circuit.For example, secondary exposure of family members to 300 cytotoxic drugs via excreta of the treated cancer patient was recently described for CP. Levels of 0.03-7.34 301 ng/cm<sup>2</sup> were found in patients' home, and cytotoxic drugs werealso found in urine samples of family members 302 (Yuki et al. 2013; Yuki et al. 2015). Exposure to cytotoxic drugs outside the hospital environment could also 303 concern the pharmaceutical industry, universities, pharmacies, veterinary practices, laundry facilities and waste 304 treatment(Meijster et al. 2006).For example, patients' bed sheets appeared to be contaminated with detectable 305 levels of cytotoxics (0.13-30.6 ng/cm<sup>2</sup>) before the washing procedure in an industrial laundry facility(Fransman 306 et al. 2007).

307 Several studies demonstrated the value of regular environmental monitoring. The MEWIP Project 308 aimed to collect informations about the mechanisms and the release/propagation pathways of cytotoxic 309 drugs(Kiffmeyer et al. 2013). To study the impact of monitoring, 130 pharmacies were randomized into two 310 groups.Environmental monitoring in group A was regular throughout the study period, but occurred only at the 311 beginning and at the end of the project in group B. Using a validated multicompound technique (Tuerk et al. 312 2011), eight cytotoxics were quantified, a sample being considered positive if at least one of the drugs was 313 detected. Contamination levels were constantly decreasing in group Apharmacies, where, after the first report of 314 results, cleaning protocols, gloves, equipment modifications and more intensive training of cytotoxic drugs' 315 handlerwere implemented. Thus, it appears that repeated monitoring has a greater effect on level of 316 contamination than a single campaign. Another multicenter study was performed after publication of a prevention 317 guide recommending annual monitoring and the development of an environmental monitoring 318 program(Bussières et al. 2012). Every hospital included had at least one sample with a positive result for at least one cytotoxic (CP, IF or MTX). Once again, periodic monitoring of surface contamination was shown to ensureupdating of practices for better worker protection.

321 Current knowledge is too limited to set a no-health-effect levelfor cytotoxic drug exposure (Schierl et 322 al. 2009), and a zero level of exposure is not likely to be achievable in workplaces (Kiffmeyer et al. 323 2013). However, as analytical techniques evolve, LLQs decrease and the number of positive samples increases, 324 even though mean contamination levelshave beenreduced. In 2009 (Schierl et al. 2009) and 2013(Kiffmeyer et al. 325 2013), two large studies established from more than 1,200 wipe samplings and more than 100 hospitals or 326 community pharmacies, a mean level of contamination by 5FU and other cytotoxic drugs. For 5FU, although the 327 number of positive samples varied from 31% (LLQ 5FU = 11 pg.cm<sup>-2</sup>) to 74.4% (LLQ 5FU = 0.75 pg.cm<sup>-2</sup>), the  $75^{\text{th}}$  and  $90^{\text{th}}$  percentile from these studies were similar( $90^{\text{th}}$  percentile = 0.117 and 0.251 ng/cm<sup>2</sup>,  $75^{\text{th}}$  percentile 328 329 = 0.016 and 0.029 ng/cm<sup>2</sup>). The first study suggested technical guidance values based on the 50<sup>th</sup> ( $5.10^{-3}$ ng/cm<sup>2</sup>) 330 and the 75<sup>th</sup> percentile (0.03 ng/cm<sup>2</sup>)(Schierl et al. 2009).The second study recommended less strict technical 331 guidance values, based on the 90<sup>th</sup> percentile (0.1 ng/cm<sup>2</sup>). This guidance value is the same for all 8 cytotoxic 332 drugs tested in the study. This recommendation is based on two factors: the urgent need to improve the situation 333 in workplaces with high levels of contamination, and the possibility that the 75<sup>th</sup> percentile of most substances 334 will fall below the LLQ. Furthermore, this technical guidance value of 0.1 ng/cm<sup>2</sup>, applied to CP, is tenfold 335 lower than the USP <797> value (a content higher than 1 ng/cm<sup>2</sup>ofCP was found to cause human uptake). These 336 guidance values were established for pharmacies, asthere are fewer studies conducted in hospital wards. From 337 our knowledge, only one large study (Hedmer et al. 2012) conducted in 17 workplaces from 6 hospitals allowed 338 the authors to determine guidance values for hospital wards for CP and IF. In this study, the authors emphasized 339 on the heterogeneity of contamination among the different categories of tested surfaces. The suggested guidance 340 values were established from the 90<sup>th</sup> percentile, for each sort of surface.

