Dermal Xenobiotic Metabolism: A Comparison between Native Human Skin, Four in vitro Skin Test Systems and a Liver System
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Introduction

The skin is the largest organ of the human body and the first site of contact for many external stimuli. It protects the body in several ways, and its barrier function determines the local and systemic bioavailability of dermally applied substances, which may be present in high concentrations. Previously, the skin has been described only as a physical permeability barrier. However, today it is well known that skin also has the capacity to metabolize xenobiotics [1, 2].

In addition to monolayer cultures of keratinocytes or fibroblasts, reconstructed human skin equivalents have gained importance as an animal-free alternative to assess toxicological effects relevant to humans and the efficacy of raw materials, cosmetics, pharmaceuticals, biocides and agrochemicals [3–5]. This is especially relevant with respect to the already existing implementation of the 7th Amendment to the EU Cosmetic Directive [6], which bans animal tests for compounds which are used in cosmetic products, and the Registration Evaluation and Authorisation of Chemicals (REACH) regulations [7], which require the avoidance of animal tests and the use of methods relevant to humans. Consequently, growing efforts are being put into assays using in vitro models which mir-
ror the human in vivo situation realistically for the species- and organ-specific safety assessment of dermally applied compounds regarding corrosion, irritation, genotoxicity and sensitization. 3D skin models offer the added advantage of being suitable for testing lipophilic compounds, which, due to their lack of water solubility, cannot be easily tested in monolayer cell cultures.

As a result, a growing number of skin models have been incorporated into in vitro genotoxicity and sensitization assays to improve their predictive capability. It is of importance to measure the levels of phase I and II enzymatic activities in skin models that are used in safety evaluation studies. Phase I enzymes such as cytochrome P450 (CYP) or flavin-dependent monooxygenases (FMOs) activate lipophilic compounds by introducing a polar group into the xenobiotic. The activated intermediates may be substrates of phase II enzymes, which conjugate the substrates to result in a more hydrophilic and excretable molecule. In contrast to the liver, less is known about the xenobiotic metabolism of the skin and appropriate in vitro systems and about how the activities are regulated. Although some studies have performed comprehensive gene expression analyses of xenobiotic metabolizing enzymes (XMEs) in native skin and 3D skin models [3, 8], only a few publications have investigated both enzyme gene expression and phase I and II activities in skin models.

We have prepared and analyzed 4 in vitro models of different physiological complexities (from monolayers to 3D) and compared them with native human skin. The models were: the Phenion® Full-Thickness (Phenion FT) Skin Model [9], the Open-Source Reconstructed Epidermis (OS-REp) model [10] and monolayer cultures of fibroblasts and keratinocytes.

The OS-REp model is a recently introduced 3D skin model for which the intellectual property and the tissue production protocol are available to everyone (hence ‘open-source’). It is based on a serum-free and chemically defined tissue culture technique described by Poumay et al. [11] that allows the reconstruction of human epidermis from primary human keratinocytes, with the resulting tissue models exhibiting basic epidermal characteristics. The reproducibility of its production and the suitability of the tissue for predicting the skin irritation potential of products will be verified in a validation study.

The Phenion FT Skin Model consists of keratinocytes and fibroblasts forming an epidermis, a basement membrane and a dermis with a morphology and tissue functionality similar to those of native human skin [9, 12]. The barrier properties of this model appear to increase with the lipophilicity of the test compounds, confirming the additional reservoir or physical barrier formed by the dermis equivalent [12]. There is evidence that xenobiotic metabolism may be influenced by cross-talk between dermal fibroblasts and epidermal keratinocytes [13]. Therefore, it may be expected that the metabolic capacity of this model may be closer to native skin than that of 2D or 3D skin models which represent the epidermis only.

The aim of the present study was to investigate which dermal model best reflected the in vivo situation such that it may be used for safety assessment tests. To this end, we compared a number of phase I and phase II metabolic profiles in the epidermis and dermis of native human skin and the different skin models at the levels of gene expression as well as protein and enzymatic activity. All 4 skin models were compared with native skin from the same 3 human donors so that donor variation could be excluded from the comparisons. In order to achieve this, the first half of the skin sample was directly subjected to gene expression analysis, whereas cells from the second half were isolated and propagated as monolayer cultures of either keratinocytes or fibroblasts. Thereafter, OS-REp and Phenion FT Skin Models were prepared using cells from the same donors. To enable a comparison of the organ-specific assessment by skin models with the assessment by a hepatic model, HepG2 cells were chosen as a well characterized cell line with a reproducible culture method. These cells have been shown to exhibit phase I and II metabolizing activities if cultured under suitable conditions [14, 15]. In order to better compare the 3D skin models with the hepatic model, we also cultured the HepG2 cells in a 3D format, i.e. spheroids.

