Techniques

 Acta Cytologica 2015;59:474–478 DOI: [10.1159/000443761](http://dx.doi.org/10.1159%2F000443761)

 Received: November 30, 2015 Accepted after revision: January 4, 2016 Published online: February 5, 2016

Cytogenetic Biomonitoring in Buccal Mucosa Cells from Young Smokers

Victor Hugo Pereira da Silva^a Raquel de Luna Antonio^b Sabine Pompeia^b Daniel Araki Ribeiro^a

Departments of ^a Biosciences and ^b Psychobiology, Federal University of São Paulo UNIFESP, Santos, Brazil

Key Words

Oral mucosa cells · Cigarette smoke · Micronucleus test

Abstract

Objective: Nowadays, much attention has been focused on the search for new non-invasive methodologies able to predict malignant transformation of oral mucosa cells. The aim of the present study was to comparatively evaluate DNA damage (micronucleus) and cellular death (pyknosis, karyolysis and karyorrhexis) in exfoliated oral mucosa cells from smokers and non-smokers in buccal mucosa cells. *Study Design:* A total of 24 young, healthy smokers and 14 non-smokers were included in this setting. Individuals had epithelial cells from the cheek mechanically exfoliated, placed in fixative and dropped in clean slides which were checked for the above nuclear phenotypes. *Results:* Smokers presented more (p < 0.05) micronucleated oral mucosa cells than non-smokers. Tobacco smoke was not able to increase other nuclear alterations closely related to cytotoxicity such as karyorrhexis, pyknosis and karyolysis. *Conclusion:* In summary, these data indicate that the cigarette is able to induce micronuclei in oral mucosa cells, so the micronucleus test is a suitable method for predicting oral cancer risk. © 2016 S. Karger AG, Basel

KARGER 125

 © 2016 S. Karger AG, Basel 0001–5547/16/0596–0474\$39.50/0

E-Mail karger@karger.com www.karger.com/acy

Introduction

Cancer is defined as a complex genetic disease characterized by altered expression of cell cycle regulatory proteins caused by mutagenic agents and carcinogens and is the common cause of mortality both in developed and in developing countries. Epidemiologic studies have proven that cigarette smoking is the major cause of oral cancer $[1, 2]$. Therefore, tobacco has been considered the single most important man-made cause of cancer that can be avoided. On a scientific basis, these studies provide convincing evidence of an association between cigarette smoking and oral cancer.

 A great deal of attention has been focused on the search for new non-invasive methodologies that enable the prediction of when, and to what extent, the oral mucosa cells undergo malignant transformation as a result of environmental mutagenesis. Herein, the micronucleus test has become the most popular method for detecting structural and numerical chromosomal aberrations caused by environmental mutagenic agents, both in experimental test systems and in human studies [3]. Micronuclei are defined as acentric fragments or whole chromosomes which are not included into the main nu-

 Correspondence to: Dr. Daniel Araki Ribeiro Departamento de Biociências, Universidade Federal de São Paulo UNIFESP Av. Ana Costa 95 Santos, SP 11060-001 (Brazil) E-Mail daribeiro @ unifesp.br

clei of the daughter cells. The formation of micronuclei can be induced by substances that cause chromosome breakage (clastogens), as well as by agents that affect the spindle apparatus (aneugens) [4] . According to Tolbert et al. [5], the specificity of the test to detect genotoxic and cytotoxic effects is improved by analysing other degenerative nuclear alterations indicative of cell death. Among them, pyknosis, karyolysis and karyorrhexis are suitable for this purpose.

 Unfortunately, the evaluation of earlier micronucleus studies using buccal cells in smokers has demonstrated that the results are strongly controversial. This is because positive findings were obtained mainly with non-DNA-specific stains or when studying other confounding factors, not specifically focused on the mutagenic outcomes induced by cigarette smoke [6]. For example, Bloching et al. [7] evaluated micronuclei in smokers suffering from cancer or even premalignant lesions of the oral mucosa. An elevated number of micronuclei in these patients was detected, probably due to oral neoplasms, because it is well established that tumours are able to induce mutagenicity as a result of micronucleated cells in oral exfoliated cells. In the study by Stich and Rosin [8], the number of micronuclei of heavy smokers was similar to that of non-smokers. Suhas et al. [9] showed an increased frequency of micronuclei in smokers of beedi, in which concentrations of nicotine, tar, and other toxic agents in smoke from burnt tobacco are higher than in cigarette smoke. The data presented by Wu et al. [10] revealed that cigarette smoking did not increase the number of micronuclei in smokers when compared with controls. Kayal et al. [11] investigated micronuclei in buccal mucosa cells of persons who chewed indigenous products (areca nut, mava, tamol, tobacco with lime, dry snuff, or mashery), but not tobacco cigarettes. Motgi et al. [12] have demonstrated that total numbers of micronucleated cells were significantly lower in non-tobacco users when compared with tobacco users, but such data were obtained by using non-specific DNA stains (Papanicolaou stain). Others have yet revealed a lack of statistical significance for micronucleus frequency between smokers and non-smokers in patients previously submitted to dental X-ray [13, 14]. These data contrast with the current knowledge of cigarette smoke in the risk of oral cancer [15]. It has been discussed whether this procedure may be a reliable method for the detection of human cancer risks as most tumours are of epithelial origin [16] . Such data elicits concerns about the predictive value of the method itself, as it is well documented that

