Tat_BioV: Tattoo ink exposure and biokinetics of selected tracers in a short-term clinical study of 24 subjects

- 4
- 5 Susanne Kochs¹, Sandra Schiewe¹, Milena Foerster², Kathrin Hillmann³, Claudia Blankenstein³,
- 6 Martina C. Meinke⁴, Josephine Kugler¹, David Kocovic⁵, Andreas Luch¹, Ulrike Blume-Peytavi³, Ines
- 7 Schreiver^{1,*}
- ¹German Federal Institute for Risk Assessment (BfR), Department of Chemical and Product Safety, Berlin,
 Germany
- ²International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC), Environment and Lifestyle Epidemiology Branch, Lyon,
 France
- ³Charité-Universitätsmedizin Berlin, Corporate Member of Freie Universität Berlin and Humboldt Universität zu
- Berlin, Department of Dermatology, Venereology and Allergology, Clinical Research Center for Hair and Skin Science, Berlin, Germany
- ⁴Charité-Universitätsmedizin Berlin, Corporate Member of Freie Universität Berlin and Humboldt Universität zu
 Berlin, Department of Dermatology, Venereology and Allergology, Center of Experimental and Applied
 Cutaneous Physiology, Berlin, Germany
- ⁵Institute for Medicines and Medical Devices of Montenegro, Center for Inspection Supervision and Market
 Control, Podgorica, Montenegro
- 20
- 21
- 22 Declaration of Competing Interests
- 23 The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal relationships
- 24 that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper.

26 **Abstract**

Background: About one-fifth of people in industrialised countries are tattooed, potentially putting them at risk of exposure to possible carcinogenic or otherwise harmful substances. Health risks are directly correlated with the amounts of substances introduced, yet reliable data on the systemic exposure to tattoo inks are lacking.

Objectives: This study aims to determine the exposure to soluble tattoo ink ingredients and their excretion within 24 hours after tattooing. Comparative *in vivo* and *in vitro* experiments were conducted to determine the change in metabolite exposure between tattooing and oral exposure.

Methods: In a clinical study, 24 subjects were tattooed with black or red tattoo ink to which the tracer substances potassium iodide, 4-aminobenzoic acid (PABA) and 2-phenoxyethanol (PEtOH) had been added to mimic known hazardous substances found in tattoo inks. Tracers and their metabolites were quantified in blood, urine, ink, and consumables pre- and post-tattooing. Tattooed skin area was determined using picture analysis. PABA metabolism upon tattooing was compared to peroral administration. Skin fibroblasts and macrophages were tested *in vitro* for their ability to metabolise PABA.

Results: All tracers or their metabolites were identified in urine; iodide and the PABA metabolite 4acetamidobenzoic acid (ACD) were identified in plasma. The worst-case scenario for systemic ink exposure was estimated to be 0.31 g of ink per tattoo session (75th percentile). Peroral administration resulted in lower levels of ACD than tattooing. Fibroblasts and macrophages were capable of converting PABA into ACD.

Discussion: Our results are the first human *in vivo* data on soluble tattoo ink ingredients and suggest that the overall exposure might be lower than the estimates previously used for regulatory purposes. In addition, the first-pass effect by skin metabolism leads to an altered metabolite profile compared to oral exposure. Skin metabolism might also contribute to detoxification of certain carcinogenic substances through *N*-acetylation.

51 Introduction

52 The high prevalence of body tattooing and its facial equivalent, the latter better known as permanent make-up, has already raised health concerns for decades.¹ Between 17 and 31.5% of all people across 53 Europe and the United States are tattooed.^{2,3} The European REACH (Registration, Evaluation, 54 Authorisation and Restriction of Chemicals) restriction on tattoo and permanent make-up inks bans 55 more than 4000 substances due to their hazard potential, thus making it the strictest regulation 56 worldwide.⁴ Substances with toxic potential found in tattoo inks include heavy metals (e.g., 57 chromium, nickel, cobalt), primary aromatic amines (PAAs) and polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons 58 (PAHs), which may have allergic and/or carcinogenic potential.⁵⁻¹² While acute adverse reactions 59 occur promptly after tattooing and are therefore relatively easy to correlate with them, long-term 60 effects of tattoos, such as cancer and immunotoxicity, are not easily linked.¹³ Exposure quantification 61 62 is crucial to calculate safe limits and to assess population-wide risks associated with intentionally or 63 non-intentionally added hazardous substances in tattoo inks.

During tattooing, insoluble pigments and soluble co-formulants are introduced into the dermal layer of the skin. Previous studies as well as clinical observations have shown that pigments can be transported to regional lymph nodes of tattooed individuals,¹⁴ indicating the possibility of further migration towards more distant organs. Since pigments remain in the body, long-term exposure has to be considered, whereas water soluble ingredients are likely to be metabolised and excreted rapidly. In this case, a short-term, acute exposure period can be assumed. Exposure through

70 tattooing is determined by the amount of ink applied per surface area of the tattooed skin. Several 71 studies were conducted to determine exposure levels, including weighing ex vivo skin before and after tattooing¹⁵ and quantifying pigments after tattooing of *ex vivo* skin.¹⁶ However, these data 72 73 primarily refer to the initial pigment deposition rather than the soluble fraction administered, and they vary greatly (0.6 – 9.5 mg_{pigment}/cm²).¹⁶ In 2017, the European Chemicals Agency (ECHA) 74 estimated an exposure level of 14.36 mg_{ink}/cm² based on a study by Engel and colleagues.¹⁶ For a 75 tattooed area of 300 cm², this would result in an equivalent to 4.308 g of ink per session.¹⁷ However, 76 these were ex vivo generated data and therefore do not consider the actual absorption of the soluble 77 78 ink fraction into the body. Thus, their relevance for real-life exposure estimation remains elusive.

As tattooing is a unique kind of exposure route, comparison of metabolic profiles with peroral dosing – an administration route often used in toxicity studies – is of high interest. Skin metabolism was previously described as detoxifying for carcinogens such as PAAs.¹⁸ A different metabolic profile might therefore lead to increased or reduced adverse effects despite a similar systemic dose. Main driver of this detoxification is the *N*-acetylation of PAAs by keratinocytes.¹⁸ However, gene expression of *N*-acetyltransferase 1 (NAT1) was also found in fibroblasts.^{19,20} Fibroblasts are the most common cell type in the dermis and tattoo pigments reside predominantly in fibroblasts and macrophages.^{21,22}

86 In the present study, we used an in vivo human quasi-experimental design to derive a reasonable 87 worst-case exposure scenario that may be applied in future risk assessments. As most of the 88 potentially harmful tattoo ink ingredients cannot be used in human experimental exposure studies 89 due to their hazard potential, we added tracer substances (potassium iodide, 4-aminobenzoic acid 90 (PABA), and 2-phenoxyethanol (PEtOH)) to tattoo inks, as hazard-free alternatives. To estimate the 91 short-term exposure and biodistribution of tattoo inks, the tracers were quantified in blood, urine 92 and consumable products in contact with ink of 24 subjects by using previously validated analytical 93 methods.²³ The tattooed body surface per session was derived by digital picture analysis. In addition, skin and peroral metabolism of PABA were investigated in vitro and in vivo, respectively. 94

