

Dose-Response: An International Journal

Volume 5 | Issue 2

Article 4

6-2007

CHLORAMPHENICOL, EUROPEAN LEGISLATION AND HORMESIS - COMMENTARY

Jaap C Hanekamp

Zoetermeer, The Netherlands

Edward J Calabrese

University of Massachusetts, Amherst, MA

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.umass.edu/dose_response

Recommended Citation

Hanekamp, Jaap C and Calabrese, Edward J (2007) "CHLORAMPHENICOL, EUROPEAN LEGISLATION AND HORMESIS - COMMENTARY," *Dose-Response: An International Journal*: Vol. 5 : Iss. 2 , Article 4.

Available at: https://scholarworks.umass.edu/dose_response/vol5/iss2/4

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by ScholarWorks@UMass Amherst. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dose-Response: An International Journal by an authorized editor of ScholarWorks@UMass Amherst. For more information, please contact scholarworks@library.umass.edu.

Dose-Response, 5:91–93, 2007
Formerly Nonlinearity in Biology, Toxicology, and Medicine
Copyright © 2007 University of Massachusetts
ISSN: 1559-3258
DOI: 10.2203/dose-response.06-012.Hanekamp

International Hormesis Society
www.hormesisociety.org

CHLORAMPHENICOL, EUROPEAN LEGISLATION AND HORMESIS - COMMENTARY

Jaap C. Hanekamp □ Runderweide 2, 2727 HV Zoetermeer, The Netherlands

Edward J. Calabrese □ Department of Public Health, Environmental Health
Sciences, Morrill I, N344, University of Massachusetts, Amherst, MA

Keywords: hormesis, chloramphenicol, risk assessment, U-shaped, biphasic

The detection of chloramphenicol (CAP)—a broad-spectrum antibiotic—in shrimp imported into Europe from Asian countries in 2002 was regarded as yet another food-scandal by governments, albeit hardly noticed by the media and the public. The European reaction was closing down of the borders for fish products and making laboratories work overtime to analyse numerous batches of imported goods. Some European countries went so far as to have antibiotic-containing food-products destroyed, as these goods were presented as detrimental to human health.

Any presence of CAP in food, which can be detected by several analytical methods, was a violation of European law, deemed a human health threat and followed by an immediate regulatory sanction of zero-tolerance (Hanekamp *et al.* 2003). Because CAP is regarded as probably carcinogenic (2A) and could be weakly genotoxic, the zero-tolerance approach reflects the traditional use of the Linear Non-Threshold (LNT) model so deeply embedded in toxicological and regulatory thinking, especially concerning genotoxic carcinogens. This regulatory position and human health perspective, however, proved to be untenable in the case of CAP but also for other antibiotics not allowed in the food chain, such as nitrofurans.

Because of blatant misuses, zero-tolerance had been deemed an opportune method to ban the use of certain veterinary products, residues of which may show up in foods. However, the unfeasibility of zero-tolerance came to the fore as a result of the analytical progress made in the last two decades of the twentieth century. CAP (and also nitrofurans) proved to be more ubiquitous in food—albeit at extremely low levels—than mere abuse probably could account for (Hanekamp *et al.* 2003).

Address correspondence to Edward J. Calabrese, Department of Public Health, Environmental Health Sciences, Morrill I, N344, University of Massachusetts, Amherst, MA 01003; Phone: 413-545-3164; Fax: 413-545-4692; E-mail: edwardc@schoolph.umass.edu

J. C. Hanekamp and E. J. Calabrese

However, one of the present authors (JCH) recognized that zero-tolerance and the LNT model (IPCS-INCHEM 2006) are regulatory conveniences infused with a precautionary human health perspective. Moreover, it was clear that medicinal products such as CAP are rarely in use as human medicine and are banned for veterinary use not because of inherent risks at low-level exposures, but because JECFA (Joint Expert Committee on Food Additives, FAO) could not establish an ADI for lack of scientific data (IPCS-INCHEM 2006). In Europe this was expediently translated as ‘dangerous at any dose’ and officially regarded as such.

Confronted with such intransigence, Hanekamp embraced the case for hormesis presented by Calabrese in numerous papers (Calabrese *et al.* 1999; Calabrese and Baldwin 2001a; Calabrese and Baldwin 2001b; Calabrese and Baldwin 1997; Calabrese and Baldwin 2003a; Calabrese and Baldwin 2003b), as a means to advance a rational approach of low-level exposures of chemicals in food, which need not be zero according to hormesis (Hanekamp and Kwakman 2004). In doing so, the concept of a Toxicological Insignificant Exposure level (TIE) (Kroes *et al.* 2004) was introduced, whereby the hormetic part of the dose-response curve was ‘translated’ into a toxicological threshold. We then evaluated the TIE within the framework of hormesis, where insignificance was understood not as a regulatory evaluation based on a MTR (Maximum Tolerable Risk) level of say 1:1,000,000, as is done within the threshold of toxicological concern (TTC) concept, but as a direct toxicological dose response bioassay and assessment (Calabrese and Cook 2005).