**Methods**

**Chemicals**

β-Naphthoflavone (β-NF), phenobarbital, all-trans-retinoic acid, 7-ethoxyresorufin, dicoumarol, 4-methylumbellifere, collagenase and thermolysin were purchased from Sigma (Germany). All medium components and trypsin solution were purchased from Invitrogen (Darmstadt, Germany) unless stated otherwise.

**Cell Isolation and Culture Medium**

The human fibroblasts and keratinocytes used for each model were isolated from foreskin tissue, as described by Mewes et al. [9]. The dermis and epidermis were first separated by incubating in thermolysin overnight. After separation, the epidermal layer was then incubated in a trypsin solution until it was completely dissociated into a single cell suspension of keratinocytes. The connective tissue was dissociated and fibroblasts released by incubation in a solution containing 0.2 IU/ml collagenase. Fibroblasts were harvested and seeded in cell culture flasks in DMEM with GlutaMAX supplemented with 10% FCS (PAA...
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Laboratories, Cölbe, Germany), 1 mM ascorbic acid 2-phosphate (Sigma), 100 IU/ml penicillin and 100 μg/ml streptomycin. For comparison with the 2D cultures, keratinocytes were cultured in EpiLife medium (Cascade Biologics, Portland, Oreg., USA) containing HKGS supplemented with 1.5 mM CaCl₂ (Cascade Biologics).

For the preparation of 3D cultures, keratinocytes were seeded into cell culture flasks inoculated with feeder cells (mitomycin-inactivated fibroblasts in keratinocyte medium) in DMEM with GlutaMAX/Ham’s F12 medium (3:1) supplemented with 1.6 mg/ml bovine serum albumin, 0.4 g/ml hydrocortisone, 0.12 IU/ml insulin, 1 mM ascorbic acid 2-phosphate (all from Sigma), 100 IU/ml penicillin and 100 μg/ml streptomycin. Organotypical skin models were prepared from fibroblasts up to a maximum passage of 5, and keratinocytes up to a maximum passage of 5.

Phenion FT Skin Model

Fibroblasts were first seeded onto the equilibrated collagen matrices in fibroblast growth medium at 3–5·10⁵ cells per matrix for 2 weeks, during which time the culture medium was changed daily. Keratinocytes were seeded on top of the fibroblast-colonized matrix. The keratinocyte growth medium was changed daily. After 1 week of culture under submersed conditions, the developing skin models were then transferred to the air-liquid interface (ALI) and further cultured in DMEM with GlutaMAX/Ham’s F12 medium (3:1) supplemented with 1.6 mg/ml bovine serum albumin, 0.4 g/ml hydrocortisone, 0.12 IU/ml insulin, 1 mM ascorbic acid 2-phosphate (all from Sigma), 100 IU/ml penicillin and 100 μg/ml streptomycin. Analyses were started after culturing the models in ALI medium at the ALI for 12 days. For analysis, the dermal and epidermal layers from the Phenion FT Skin Model were separated by incubation with dispase for 3 h at 4°C. This enzyme was found to have a minimal effect on the expression of over 1,300 skin-relevant genes (using DNA chips; Miltenyi Biotec, Bergisch Gladbach, Germany).

Open-Source Reconstructed Epidermis

Keratinocytes were cultured at a high cell density (5·10⁵ cells/cm²) for 12 days in serum-free and high-calcium (1.5 mM) EpiLife medium (Cascade Biologics) on an inert polycarbonate membrane at the ALI [11].

HepG2 2D and 3D Cultures

For comparison with the monolayers, HepG2 cells were seeded at 2,000 cells/well in a 96-well plate in DMEM with GlutaMAX supplemented with 10% FCS (PA Laboratories). For the preparation of spheroids, a methyl cellulose stock solution was prepared in phenol red-free DMEM according to Korff et al. [16]. The HepG2 cells were resuspended in 10 ml medium containing 20% methyl cellulose and seeded in 100 μl at 200 and 400 cells/well in a 96-well nonadhesive round-bottom tissue culture plate (Greiner, Frickenhausen, Germany). This method resulted in the formation of spheroids within 24 h, after which point the cells were characterized for XMEs. Hepatocyte function was also monitored by measuring two hepatic markers, albumin and urea. Albumin was measured by enzyme-linked immunosorbent assay (Albumin ELISA Kit; Assaypro, St. Charles, Mo., USA), and the urea content in the supernatant medium samples was quantified by colorimetric determination at 470 nm using the Urea Assay Kit by BioChain (Newark, Calif., USA). Both proteins were secreted by the spheroids over 24, 48 and 72 h at levels which were higher than in the monolayer cultures (data not shown).

