



Designation: F 748 – 9804

Standard Practice for Selecting Generic Biological Test Methods for Materials and Devices¹

This standard is issued under the fixed designation F 748; the number immediately following the designation indicates the year of original adoption or, in the case of revision, the year of last revision. A number in parentheses indicates the year of last reapproval. A superscript epsilon (ϵ) indicates an editorial change since the last revision or reapproval.

1. Scope

1.1 This practice recommends generic biological test methods for materials and devices according to end-use applications. While chemical testing for extractable additives and residual monomers or residues from processing aids is necessary for most implant materials, such testing is not included as part of this ~~standard~~ practice. The reader is cautioned that the area of materials biocompatibility testing is a rapidly evolving field, and improved methods are evolving rapidly, so this ~~standard~~ practice is by necessity only a guideline. A thorough knowledge of current techniques and research is critical to a complete evaluation of new materials.

1.2 These test protocols are intended to apply to materials and medical devices for human application. Biological evaluation of materials and devices, and related subjects such as pyrogen testing, batch testing of production lots, and so on, are also discussed. Tests include those performed on materials, end products, and extracts. Rationale and comments on current state of the art are included for all test procedures described.

1.3 The biocompatibility of materials used in single or multicomponent medical devices for human use depends to a large degree on the particular nature of the end-use application. Biological reactions that are detrimental to the success of a material in one device application may have little or no bearing on the successful use of the material for a different application. It is, therefore, not possible to specify a set of biocompatibility test methods which will be necessary and sufficient to establish biocompatibility for all materials and applications.

1.4 The ethical use of research animals places the obligation on the individual investigator to determine the most efficient methods for performing the necessary testing without undue use of animals. Where adequate prior data exists to substantiate certain types of safety information, these guidelines should not be interpreted to mean that testing should be unnecessarily repeated.

1.5 *This standard does not purport to address all of the safety concerns, if any, associated with its use. It is the responsibility of the user of this standard to establish appropriate safety and health practices and determine the applicability of regulatory limitations prior to use.*

2. Referenced Documents

2.1 *ASTM Standards:*²

E 12602 Guide for Development of Micronucleus Assay Standards

E 1262 Guide for Performance of the Chinese Hamster Ovary Cell/Hypoxanthine Guanine Phosphoribosyl Transferase Gene Mutation Assay

E 128063 Guide for Performance Conduct of Micronucleus Assays in Mammalian Bone Marrow Erythrocytes

E 1280 Guide for Performing the Mouse Lymphoma Assay for Mammalian Cell Mutagenicity

E 1397 Practice for the *in vitro* Rat Hepatocyte DNA Repair Assay

E 1398 Practice for the *in vivo* Rat Hepatocyte DNA Repair Assay

~~F 619 Standard Practice~~ 619 Practice for Extraction of Medical Plastics

F 719 Practice for Testing Biomaterials in Rabbits for Primary Skin Irritation

F 720 Practice for Testing Guinea Pigs for Contact Allergens: Guinea Pig Maximization Test

F 749 Practice for Evaluating Material Extracts by Intracutaneous Injection in the Rabbit

F 750 Practic for Evaluating Material Extracts by Systemic Injection in the Mouse

F 756 Practice for Assessment of the Hemolytic Properties of Materials

¹ This practice is under the jurisdiction of ASTM Committee F04 on Medical and Surgical Materials and Devices and is direct responsibility of Subcommittee F04.16 on Biocompatibility Test Methods.

Current edition approved August 10, 1998; May 1, 2004. Published October 1998; June 2004. Originally published as F 748 – 82; approved in 1982. Last previous edition approved in 1998 as F 748 – 958.

² For referenced ASTM standards, visit the ASTM website, www.astm.org, or contact ASTM Customer Service at service@astm.org. For *Annual Book of ASTM Standards*, Vol 11.04, volume information, refer to the standard's Document Summary page on the ASTM website.