95 Methods

96 Study design

97 The single-arm study was conducted at the Clinical Research Center for Hair and Skin Science, 98 Charité-Universitätsmedizin Berlin (Berlin, Germany) from November 2021 to September 2022. A 99 total of 24 subjects were tattooed by professional tattoo artists with different tattoo inks (14 black, 100 10 red) spiked with the tracers iodide, PABA and PEtOH. These tracers were selected based on their physico-chemical similarities to tattoo-associated substances, whilst having a low toxicological profile 101 and also being used in drug products (details cf. Supplemental Material 1).²³⁻³⁰ lodide was chosen for 102 103 its straightforward quantifiability for the determination of applied ink, PABA has structural 104 similarities to PAAs, and PEtOH was selected as a potential preservative in tattoo inks that has 105 similarities to the more commonly used benzyl alcohol. Tracers were added to commercial tattoo 106 inks at a clinical pharmacy unit under sterile conditions (cf. Supplemental Material 1). Subjects and 107 tattoo artists were recruited through flyers and social media. The inclusion criteria for subjects were: 108 healthy, male, 18 - 45 years of age, 60 - 100 kg, autonomous wish for a tattoo (tattooed area \pm 30%: 109 black ~ 300 cm², red ~ 100 cm²), and at least one already existing tattoo. The design of the tattoo and 110 the tattoo artist were of subject's choice. Exclusion criteria included health restrictions, intake of 111 certain drugs or dietary supplements containing the tracers or that might otherwise affect the study, 112 and unwillingness to follow the behavioural and dietary rules (Supplemental Material 2). Since PEtOH 113 can be present in cosmetic products, subjects were instructed to use specified cosmetic products 114 provided for the study period only.

Participation in the study involved 3–4 appointments for each subject. Preliminary examinations included parameters such as age, height, weight, body fat (three-site measurement technique according to Jackson and Pollock³¹) and blood parameters to determine liver, kidney and thyroid function. Subjects were instructed on usage of urine canisters, dietary rules and provided with cosmetic products.

Urine was collected autonomously by subjects for 48 hours with container changes at specific time intervals (*Figure 1*). Blood samples were collected at specific time points (*Figure 1*) at the study centre using 5 ml citrate-phosphate-dextrose-adenine (CPDA) blood collection tubes. During and at the end of the tattooing process, all consumables and items that had come into contact with the ink were collected in designated bags. The samples were then transported to the German Federal Institute for Risk Assessment (Bundesinstitut für Risikobewertung, BfR, Berlin, Germany) and analysed.

127 Ethics approval

128 The study was approved by the ethics committee of the Charité – Universitätsmedizin Berlin (Berlin, 129 Germany) under the proposal number EA4/085/21. Informed consent was obtained from all subjects 130 before study participation. Written consent from subjects and artists was obtained for the 131 photographs of tattoos shown. Artist copyright was indicated as requested. The study was registered 132 in the German Clinical Trials Register under DRKS00026022 including a detailed study protocol.

133 Analysis of plasma, urine, tattoo inks and consumables

Blood samples were stored and transported at 2–8 °C before processing to plasma via centrifugation at 2500 rcf for 15 min (centrifuge 5804 R, Eppendorf, Hamburg, Germany). Due to canister size, urine samples were kept at room temperature by subjects and stored and transported at 2–8 °C upon arrival at the study centre. Urine volume was determined upon arrival at the BfR.

Quantification methods of all tracers were validated according to a guideline of the European
 Medicines Agency with additional parameters according to an ICH guideline.^{23,32,33}

For iodine quantification, plasma and urine samples as well as ink samples and consumables were analysed using inductively coupled plasma mass spectrometry (ICP-MS) after sample preparation as previously described.²³ The method is described in detail in *Supplemental Material 3*. Consumables were extracted with 1 l ultrapure water for 2 x 30 min on every side to extract iodide while shaking (250 rpm) before addition of the internal standard.

145 PABA, PEtOH and their metabolites were analysed in plasma, urine and ink using high performance 146 liquid chromatography coupled to a quadrupole time-of-flight mass spectrometer (HPLC-QTOF-MS) as previously described.²³ Isotope-labelled internal standards were utilised for quantification against 147 148 a calibration curve in the corresponding matrix (plasma or urine). In brief, sample preparation 149 included addition of internal standards, protein precipitation by ice-cold acetonitrile (Carl Roth GmbH 150 & Co, Karlsruhe, Germany, catalogue number: HN40.2) and centrifugation and further dilution with 151 ultrapure water. In addition, alkaline hydrolysis was performed to determine the total PABA content 152 in urine. For the analysis of 2-phenoxyacetic acid (PAc) in urine samples a standard addition method 153 was used. The method is described in more detail in Supplemental Material 3. The cosmetic products 154 used by the subjects were screened to confirm absence of PEtOH. No relevant concentrations were 155 detected (Supplemental Material 4).

156 **Picture analysis**

157 Digital photographs of the tattooed area were taken from a straight angle under appropriate light 158 conditions. A measurement device was placed next to the tattoo for calibration purposes. Total

tattooed body surface in cm² was derived by digital picture analysis using the open-source software

FiJi/ImageJ (version 2.3.0/1.53q) and its plugin Trainable Weka Segmentation. This method has already been previously applied for analysis of tattooed body surface.³⁴

162 Determination of tattoo ink, urine recovery and exposure

163 The amount of ink applied to the skin was calculated using two approaches (Figure 1B,C). Firstly, 164 hypothetical use of ink per session (hypo) was derived by iodine quantification from consumables. 165 The tattoo ink bottles were weighed before and after tattooing and the calculated amount of ink in 166 the consumables was subtracted from the mass difference to obtain the amount of ink applied to the 167 skin. Secondly, systemic exposure to ink components per session (sys) was calculated from the 168 excreted amount of PABA or iodine in urine C-F. Since iodine has a physiological background and 169 some individuals have a minor 4-acetamidobenzoic acid (ACD) background depending on their diet, 170 urine A-B collected in the 24 hours before tattooing was subtracted as subject specific background. 171 Both, hypo and sys, were divided by the derived tattooed area from the picture analysis to obtain the

- amount of ink per cm².
- 173 For the urine recovery, the amount of each tracer excreted within 24 hours (urine C–F) was divided

by ink per session (hypo). Additionally, the mean recovery of all tracers was determined for everysubject.

176 Data analysis

Graphs were created using GraphPad Prism Version 10.1.2 (GraphPad Software, Boston, MA, USA)
and R (version 4.3.1). The standard deviation used in Microsoft Excel LTSC MSO (Redmond, WA, USA)
was STDEV.P, as we aimed to display the deviation within our study population.