Gene Expression Analysis

Total RNA was extracted from the native human skin, 3D models or cells using the RNaseq Kit (Qiagen, Hilden, Germany) according to the supplier’s instructions. Two micrograms of total RNA were reverse-transcribed utilizing random primers for amplification (Promega) and the Omniscript®-RT Kit (Qiagen), following the manufacturer’s protocol. Real-time PCR was performed using a Bio-Rad iCycler iQ detection system (Bio-Rad Laboratories, Munich, Germany) in combination with TaqMan gene expression assays (Applied Biosystems, Foster City, Calif., USA). Each kit for the genes of interest (online suppl. table S1; for all online suppl. material, see www.karger.com/doi/10.1159/000358272) contained gene-specific primers and fluorogenic probes that were preoptimized by the manufacturer to yield 100 ± 10% amplification efficiency using human tissue RNA pools. The real-time PCR reaction was carried out in Thermo-Fast plates (Abgene, Hamburg, Germany). The cycling conditions were the following: 50°C for 2 min (1 cycle), 95°C for 10 min (1 cycle), 95°C for 1 s and 60°C for 1 min (40 cycles). The ΔCt method was applied for the relative quantification of gene expression, and β-actin was used as a reference gene. Preliminary tests showed that β-actin was the most stable reference gene under test system conditions. For the calculation, we chose a conservative Ct value of 34. This cutoff was chosen because CYP3A4 mRNA was not detected at Ct values below 34 in samples which contained this CYP at the protein level (data not shown).

Western Blot Analysis

Cells were harvested in RIPA buffer (50 mM Tris/HCl, pH 7.5; 1 mM EDTA; 1% SDS; 150 mM NaCl). Twenty micrograms of total protein were subjected to SDS-PAGE on gradient gels (4–12.5%; Invitrogen). The separated proteins were transferred onto nitrocellulose membranes by electroblotting at 170 mA for 2 h. After blocking with 5% low-fat milk powder and incubation overnight at 4°C with the first antibody (1:1,000 CYP3A4 mouse polyclonal antibody; Abnova, Taipei, Taiwan), the blots were further processed for chemiluminescence detection, using a second antibody (1:250 anti-mouse IgG-peroxidase conjugate; Sigma) for 2 h at room temperature and the ECL Plus Kit (Amersham Biosciences, Freiburg, Germany).

Enzyme Activities

For the determination of ethoxyresorufin O-deethylase (EROD) activity, intact epidermis (separated and thoroughly washed in PBS) or intact cells were incubated in 12-well plates with 1 μM 7-ethoxyresorufin in fresh phenol red-free medium supplemented with 25 μM dicoumarol. After separation of the epidermis from the dermis, it was practically only possible to measure resorufin-related activity in the intact epidermal part of the Phenion FT Skin model. Resorufin fluorescence was measured directly in 24-well plates. The change in fluorescence was measured every 40 min at 37°C with 530 nm excitation and 590 nm emission. Activities were expressed as the rate of change in relative fluorescence units (dRFU) per minute per microgram protein for the skin models and the rate of dRFU per minute per 100 cells for the HepG2 models.

Glutathione S-transferase (GST) activity was measured according to the protocol of Habig et al. [17], using the GST Assay Kit by Sigma (Germany). The cytosolic fraction was prepared by centrif-
Gestation at 15,000 g for 15 min. CDNB (1-chloro-2,4-nitrobenzene) was used as a broad-spectrum substrate of GSTs. The time-dependent kinetics of conjugate formation in the cytosol was obtained using a 96-well plate reader set at 340 nm. The blank contained buffer instead of protein to detect nonenzymatic CDNB conjugation. The GST activities were expressed as nanomoles per minute per milligram protein for both the skin and HepG2 models.