- F 763 Practice for Short-Term Screening of Implant Materials
- F 813 Practice for Direct Contact Cell Culture Evaluation of Materials for Medical Devices
- F 895 Test Method for Agar Diffusion Cell Culture Screening for Cytotoxicity
- F 981 Practice for Assessment of Compatibility of Biomaterials for Surgical Implants with Respect to Effect of Materials on Muscle and Bone
- F 1027 Practice for Assessment of Tissue and Cell Compatibility of Orofacial Prosthetic Materials and Devices
- F 1408 Practice for Subcutaneous Screening Test for Implant Materials
- F 1439 Guide for Performance of Lifetime Bioassay for the Tumorigenic Potential of Implant Materials
- F 1877 Practice for Characterization of Particles
- F 1903 Practice for Testing for Biological Responses to Particles *in vitro*
- F 1904 Practice for Testing the Biological Responses to Particles *in vivo*
- F 1905 Practice for Selecting Tests for Determining the Propensity of Materials to Cause Immunotoxicity
- F 1906 Practice for Evaluation of Immune Responses In Biocompatibility Testing Using ELISA Tests, Lymphocyte, Proliferation, and Cell Migration
- F 1983 Practice for Assessment of Compatibility of Absorbable/Resorbable Biomaterials for Implant Applications
- F 1984 Practice for Testing for Whole Complement Activation in Serum by Solid Materials
- F 2065 Practice for Testing for Alternative Pathway Complement Activation in Serum by Solid Materials
- F 2147 Practice for Guinea Pig: Split Adjuvant and Closed Patch Testing for Contact Allergens
- F 2148 Practice for Evaluation of Delayed Contact Hypersensitivity Using the Murine Local Lymph Node Assay (LLNA)
- F 2151 Practice for Assessment of White Blood Cell Morphology After Contact with Materials

2.2 *Other Referenced Documents:*

ISO/AAMI/ANSI 10993-1 Biological Testing of Medical and Dental Materials and Devices - Part 1: Guidance on Selection of Tests³

EN 30993-1 Biological Testing of Medical and Dental Materials and Devices - Part 1: Guidance on Selection of Tests³

General Program Memorandum #G95-1 FDA⁴

Immunotoxicity Testing Guidance-FDA⁵⁻⁴

3. Summary of Practice

3.1 A matrix listing biological test methods versus materials (devices) and their applications is included in Table 1. The expected duration of use of the device is also considered. Intra-operative is less than 24 h, short-term is up to and including 30 days, chronic is greater than 30 days. The position of row and column intersection is marked to indicate whether the test is recommended for a material or device for the specific application indicated. The terms relating to device or material type and application are addressed in Section 5. Discussion of applicability, current state of the art, and rationale for individual test methods also appears in that section.

4. Significance and Use

4.1 The objective of this practice is to recommend sufficient biological testing to establish a reasonable level of confidence concerning the biological response to a material or device, while at the same time avoiding unnecessary testing.

4.2 This document practice is intended to provide guidance to the materials investigator in selecting the proper procedures to be carried out for the screening of new or modified materials. Because each material and each implant situation involves its own unique circumstances, these recommendations should be modified as necessary and do not constitute the only testing that will be required for a material nor should these guidelines be interpreted as minimum requirements for any particular situation. While an attempt has been made to provide recommendation for different implant circumstances, some of the recommended testing may not be necessary or reasonable for a specific material or application.

5. Classification of Materials and Devices by End-Use Applications

5.1 *General:*

5.1.1 When new materials are sought for a medical application for use on humans, the material(s) may comprise the whole final device product, or may be one of many component materials in the device. The first step is a thorough literature search for previous use of the material or biocompatibility testing studies to ~~assure~~ ensure that it has not been known to produce an adverse biological response that exceeds the expected benefit in the use of the device. Note that the final fabricated product may differ chemically, physically, or biologically from the raw materials used to fabricate the product due to processing and this has to be considered when designing test protocols. For some devices, it may be necessary or desirable to take material test samples directly from the final

Annual Book of ASTM Standards, Vol 13.01.

³ Available from American National Standards Institute (ANSI), 25 W. 43rd St., 4th Floor, New York, NY 10036.

⁴ Available from American National Standards Institute (ANSI), 25 W. 43rd St., 4th Floor, New York, NY 10036; CDRH, 5600 Fishers Ln., Rockville, MD 20857.