180 PABA metabolism after oral uptake

181 To compare peroral and intradermal administration of substances by tattooing, three healthy 182 volunteers took 50 mg of PABA supplement. Urine was collected according to the tattoo study 183 (*Figure 1A*) and analysed using the same HPLC-QTOF-MS method.

184 PABA metabolism in cell culture

As PAAs and PABA can be metabolised by skin, particularly through N-acetylation,^{35,36} the metabolism 185 186 of PABA was investigated in pooled human dermal fibroblasts (HDFp) from CELLnTEC advanced cell 187 systems AG (Bern, Switzerland, catalogue number: HDfp, lot: MC1904099) and monocyte-derived 188 macrophages (MDM) isolated from buffy coats of three different donors as previously described.³⁷ The cultivation of cells is detailed in Supplemental Material 5. For the experiments, cells were seeded 189 190 in 12-well plates (HDFp: 8×10^4 cells/well and MDM: 8.75×10^5 cells/well) and incubated for 24 hours 191 before treatment with different concentrations of PABA (0, 0.1, 1, and 10 µg/ml) dissolved in 192 Dulbecco's Modified Eagle's Medium/F12 1:1 (DMEM/F12) with L-glutamine, 1.2 g/l NaHCO₃ but 193 without phenol red from PAN-Biotech GmbH (Aidenbach, Germany, catalogue number: P04-41650). 194 After another 24 hours of incubation, the cell culture medium was collected and analysed using the 195 above mentioned HPLC-QTOF-MS method.

196 **Results**

197 Quality control of study inks

All inks used in the study were analysed to confirm the absence of PEtOH. The concentrations of the tracers after their addition were determined and were all within a limit of \pm 15% of the nominal tracer concentration. All analytical data, corrections (e.g., concentration of iodine in the ink had to be corrected for one subject and the concentrations of all tracers for one other subject), and justifications are reported in the supplements (*Supplemental Excel File*).

203 Study subjects and deviations

204 The age of the subjects ranged from 22 to 43 years (median 32.5 years) and the body weight from 205 62 to 98 kg (median 80.5 kg). Height and body fat were 161 – 193 cm (median 181.5 cm) and 7.73 – 206 36.58% (median 18.38%), respectively. No dermatological observations other than normal skin 207 reaction after tattooing were reported. Minor laboratory deviations were noted but judged by the 208 study physician as clinically non-relevant. Other deviations included coffee consumption, intake of 209 ibuprofen the day before tattooing, difficulties during blood sampling, deviations from the sampling 210 times and the ink bottle falling over during tattooing. The spilled ink was cleaned up with wipes and 211 sent in a separate bag which was analysed together with other consumables with ink residues. All 212 subject data and deviations are reported in detail in the supplements (Supplemental Excel File).

213 Ink exposure and urine recovery of tracers

214 Data sets of two subjects (Black 9, Red 4) could not be fully included due to unsuccessful 215 quantification of iodine in the consumables. They could therefore not be used to quantify the 216 hypothetically applied ink per session (hypo). The PEtOH recovery for subject Red 8 was 425.75% and 217 therefore significantly higher than the applied PEtOH concentration. It is possible that cosmetic 218 products containing PEtOH were used during the study instead of the cosmetic products provided. 219 However, the use of other cosmetic products was not reported. This value was therefore excluded 220 from the calculations. It was also necessary to exclude PEtOH data of subject Black 12, since 221 exclusion of several calibration points was necessary, leading to unreliable quantification (Table 1).

222 The average ink quantity per session (hypo) was 0.89 ± 0.48 g for both colours combined, 223 1.02 ± 0.52 g for black and 0.71 ± 0.33 g for red (*Table 1, Figure 2A*). The tattooed areas were 224 subjectively estimated to be around 300 cm² for black and 100-300 cm² for red, whereby non-225 tattooed, empty spaces were included in the area. This was a prerequisite in subject recruitment, 226 since we aimed for larger tattoos to reach detectable amounts of tracers in blood and urine. However, as demonstrated by Foerster et al.,³⁴ the actual tattooed areas are often smaller than the 227 228 estimated areas. We therefore used the same picture analysis method to calculate the area of the 229 tattooed surface. The analysis of the tattooed area per session resulted in an average size of 230 86.4 ± 53.6 cm² for both colours, with the average being 107.8 ± 53.7 cm² for black tattoos and 231 $56.5 \pm 36.5 \text{ cm}^2$ for red tattoos (*Table 1, Figure 2B*). The estimated exposure to tattoo ink per skin 232 area (hypo) was therefore $12.45 \pm 8.85 \text{ mg}_{ink}/\text{cm}^2$, with $10.09 \pm 5.42 \text{ mg}_{ink}/\text{cm}^2$ for black and 233 $15.84 \pm 11.39 \text{ mg}_{ink}/\text{cm}^2$ for red (*Table 1, Figure 2C*).

Black ink was used for contouring, shading and for monochromatic tattoos, whereas red ink was often used to fill larger continuous areas. In some cases, outlines or other shades were done before start of tattooing with spiked ink. The ink used for this purpose did not contain tracers and the start of blood sampling was aligned with the start of tattooing with spiked ink. Tattoo aftercare varied between tattoo artists. In one case a wound dressing was applied to a red study subject and displayed exudation of black and red ink (*Figure 3*).

240 Adjustments for absorbed fraction of tracers

The recovery of all three tracers after 24 hours was calculated by dividing the sum of excretion of each tracer in urine C-F by the initial amount of tracer in the ink per session (hypo). Although the average recoveries for all three tracers within each individual study subject were similar, the tracer recoveries for all 24 subjects were unexpectedly low and varied between 3.16 – 79.50% (*Table 1, Figure 2F*). Therefore, we re-evaluated the data with different approaches.

Firstly, the data set was reduced by excluding subjects with a mean urine recovery of < 25% (n = 13), since extremely low recoveries are most likely error prone (*Figure S1A–C*). The average amount of ink

applied was 0.78 g for the reduced data set and therefore lower compared to the full dataset (*Figure* 249 2A-C) with 0.89 g of ink. Overall, the data scattering was lower for the reduced data set.

250 Secondly, peroral dosing of PABA showed complete recovery in urine within 24 hours (94.75 ± 3.54%, 251 cf. section PABA metabolism after oral and intradermal administration). Since PABA is fully dissolved 252 in the tattoo ink, it can be assumed that it is freely available in the body, as was the case in peroral 253 administration. Therefore, the sum of excreted PABA in urine corresponds to the systemically 254 available fraction of the applied ink after tattooing. Hence, the applied ink per session (sys) was 255 calculated from PABA recovered within 24 hours after the start of tattooing (Table 2). Similarly, 256 applied ink was approximated by iodine excretion with subtraction of the iodine background from 257 the 24 hours before tattooing (Figure S1D-G). For both iodine and PABA, the estimation of ink per 258 session (sys) was about 25% lower compared to quantification via consumables (hypo).