UDP-glucuronyltransferase (UGT) activity was determined as described by Gomez-Lechon [18]. Briefly, 4-methylumbelliferone (100 μM final concentration) was incubated with the cultures for 1 h. Samples were diluted 1:20 in 10 mM NaOH, and the remaining 4-methylumbelliferone was quantified fluorometrically at 376 nm excitation and 460 nm emission. The values were calculated as micromolars of 4-methylumbelliferone consumed per minute per milligram protein for the skin models, and as micromolars of 4-methylumbelliferone consumed per minute per 100 cells for the HepG2 models.

**Results**

**Comparison of Basal Gene Expression Profiles in Native Human Skin with That in the Four Donor-Linked in vitro Dermal Test Systems**

The basal gene expression of the phase I and phase II enzymes in each model was compared with that in the native skin from which these models were derived (table 1).

| Table 1. Basal gene expression profile in native human skin and different in vitro models |
|---------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
|                                 | Native human skin | Phenion FT Skin Model | OS-REp | Monolayers |
|                                 | dermis | epidermis | dermis | epidermis | fibroblasts | NHEKs |
| Phase I enzymes                 |         |         |         |         |         |         |
| CYP1A1                          | +/--/+  | ++/--/+  | --/--  | --/--  | +/++/+  | ++/+  |
| CYP1B1                          | +/+/+/+  | ++/+/+   | ++/+   | +/+    | ++/+    | ++/+ |
| CYP2A6                          | --/+/-  | --/+/-   | --/+/- | --/+/- | ++/+    | +/+ |
| CYP2B6                          | --/-/-  | --/-/-   | --/-/- | --/-/- | ++/+    | +/+ |
| CYP2D6                          | --/-/-  | --/-/-   | --/-/- | --/-/- | ++/+    | +/+ |
| CYP2E1                          | +/+/-/+  | ++/+/-/+  | ++/+  | ++/+   | +/+    | ++/+ |
| CYP2S1                          | +/+/-/+  | ++/+/-/+  | ++/+  | ++/+   | +/+    | ++/+ |
| CYP3A4                          | --/+/-  | ++/+/-   | --/+/- | --/+/- | ++/+    | +/+ |
| FMO1                            | +/+/+    | ++/+    | ++/+    | ++/+    | ++/+    | ++/+ |
| FMO3                            | ++/+    | ++/+    | ++/+    | ++/+    | ++/+    | ++/+ |
| FMO5                            | ++/+    | ++/+    | ++/+    | ++/+    | ++/+    | ++/+ |

Comparison of basal gene expression levels between 3 foreskins from males not older than 4 years and 4 different in vitro models made of the 3 appropriate foreskins to exclude donor variability. The order of donors in the different columns and lines is always donor 1/2/3. RNA isolation, cDNA translation and PCR were performed as described in the Methods section. ΔCt values are presented as follows: – ‘not detected’; ++ ‘ΔCt to β-actin control >10’, i.e. weak gene expression; + ‘ΔCt = 5–10’, i.e. moderate gene expression, and +++ ‘ΔCt <5’, i.e. high gene expression. All results are based on duplicates.
becomes evident. A decreasing complexity of the test systems leads to a decrease in gene expression: CYP2A6, CYP3A4, FMO1 and UGT1A10 expression was below the detection limit in normal human epidermal keratinocytes (NHEKs) from all donors in the monolayer culture and clearly detectable in the more complex models. The only exception was CYP2D6, which was below the detection limit in native human skin but, if cultured in monolayers, was detected in the NHEKs from 2 of the 3 donors.

The expression of all the investigated enzymes in both compartments of the Phenion FT Skin Model was comparable with that in native skin, albeit at a marginally lower level. The exceptions to this were CYP1A1, which was present in the original donor but not in the Phenion FT Skin Model, and CYP2D6, which was expressed in the epidermis of 1 donor of Phenion FT Skin Model but not in the native skin of the same donor.

The constitutive expression of the enzymes in the epidermal model, OS-REp, compared well with that in the epidermal compartment of native skin. One notable exception was CYP2D6 expression in the OS-REp models of all donors, which was lacking in the native epidermis. Using Western blotting of CYP2D6, protein expression was also investigated in native skin and the Phenion FT Skin Model, but no protein was detected in either tissue (data not shown).

Comparison of Basal and Induced Levels of Phase I and II Enzymes in Skin with Those in the Liver Models

The 3D skin models were compared with the hepatic in vitro model using HepG2 cells. The importance of 3D culturing for differentiated phenotyping was investigated by using cells cultured as spheroids or in monolayers. To correlate the dermal test systems with a liver system, 3 representative groups of enzymes were chosen, which comprised 2 CYPs (CYP1A1 and CYP3A4), 1 non-CYP phase I enzyme (FMO3) and 2 representative phase II enzymes (UGT and GST).