TABLE 1 Applicable Tests

Classification of Material or Device and Application	Cell Culture Cytotoxicity	Sensitization	Skin Irritation or Intra-cutaneous	Mucous Membrane Irritation	Systemic Toxicity, Acute or Subchronic	Blood Compatibility	Hemolysis	Pyrogen Test	Short-term Implantation	Long-term Implantation	Immune Response	Genotoxicity	Carcinogenicity
External devices													
Intact surfaces (all time periods)	x	x	x										
Breached surfaces													
Intraoperative	x	x	x		x								
Short-Term	x	x	x									x	
Chronic	x	x	x										
External Devices Communicating with:													
Intact Natural Channels													
Intraoperative	x	x	x	x					x				
Short-term	x	x	x	x	x				x				
Chronic	x	x	x	x					x				x
Body Tissues and Fluids													
Intraoperative	x	x	x	x	x			i ^A	x				
Short-term	x	x	x	x	x			i ^A	x				
Chronic	x	x	x	x	x			i ^A	x				x
Blood Path, indirect													
Intraoperative	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x				
Short-term	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x				
Chronic	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x				
Blood Path, direct													
Intraoperative	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x				
Short-term	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x				
Chronic	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x				x
Implanted Devices principally contacting Bone/Tissue/tissue fluid													
Intraoperative	x	x	x	x	x				x				
Short-term	x	x	x	x	x				x				
Chronic	x	x	x	x	x				x				
Blood													
Intraoperative	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x				
Short-term	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x				x
Chronic	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x				x

^A (i) Pyrogenicity testing may be considered for all devices contacting the central nervous system.

device product. Samples should be fully representative of the finished product in terms of processing, cleaning, packaging, sterilization, and any other procedures that are performed on the materials before the device is used.

5.1.2 At this point, preliminary material screening may be employed, depending on the expertise of the organizations evaluating the materials. Since preliminary screening is normally an option to minimize the economic impact of a candidate material failing final biological tests after extensive time and effort, it is not a required procedure. The investigator should be aware that, should an adverse tissue response be observed with a final product, it may be impossible to determine which component or process is responsible without these initial screening tests.

5.1.3 This practice addresses two dimensions of tissue-material interactions: duration and tissue type. A third dimension, which should be considered, is the relative size difference between the host and the material, that is, to how much material surface area is the host exposed. The material surface area to body weight ratio may become a significant factor for porous materials, and devices of repeated short-term applications (for example, dialysis products). While this practice does not address the issue of “intensity factor” of increased surface area, the biocompatibility testing facility personnel should consider it in their material screening and testing protocol design.

5.1.4 For the purposes of this document, devices, practice, devices and the materials that comprise them; are classified as to end-use human application as outlined in 5.2-5.4.

5.2 External Devices:

5.2.1 *Devices That Contact Intact Body Surfaces Only*—examples include electrodes, splints, external prostheses, certain dressings, monitors of various types, or ostomy appliances.

5.2.2 *Devices That Contact Breached Body Surfaces*—examples include ulcer, burn, and granulation tissue dressings, or healing devices.

5.3 Externally Communicating Devices :

5.3.1 *Devices Communicating with Intact Natural Channels:*

5.3.1.1 *Intraoperative (<24 hours)*—examples include intrainestinal devices (such as sigmoidoscopes, colonoscopes, stomach tubes, or gastroscopes), tracheal tubes, bronchoscopes and any parts of ancillary equipment that are in contact with materials entering the body, and irrigation sets.

5.3.1.2 *Short-term (up to and including 30 days)*—examples include contact lenses, urinary catheters, and intravaginal devices.

5.3.1.3 *Chronic (>30 days)*—examples include urinary catheters for chronic use and intrauterine devices.

5.3.2 *Devices Communicating with Body Tissues and Fluids:*

5.3.2.1 *Intraoperative (<24 hours)* —examples include hypodermic needles, penetrating electrodes, biopsy instruments, arthroscopes, laparoscopes, irrigation equipment, surgical instruments, trochars, and any parts of ancillary equipment that are in contact with materials entering the body.

5.3.2.2 *Short-term (up to and including 30 days)*—examples include cranial calipers, perfusion apparatus, drainage apparatus, stabilizing orthopedic devices, and any parts of ancillary equipment that are in contact with material entering the body.

5.3.2.3 *Chronic (>30 days)*—examples include percutaneous electrodes, active penetrating electrodes, stapedectomy prostheses, partial and total ossicular replacement prostheses, or tympanoplasty ventilation tubes.

5.3.3 *Blood Path, Indirect*—Products contacting blood path at one point for usually less than 24 hours, and serves as a conduit for fluid entry into the vascular system. Examples include solution administration sets, extension sets, transfer sets, or blood administration sets.