the oral cavity is one of the target organs for cancer induction by smoking [17].

 As a result and because of controversial scientific evidence, the aim of this study was to investigate cytotoxicity and mutagenicity in buccal mucosa cells induced by cigarette smoke in young individuals by a micronucleus test using the Feulgen fast green method (specific DNA stain).

Materials and Methods

Subjects

 The subjects of this study comprised a total of 24 healthy young adults (10 men and 14 women) with a mean age of 28.8 ± 4.2 years. In this study, the volunteers were considered smokers if they had smoked more than 10 cigarettes/day for at least 5 years. Furthermore, 14 adults (9 men and 5 women) with a mean age of 25.6 ± 4.2 years were included as non-smokers. None of the participants had a history of major illnesses, they were on no medication at the time of the study, they had a body mass index below 27, used illicit drugs less than once a month, and had at least 11 years of schooling. The study was approved by the Human Ethics Committee of the Universidade Federal the São Paulo. Informed consent was obtained from all participants.

Micronucleus Test in Oral Mucosa Cells

 After rinsing the mouth with tap water, cells were obtained by scraping the right/left cheek mucosa with a moist wooden spatula. Cells were transferred to a tube containing saline solution, centrifuged (800 rpm) during 5 min, fixed in 3:1 methanol/acetic acid, and dropped onto precleaned slides. Later, the air-dried slides were stained using the Feulgen fast green method, and examined under a light microscope at a magnification of ×1,000 to determine the frequency of micronucleated cells. Two thousand cells were scored from each test person. Samples of smokers were obtained approximately 2 h after the last cigarette.

Data Analysis

 Micronuclei were scored according to the criteria described by Beliën et al. [4] as a parameter of DNA damage (mutagenicity). For cytotoxicity, the following nuclear alterations were considered: pyknosis, karyolysis and karyorrhexis. Results were expressed in percentages. This analysis was established in a previous study conducted by our research group [18]. The analysis was evaluated independently by two biomedical doctors in a blinded fashion.

Statistical Methods

 The Mann-Whitney non-parametric test was used to compare the frequencies of cytotoxicity among the samples between smokers and non-smokers (control group). Micronucleus frequencies between controls and smokers were evaluated as established by Pereira [19]. The statistical analysis was conducted using BioStat software, version 5.0 (Maringa, PR, Brazil). The level of statistical significance was set at 5%.

 Table 1. Micronucleus incidence in buccal mucosa cells of smokers

	Micronucleus incidence		
Control	0.0 ± 0.1		
Smokers	$0.7 \pm 0.8^*$		

* p < 0.05 when compared to control group.

 Table 2. Cytotoxicity parameters (karyorrhexis, pyknosis and karyolysis) in buccal mucosa cells of smokers

Groups	Pyknosis	Karyorrhexis	Karyolysis
Control Smokers	108.8 ± 37.4 110.0 ± 33.3	21.6 ± 31.5 16.3 ± 13.8	17.3 ± 13.4 14.4 ± 22.0
$p > 0.05$.			

Results

 Table 1 shows the frequencies of micronucleated cells in buccal mucosa cells of non-smokers and smokers. Significant statistical differences ($p < 0.05$) were obtained, smokers having presented a higher micronucleus incidence.

 However, cigarette smoke was not able to increase other nuclear alterations closely related to cytotoxicity such as karyorrhexis, pyknosis and karyolysis of non-smokers and smokers (p values > 0.05; table 2).

 Finally, exposure to known genotoxins was not investigated. The daily alcohol consumption was not considered in this study, because a recall bias phenomenon had occurred.

Discussion

 The aim of this study was to comparatively evaluate chromosome damage and cellular death induced by exposure to cigarette smoking as indicators of genotoxicity and cytotoxicity, respectively. The investigation was conducted using the micronucleus test in oral exfoliated cells in vivo.