**CYP1A1**

Figure 1 shows the basal gene expression of CYP1A1 in the different in vitro skin models, and because the values were reproducible across all 3 donors, the values shown are means of the 3 donors. The level of CYP1A1 mRNA was below the lower limit of detection in both the dermis and epidermis compartments of the Phenion FT Skin Model. CYP1A1 mRNA was detected in control-treated OS-REp and monolayers of NHEKs and fibroblasts, although the corresponding basal EROD activities were near to the limit of detection in all 4 skin models (fig. 1, 2). Despite the low basal mRNA expression of this CYP, it was readily inducible in intact Phenion FT Skin and OS-REp models and in monolayers of NHEKs by 25 μM β-NF over 72 h (fig. 1), an
The increase in CYP1A1 mRNA expression was mirrored by an increase in EROD activity, although the relative levels of activity reached in β-NF-induced models were different as well as donor dependent. The highest induced activity was measured in keratinocyte cultures from donor 1 after 72 h of β-NF treatment (67 dRFU·min⁻¹·μg protein⁻¹ vs. <45 dRFU·min⁻¹·μg protein⁻¹ in other models from this donor and other treatments). In contrast to the other 3 models, CYP1A1 mRNA expression and EROD activities were not induced by β-NF in monolayer fibroblasts in any of the 3 donors at any time point over 72 h (fig. 1, 2). Notably, the EROD activities in fibroblast monolayers from all 3 donors were lower than in the corresponding NHEKs from the same donors. This was in line with the lack of EROD activity in the dermis of the Phenion FT Skin Model (data not shown).

CYP1A1 expression was induced by β-NF in spheroids with lower cell numbers (200 and 400 cells) but not in HepG2 cells cultured as monolayers (data not shown). The EROD activity in HepG2 cells was always higher when they were cultured as spheroids than when cultured as monolayers (fig. 3). The induction response of spheroids to β-NF was evident at 48 and 72 h. Although EROD was induced in monolayer cultures of HepG2, its activity remained low even if treated with β-NF (fig. 3).

CYP3A4

One of the most important drug-metabolizing enzymes in the liver is CYP3A4, and this was found to be constitutively expressed in the HepG2 cultures. Treatment with 2 mM phenobarbital caused no significant increase in CYP3A4 gene expression after 24 and 72 h in spheroids and in monolayers (data not shown). Native human skin was found to have only a low level of CYP3A4
protein, moderately induced after 24 h by 2 mM phenobarbital (measured by Western blotting; data not shown). The level of induction was not further increased between 24 and 72 h. Despite the moderate increase in CYP2B6 mRNA, this did not result in an increase in CYP3A4-dependent BROD activity by phenobarbital (0.5–2 mM for 24, 48 and 72 h), rifampicin (50 and 100 μM for 24 h) or dexamethasone (10 and 50 μM for 24, 48 and 72 h). Flavin-Dependent Monooxygenase 3

All-trans-retinoic acid, at a concentration of 10 μM, induced FMO3 in native human skin after 24 h, and this induction was sustained up to 72 h (measured by Western blot analysis; fig. 4). All-trans-retinoic acid also induced FMO3 at the mRNA level after 24 h in both compartments of the Phenion FT Skin Model, the OS-REp model and fibroblast monolayers (fig. 5). By contrast,
FMO3 was not constitutively expressed or induced by all-trans-retinoic acid in NHEK cultures from any of the 3 donors. In contrast to native skin and the in vitro dermal models (table 1), FMO3 mRNA expression was below the limit of detection in HepG2 cells cultured as spheroids or monolayers.

Glutathione S-Transferase

GST activity in the in vitro skin models of variable complexity was compared with that in native human skin and HepG2 cells (fig. 6). GST activity in the native human skin from intact biopsies was 80 nmol·min⁻¹·mg protein⁻¹; it was present at higher levels in the epidermis (100 nmol·min⁻¹·mg protein⁻¹) than in the dermis (40 nmol·min⁻¹·mg protein⁻¹). The relative levels of GST activity in the epidermis and dermis of the Phenion FT Skin Model were comparable with those measured in the two compartments of native human skin. Likewise, GST activity was higher in NHEKs than in fibroblast monolayers. The highest GST activity was measured in the OS-REp model (160–220 nmol·min⁻¹·mg protein⁻¹), whereas fibroblasts showed the lowest GST activity.