5.3.3.1 Products that are used for >24 hours or that are used repeatedly in the same patient will be considered as chronic usage and should undergo extended testing.

5.3.4 *Blood, Path, Direct*—Single recirculating blood exposure or product is in blood path generally less than 24 hours. Examples include intravenous catheters, oxygenators, extracorporeal oxygenator tubing and accessories.

5.3.5 *Blood Path, Direct, Short Term, or Chronic, or repeated exposure*—Examples include dialyzers or dialysis tubing and accessories, shunts.

5.4 Implanted Long-Term Devices :

5.4.1 *Devices Principally Contacting Bones*—examples include orthopedic pins, screws, replacement joints, bone prostheses, cements, or dental implants.

5.4.2 *Devices Principally Residing in the Subcutaneous Space*—examples include pacemakers, neuromuscular stimulators, facial augmentation devices, tissue expander devices, and breast prostheses.

5.4.3 *Devices Principally Contacting Soft Tissue and Tissue Fluids*—examples include drug supply devices, neuromuscular sensors, replacement tendons, penile, and other implants, cerebrospinal fluid drains, artificial larynx, vas deferens valves, or ligation clips.

5.4.4 *Devices Principally Contacting Blood*—examples include pacemaker leads, artificial arteriovenous fistulae, heart valves, vascular grafts, stents, blood monitors, internal drug delivery catheters, or ventricular assist pumps.

6. Selection of Test Procedures

6.1 General—:

6.1.1 Biocompatibility testing involves tests of either the material itself, or an extract from it, or both, depending on the nature of the end-use application. While this practice does not address specific chemical methods for evaluating the extractable substances

or residuals from implant materials, several of the recommended tests (see 6.2, 6.7, 6.6, and 6.3) utilize extracts rather than the original material for testing. If sensitive chemical assay techniques (such as GC, HPLC, and AA) should reveal no detectable substances being extracted into the medium, consideration may be given to deletion of these tests from the test battery. The investigator is cautioned, however, that the detection limit of the analytical chemistry procedures may not be adequate to detect trace extractables that may generate a tissue response. Before analysis of extracts is substituted for actual biocompatibility testing of the extracts, validation procedures may be necessary to show the relative tissue response to levels of extractable which are slightly above the detection limit. It is particularly appropriate that animal testing involving extracts be considered for deletion if there are no detectable substances being extracted.

6.1.2 If the material to be tested is being tested in the form of particles, characterization of the particles in accordance with Practice F 1877 should be performed so that the particles can be fully described and their relevance to clinical usage situations evaluated.

6.2 *Cell Culture Cytotoxicity Assays*—This test evaluates *in vitro* toxicity of substrate materials to cultured cells.

6.2.1 Generally, materials that do not pass the cytotoxicity assays are not considered for further biocompatibility testing and are not used in devices for human application. Thus, the direct relation between results of cytotoxicity testing and biocompatibility of materials has not been documented and there is some controversy as to the value of the testing since some good materials may be excluded and some others that are not biocompatible may pass this test. Cytotoxicity testing is recommended as an early screening test and also to provide information that will aid in the development of cytotoxicity tests predictive of *in vivo* performance.

6.2.2 Several different tests are included under this heading, such as Agar Diffusion, Fluid Medium, Agar Overlay, Flask Dilution, ~~etc.~~ and so forth. All of these tests emphasize *in vitro* toxicity of either substrate materials or extract solutions to cultured cells. Cellular damage is observed and graded. Two available versions are included in Practice F 813 and Test Method F 895. An application-specific method is included in Practice F 1027. An HIMA/PMA guideline is available from the FDA for a discussion and references on other versions of this test.

6.2.3 Since the biological reaction to particles generated during function may differ from the reaction to soluble products, *in vitro* testing of macrophage/monocyte interaction with representative particles (Practice F 1903) may be considered.

6.3 *Sensitization Test*—The guinea pig maximization test (Practice F 720) is a procedure whereby the material (or extracts thereof) is mixed with Freund's complete adjuvant and administered to the test animals during a 2-week induction period. After 2 weeks' rest, the guinea pigs are challenged with the test substance and the skin graded for allergic reaction after 24 hours. Other test methods such as the guinea pig split adjuvant and closed patch test (Practice F 2147) or the repeated dermal patch may also be used. The mouse local lymph node assay (Practice F 2148) should be considered as an alternative to the guinea pig maximization test. Controls are necessary for all tests.