- 259 The ink per area (sys, PABA) is more positively correlated with red tattoos than black tattoos (*Figure*
- 260 2D). Likewise, a negative correlation with tattooed area was demonstrated for both colours (*Figure* 261 2E). An additional multiple factor analysis showed a minor connection between ink per area (sys,
- 261 22). All doubter indupie factor analysis showed a finite connection betw
 262 PABA), urine excretion and body fat (*Supplemental Material 6*).
- The ECHA used the 75th percentile of previously available data to calculate the ink per area, which resulted in an estimation of 14.36 mg_{ink}/cm^2 . Thus, we also applied the 75th percentile to our data set (*Table 2*). On the basis of the ink per session (hypo), our 13.82 mg_{ink}/cm^2 for the reduced data set
- with a recovery > 25% were close to the ECHA estimations. However, when ink per session (sys) was
- 267 applied, the mean 75^{th} percentile was 3.67 mg_{ink}/cm² (*Table 2*).

268 Metabolite profile and plasma kinetics

- 269 Several PABA metabolites were identified in the subjects' urine. ACD was quantified in all subjects, 270 whereas 4-aminohippuric acid (PAHA) was only above the limit of detection (LOD) in 15 subjects 271 (Supplemental Excel File). The quantifiable metabolites of PABA were predominantly in the form of 272 ACD (41.76 \pm 11.15%), with only a small percentage in the form of PAHA (0.79 \pm 0.76%)(Figure S2). 273 Additionally, metabolites that could not be quantified directly, such as 4-acetamidobenzoic acid 274 glucuronide (ACD-GlcA) and 4-acetamidohippuric acid (ACHA), were detected based on their 275 monoisotopic masses (355.09 g/mol for ACD-GlcA and 236.08 g/mol for ACHA) and the 276 corresponding extracted ion chromatograms (Figure S3).
- In plasma, iodine and PABA metabolite ACD were detected, however ACD concentrations were close
 or below the limit of quantification (LOQ) or LOD (*Supplemental Excel File, Figure S4*). This was
 particularly the case for subjects with low total PABA excretion in urine.

280 PABA metabolism after oral and intradermal administration

- Peroral administration resulted in an average PABA urine recovery of 94.75 ± 3.54% (*Table S1*), which is considered as complete excretion. For comparison between peroral and intradermal administration, data of three tattoo study subjects were selected based on their similar applied ink per session (hypo), resulting in a similar applied amount of PABA (48.21 mg, 36.00 mg, 38.82 mg). Also, their total PABA recovery in urine of 22.63 ± 1.84% was similar (*Table S1*).
- As some metabolites could not be quantified, a peak area comparison was carried out. Peak areas are not necessarily related to concentrations since ionisation efficiencies of each metabolite may vary significantly. However, it allows for a general comparison of the metabolite profile of the two routes of administration. Therefore, all corresponding peaks were integrated and the ratio of the respective peaks to the total peak area of all metabolites in urine C–F was determined (*Figure 4*). After 24 hours, almost one fifth (18.83 ± 3.26%) of the peak areas correspond to ACHA when

administered perorally, whereas intradermal application resulted in 3.20 ± 0.69%. The ACD content
 was higher after tattooing compared to peroral administration, which was already determined by
 quantification. No differences were observed for the ACD-GlcA areas.

295 PABA metabolism in fibroblasts and monocyte-derived macrophages

Since our study results and the peroral comparison indicate a cutaneous first-pass effect during tattooing, the metabolic capacity to form ACD in tattoo-relevant skin cells was investigated. After 24 hours of incubation with PABA, both fibroblasts and monocyte-derived macrophages catalysed formation of ACD (*Table S2*). The samples were also screened for other known PABA metabolites via the corresponding extracted ion chromatograms in the obtained data sets, but no other metabolites were observed.

302 **Discussion**

In this study, we obtained *in vivo* human exposure data on tattooing that are the first of their kind and represent a reasonable worst-case scenario. These data can be used to adapt risk assessments related to carcinogens and other toxic substances in tattoo and permanent make-up inks, thereby allowing for a better prediction of tattoo-associated health risks in the general population. Additionally, our data provide evidence for the capacity of skin cells to metabolise certain substances to an extent that affects parent compound-inherent toxic properties during tattooing, especially in the case of PAAs.

310 lodine quantification in plasma was most successful since it is least affected by matrix effects and has a significantly lower LOD.²³ Neither PEtOH nor its metabolite PAc were detected in plasma. Given 311 312 that the concentration of the PABA metabolite ACD was already close to the LOD, it is reasonable 313 that neither PEtOH nor PAc could be detected, as the PEtOH concentration in the ink was six times 314 lower when compared to PABA and detection limits of PEtOH and PAc were slightly higher.²³ Blood 315 samples only reflect a specific time point, bearing the risk to miss the peak concentrations or any 316 concentration above the LOD within the plasma kinetics. In urine samples, both PABA and PEtOH parent compounds were absent since they undergo fast metabolic conversion. Also, PABA-GlcA was 317 not found despite previously reported as PABA metabolite.³⁸ In case of PEtOH, *in silico*³⁹ and animal 318 experiments^{40,41} suggest a variety of possible metabolites, including those formed via oxidation, 319 320 hydroxylation, sulfation or glucuronidation. In one human study, PEtOH was excreted in the form of both PAc (85%) and PAc conjugates (15%, n = 1), whereas another study on four subjects only 321 detected PAc.^{40,41} A recent study by Eckert et al. identified 4-hydroxyphenoxyacetic acid as an 322 additional metabolite in a lower ratio compared to PAc.⁴² In our study, no metabolite other than PAc 323 324 was found. However, the PEtOH concentration used was much lower compared to the study by 325 Eckert et al., hence it may be possible that 4-hydroxyphenoxyacetic acid was formed but below 326 identification limits.

327 In our study, red tattoos correlated with higher use of ink but smaller tattooed areas when compared 328 to black tattoos. This correlation can be explained by the fact that red tattoo designs mostly 329 consisted of filled areas rather than shading and outlines which were more prominent in black 330 tattoos. In the picture analysis, shaded areas were not considered. Therefore, tattoo design rather 331 than ink colour plays an important role in the degree of ink exposure. Minor correlations of ink per 332 area and total excreted urine volume were observed. With the small number of study subjects, the power of such analysis is limited. However, similar findings regarding increased excretion of iodine 333 and other biomarkers with high urine volume have been reported previously.43,44 334

A subject's wound dressing showed distinguishable red and black tattoo ink remains after 24 hours, indicating ink exudation through the damaged skin barrier. It is therefore most likely that not all of

