



## **Technical Report No. 75**

### **Consensus Method for Rating 0.1 $\mu$ m Mycoplasma Reduction Filters**

Currently in preview, click to buy full version



## **PDA Consensus Method for Rating 0.1µm Mycoplasma Reduction Filters Technical Report Team**

### **Authors and Contributors**

---

**Barbara Potts, Ph.D.**, Potts and Nelson Consulting, LLC, Team Lead

**Kurt Brorson, Ph.D.**, U.S. Food and Drug Administration, Team Lead

**Christine Arbesser Rastburg, Ph.D.**, Baxalta

**Dilip Ashtekar, Ph.D.**, PAREXEL International

**Brian Beck, Ph.D.**, Microbiologics

**Allen Burgenson**, Lonza Walkersville

**Ruth Curran**, Parker Hannifin Manufacturing Ltd. Domnick Hunter

**John Duguid**, Vericel Corporation

**Martha Folmsbee, Ph.D.**, Pall Corp.

**Gerhard Haake**, Sartorius Stedim Biotech GmbH

**Nick Hutchison**, Parker Domnick Hunter

**Robert Kiss, Ph.D.**, Genentech (a Member of the Roche group)

**Leesa McBurnie**, Meissner Filtration Products

**Hans Noordergraaf**, Abbott Biologicals

**Laura Okhio-Seaman**, Sartorius Stedim Biotech

**Vinayak Pawar, Ph.D.**, U.S. Food and Drug Administration

**Herbert Reichert**, Meissner Filtration Products

**Kerry Roche Lentine**, MilliporeSigma, a business of Merck KGaA, Darmstadt, Germany

**Renate Rosengarten, D.V.M., Ph.D.**, Mycoplasma Biosafety Services GmbH

**Rosemary Versteeg, Ph.D.**, International Serum Industry Association

**Helena Wind**, Mycoplasma Experience Limited

**Christopher Wilcox, Ph.D.**, Pfanstiehl, Inc.

**Christine Wright, Ph.D.**, MilliporeSigma, A business of Merck KGaA, Darmstadt, Germany

**DISCLAIMER:** The content and views expressed in this technical report are the result of a consensus achieved by the authoring task force and are not necessarily views of the organizations they represent. The consensus method provided in this Report is not intended to establish mandatory standards, but presents best practice as developed jointly by the various filter vendor, regulatory, and end user task force members.

# Consensus Method for Rating 0.1 $\mu$ m Mycoplasma Reduction Filters

Technical Report No. 75

ISPN: 08-0-939459-91-9

© 2010 Parenteral Drug Association, Inc.

All rights reserved.



# Table of Contents

<b>1.0 INTRODUCTION</b> .....	<b>1</b>	<b>4.0 APPENDIX I: CONSENSUS METHOD PROTOCOL..</b>	<b>8</b>
1.1 Purpose .....	1	4.1 Material and Equipment .....	8
1.2 Scope .....	2	4.2 Preparation of Media .....	9
<b>2.0 GLOSSARY OF TERMS</b> .....	<b>3</b>	4.3 Preparation of Challenge Microorganism .....	9
<b>3.0 MYCOPLASMA FILTRATION CONSENSUS METHOD</b> .....	<b>4</b>	4.4 Preparation of the Challenge Suspension .....	9
3.1 Standardizing Culture Media Test Parameters ..	4	4.5 Challenge Test Apparatus .....	10
3.2 Filter Rating .....	4	4.6 Assay Method .....	12
3.3 Integrity Testing.....	4	4.7 Acceptance Criteria.....	12
3.4 Mycoplasma Challenge Testing .....	5	4.8 Data Reporting.....	13
3.5 Test Validity Criteria.....	5	<b>5.0 APPENDIX II: BUBBLE POINT METHOD</b> .....	<b>14</b>
3.6 Consensus Test Parameters .....	6	5.1 Manual Bubble Point Test Method .....	14
		<b>6.0 REFERENCES</b> .....	<b>15</b>