6.3.1 These tests are for sensitization of the cell mediated type (Type IV). Since there are concerns about materials causing sensitization of the atopic type (Type I), measurement of IgE antibodies in test animals should also be considered. Similarly, measurement of IgE antibodies in humans in clinical trials may be considered.

6.4 *Skin Irritation Assay*—This is a patch test on the skin of rabbits, and after 24 hours the patches are removed and skin graded for erythema and edema. One available version is included in Practice F 719.

6.5 *Mucous Membrane Irritation*—The end use of the device product must be considered when deciding what tests to undertake. In some circumstances, the mucous membrane should be considered for the testing site. Numerous tests utilizing different mucous membranes and different animals have been reported. There remains some controversy about the applicability of the results of these tests to human clinical use. The material investigator should consider the appropriateness of a particular test site and published discussion of these methods when planning testing. The intracutaneous irritation test (see section 6.6) may be the more suitable test.

6.6 *Intracutaneous Injection (Irritation) Assay*—This assay is designed to determine biological response of rabbits to the single-dose intracutaneous injection of appropriate extracts prepared from test samples. All rabbits are observed for signs of erythema (tissue redness) and edema (tissue swelling) at the injection site for periods up to 72 h. Significant reactions are recorded and the test extract is graded. A USP test has been in use for many years, and Practice F 749 may be consulted for additional information.

6.7 *Systemic Injection (Acute Toxicity) Assay*—This assay is designed to determine the biological response of animals (mice) to the single-dose intravenous or intraperitoneal injection of extracts prepared from test samples. The preferred extracts are saline, vegetable oil, or other liquids simulating body fluids or the vehicles of pharmaceutical products that may contact and potentially extract the material before reaching the patient. All mice are observed for signs of toxicity immediately after injection and again at specified intervals. Significant responses are recorded, and the test extract is graded. A USP procedure has been in use for many years, and many variations exist, including Practice F 750.

6.8 *Blood Compatibility*—Hemolysis and thrombosis are the most obvious examples of blood materials incompatibility, although adverse effects on plasma proteins, enzymes, and formed blood elements can also occur. One such method for screening for the adverse effects on formed blood elements is Practice F 2151. Thrombogenicity can be studied through specifically designed *in vitro*, or *ex vivo* procedures specific to the type of product being tested. Normally these tests are dynamic, simulated in-use

procedures, with each being developed specifically by the organization interested in evaluating the device in question. Hemolysis is covered in 6.9.

6.9 *Hemolysis*—While hemolysis testing is frequently performed in combination with other tests for blood compatibility as specified in 6.8, several methods are in use whereby both materials and extracts are utilized for determining hemolysis. Test rods and extracts of the materials are incubated with human or rabbit blood in dynamic and static test tubes. The amount of plasma hemoglobin is measured and compared to reference materials and controls. Practice F 756 describes one method for the performance of hemolysis testing. In addition, hemolysis may be evaluated in finished devices by means of dynamic *in vitro*, *in vivo*, or *ex vivo* procedures designed to emphasize the hemolytic effect of the entire device. These tests tend to be proprietary to the various organizations who employ them.

6.10 *Complement Activation*—The interaction of blood with some materials, especially large surfaces (such as in dialysis membranes), may lead to the activation of the complement cascade leading to patient morbidity. Testing for activation of the various complement components using *in vitro* systems is available and recommended for blood contacting materials and devices. Two test methods may be found in Practices F 1984 and F 2065.

6.11 *Pyrogenicity*—Pyrogenic (fever producing) substances are either components of bacteria (gram negative bacterial cell membranes (called endotoxin predominately) or lipopolysaccharide (LPS); fungi (rarely) or are chemical in origin, called chemical pyrogens. Sterile devices designed to contact the human vascular system origin. The latter are most commonly labeled “nonpyrogenic,” and each batch known as “material-mediated” pyrogens. The most common causes of product is tested for pyrogenicity by either the USP Rabbit Test are endotoxins or lipopolysaccharide (LPS) of gram negative bacterial cell wall membranes, which can be detected in the Limulus Amebocyte Lysate Test (LAL) test (USP bacterial endotoxin test). While endotoxin contamination is detectable by either Endotoxins are also detected using the USP rabbit test or the LAL test, use which will detect all types of the LAL test for endotoxin detection is the preferred method whenever possible. Substances pyrogens, including material-mediated pyrogens. Sterile devices that are LAL positive should not be tested by the rabbit test. Chemical pyrogens can only be detected by demonstrated as passing either the USP rabbit test or the LAL test are commonly labeled as “non-pyrogenic” and this may each batch of product is tested for pyrogenicity (unless a different schedule can be adopted based on LAL negative substances: historical data, process validation, or controls).