341 Conclusion

342

The reliability of detection techniques is constantly improving. Multi-compound analyses allow fast and economical environmental monitoring. However, the constant decrease in detection limits inevitably leads to anincrease in positive samples. Without toxicological studies establishing a correlation between exposure values and health impact on healthcare workers, "as low as reasonably achievable" levels remain the gold standard.

347 The studies reviewed here underline the need to keep striving to better protect workers, at the same 348 timerevealingseveral working procedure problems. Environmental monitoring is a useful tool not only for local

- 349 contamination evaluation, but also to evaluate technologies involved in the cytotoxic drug circuit.Recommended
- dosing techniques should be used routinely in every place where cytotoxic exposure is suspected. Good practice
- 351 recommendations need to include environmental monitoring from the industrial process to the patient's home,
- 352 with a special focus on hospital pharmacies and care areas. Real awareness has emerged inseveral countries
- 353 regarding the overall management of cytotoxics, but international or at least national recommendations for
- are needed.
- 355

366

375

376

377

382

383

384

385

394

395

396

# 356 References357

- American Society of Health-System Pharmacists.(2006) ASHP guidelines on handling hazardous
   drugs.American Journal of Health-System Pharmacy, 63(12), 1172-1191.
- ANSM: French National Agency of Medicine and Health Products Safety. (2007) Bonnes pratiques de
   preparation, chapitre 7: Préparations de médicaments contenant des substances dangereuses pour le personnel
   et l'environnement. Ressource
   document.http://ansm.sante.fr/var/ansm\_site/storage/original/application/a5d6ae4b3d5fdee013ca463462b7b2
  - document.http://ansm.sante.fr/var/ansm\_site/storage/original/application/a5d6ae4b3d5fdee013ca463462b7b2 96.pdf Accessed 20 june 2016.[French]
- Baumann, F.; Preiss, R. (2001) Cyclophosphamide and related anticancer drugs.Journal of chromatography.B,
  Biomedical sciences and applications, 764(1-2), 173-192.
- Brouwers, E.E.;Huitema, A.D.; Bakker, E.N.;Douma, J.W.;Schimmel, K.J.; Van Weringh, G., et al. (2007)
  Monitoring of platinum surface contamination in seven Dutch hospital pharmacies using inductively coupled
  plasma mass spectrometry. International Archives of Occupational and Environmental Health, 80(8), 689699.
  - Bussières, J.F.; Tanguay, C.; Touzin, T. (2012) Environmental Contamination with Hazardous Drugs in Quebec Hospitals. Canadian Journal of Hospital Pharmacy, 65(6), 428-435.
- Castiglia, L.;Miraglia, N.; Pieri, M.;Simonelli, A.;Basilicata, P.;Genovese, G., et al.(2008)Evaluation of
  occupational exposure to antiblastic drugs in an Italian hospital oncological department.Journal of
  Occupational Health, 50(1), 48-56.
  - Cavallo, D.;Ursini, C.L.;Perniconi, B.; Di Francesco, A.;Giglio, M.;Rubino, F.M., et al. (2005) Evaluation of genotoxic effects induced by exposure to antineoplastic drugs in lymphocytes and exfoliated buccal cells of oncology nurses and pharmacy employees.Mutation Research, 587(1-2), 45-51.
- Connor, T.H.; Anderson, R.W.;Sessink, P.J.; Spivey, S.M. (2002) Effectiveness of a closed-system device in containing surface contamination with cyclophosphamide and ifosfamide in an i.v. admixture area. American Journal of Health-System Pharmacy, 59(1), 68-72.
- Connor, T.H.;Sessink, P.J.; Harrison, B.R.; Pretty, J.R.; Peters, B.G.; Alfaro, R.M., et al. (2005) Surface
  contamination of chemotherapy drug vials and evaluation of new vial-cleaning techniques: results of three
  studies.American Journal of Health-System Pharmacy, 62(5), 475-484.
  - Connor, T.H. (2006) Hazardous anticancer drugs in health care: environmental exposure assessment. Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences, 1076, 615-623.
- Connor, T.H.;DeBord, D.G.; Pretty, J.R.; Oliver, M.S.; Roth, T.S.; Lees, P.S., et al. (2010) Evaluation of
  Antineoplastic Drug Exposure of Health Care Workers at Three University-Based US Cancer Centers.
  Journal of Occupational and Environmental Medicine, 52(10), 1019-1027.