There was no constitutive gene expression of the dermally located GST subtype p1 in HepG2 spheroids or monolayer cultures. However, a GST-mediated metabolism of CDNB was clearly measurable in HepG2 spheroids and monolayers (fig. 6). In contrast to CYP1A1 and CYP3A4 activities, GST activity was markedly lower in HepG2 cells (5–13 nmol·min⁻¹·μg protein⁻¹) than in any of the in vitro skin models tested.

UDP-Glucuronosyltransferase

Basal UGT activity was measurable in all the in vitro models tested (fig. 7) and varied between 1 and 6 μM·min⁻¹·mg protein⁻¹. Despite the fact that the level of activity was donor dependent, it was always higher in the Phenion FT Skin Model than in the other models. The UGT activity in the Phenion FT Skin Model was marginally higher in the dermal than in the epidermal compartment. It was statistically significantly increased in the Phenion FT Skin Models from 2 donors (fig. 7a, c) and in fibroblasts from donor 3 (fig. 7c) after 72 h. By contrast, in the OS-REp model as well as in the NHEK and fibroblast monolayers, UGT activity was not induced by treatment with β-NF for up to 72 h.

UGT1A10 mRNA was expressed at basal levels in HepG2 spheroids and monolayer cultures, in which the UGT activity was higher in the spheroids than in the monolayer cultures (fig. 8). Its activity in the spheroids was constant over 72 h and readily induced by β-NF at all the time points tested (2.7-, 3.8- and 6.6-fold increase at 24, 48 and 72 h, respectively). The activity increased gradually over time if HepG2 cells were cultured as monolayers, and the effect of β-NF was lower than in the spheroids (0.8-, 1.9- and 1.3-fold increase at 24, 48 and 72 h, respectively; fig. 8).
Discussion

To perform risk assessments of chemicals that are dermally applied such as cosmetics, pharmaceuticals and agrochemicals, it is important to use relevant in vitro systems which mirror the human skin most realistically. Skin histology and barrier function of the commercially available skin models in particular are well known [19]. Several studies have been published regarding dermal xenobiotic metabolism [20–23]; however, a systematic analysis of test systems with different complexity is still lacking. Thus, the objective of our study was to close this gap and to characterize XMEs in in vitro models in order to interpret the results from skin sensitization and genotoxicity assays that use them.

A first approach, using semi-quantitative real-time PCR in combination with gene-specific TaqMan assays, showed that many hepatic enzymes which are involved in xenobiotic metabolism were also constitutively expressed in detectable quantities in native human skin; those were CYP1A1, CYP1B1, CYP2E1, CYP3A4, FMOs, GSTp1, UGT1A10 and NAT1. Most enzymes detected in both compartments of human native skin, were also expressed in both 3D skin models, with the exception of CYP1A1, which was lacking in the Phenion FT Skin Model. There are a number of reports of donor variation in the expression of CYPs (reviewed by Oesch et al. [2]), and this was also evident in our study with respect to CYP1A1, CYP2A6 and CYP3A4. Of the 3 donors tested here, none expressed CYP2B6. This is in accordance with results by Saeki et al. [24], wherein CYP2B6 expression was undetectable in different types of skin cell. Yengi et al. [25] reported a large range of CYP2B6 expression in native human skin from undetectable to high levels in some individuals.
Likewise, there are reports that CYP3A4 is not expressed in whole human skin [3, 8], but this CYP was present at measurable levels in the epidermis of native skin from all 3 donors tested here. This expression was lost if the fibroblasts and keratinocytes were cultured as monolayers, but re-expressed in the 3D epidermal OS-REp model, suggesting a strong influence of the culture conditions. CYP2D6 expression was below the limit of detection in both compartments of native skin and the dermis of the Phenion FT Skin Model from all donors. However, a low expression was detected in the epidermis of the Phenion FT Skin Model from 1 donor, in the OS-REp model from all donors and in keratinocytes from 2 of the 3 donors. Since CYP2D6 is not inducible [26], the reason for the presence of this CYP in the 3D models and keratinocytes may lie in the fact that a higher concentration of keratinocytes was measured in the samples. In general, there was a lower basal gene expression of 10 (out of 13) enzymes in fibroblast and keratinocyte monolayer cultures than in native human skin; UGT1A10, for instance, was not detected in monolayer fibroblasts, and FMO1 was lacking in keratinocyte cultures from all 3 donors.