6.11.1 Since depyrogenating endotoxin-contaminated devices is difficult, costly, and often impractical, pyrogen testing is sometimes performed on incoming raw materials or components as a screening method. The LAL test should be used for these LPS screening purposes for LPS before any rabbit test for chemical material-mediated pyrogens. If the identities of possible chemical material-mediated pyrogens is are known, every effort should be made to detect chemical material-mediated pyrogens by analytical or other means not involving the USP rabbit test.

6.12 *Implantation Tests*—The end-use application should be considered when choosing the most suitable site for testing.

6.12.1 *Short-Term Subcutaneous Implantation Test*—Since many implants are intended specifically for subcutaneous use, it is important to consider the reaction of this tissue space to implants and materials. The potential for mobility of implants and tissue of the subcutaneous plane makes this site significantly different from other tissue implantation sites. Inflammatory responses may be increased with motion. Practice F 1408 provides one method for short-term implant testing in a subcutaneous site.

6.12.2 *Short-Term Intramuscular Implantation Test*—This type of test is designed to evaluate the reaction of living tissue to a sample material that is surgically implanted into animal tissue (preferably the rabbit, but larger animals (such as the dog) may be considered where necessary). At the conclusion of the assay period, the sites of implantation are examined for significant reaction, and the test material is graded. A USP test has been in use for many years and 7- and 30-day evaluation is available in Practice F 763.

6.12.3 *Implantation Testing for the Biological Response to Particles*—Practice F 1904 is an intermediate-term test to evaluate the unique responses that may occur when materials are introduced in a particulate form or are reduced to particulate form as a result of the mechanical actions of device utilization.

6.12.4 *Long-Term Implant Test*—Practice F 981 is a long-term implantation test in muscle and bone for metals, plastics, and ceramics. In the case of absorbable/resorbable implant materials, Practice F 1983 should be considered as an alternative to or in addition to Practice F 981. Other long-term implant tests may be appropriate for long-term implant applications.

6.13 *Genotoxicity*—A number of tests are available to assess genotoxic potential. The Ames test may be used as a preliminary screening study with materials. ~~Two methods~~ Methods that have been developed for genotoxicity testing in mammalian cells are included in Guides E 1202, E 1262, E 1263, and ~~Guide E 1280~~; E 1280 and Practices E 1397 and E 1398. Additionally, other tests may be suggested by regulatory agencies for certain implant applications and sites. No single test yet developed can detect all types of mutagens.

6.14 *Carcinogenicity*—Carcinogenicity testing is usually quite specific for the test substance, with no standard procedures available at this time. Guide F 1439 provides guidelines for the performance of these types of tests on implant materials. The National Toxicology Program has published a very comprehensive document⁵ relating to the conduct of carcinogenicity testing of chemicals. While much of this document may not be applicable to implant materials, many of the recommendations for animal

⁵ Available from CDRH, Rockville, MD.

⁵ General Statement of Work for the Conduct of Toxicology and Carcinogenicity Studies in Laboratory Animals, *National Toxicology Program*, April 1987.

care, selection of model, and methods for ensuring the integrity of data may be applicable. The user of this document should be aware that very little is known about the latency periods for the development of tumors due to implant materials in the human or the relationship between the results of animal testing and the long-term clinical response. The primary measure of the carcinogenic potential of implant materials will be the results of long term clinical use.

6.15 *Immunotoxicity*—Materials may influence the immune system of the host in various ways. There may be toxicity to the cells in the immune system resulting in decreased responsiveness to antigens. There may be stimulation of the immune system resulting in increased immune responses to antigens. There may be stimulation of an immune response to components or extracts of the materials, which may or may not result in patient morbidity or unsatisfactory performance of the device. Testing for immunotoxicity and specific immune responses may be considered, especially for materials of natural origin or materials that are oil, wax, or gel in nature. Two such methods that may be considered are Practices F 1905 and F 1906.