- 401 Crauste-Manciet, S.;Sessink, P.J.; Ferrari, S.;Jomier, J.Y.; Brossard, D. (2005) Environmental contamination
  402 with cytotoxic drugs in healthcare using positive air pressure isolators. Annals of Occupational Hygiene,
  403 49(7), 619-628.
- 405
  406
  406
  407
  407
  Donner, A.L. (1978) Possible risk of working with antineoplastic drugs in horizontal laminar flow hoods. American journal of hospital pharmacy, 35(8), 900.
- 408 Easty, A.C.; Coakley, N.; Cheng, R.;Cividino, M.; Savage, P.; Tozer, R., et al. (2015) Safe handling of cytotoxics: guideline recommendations.Current Oncology, 22(1), e27-37.
  410
- 411 Ensslin, A.S.;Pethran, A.;Schierl, R.;Fruhmann, G. (1994) Urinary platinum in hospital personnel occupationally
  412 exposed to platinum-containing antineoplastic drugs. International Archives of Occupational and
  413 Environmental Health, 65(5), 339-342.
- Favier, B.; Gilles, L.;Ardiet, C.;Latour, J.F. (2003) External contamination of vials containing cytotoxic agents
  supplied by pharmaceutical manufacturers. Journal of Oncology Pharmacy Practice, 9(1), 15-20.
- Fleury-Souverain, S.;Nussbaumer, S.;Mattiuzzo, M.;Bonnabry, P.(2014)Determination of the external contamination and cross-contamination by cytotoxic drugs on the surfaces of vials available on the Swiss market.Journal of Oncology Pharmacy Practice, 20(2), 100-111.
- Fransman, W.;Peelen, S.;Hilhorst, S.;Roeleveld, N.;Heederik, D.;Kromhouts, H. (2007) A pooled analysis to study trends in exposure to antineoplastic drugs among nurses. Annals of Occupational Hygiene, 51(3), 231-239.
- Fransman, W.;Huizer, D.;Tuerk, J.;Kromhout, H. (2007) Inhalation and dermal exposure to eight antineoplastic drugs in an industrial laundry facility.International Archives of Occupational and Environmental Health,80(5), 396-403.
- 429 Gilbar, P.J. (2005) External contamination of cytotoxic drug vials. Journal of Pharmacy Practice and Research,
   430 35(4), 264-265.
- Gilles, L.; Favier, B.;Catillon, F.; Dussart, C.; Peyron, F.;Simoens, X., et al. (2009) Optimisation des procédures
  de manipulation des chimiothérapies anticancéreuses : impact des contrôles de contamination
  environnementaux. Bulletin du Cancer, 96(9), 839-849. [French]
- Hedmer, M.;Jonsson, B.A.;Nygren, O. (2004) Development and validation of methods for environmental monitoring of cyclophosphamide in workplaces. Journal of Environmental Monitoring, 6(12), 979-984.
- Hedmer, M.; Wohlfart, G. (2012) Hygienic guidance values for wipe sampling of antineoplasic drugs in Swedish
  hospitals.Journal of Environmental Monitoring, 14(7), 1968-1675.
- Huizing, M.T.;Rosing, H.;Koopman, F.; Keung, A.C.;Pinedo, H.M.;Beijnen, J.H. (1995) High-performance
  liquid chromatographic procedures for the quantitative determination of paclitaxel (Taxol) in human urine.
  Journal of chromatography.B, Biomedical sciences and applications, 664(2), 373-382.
- International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC). (2016) IARC monographs.Ressource
   document.<u>http://monographs.iarc.fr/ENG/Classification/</u>. Accessed 20 june 2016.
- International Society of Oncology Pharmacy Practitioners Standards Committee. (2007) ISOPP standards of practice. Safe handling of cytotoxics. Journal of Oncology Pharmacy Practice, 13,1-81.
- Juhascik, M.P.; Jenkins, A.J.(2009) Comparison of Liquid/Liquid and Solid-Phase Extraction for Alkaline
   Drugs.Journal of Chromatographic Science, 47(7), 553-557.
- 454 Kiffmeyer, T.K.;Tuerk, J.; Hahn, M.;Stuetzer, H.;Hadtstein, C.; Heinemann, A., et al. (2013) Application and
  455 Assessment of a Regular Environmental Monitoring of the Antineoplastic Drug Contamination Level in
  456 Pharmacies The MEWIP Project. Annals of Occupational Hygiene, 57(4), 444-455.