 The big advantage of the micronucleus assay is the relative ease of scoring, the limited costs and person-time required, and the precision obtained from scoring larger numbers of cells. The measurement of the frequency of micronuclei induced in cells by mutagen agents is widely

> Acta Cytologica 2015;59:474–478 DOI: [10.1159/000443761](http://dx.doi.org/10.1159%2F000443761)

used for cytogenetic biomonitoring [4] . Micronuclei contain genetic material that is lost from the whole DNA during mitosis, as a result of clastogen or aneugen events [4] . Hence, there will arise bigger micronuclei from whole chromosomes as a follow-up to damaging of the spindle apparatus of the cell (aneugen). Smaller micronuclei are the result of structural aberrations and consist of chromosomal breakage. Damages that lead to the formation of micronuclei take place in the basal layer of the epithelial tissue, where cells undergo mitosis. Programmed turnover of epithelial tissues brings the cells to the surface where they exfoliate, and therefore it is possible to detect them.

 Genomic damage plays a pivotal role during carcinogenesis. It has been well established that genomic damage is produced by environmental exposure to mutagens, carcinogens as well as to genetic factors such as defects in the xenobiotic metabolism and DNA repair deficiency [20] . Micronucleated cell frequencies predict genomic instability [21]. The detection of an elevated frequency of micronuclei in a given population indicates an increased risk of cancer [8]. However, cell types that repair DNA damage efficiently are likely to show lower levels of residual damage than cells less proficient in DNA repair [22]. Buccal cells have been shown to have limited DNA repair capacity relative to peripheral blood lymphocytes, and therefore may more accurately reflect genomic instability events in epithelial tissues [4].

 Tobacco is known to contain various genotoxic chemicals, and smoking is a well-documented cause of cancer including the oral cavity [23] . Our results demonstrated an increase in micronucleus frequency in buccal cells from smokers using a small sample, indicating that this technique is sensitive to these changes. In fact, several works have failed to show any positive mutagenic effect of smoke. Some works have reported no differences in the induction of micronuclei between smokers and nonsmokers [6], while others have shown that smokers had less DNA damage than non-smokers [24] . Exposure to nicotine caused a statistically significant increase in micronucleus frequency in human gingival fibroblasts in vitro [25] . However, it has been demonstrated that nicotine inhibits the action of nitrosamines which is catalyzed by P450 2E1 [26, 27], and also it participates in the conversion of benzo[a]pyrene to DNA-reactive metabolites [28]. Nitrosamines and polycyclic aromatic amines are considered important chemical agents able to promote genetic insult as far as carcinogenesis [15] . In this regard, it has been postulated that nicotine attenuates the acute toxic effects of tobacco condensate in cultured human epithelial cells [29].

Pereira da Silva/de Luna Antonio/

Pompeia/Ribeiro

 To monitor cytotoxic effects, the frequencies of karyorrhexis, karyolysis and pyknosis were included into this experimental design. Our results showed that in young smokers tobacco use did not induce cytotoxicity as depicted by no statistically significant differences ($p > 0.05$) between smokers and non-smokers. Some authors have argued that nicotine is able to prevent apoptosis in human gingival fibroblasts in vitro [25] . Conversely, others have suggested an increase in apoptosis after cigarette smoke extract stimulation in rat alveolar cells [30]. Curiously, it has been shown that nicotine has anti-oxidant properties [31, 32], so it could interfere with positive results of cytotoxicity. Notwithstanding, explanations for the diverging results may be found in differences pertaining to methodology and/or population characteristics, as well as the sample size. Moreover, it is important to stress that variations in the nicotine levels of the cigarettes smoked by the participants play a crucial role in the human health effects [6]. This issue requires further investigation.

 Besides the power of the statistical analysis as a critical factor for the determination of putative outcome, various additional explanations (including seasonal and regional differences) for the reported discrepancies have been proposed [6]. Particularly, some confounding factors are relevant and must be considered when studying biomonitoring human cytogenetic studies. Viruses, alterations in the immune system, failures in the DNA repair system and interindividual variations have already been associated with increased frequencies of chromosome aberrations [33] . Furthermore, an age-related increase in micronuclei has been postulated [34]. Due to the homogeneity in casuistics, it was not possible to correlate the frequency of micronucleated cells with the age in this setting.

 In conclusion, the results of the present study suggest that smokers are a high-risk group for developing oral cancer since positive mutagenicity was found. Moreover, we conclude that the micronucleus assay in buccal mucosa cells is a suitable method for predicting the oral cancer risk.