The dermis and epidermis of native human skin had distinct gene expression profiles. FMO3, for example, another phase 1 enzyme, was only detected in dermal compartments of both native human skin and the Phenion FT Skin Model, as well as in fibroblasts. Conversely, the OS-REp models and the keratinocytes from which they were derived lacked FMO3. This rather profound difference in FMO3 distribution is in accordance with the findings by Luu-The et al. [8]. FMO1, reported as being selectively expressed in the epidermis [8], was detected in the dermis of 2 of the 3 native skin donors in this study, as well as in the dermis of the Phenion FT Skin Model. Notably, FMO1 was absent from keratinocytes, but reexpressed if the keratinocytes were cultured as the 3D OS-REp model, suggesting this enzyme is strongly affected by the culture conditions [2].

Another example in which the relative expression of an enzyme was different is UGT1A10, an important phase II enzyme involved in the detoxification of polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons [27] and in the metabolism of many compounds after dermal exposure [28]. The basal gene expression of this enzyme was higher in the epidermis than in the dermis of native skin and the Phenion FT Skin Model, was present at high levels in the OS-REp model, and was present at lower levels in NHEK cells but absent in fibroblasts. This suggests that UGT1A10 is mainly expressed in keratinocytes and may require a 3D environment with other cells to be expressed in fibroblasts.

Like UGTs, NAT1 is a well-described major detoxification enzyme in the skin, whereas NAT2 is not expressed in this organ. The basal gene expression levels of NAT1 were similar in the dermal and epidermal compartments of native skin and the Phenion FT Skin Model, and it was ubiquitously expressed in all in vitro models tested. This is in line with recent publications showing that the activity of NAT1 can be several-fold higher in the skin than in the liver [29] and can also be determined in a keratinocyte cell line such as HaCaT [30].

The inducibility of CYP1A1 in in vitro models of variable complexity was investigated using the prototypical inducer β-NF [31–33]. CYP1A1 gene expression was most strongly induced in the Phenion FT Skin Model and in NHEKs. CYP1A1 was also induced to a lower extent by β-NF in the OS-REp model; however, this epidermal model also expressed higher basal levels of CYP1A1 than did the other in vitro models. In fibroblasts, an induction of CYP1A1 gene expression was only observed if they were cultured in the Phenion FT Skin Model, not if they were cultured as monolayers, in which this enzyme was always present at low levels (as also observed by Sadek and Allen-Hoffmann [34]). EROD activities, reflecting CYP1A1-, CYP1A2- and CYP1B1-mediated metabolism [35], were generally at the limit of detection in all in vitro skin models and much lower than in HepG2 cells. The
only exception to this was the EROD activity in NHEKs from 2 of the 3 donors, which may have been increased by the growth factors in the medium. Others have also reported low or no basal EROD activity in dermal models [36, 37]. Treatment with β-NF resulted in a clear increase in EROD activities measured in HepG2 cells and in the intact epidermal compartment of Phenion FT skin and the OS-REp model, as well as in NHEKs from all 3 donors over time. Only fibroblast monolayers failed to respond to induction by β-NF. The low basal level of CYP1A1 expression in fibroblasts and the lack of induction of its expression or of EROD activity are in line with a report that the CYP1A1 protein is mainly localized in the epidermis [38].

The inducibility of CYP3A4 was analyzed using the prototypical inducer phenobarbital [39, 40]. Gene and protein expression analysis showed no inducibility of dermal CYP3A4 after systemic incubation for up to 72 h. Further investigations into the induction of various metabolic enzymes by different compounds included retinoic acid, which is a known inducer [41]. In our study, retinoic acid also induced FMO3 protein and mRNA expression in fibroblasts. Interestingly, FMO3 was also inducible in the epidermis of the Phenion FT Skin Model and the epidermal OS-REp model, which were shown to lack any basal gene expression of this enzyme. FMO3 induction could only be detected in the 3D models but not in the 2D keratinocyte model, suggesting more complex culture conditions are required for this process. To our knowledge, this is the first report of FMO3 being inducible by retinoic acid in dermal models.