- 458 Konate, A.; Poupon, J.; Villa, A.; Garnier, R.; Hasni-Pichard, H.; Mezzaroba, D., et al. (2011) Evaluation of 459 environmental contamination by platinum and exposure risks for healthcare workers during a heated 460 intraperitoneal perioperative chemotherapy (HIPEC) procedure. Journal of Surgical Oncology, 103(1), 6-9. 461
- 462 Kopp, B.; Crauste-Manciet, S.; Guibert, A.; Mourier, W.; Guerrault-Moro, M.N.; Ferrari, S., et al. (2013) 463 Environmental and biological monitoring of platinum-containing drugs in two hospital pharmacies using 464 positive air pressure isolators. Annals of Occupational Hygiene, 57(3), 374-383.

467

468 469

470

471

474

475 476

477

478

497

499

500 501

502

- Kosjek, T.; Perko, S.; Žigon, D, Heath, E. (2013) Fluorouracil in the environment: analysis, occurrence, degradation and transformation. Journal of Chromatography A, 1290, 62-72.
- Krstey, S.; Perunicić, B.; Vidacović, A. (2003) Work practice and some adverse health effects in nurses handling antineoplastic drugs.MedicinadelLavoro, 94(5), 432-439.
- 472 Lee, S.G.; Tkaczuk, M.; Jankewicz, G.; Ambados, F. (2007) Surface Contamination from Cytotoxic 473 Chemotherapy Following Preparation and Administration. Journal of Pharmacy Practice and Research, 37(4), 271-276.
  - Mason, H.J.; Blair, S.; Sams, C.; Jones, K.; Garfitt, S.J.; Cuschieri, M.J., et al. (2005) Exposure to antineoplastic drugs in two UK hospital pharmacy units. Annals of Occupational Hygiene, 49(7), 603-610.
- 479 McDevitt, J.J.; Lees, P.S.; McDiarmid, M.A. (1993) Exposure of hospital pharmacists and nurses to 480 antineoplastic agents. Journal of Occupational Medicine, 35(1), 57-60. 481
- 482 McDiarmid, M.A.; Rogers, B.; Oliver, M.S. (2014) Chromosomal effects of non-alkylating drug exposure in 483 oncology personnel. Environmental and Molecular Mutagenesis, 55(4), 369-374. 484
- 485 Meijster, T.;Fransman, W.; Veldhof, R.;Kromhout, H. (2006) Exposure to antineoplastic drugs outside the 486 hospital environment. Annals of Occupational Hygiene, 50(7), 657-664. 487
- 488 Micoli, G.; Turci, R.; Arpellini, M.; Minoia, C. (2001) Determination of 5-fluorouracil in environmental samples 489 by solid-phase extraction and high-performance liquid chromatography with ultraviolet detection. Journal of 490 chromatography.B, Biomedical sciences and applications, 750(1), 25-32. 491
- 492 Minoia, C.; Turci, R.; Sottani, C.; Schiavi, A.; Perbellini, L.; Angeleri, S., et al. (1998) Application of high-493 performance liquid-chromatography tandem mass-spectrometry in the environmental and biological 494 monitoring of health-care personnel occupationally exposed to cyclophosphamide and ifosfamide. Rapid 495 Communications in Mass Spectrometry, 12(20), 1485-1493. 496
- Naito, T.; Osawa, T.; Suzuki, N.; Goto, T.; Takada, A.; Nakamichi, H., et al. (2012) Comparison of 498 contamination levels on the exterior surfaces of vials containing platinum anticancer drugs in Japan. Biological and Pharmaceutical Bulletin, 35(11), 2043-2049.
  - Ng, L.M.; Jaffe, N. (1970) Possible hazards of handling antineoplastic drugs. Pediatrics, 46(4), 648-649.
- 503 NIOSH (National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health). (2004) NIOSH Alert: Preventing Occupational 504 Exposures to Antineoplastic and Other Hazardous Drugs in Health Care Settings. No. 2004–165. Atlanta 505 (GA): Department of Health and Human Services (US), Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. 506 Ressource document.www.cdc.gov/niosh/docs/2004-165/. Accessed 20 june 2016. 507
- 508 NIOSH (National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health). (2014) NIOSH list of antineoplastic drugs and 509 other hazardous drugs in healthcare settings, No. 2014-138. Atlanta (GA): Department of Health and Human 510 Services (US), Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Ressource 511 document.www.cdc.gov/niosh/docs/2014-138/. Accessed 20 june 2016.
- 513 Nussbaumer, S.; Fleury-Souverain, S.;Antinori, P.;Sadeghipour, F.;Hochstrasser, D.F.;Bonnabry, P., et al. 514 (2010) Simultaneous quantification of ten cytotoxic drugs by a validated LC-ESI-MS/MS method. Analytical 515 and Bioanalytical Chemistry, 398(7-8), 3033-3042. 516