337 the ink applied will be absorbed by the body. Also, the recovery of tracers was extremely variable 338 and ranged between 3.16 and 79.50%. Since all three tracers resulted in similar recoveries within 339 each subject, analytical errors are unlikely to cause the low tracer recovery. An important source of 340 errors is the indirect calculation of ink in consumables. Failing to collect all materials could lead to an 341 underestimation of ink in consumables, leading to an overestimation of applied ink. Due to the 342 variety of materials used by the artists that were not all tested during method validation, 343 quantitation errors of the amount of ink adhered to consumables are certainly possible. Incomplete 344 urine collection could also lead to an underestimation of excreted tracers. Factors influencing the 345 absorption of ink into the body may include skin histology of different body parts, the tattoo artist's 346 technique or the wound healing process. Compound retention within the skin or the lymphatic 347 system leading to a depot effect does not seem plausible in our view. Since the recovery rates in 348 urine were similar for all three tracers, a possible depot effect in tissue could be only explained by physico-chemical differences, but is less likely to occur with small molecules (or ions) completely 349 dissolved in the application media.⁴⁵ Therefore, the most plausible factor responsible for the 350 discrepancies in the systemic exposure levels might be transepidermal loss by wound healing. 351 352 Accordingly, only a fraction of the hypothetically applied ink actually entered the body and that the 353 fraction of soluble ink components absorbed into the body is likely overestimated using the 354 hypothetically applied ink for exposure calculations.

355 This conclusion is also substantiated by our peroral in vivo data. PABA was completely excreted 356 within 24 hours in the peroral setup, whereas PABA recovery during tattooing was only about 25% of 357 the hypothetically applied ink. We concluded that the absorbed fraction of PABA and its metabolites 358 would also be fully excreted during tattooing and calculated the systemically absorbed ink fraction 359 from total PABA (and iodine) recovered in urine. lodine was included because recovery results were 360 similar to those of PABA. In this case, inaccuracies in consumable collection and iodine quantification 361 are not relevant. Also, PABA is mainly excreted within the first hours after tattooing where study 362 participants were still at the study centre, and where compliance in terms of complete urine 363 collection is more reliable than at home. Therefore, only little effects on the exposure estimation are 364 expected.

In the ECHA Annex XV restriction report, the 75th percentile of the available data set was used to 365 calculate a reasonable worst-case scenario, as these data reflected a high exposure situation only.¹⁷ 366 367 In this study, only medium to large tattoos were included. Hence, according to our data, the 75th 368 percentile of 0.31 g ink per session (sys) displays a reasonable worst-case exposure level per tattoo 369 session. This value is about 14-times lower than the 4.31 g per session previously estimated by the 370 ECHA. Applying the exposure levels calculated from our data would have a significant impact on the 371 risk assessment and health risk predictions of hazardous substances. For example, a market survey 372 from 2022 analysed tattoo inks for their preservative concentrations and the highest PEtOH concentration found was 6475 µg/gink (about 0.65% PEtOH).⁴⁶ Assuming that our calculated exposure 373 374 value of 0.31 g ink per session is accurate, approximately 2 mg of PEtOH are introduced into the body 375 during one tattooing session. However, according to REACH, only 0.01% PEtOH are allowed in tattoo 376 inks due to its eye irritation properties. In cosmetics, 1% of PEtOH can be used and 0.5% is a common concentration to preserve injected pharmaceuticals.²⁵ One of the highest findings of PAAs was 377 1775 μg/g_{ink} o-anisidine pre-REACH.^{47,48} However, PAA limits set by REACH are concentrations up to 378 5 $\mu g/g_{ink}$. Here, a value of 0.31 g of ink would result in a maximum of 1.55 μg PAA entering the body 379 380 when applying a REACH compliant tattoo ink preparation under reasonable worst-case conditions.⁴

The majority of research to date has been conducted in Europe and tattoo inks are currently more regulated in the European Union than in other regions. The United States are also seeking to increase consumer protection with the Modernization of Cosmetics Regulation Act of 2022 (MoCRA), which

would also apply to tattoo inks.⁴⁹ However, no quantitative limits for toxic substances in tattoo inks
 are defined in the proposed legislation.

386 In general, toxicological data on the intradermal application of substances are scarce. Therefore, 387 transfer of data from other routes of administration (e.g., peroral) to the intradermal application 388 route is justified to obtain an idea of the level of internal exposure. An important factor 389 distinguishing tattooing from other absorption routes (e.g., peroral or intravenous) is cutaneous 390 metabolism. Therefore, we compared the peroral intake of the tracer PABA to absorption via 391 tattooing and investigated the metabolism of PABA in tattoo-relevant cells. The normalised peak area 392 of the metabolite ACHA was more dominant in peroral administration when compared to 393 intradermal administration, possibly due to the hepatic and gastrointestinal first-pass effect. No peak 394 in the extracted ion chromatograms of PABA-GlcA was detected during chemical analysis, indicating 395 that either this is not a favoured metabolic pathway at the concentrations administered in this study 396 or that its signal was below background signal. When normalised to the total hydrolysed PABA in 397 urine, the tattoo samples contained about twice as much ACD compared to peroral intake. 398 Therefore, skin metabolism may play a role in detoxification of substances in inks that are known 399 targets of the enzyme N-acetyltransferase 1. A detoxifying first-pass effect by N-acetylation of a genotoxic PAA (i.e., 2,4-toluenediamine) in skin and different skin cell types was previously 400 401 described.¹⁸ Keratinocytes in the epidermis, which are known for their capacity to catalyse Nacetylation,^{35,36,50,51} may be in contact with the ink constituents during tattooing and in the early 402 403 phase of wound healing. However, microscopic images of post mortem tattooed pig skin indicated 404 that the majority of the ink is immediately deposited in the dermal layer with only minor direct contact to keratinocytes.⁵² Therefore, ACD formation during tattooing might be driven by fibroblasts 405 406 and macrophages rather than keratinocytes. The comparison of peroral with intradermal and cell 407 culture data indicates that the substances are likely to be metabolised in the skin during tattooing. A 408 major difference between the two routes of administration is that tattooing delivers the dose 409 unevenly over a longer period of time, depending on the motif, whereas peroral administration 410 delivers the dose all at once. These differences certainly have an effect on the ratio of metabolites, as 411 the routes of metabolism often depend on the dose of substance reaching the tissue. The 412 quantitative impact on the detoxification of aromatic amines by this cutaneous first-pass effect 413 compared to peroral administration is yet to be understood. Kinetic modelling might help to address 414 this data gap in the future.

In conclusion, the present study fills the data gaps on systemic exposure to tattoo ink ingredients

needed for health risk assessments. Given the loss of soluble and insoluble ink components via

417 wound healing, future studies particularly should consider exudation. The data presented can be

418 used to simulate the kinetics and internal exposure to these substances – ideally taking into account

the cutaneous first-pass effect during tattooing as shown in this study. This may help to predict

420 kinetics of substances that cannot be tested in human subjects due to their toxicological profile and

421 to extrapolate toxicity data obtained from other sources (e.g., oral animal or *in vitro* data). Such

422 additional data will contribute significantly to the efforts of our study to translate the kinetics and

423 exposure data into health protection for consumers. The study data presented here should be used

for discussion with competent authorities to develop harmonised exposure assessments and to

426 Funding

This work was supported by the intramural research projects SFP 1323-103, SFP 1322-808 and the externally funded project (60-0102-02.P600) at the German Federal Institute for Risk Assessment (BfR).