6.16 *Batch Testing of Materials and Devices for Biocompatibility*—Biocompatibility testing of materials may, in some circumstances, be done on samples from a batch of material to be used and the methods used for testing depend on the type of industry, product, and manufacturing and quality control operations in use. Periodic biocompatibility audits may be performed, depending on the manufacturer's degree of assurance that the supplier will not change his product or process, intentionally or otherwise. Additional biocompatibility testing must be performed when changes are made in the composition or processing of the materials.

7. Keywords

7.1 animal testing; biocompatibility; *in vivo* testing; laboratory testing; toxicity

APPENDIX

(Nonmandatory Information)

X1. RATIONALE

X1.1 Application of any biocompatibility test to a material requires judgment about its appropriateness. No counsel can be given which will be correct under all circumstances. Regulatory agencies may be extremely helpful when available but such guidelines do not exist for all materials or products. It is for such circumstances that a biocompatibility guideline is needed.

X1.2 With time, greater emphasis has been placed on speed and reduced expense in the performance of biocompatibility screening procedures. It is incumbent on the researcher to reduce the numbers of animals used in experimental testing whenever possible. For primary screening, tissue culture testing may satisfy these requirements but no test is universally applicable.

X1.3 Test selection is based upon a stable manufacturing process and for materials that have been characterized chemically. Intended use and duration of use should affect the direction of more extensive testing. Since the results of biological testing may be affected by the cleaning and sterilization processes used, ~~cleaning and sterilization methods, which~~ methods that are representative of final processing should be used for test specimens.

X1.4 The rationale for both the ~~standard practice~~ and the various sections is integrated into the text, since the nature of this ~~document is~~ practice is such that understanding of the reasoning behind the statement, requirements, and discussion is required as one reads the ~~standard document~~.

X1.5 Biocompatibility has traditionally been associated with materials and devices that do not stimulate an adverse biological response. However, there is a growing number of devices that are designed to be bioactive or biointeractive. With these materials and devices, the presence of, or enhancement of a biological reaction is desirable. Therefore, interpretation of results of biological testing should be done in light of the intended end use of the material and device.

X1.6 Since this ~~P practice~~ was originally written, the International Standards Organization has prepared a document with similar intent and content. (See ISO 10993-1) This ISO standard has been adopted as a European standard, EN 30993-1, and as an American National Standard. The FDA has enacted a document, General Program Memorandum #G95-1, with guidelines and a table of tests for consideration for evaluation of biocompatibility. Manufacturers and other investigators may want to consult these and other documents to assure ~~ensure~~ that any differences are addressed in the planning of tests.

X1.7 The user of this ~~guideline practice~~ and the methods that are recommended should be aware that these methods reflect the best available knowledge concerning the assessment of possible physiological effects of materials and their components. No test can guarantee the biocompatibility of a material.

X1.7.1 *In vitro* testing and animal testing are only models of the human clinical environment. The actual clinical experience with a material will only be determined after a period of clinical use. It has been suggested that a clinical use period of several years

in a carefully controlled trial with adequate follow-up will be necessary for reasonable assurance of biocompatibility.

X1.7.2 The latency period for the appearance of malignant tumors in response to carcinogenic agents may be 20 years or more in the human. It is unknown what the relationship between the latency period in animals and in the human will be for undiscovered tumor-causing materials.

ASTM International takes no position respecting the validity of any patent rights asserted in connection with any item mentioned in this standard. Users of this standard are expressly advised that determination of the validity of any such patent rights, and the risk of infringement of such rights, are entirely their own responsibility.

This standard is subject to revision at any time by the responsible technical committee and must be reviewed every five years and if not revised, either reapproved or withdrawn. Your comments are invited either for revision of this standard or for additional standards and should be addressed to ASTM International Headquarters. Your comments will receive careful consideration at a meeting of the responsible technical committee, which you may attend. If you feel that your comments have not received a fair hearing you should make your views known to the ASTM Committee on Standards, at the address shown below.

This standard is copyrighted by ASTM International, 100 Barr Harbor Drive, PO Box C700, West Conshohocken, PA 19428-2959, United States. Individual reprints (single or multiple copies) of this standard may be obtained by contacting ASTM at the above address or at 610-832-9585 (phone), 610-832-9555 (fax), or service@astm.org (e-mail); or through the ASTM website (www.astm.org).