- 523 525 527 529 532 535
- Nussbaumer, S.;Geiser, L.;Sadeghipour, F.;Hochstrasser, D.;Bonnabry, P.;Veuthey, J.L., et al.(2012) Wipe
  sampling procedure coupled to LC-MS/MS analysis for the simultaneous determination of 10 cytotoxic drugs
  on different surfaces. Analytical and Bioanalytical Chemistry,402(8), 2499-2509.
  - Nygren, O.; Gustavsson, B.; Strom, L.; Friberg, A. (2002) Cisplatin contamination observed on the outside of drug vials. Annals of Occupational Hygiene, 46(6), 555-557.
  - OSHA (Occupational Safety and Health Administration, United States Department of Labor).(1999)Controlling Occupational Exposure to Hazardous Drugs.OSHA Technical Manual, Section VI, Chapter 2.Ressource document. <u>https://www.osha.gov/dts/osta/otm/otm\_vi/otm\_vi\_2.html</u>. Accessed 20 june 2016.
  - Pethran, A.;Schierl, R.;Hauff, K.; Grimm, C.H.; Boos, K.S.; Nowak, D. (2003) Uptake of antineoplastic agents in pharmacy and hospital personnel. Part I: monitoring of urinary concentrations. International Archives of Occupational and Environmental Health, 76:5-10.
  - Randolph, S.A. (2012) (NIOSH) Hazardous Drugs in Health Care Settings Recognition and Control.Workplace Health and Safety, 60(9), 412.
  - Rombaldi, F.; Cassini, C.; Salvador, M.;Saffi, J.;Erdtmann, B. (2009) Occupational risk assessment of genotoxicity and oxidative stress in workers handling anti-neoplastic drugs during a working week.Mutagenesis, 24(2), 143-148.
  - Sabatini, L.; Barbieri, A.; Tosi, M.; Violante, F.S. (2005) A new high-performance liquid chromatographic/ electrospray ionization tandem mass spectrometric method for the simultaneous determination of cyclophosphamide, methotrexate and 5-fluorouracil as markers of surface contamination for occupational exposure monitoring. Journal of Mass Spectrometry, 40(5), 669-674.
  - Schierl, R.;Böhlandt, A.; Nowak, D. (2009) Guidance Values for Surfaces Monitoring of Antineoplasic Drugs in German Pharmacies. Annals of Occupational Hygiene, 53(7), 703-711.
  - Schierl, R.; Herwig, A.;Pfaller, A.;Groebmair, S.; Fischer, E.(2010) Surface contamination of antineoplastic drug vials: comparison of unprotected and protected vials. American Journal of Health-System Pharmacy, 67(6), 428-429.
  - Schierl, R.;Masini, C.;Groeneveld, S.; Fischer, E.;Böhlandt, A.;Rosini, V., et al. (2016) Environmental contamination by cyclophosphamide preparation: Comparison of conventional manual production in biological safety cabinet and robot-assisted production by APOTECAchemo. Journal of Oncology Pharmacy Practice, 22(1), 37-45.
  - Schmaus, G.;Schierl, R.;Funck, S. (2002) Monitoring surface contamination by antineoplastic drugs using gas chromatography-mass spectrometry and voltammetry. American Journal of Health-System Pharmacy, 59(10), 956-961.
  - Schreiber C.; Radon K.;Pethran A.;Schierl R.;Hauff K.; Grimm C.H. (2003) Uptake of antineoplastic agents in pharmacy personnel. Part II study of work-related risk factors.International Archives of Occupational and Environmental Health, 76(1), 11-16.
  - Sessink, P.J.; Boer, K.A.;Scheefhals, A.P.;Anzion, R.B.;Bos, R.P. (1992) Occupational exposure to antineoplastic agents at several departments in a hospital. Environmental contamination and excretion of cyclophosphamide and ifosfamide in urine of exposed workers.International Archives of Occupational and Environmental Health, 64(2), 105-112.
  - Sessink, P.J.; Connor, T.H.; Jorgenson, J.A.; Tyler, T.G. (2011) Reduction in surface contamination with antineoplastic drugs in 22 hospital pharmacies in the US following implementation of a closed-system drug transfer device. Journal of Oncology Pharmacy Practice, 17(1), 39-48.
  - Sessink, P.J.;Leclercq, G.M.;Wouters, D.M.;Halbardier, L.;Hammad, C.;Kassoul, N. (2015) Environmental contamination, product contamination and workers exposure using a robotic system for antineoplastic drug preparation. Journal of Oncology Pharmacy Practice, 21(2), 118-127.