- .___ (2...).
- 430 Ethics approval

431 The study was approved by the ethics committee of the Charité – Universitätsmedizin Berlin (Berlin,

432 Germany) under the proposal number EA4/085/21.

433 Acknowledgements

434 We would like to thank Dr Annegret Blume, PD Dr Klaus Abraham and Dr Bernhard Monien for 435 helpful discussions on the study design. We would also like to thank Dr Holger Hoffmann for the 436 fruitful discussion on hydrolysis and our colleagues from Department 7 for providing cells and for the 437 help with the realisation of peroral PABA metabolism. We would like to thank the entire study team 438 of the Clinical Research Center for Hair and Skin Science for conducting the study, especially Dr Anna 439 Lechner during study preparation. In addition, many thanks to the pharmacy of Charité-440 Universitätsmedizin Berlin, especially Dr Eric Woith and his team for spiking the tattoo inks with the 441 tracers. Special thanks to the tattoo artists and study subjects, without whom this study would not 442 have been possible.

444 References

445

446 1. McGovern V. Metal Toxicity: Tattoos: Safe Symbols? *Environmental Health Perspectives*.
447 2005;113(9):A590. doi:10.1289/ehp.113-a590a

Kluger N, Seité S, Taieb C. The prevalence of tattooing and motivations in five major countries
over the world. *Journal of the European Academy of Dermatology and Venereology*.
2019;33(12):e484-e486. doi:10.1111/jdv.15808

4513.Borkenhagen A, Mirastschijski U, Petrowski K, Brähler E. Tattoos in der deutschen452Bevölkerung – Prävalenzen, Soziodemografie und Gesundheitsorientierung. Bundesgesundheitsblatt -453Gesundheitsforschung - Gesundheitsschutz. 2019/09/01 2019;62(9):1077-1082. doi:10.1007/s00103-454019-02999-7

455 4. Commission Regulation (EU) 2020/2081 of 14 December 2020 amending Annex XVII to 456 Regulation (EC) No 1907/2006 of the European Parliament and of the Council concerning the 457 Registration, Evaluation, Authorisation and Restriction of Chemicals (REACH) as regards substances in 458 tattoo inks or permanent make-up.

Agnello M, Fontana M. Survey on European Studies of the Chemical Characterisation of
Tattoo Ink Products and the Measurement of Potentially Harmful Ingredients. In: Serup J, Kluger N,
umler W, eds. *Tattooed Skin and Health*. S.Karger AG; 2015:0.

462 6. The Danish Environmental Protection Agency. Chemical substances in tattoo ink. Survey of 463 chemical substances in consumer products no. 116. 2012.

464 7. Lehner K, Santarelli F, Vasold R, et al. Black Tattoos Entail Substantial Uptake of
465 Genotoxicpolycyclic Aromatic Hydrocarbons (PAH) in Human Skin and Regional Lymph Nodes. *PLOS*466 *ONE*. 2014;9(3):e92787. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0092787

467 8. Lehner K, Santarelli F, Vasold R, König B, Landthaler M, Bäumler W. Black tattoo inks are a
468 source of problematic substances such as dibutyl phthalate. *Contact Dermatitis*. 2011;65(4):231-238.
469 doi:10.1111/j.1600-0536.2011.01947.x

470 9. Regensburger J, Lehner K, Maisch T, et al. Tattoo inks contain polycyclic aromatic
471 hydrocarbons that additionally generate deleterious singlet oxygen. *Experimental Dermatology*.
472 2010;19(8):e275-e281. doi:10.1111/j.1600-0625.2010.01068.x

47310.Lim H-H, Shin H-S. Sensitive Determination of Volatile Organic Compounds and Aldehydes in474TattooInks.JournalofChromatographicScience.2017;55(2):109-116.475doi:10.1093/chromsci/bmw163

476 11. Battistini B, Petrucci F, De Angelis I, Failla CM, Bocca B. Quantitative analysis of metals and
477 metal-based nano- and submicron-particles in tattoo inks. *Chemosphere*. 2020/04/01/
478 2020;245:125667. doi:10.1016/j.chemosphere.2019.125667

479 12. Forte G, Petrucci F, Cristaudo A, Bocca B. Market survey on toxic metals contained in tattoo
480 inks. Science of The Total Environment. 2009/11/15/ 2009;407(23):5997-6002.
481 doi:10.1016/j.scitotenv.2009.08.034

48213.Foerster M, Ezzedine K, Ribet C, Zins M, Goldberg M, Schüz J. Tattoos: a new ancient483carcinogen? ISEE Conference Abstracts. 2022;2022(1)doi:10.1289/isee.2022.P-0359

484 14. Schreiver I, Hesse B, Seim C, et al. Synchrotron-based v-XRF mapping and μ-FTIR microscopy
485 enable to look into the fate and effects of tattoo pigments in human skin. Scientific Reports.
486 2017/09/12 2017;7(1):11395. doi:10.1038/s41598-017-11721-z

487 15. Arbache S, Mattos EdC, Diniz MF, et al. How much medication is delivered in a novel drug
488 delivery technique that uses a tattoo machine? *International Journal of Dermatology*.
489 2019;58(6):750-755. doi:10.1111/ijd.14408

490 16. Engel E, Santarelli F, Vasold R, et al. Modern tattoos cause high concentrations of hazardous
491 pigments in skin. *Contact Dermatitis*. 2008;58(4):228-233. doi:10.1111/j.1600-0536.2007.01301.x

492 17. European Chemicals Agengy (ECHA). Annex XV Restriction Report. Substances in tattoo inks493 and permanent make up. 2017.

494 18. Grohmann L, Becker D, Rademann J, Ma N, Schäfer-Korting M, Weindl G. Biotransformation
495 of 2,4-toluenediamine in human skin and reconstructed tissues. *Archives of Toxicology*. 2017/10/01
496 2017;91(10):3307-3316. doi:10.1007/s00204-017-1954-5

49719.Bhaiya P, Roychowdhury S, Vyas PM, Doll MA, Hein DW, Svensson CK. Bioactivation, protein498haptenation, and toxicity of sulfamethoxazole and dapsone in normal human dermal fibroblasts.499Toxicology and Applied Pharmacology.2006/09/01/2006;215(2):158-167.500doi:10.1016/j.taap.2006.02.006

Wiegand C, Hewitt NJ, Merk HF, Reisinger K. Dermal Xenobiotic Metabolism: A Comparison
between Native Human Skin, Four in vitro Skin Test Systems and a Liver System. Skin Pharmacology
and Physiology. 2014;27(5):263-275. doi:10.1159/000358272