## FIGURES AND TABLES INDEX

<b>Table 4.1-1</b>	Material and Equipment for Consensus Method.....	8	<b>Table 4.8-</b>	Example of devices with the same mycoplasma reduction performance but different titer reduction/LRV as an artifact of the calculation .....	13
<b>Table 4.2-1</b>	Preparation of Broth Culture.....	9	<b>Figure 5.0-1</b>	Manual bubble point test apparatus..	14
<b>Table 4.5-1</b>	Challenge Test Parameters.....	10			
<b>Figure 4.5-1</b>	Example of a Challenge Test Apparatus.....	1			

# 1.0 Introduction

Mycoplasmas (trivial name for organisms of the class Mollicutes) are well-known microbial contaminants found in biologic processes, particularly cell culture processes. Historical surveys of cell lines have found high rates of mycoplasma contamination in research labs and production facilities. (1,2) With their ability to establish occult contaminations, mycoplasmas can evade conventional bioburden assays, and even lead to changes in metabolism and phenotype of the cell culture.

Filters are rated based on performance and not on an absolute measure of pore size. The absence of a rigid peptidoglycan-based bacterial cell wall enable mycoplasmas to pass through sterilizing grade (0.2  $\mu\text{m}$ ) and mycoplasma reduction grade (0.1  $\mu\text{m}$ ) filters, potentially contaminating an entire production process. Because of these invasive capabilities, mycoplasma contamination has garnered special attention by regulatory agencies, resulting in expectations for testing and risk-mitigation. (3)

USP <1043> provides categories that are useful for assessing material risks associated with mycoplasma contamination in raw materials. (4) Examples of contamination risks include:

- Process materials, which can provide a suitable environment for mycoplasma to remain present at high levels for at least 6 months (5)
- Biological process fluids (typically containing either plant or animal derived components), prepared with 0.2  $\mu\text{m}$  filtration (6,7)

The risk of contamination not only depends on the media, but also on where the material is used in the process and whether the process contains subsequent purification (i.e., inactivation or removal) steps. Therefore, pretreatment of raw materials (e.g., heat treatment or irradiation) should be considered, where appropriate.

In a biologics process, 0.1  $\mu\text{m}$  filtration is often used in drug substance manufacturing as a mycoplasma contamination prevention measure. This barrier approach, with risk reduction as the goal, is prevalent in the mammalian cell culture industry. The concept is similar to bioburden reduction filtration used in protein purification processes. For upstream barrier applications, such as cell culture media filtration, process-specific mycoplasma reduction validation is generally not a regulatory expectation. However, based on a risk assessment, an end user may evaluate a process-specific reduction of mycoplasma using the mycoplasma consensus method as described in this technical report and a companion article published in the *PDA Journal of Science and Technology*. (8)

For manufacturers of raw materials (e.g., serum) that wish to make a “mycoplasma-free” claim based on filtration, validation of the mycoplasma removal filtration process should be performed following the principles outlined in *PDA Technical Report No. 26 (Revised 2008): Sterilizing Filtration of Liquids*. (9) In addition, manufacturers of raw materials should also consider using the mycoplasma consensus method described in this technical report to grow the *Acholeplasma laidlawii* challenge organism for validation purposes. (8)

## 1.1 Purpose

Filters are rated based on performance and not on an absolute measure of pore size. The guiding principles of this technical report describe a consensus filter challenge test for standardizing test parameters across laboratories. The express purpose of this technical report is to educate users and filter manufacturers about best practices for mycoplasma reduction filtration and suggest a consistent method which filter manufacturers can use to for testing and rating the effectiveness of mycoplasma reduction filters. It describes the implementation of a specific filtration testing method and positive controls for establishing a manufacturer’s claims of mycoplasma reduction for their filters.

## 1.2 Scope

For filter manufacturers, the consensus method described in this document is intended to be used for developing mycoplasma reduction claims for their products.

For filter end users, the consensus method provides assurance that the stated mycoplasma reduction capability for a given filter is derived from a standardized challenge test uniformly practiced and reported by filter manufacturers. In addition, the consensus method also provides cultivation parameters for *Acholeplasma laidlawii* as a challenge microorganism, if a risk assessment determines that process-specific evaluation is appropriate.

Currently in preview, click buy full version