- 577 Siderov, J.;Kirsa, S.;McLauchlan, R. (2010) Reducing workplace cytotoxic surface contamination using a 578 closed-system drug transfer device. Journal of Oncology Pharmacy Practice, 16(1), 19-25. 579
  - Smith, J.P.; Sammons, D.L.; Pretty, J.R.; Kurtz, K.S.; Robertson, S.A.; DeBord, D.G., et al. (2016) Detection of 5-fluorouracil surface contamination in near real time. Journal of Oncology Pharmacy Practice, 22(1), 60-67.

581

582 583

584

585

586 587

588

589

590

591 592

593

594

595 596

597

598

599 600

601

602 603

604

605

606 607

608

609

610 611

612

613

614 615

616

617

618 619

620

621

622 623

624 625

- Sottani, C.;Turci, R.;Micoli, G.;Fiorentino, M.L.;Minoia, C. (2000) Rapid and sensitive determination of paclitaxel (Taxol) in environmental samples by high- performance liquid chromatography tandem mass spectrometry. Rapid Communications in Mass Spectrometry, 14(10), 930-935.
- Sottani, C.;Turci, R.;Schierl, R.;Gaggeri, R.; Barbieri, A.;Violante, F.S., et al. (2007) Simultaneous determination of gemcitabine, taxol, cyclophosphamide and ifosfamide in wipe samples by high-performance liquid chromatography/tandem mass spectrometry: protocol of validation and uncertainty of measurement. Rapid Communications in Mass Spectrometry, 21(7), 1289-1296.
- Sottani, C.; Porro, B.; Comelli, M.; Imbriani, M.; Minoia, C. (2010) An analysis to study trends in occupational exposure to antineoplastic drugs among health care workers. Journal of chromatography.B, Biomedical sciences and applications, 878(27), 2593-2605.
- Stücker, I.; Mandereau, L.; Hémon, D. (1993) Relationship between birthweight and occupational exposure to cytostatic drugs during or before pregnancy.Scandinavian Journal of Work, Environment & Health, 19(3), 148-153.
- Tkaczuk, M.; Lee, S.G.; Jankewicz, G.; Ambados, F. (2010) Surface contamination of cytotoxic drug 5fluorouracil (5-FU) and decontamination. Journal of Health, Safety and Environment, 26(2), 171-181.
- Touzin, K.;Bussières, J.F.;Langlois, E.; Lefebvre, M.; Gallant, C. (2008) Cyclophosphamide contamination observed on the external surfaces of drug vials and the efficacy of cleaning on vial contamination. Annals of Occupational Hygiene, 52(8), 765-771.
- Tuerk, J.;Kiffmeyer, T.K.;Hadtstein, C.; Heinemann, A.; Hahn, M.;Stuetzer, M., et al. (2011) Development and validation of an LC-MS/MS procedure for environmental monitoring of eight cytostatic drugs in pharmacies.International Journal of Environmental Analytical Chemistry, 91(12), 1178-1190.