Acknowledgements

 This study was supported by CNPq, AFIP and FAPESP (Fundação de Amparo a Pesquisa do Estado de São Paulo, project No. 2012/20664-8 and 2013/10985-4).

Disclosure Statement

There is no conflict of interest declared.

References

- 1 Nanjappa V, Renuse S, Sathe GJ, Raja R, Syed N, Radhakrishnan A, Subbannayya T, Patil A, Marimuthu A, Sahasrabuddhe NA, Guerrero-Preston R, Somani BL, Nair B, Kundu GC, Prasad TS, Califano JA, Gowda H, Sidransky D, Pandey A, Chatterjee A: Chronic exposure to chewing tobacco selects for overexpression of stearoyl-CoA desaturase in normal oral keratinocytes. Cancer Biol Ther 2015;16:1593– 1603.
- 2 Sanner T, Grimsrud TK: Nicotine: carcinogenicity and effects on response to cancer treatment – a review. Front Oncol 2015;5:196.
- 3 Fenech M, Kirsch-Volders M, Natarajan AT, Surralles J, Crott JW, Parry J, Norppa H, Eastmond DA, Tucker JD, Thomas P: Molecular mechanisms of micronucleus, nucleoplasmic bridge and nuclear bud formation in mammalian and human cells. Mutagenesis 2011; 26:125–132.
- 4 Beliën JA, Copper MP, Braakhuis BJ, Snow GB, Baak JP: Standardization of counting micronuclei: definition of a protocol to measure genotoxic damage in human exfoliated cells. Carcinogenesis 1995;16:2395–2400.
- 5 Tolbert PE, Shy CM, Allen JW: Micronuclei 10 Wu PA, Loh CH, Hsieh LL, Liu TY, Chen CJ, and other nuclear anomalies in buccal smears: methods development. Mutat Res 1992;271: 69–77.
- 6 Nersesyan A, Muradyan R, Kundi M, Knasmueller S: Impact of smoking on the frequencies of micronuclei and other nuclear abnormalities in exfoliated oral cells: a comparative study with different cigarette types. Mutagenesis 2011;26:295–3011.
- 7 Bloching M, Hofmann A, Lautenschlager C, Berghaus A, Grummt T: Exfoliative cytology of normal buccal mucosa to predict the relative risk of cancer in the upper aerodigestive tract using the MN-assay. Oral Oncol 2000; 36:550–555.
- ▶ 8 Stich HF, Rosin MP: Quantitating the synergis- ▶ 13 tic effect of smoking and alcohol consumption with the micronucleus test on human buccal mucosa cells. Int J Cancer 1983;31:305–308.
- 9 Suhas S, Ganapathy KS, Gayatri Devi M, Ramesh C: Application of the micronucleus test to exfoliated epithelial cells from the oral cavity of beedi smokers, a high-risk group for oral cancer. Mutat Res 2004;561:15–21.
- Liou SH: Clastogenic effect for cigarette smoking but not areca quid chewing as measured by micronuclei in exfoliated buccal mucosal cells. Mutat Res 2004;562:27–38.
- 11 Kayal JJ, Trivedi AH, Dave BJ: Incidence of micronuclei in oral mucosa of users of tobacco products singly or in various combinations. Mutagenesis 1993;8:31–33.
- 12 Motgi AA, Chavan MS, Diwan NN, Chowdhery A, Channe PP, Shete MVA: Assessment of cytogenic damage in the form of micronuclei in oral epithelial cells in patients using smokeless and smoked form of tobacco and non-tobacco users and its relevance for oral cancer. J Cancer Res Ther 2014;10:165–170.
	- 13 Ribeiro DA, Sannomiya EK, Pozzi R, Miranda SR, Angelieri F: Cellular death but not genetic damage in oral mucosa cells after exposure to digital lateral radiography. Clin Oral Investig 2011;15:357–360.
- 14 Angelieri F, de Cássia Gonçalves Moleirinho 21 Thomas P, Harvey S, Gruner T, Fenech M: 28 Weber RP, Coon JM, Triolo AJ: Nicotine in-T, Carlin V, Oshima CT, Ribeiro DA: Biomonitoring of oral epithelial cells in smokers and non-smokers submitted to panoramic Xray: comparison between buccal mucosa and lateral border of the tongue. Clin Oral Investig 2010;14:669–674.
- 15 International Agency for Research on Cancer: Tobacco Smoke and Involuntary Smoking. IARC Monographs on the Evaluation of Carcinogenic Risks to Humans. Lyon, IARC, 23 2004, vol 83.