50421.Strandt H, Voluzan O, Niedermair T, et al. Macrophages and Fibroblasts Differentially505Contribute to Tattoo Stability. Dermatology. 2020;237(2):296-302. doi:10.1159/000506540

Baranska A, Shawket A, Jouve M, et al. Unveiling skin macrophage dynamics explains both
tattoo persistence and strenuous removal. *Journal of Experimental Medicine*. 2018;215(4):11151133. doi:10.1084/jem.20171608

Kochs S, Schiewe S, Zang Y, et al. 4-Aminobenzoic acid, 2-phenoxyethanol and iodine used as
tracers in a short-term in vivo-kinetics study for tattoo ink ingredients: Mass spectrometry method
development and validation. *Journal of Chromatography B*. 2023/09/01/ 2023;1229:123891.
doi:10.1016/j.jchromb.2023.123891

513 24. Bührer C, Bahr S, Siebert J, Wettstein R, Geffers C, Obladen M. Use of 2% 2-phenoxyethanol
514 and 0.1% octenidine as antiseptic in premature newborn infants of 23–26 weeks gestation. *Journal of*515 *Hospital Infection*. 2002/08/01/ 2002;51(4):305-307. doi:10.1053/jhin.2002.1249

516 25. Meyer BK, Ni A, Hu B, Shi L. Antimicrobial preservative use in parenteral products: Past and
517 present. Journal of Pharmaceutical Sciences. 2007/12/01/ 2007;96(12):3155-3167.
518 doi:10.1002/jps.20976

Solution 26. Roy J, Carrier S. Acute Hepatitis Associated with Treatment of Peyronie's Disease with
Potassium Para-Aminobenzoate (Potaba). *The Journal of Sexual Medicine*. 2008/12/01/
2008;5(12):2967-2969. doi:10.1111/j.1743-6109.2008.00918.x

Sharma RS, Joy RC, Boushey CJ, Ferruzzi MG, Leonov AP, McCrory MA. Effects of ParaAminobenzoic Acid (PABA) Form and Administration Mode on PABA Recovery in 24-Hour Urine
Collections. *Journal of the Academy of Nutrition and Dietetics*. 2014/03/01/ 2014;114(3):457-463.
doi:10.1016/j.jand.2013.07.045

Nauman J, Wolff J. lodide prophylaxis in Poland after the chernobyl reactor accident: Benefits
and risks. *The American Journal of Medicine*. 1993/05/01/ 1993;94(5):524-532. doi:10.1016/00029343(93)90089-8

Le Guen B, Stricker L, Schlumberger M. Distributing KI pills to minimize thyroid radiation
 exposure in case of a nuclear accident in France. *Nature Clinical Practice Endocrinology & Metabolism*. 2007/09/01 2007;3(9):611-611. doi:10.1038/ncpendmet0593

53230.World Health Organization (WHO). Use of potassium iodide for thyroid protection during533nuclear or radiological emergencies. 2011.

534 31. Jackson AS, Pollock ML. Generalized equations for predicting body density of men. *British* 535 *Journal of Nutrition*. 1978;40(3):497-504. doi:10.1079/BJN19780152

International Council for Harmonisation of Technical Requirements for Pharmaceuticals for
 Human Use. ICH guideline M10 on bioanalytical method validation and study sample analysis
 EMA/CHMP/ICH/172948/2019. <u>https://www.ema.europa.eu/en/documents/scientific-guideline/ich-</u>
 guideline-m10-bioanalytical-method-validation-step-5_en.pdf (assessed 13.03.2023).

540 33. European Medicines Agency. Guideline on bioanalytical method validation EMEA/
541 CHMP/EWP/192217/2009 Rev. 1 Corr. 2**. <u>https://www.ema.europa.eu/en/documents/scientific-</u>
542 guideline/guideline-bioanalytical-method-validation en.pdf (assessed 13.03.2023).

54334.Foerster M, Dufour L, Bäumler W, et al. Development and Validation of the Epidemiological544Tattoo Assessment Tool to Assess Ink Exposure and Related Factors in Tattooed Populations for

545 Medical Research: Cross-sectional Validation Study. Original Paper. *JMIR Form Res.* 2023;7:e42158.
546 doi:10.2196/42158

547 35. Bonifas J, Bloemeke B. N-acetylation of aromatic amines: Implication for skin and immune 548 cells. *Frontiers in Bioscience-Elite*. 2015-01-01 2015;7(2):305-321. doi:10.2741/e733

549 36. Eilstein J, Léreaux G, Budimir N, Hussler G, Wilkinson S, Duché D. Comparison of xenobiotic
550 metabolizing enzyme activities in ex vivo human skin and reconstructed human skin models from
551 SkinEthic. Archives of Toxicology. 2014/09/01 2014;88(9):1681-1694. doi:10.1007/s00204-014-1218552 6

Aparicio-Soto M, Riedel F, Leddermann M, et al. TCRs with segment TRAV9-2 or a CDR3
histidine are overrepresented among nickel-specific CD4+ T cells. *Allergy*. 2020;75(10):2574-2586.
doi:10.1111/all.14322

556 38. Chan K, Miners JO, Birkett DJ. Direct and simultaneous high-performance liquid 557 chromatographic assay for the determination of p-aminobenzoic acid and its conjugates in human 558 urine. Journal of Chromatography B: Biomedical Sciences and Applications. 1988/01/01/ 559 1988;426:103-109. doi:10.1016/S0378-4347(00)81931-3

Hewitt NJ, Troutman J, Przibilla J, et al. Use of in vitro metabolism and biokinetics assays to
refine predicted in vivo and in vitro internal exposure to the cosmetic ingredient, phenoxyethanol,
for use in risk assessment. *Regulatory Toxicology and Pharmacology*. 2022/06/01/ 2022;131:105132.
doi:10.1016/j.yrtph.2022.105132

564 40. SCCS Opinion on Phenoxyethanol. Scientific Comittee on Cosumer Safety. 2016. 565 SCCS/1575/16.

566 41. Hartwig A, Commission M. 2-Phenoxyethanol [MAK Value Documentation, 2017]. *The* 567 *MAK-Collection for Occupational Health and Safety*. 73-116.