- Turci, R.;Micoli,G.;Minoia, C. (2000) Determination of methotrexate in environmental samples by solid phase extraction and high performance liquid chromatography: ultraviolet or tandem mass spectrometry detection? Rapid Communications in Mass Spectrometry, 14(8), 685-691.
- Turci, R.;Sottani, C.;Spagnoli, G.;Minoia, C. (2003) Biological and environmental monitoring of hospital personnel exposed to antineoplastic agents: a review of analytical methods. Journal of chromatography.B, Biomedical sciences and applications, 789(2), 169-209.
- Turci, R.; Minoia, C. (2006) Residual hazard assessment related to handling of antineoplastic drugs: safety system evolution and quality assurance of analytical measurement. Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences, 1076, 649-656.
- USP <797>(2004).Guidebook to pharmaceutical compounding-sterile preparations. In: The United States pharmacopeia [28th rev] – The national formulary [23rd ed] (pp 2461-2477). Rockville (MD): United States Pharmacopeial Convention.
- Valanis, B.G.; Vollmer, W.M.;Labuhn, K.T.; Glass, A.G. (1993) Association of antineoplastic drug handling with acute adverse effects in pharmacy personnel. American journal of hospital pharmacy, 50(3), 455-462.
- 627 628 629 630 Valanis, B.G.; Vollmer, W.M.; Steele, P. (1999)Occupational exposure to antineoplastic agents: self-reported 631 miscarriages and stillbirths among nurses and pharmacists. Journal of Occupational and Environmental 632 Medicine, 41(8), 632-638.
- 633 Wick, C.;Slawson, M.H.; Jorgenson, J.A.; Tyler, L.S. (2003) Using a closed-system protective device to reduce 634 personnel exposure to antineoplastic agents. American Journal of Health-System Pharmacy, 60(22), 2314-635 2320. 636

637 638 639 640 641	Working Committee on the Safe Handling of Hazardous Drugs.(2008) Prevention guide: safe handling of hazardous drugs. Montréal (QC): Association paritaire pour la santé et la sécurité au travail du secteur des affaires sociales. Ressource document.www.irsst.qc.ca/media/documents/PubIRSST/CG-002.pdf. Accessed 20 june 2016.
642	World Health Organization, regional office for Europe (2002)Good Practice in Occupational Health Services: A
643	Contribution to Workplace Health. Ressource document.
644 645	http://www.euro.who.int/data/assets/pdf_file/0007/115486/E77650.pdf. Accessed 11 november 2016.
646 647 648	Yuki, M.;Sekine, S.;Takase, K.; Ishida, T.;Sessink, P.J. (2013) Exposure of family members to antineoplastic drugs via excreta of treated patients. Journal of Oncology Pharmacy Practice, 19(3), 208-217.
649 650 651 652	Yuki, M.; Ishida, T.;Sekine, S. (2015) Secondary exposure of family members to cyclophosphamide after chemotherapy of outpatients with cancer: a pilot study. Oncology Nursing Forum,42(6), 665-671.