- 16 Cairns J: Mutation selection and the natural history of cancer. Nature 1975;255:197–200.
- 17 Stich HF, Stich W, Parida BB: Elevated frequency of micronucleated cells in the buccal mucosa of individuals at high risk for oral cancer: betel quid chewers. Cancer Lett 1982; 17:125–134.
- 18 Martins RA, Gomes GA, Aguiar O Jr, Ribeiro 25 Argentin G, Cicchetti R: Genotoxic and anti-DA: Biomonitoring of oral epithelial cells in petrol station attendants: comparison between buccal mucosa and lateral border of the 26 tongue. Environ Int 2009;35:1062–1065.
- 19 Pereira CAB: Teste estatístico para comparar proporções em problemas de citogenética; in Rabelo-Gay N, Rodrigues MA, Monteleone-Neto R (eds): Mutagênese, Teratogênese e Carcinogênese (in Portuguese). São Paulo, Sociedade Brasileira de Genética, 1991, pp 113–121.
- 20 Neri M, Fucic A, Knudsen LE, Lando C, Merlo F, Bonassi S: Micronuclei frequency in children exposed to environmental mutagens: a review. Mutat Res 2003;544:243–225.
- The buccal cytome and micronucleus frequency is substantially altered in Down's syndrome and normal ageing compared to young healthy controls. Mutat Res 2008;638:3–47.
- 22 Kujan O, Oliver RJ, Khattab A, Roberts SA, Thakker N, Sloan A: Evaluation of a new binary system of grading oral epithelial dysplasia for prediction of malignant transforma- 230 tion. Oral Oncol 2006;42:987–993.
- Sugano N, Minigeshi T, Kawamoto K, Ito K: Nicotine inhibits UV-induced activation of the apoptotic pathway. Toxicol Lett 2001;125: 61–65.
- ▶ 24 Burgaz S, Iscan A, Büyükbingöl ZK, Bozkurt ▶ 31 A, Karakaya AE: Evaluation of micronuclei in exfoliated urothelial cells and urinary thioether excretion of smokers. Mutat Res 1995; 232 335:163–116.
	- apoptotic effect of nicotine on human gingival fibroblasts. Toxicol Sci 2004;79:75–81.
	- Murphy SE, Heiblum R: Effect of nicotine and tobacco-specific nitrosamines on the metabolism of N′-nitrosonornicotine and 4-(methylnitrosamino)-1-(3-pyridyl)-1-butanone by rat oral tissue. Carcinogenesis 1990;11:1663– 1666.
	- Richter E, Tricker AR: Nicotine inhibits the metabolic activation of the tobacco-specific nitrosamine 4-(methylnitrosamino)-1-(3-pyridyl)-1-butanone in rats. Carcinogenesis 1994; 15:1061–1064.
- hibition of the metabolism of 3,4-benzopyrene, a carcinogen in tobacco smoke. Science 1974;184:1081–1083.
- 29 Chen J, Higby R, Tian D, Tan D, Johnson MD, Xiao Y, Kellar KJ, Feng S, Shields PG: Toxicological analysis of low-nicotine and nicotinefree cigarettes. Toxicology 2008;249:194–203.
	- 30 Chen H, Liao K, Cui-Zhao L, Qiang-Wen F, Feng-Zeng X, Ping-Wu F, Liang-Guo S, Juan-Chen Y: Cigarette smoke extract induces apoptosis of rat alveolar type II cells via the PLTP/TGF-β1/Smad2 pathway. Int Immunopharmacol 2015;28:707–714.
- Liu Q, Tao Y, Zhao B: ESR study on scavenging effect of nicotine on free radicals. Appl Magn Reson 2003;24:105–112.
- Soto-Otero R, Mendez-Alvarez E, Hermida-Ameijeiras A, Lopez-Real M, Labandeira-Garcia JL: Effects of (–)-nicotine and (–)-cotinine on 6-hydroxydopamine-induced oxidative stress and neuro-toxicity: relevance for Parkinson's disease. Biochem Pharmacol 2002;64:125–135.
- 33 Moler P, Knudsen LE, Loft H, Walin H: The comet assay as a rapid test in biomonitoring occupational exposure to DNA-damaging agents and effect of confounding factors. Cancer Epidemiol Biomarkers Prev 2000;9: 1005–1015.
- Jones KH, York TP, Jackson-Cook C: Mechanisms leading to the formation of micronuclei containing sex chromosomes differ with age. Mutat Res 2012;18;747:207–217.

Pereira da Silva/de Luna Antonio/

Pompeia/Ribeiro