GSTs are a supergene family of widely distributed isoenzymes which are essential for many conjugation reactions [42]. A number of isoforms of GST1 (alpha, mu and pi) have been identified in human skin, of which the GSTpi family, which is encoded by the GSTP1 gene, is the predominant form [42]. GSTpi is not inducible in skin by prototypical aryl hydrocarbon receptor (AhR)-mediated inducers [33, 43]; therefore, we focused on basal GST activity only. The GST activity in whole native human skin was higher in the epidermal compartment than in the dermal compartment, and this ratio of activity levels between the compartments was reflected in the Phenion FT Skin Model. The OS-REp model had the highest GST activity, which is in accordance with Harris et al. [33] and Luu-The et al. [8], who found that GST activities in reconstructed 3D epidermal models were equal or higher than the activity in the epidermal compartment of native human skin. Likewise, NHEKs also exhibited a generally high GST activity compared with native skin. These data demonstrate that both the dermis and epidermis are able to undergo glutathione conjugation.

Like GST activity, the basal activity of UGT, the second phase II enzyme selected for more in-depth analysis, was readily detectable in all 4 in vitro models. Interestingly, the highest activity was measured in the Phenion FT Skin Model. In addition, the activity was marginally higher in the dermal than in the epidermal compartment, despite the fact that the gene expression of this enzyme was higher in the epidermal compartment of this model. Protein levels of the UGT enzyme in cultured human keratinocytes have been reported to be induced by AhR agonists [44]; however, in our study, this activity was only marginally induced by β-NF (1.11-fold) after 72 h in the Phenion FT Skin Models from 2 donors and in fibroblasts from 1 donor (1.5-fold). The low mRNA expression of UGT1A10 in fibroblasts was reflected in the low rate of 4-methylumbelliferone metabolism. As with EROD activity, UGT activity was also not induced in fibroblasts, suggesting that these cells lack AhR responses.

A number of XMEs were selected to compare the metabolic capacity of the in vitro skin models with that of a hepatic model, i.e. HepG2 cells. In general, there was a higher expression of phase II enzymes than of phase I enzymes in the skin models. The CYP1A1 expression and activity were very low in the skin models, but CYP1A1 was clearly expressed in the hepatic model; moreover, EROD activity was several thousand-fold higher in the HepG2 cells than in the skin models (taking into account the protein content of HepG2 cells of 0.55 mg/1,000,000 cells [45]). CYP1A1 mRNA expression was induced by β-NF in the 2 in vitro 3D reconstructed skin models and in keratinocytes. Likewise, CYP1A1 expression and EROD activity were induced by β-NF in HepG2 cells, but only if cultured as spheroids, emphasizing the need for a 3D environment for optimal function. Unlike in the 3D in vitro skin models and fibroblasts, FMO3 was not up-regulated by retinoic acid in spheroids or monolayer cultures of HepG2 cells.

UGT activity was also higher in HepG2 cells than in the skin models, since this activity could be readily detected in cultures of only 100 cells. UGT expression and activity were also shown to be readily inducible in the hepatic model, whereas in the in vitro skin models, this enzyme was only moderately induced, possibly due to the already high basal activity. Conversely, GST was expressed in the skin models, and its activity there was at least 2-fold higher than in the liver model. CYP1A1, CYP2D6, CYP3A4 and UGT1A10 were all present in...
HepG2 spheroids and monolayers, but unlike in the skin models, the gene expression levels of FMO3 and GSTp1 were below the limit of detection in the HepG2 spheroids. This was expected in the case of GSTp1, which, despite being the most widely distributed enzyme of all GSTs and the most abundant form in many tissues, is not a major GST in the adult human liver but rather in the fetal liver [46]. FMO3 is the most abundant FMO isoform in the human liver [46], and we would have expected to have detected this in the HepG2 model.

In summary, the in vitro skin models showed distinctive profiles at the levels of gene expression and enzymatic activity with regard to xenobiotic metabolism. Organotypic models offer a way to construct a system which mirrors the in vivo situation more realistically than do monolayer cultures of either keratinocytes or fibroblasts. The differences between the test systems were more prominent than was donor variability. Furthermore, the differences between the compartments of either the native skin or the Phenion FT Skin Model were also greater than was the donor variability. Consequently, skin models seem to have a metabolic capacity close to the human in vivo situation. A comparison of phase I and phase II metabolism between in vitro dermal and hepatic models indicates that the bioactivation processes linked to phase I enzymes are more prominent in hepatic models and that detoxification activities mediated by phase II enzymes are more prominent in dermal models. These data support the use of 3D reconstructed human skin tissues as valuable test systems for improved in vitro assays in the fields of genotoxicity and sensitization research [47–49].
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