As a result, a regulatory shift away from zero tolerance came to be when the European Commission published a decision on 11 January 2005 (Commission Decision 2005), according to which CAP no longer is regulated at zero level but at the MRPL (Minimum Required Performance Limit) level. For CAP the MRPL is set at 0.3 ppb (for nitrofurans metabolites the MRPLs are set at 1 ppb). Prior to this decision, MRPLs were whatever low concentration levels that regulatory laboratories in the European Community could detect and confirm. With this decision MRPLs have now been given legal status in terms of explicit levels of concern.

The CAP case here described is the first policy example in which a regulatory shift is observed from zero tolerance to a threshold approach on the basis of hormetic considerations, which it is hoped could pave the way for incorporation of the hormetic perspective into not only food safety regulation but also into environmental regulation. In our view, this is clearly needed to improve pharmaceutical and industrial chemical regulation (European Commission 2004), especially in light of the recent EC decision (Commission Decision 2005) and the overwhelming evidence of hormesis in relation to many low-level exposures (Calabrese and Baldwin 2001a; Calabrese and Baldwin 2003a; Hanekamp and Wijnands 2004; Wiener 2001).

*Commentary***REFERENCES**

- Calabrese EJ and Baldwin LA. 2003a. The hormetic dose response model is more common than the threshold model in toxicology. *Tox Sci* 71(2):246-250.
- Calabrese EJ and Baldwin LA. 2003b. Toxicology rethinks its central belief. Hormesis demands a reappraisal of the way risks are assessed. *Nature* 421:691-692.
- Calabrese EJ and Baldwin LA. 2001a. Hormesis: U-shaped dose-response and their centrality in toxicology. *Trends in Pharmacol Sciences* 22(6):285-291.
- Calabrese EJ and Baldwin LA. 2001b. The frequency of U-shaped dose-responses in the toxicological literature. *Tox Sci* 62:330-338.
- Calabrese EJ and Baldwin LA. 1997. A quantitatively-based methodology for the evaluation of chemical hormesis. *Hum Ecol Risk Asses*, 3(4):545-554.
- Calabrese EJ, Baldwin LA., and Holland CD. 1999. Hormesis: A highly generalizable and reproducible phenomenon with important implications for risk assessment. *Risk Analysis*, 19(2):261-281.
- Calabrese EJ and Cook RR. 2005. Hormesis: how it could affect the risk assessment process. *Hum Exper Toxicol* 24:265-270.
- Commission Decision of 11 January. 2005. Laying down harmonised standards for the testing for certain residues in product of animal origin imported from third countries. *Official Journal of the European Union L16*, 11/01/2005, 61-63.
- European Commission. 2004. Reflection paper on residues in foodstuffs of animal origin. Enterprise Directorate-General, Health and Consumer Protection Directorate-General.
- Hanekamp JC and Kwakman J. 2004. Beyond zero-tolerance: a novel and global outlook on food-safety and residues of pharmacological active substances in foodstuffs of animal origin. *Environ. Liability* 1:33-39.
- Hanekamp JC, Frapporti G and Olieman K. 2003. Chloramphenicol, food safety and precautionary thinking in Europe. *Environ Liability* 6:209-221.
- Hanekamp JC, Wijnands RJ. 2004. Analytical technology, risk analysis and residues of veterinary substances: A précis and a proposal for coherent and logical clinical residue legislation. Joint FAO-WHO Technical Workshop on Residues of Veterinary Drugs without ADI/MRL. Bangkok, Thailand 24-26, working document.
- IPCS-INCHEM (Chemical Safety Information from Intergovernmental Organizations). 2006. Available at <http://www.inchem.org/documents/jecfa/jecmono/v23je02.htm> (last visited on the 25th of January 2006). IPCS-INCHEM (Chemical Safety Information from Intergovernmental Organizations), available at <http://www.inchem.org/documents/jecfa/jecmono/v33je03.htm> (last visited on the 25th of January 2006).
- Kroes R, Renwick AG, Cheeseman M, Kleiner J, Mangelsdorf I, Piersma A, Schilter B, Schlatter J, Van Schothorst F, Vos JG, and Wurtzen G. 2004. Structure-based thresholds of toxicological concern (TTC): guidance for application to substances present at low levels in the diet. *Food Chem Toxicol* 42:65-83.
- Wiener JB. 2001. Hormesis and the radical moderation of law. *Hum Exper Toxicol* 20:162-164.