568 42. Eckert E, Jäger T, Hiller J, Leibold E, Bader M, Göen T. Biotransformation and toxicokinetics of
2-phenoxyethanol after oral exposure in humans: a volunteer study. Archives of Toxicology.
2024/06/01 2024;98(6):1771-1780. doi:10.1007/s00204-024-03717-2

Johner SA, Shi L, Remer T. Higher Urine Volume Results in Additional Renal Iodine Loss.
 Thyroid[®]. 2010/12/01 2010;20(12):1391-1397. doi:10.1089/thy.2010.0161

44. Pinto J, Debowska M, Gomez R, Waniewski J, Lindholm B. Urine volume as an estimator of
residual renal clearance and urinary removal of solutes in patients undergoing peritoneal dialysis. *Scientific Reports*. 2022/11/05 2022;12(1):18755. doi:10.1038/s41598-022-23093-0

576 45. Benedetti MS, Whomsley R, Poggesi I, et al. Drug metabolism and pharmacokinetics. *Drug*577 *Metabolism Reviews*. 2009/08/01 2009;41(3):344-390. doi:10.1080/10837450902891295

Famele M, Lavalle R, Leoni C, et al. Quantification of preservatives in tattoo and permanent
make-up inks in the frame of the new requirements under the REACH Regulation. *Contact Dermatitis*.
2022;87(3):233-240. doi:10.1111/cod.14105

47. Jacobsen E, Tønning K, Pedersen E, Bernt, N, Serup J, Høgsberg T, Nielsen E. Chemical
 Substances in Tattoo Ink: Survey of Chemical Substances in Consumer Products. 2012.
 <u>https://www2.mst.dk/udgiv/publications/2012/03/978-87-92779-87-8.pdf</u> (assessed on 17.05.2024).

58448.Fels P, Lachenmeier DW, Hindelang P, Walch SG, Gutsche B. Occurrence and Regulatory585Evaluation of Contaminants in Tattoo Inks.Cosmetics.2023;10(5):141.586doi:10.3390/cosmetics10050141

587 49. U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA). Modernization of Cosmetics Regulation Act of 2022588 (MoCRA).

589 50. Hu T, Khambatta ZS, Hayden PJ, et al. Xenobiotic metabolism gene expression in the
590 EpiDerm™ in vitro 3D human epidermis model compared to human skin. *Toxicology in Vitro*.
591 2010/08/01/2010;24(5):1450-1463. doi:10.1016/j.tiv.2010.03.013

592 51. Oesch F, Fabian E, Oesch-Bartlomowicz B, Werner C, Landsiedel R. Drug-Metabolizing 593 Enzymes in the Skin of Man, Rat, and Pig. *Drug Metabolism Reviews*. 2007/01/01 2007;39(4):659-594 698. doi:10.1080/03602530701690366

- 595 52. Hering H, Sung AY, Röder N, et al. Laser Irradiation of Organic Tattoo Pigments Releases
- 596 Carcinogens with 3,3¹-Dichlorobenzidine Inducing DNA Strand Breaks in Human Skin Cells. Journal of
- 597 *Investigative Dermatology*. 2018/12/01/ 2018;138(12):2687-2690. doi:10.1016/j.jid.2018.05.031

Table 1. Summary of study results. Total ink and related values are based on hypothetically (hypo) applied ink dependent on
 iodine quantification in consumables and ink weight.

Subject	Session duration [min]	Tattooed area [cm²]	lnk per session (hypo) [g]	Ink per area (hypo) [mg _{ink} /cm²]	Urine recovery iodine [%]	Urine recovery PABA [%]	Urine recovery PEtOH [%]
Black 1	271	246.5	2.16	8.77	22.25	15.97	27.11
Black 2	206	62.0	0.92	14.90	33.08	33.62	40.43
Black 3	305	143.7	1.26	8.77	7.98	3.16	12.03
Black 4	255	185.2	1.25	6.73	9.37	6.46	8.41
Black 5	440	104.0	0.76	7.35	79.50	62.23	58.57
Black 6	340	62.0	0.74	11.85	26.97	18.12	19.62
Black 7	130	49.0	0.24	4.94	36.32	39.32	42.02
Black 8	200	80.0	1.61	20.09	32.86	20.14	22.71
Black 9	177	84.0	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Black 10	277	150.5	1.29	8.60	31.48	24.52	23.19
Black 11	260	107.5	0.76	7.09	41.51	34.53	30.02
Black 12	171	90.5	0.25	2.73	20.17	17.10	11.65*
Black 13	231	63.5	1.38	21.72	17.31	20.94	3.76
Black 14	188	80.5	0.62	7.68	25.89	27.98	21.73
Red 1	119	59.0	1.17	19.81	10.93	7.06	3.49
Red 2	125	146.5	0.78	5.32	63.63	20.87	49.30
Red 3	210	22.0	0.87	39.45	8.36	7.51	4.60
Red 4	165	17.5	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Red 5	155	41.0	1.20	29.27	38.44	23.22	24.53
Red 6	175	28.0	0.47	16.64	9.29	8.19	4.61
Red 7	120	80.0	0.86	10.76	24.78	27.75	29.40
Red 8	130	51.5	0.25	4.89	65.82	55.73	425.75*
Red 9	95	38.8	0.49	12.73	65.77	39.62	46.42
Red 10	160	80.6	0.30	3.71	53.78	55.37	59.48
Mean _{all}	204.38	86.4	0.89	12.45	32.98	25.88	26.57
SD _{all}	79.81	53.6	0.48	8.85	20.58	16.26	17.51
Medianall	182.50	80.0	0.82	8.77	29.23	22.08	23.86
Mean _{black}	246.50	107.8	1.02	10.09	29.59	24.93	25.80
SD _{black}	76.98	53.7	0.52	5.42	17.31	14.72	14.77
Median _{black}	255.00	87.3	0.92	8.60	26.97	20.94	22.71
Mean _{red}	145.40	56.5	0.71	15.84	37.87	27.26	27.73
SD _{red}	32.05	36.5	0.33	11.39	23.71	18.17	20.89
Median _{red}	130.00	51.5	0.78	12.73	38.44	23.22	29.40

601

Note: PABA = 4-aminobenzoic acid, PEtOH = 2-Phenoxyethanol. *Data were excluded from the overall evaluation.

		Ink per se	ession [g]	Ink per area [mg _{ink} /cm²]		
Basis of calculation	Samplesize	Mean	75 th p.	Mean	75 th p.	
Ink per session	n=22	0.89	1.25	12.45	17.44	
(һуро)	(n = 13, recovery >25%)	0.78	1.06	10.56	13.82	
Ink per session (sys, PABA)	n = 24	0.19	0.29	2.62	3.78	
Ink per session (sys, iodine)	n = 24	0.25	0.39	3.37	3.67	
Mean ink per session (sys, PABA/iodine)	n = 48	0.22	0.31	2.99	3.67	
ECHA calculation	n = 9		4.31		14.36	

Table 2. Comparison of mean ink exposure calculated from study data and its 75th percentile with data used by the
 European Chemical Agency (ECHA).

605 Note: 75th p.= 75th percentile, PABA= 4-aminobenzoic acid, sys= systemic available ink, hypo= hypothetically applied ink.

Figure 1. Study sampling and exposure calculation. (A) Overview of sampling times for blood and urine during the 48 h–
 study period. (B) Calculation of the hypothetical ink amount used per session (hypo) based on ink weighing and iodine
 quantification in the consumables. (C) Calculation of the systemic ink amount per session (sys) calculated by excreted
 tracers in urine C-F. Background levels in urine A–B were subtracted.

611

612 Figure 2. (A–C) Comparison of ink per session (hypo), tattooed skin area and ink per surface of all subjects (n = 22), ink per 613 session calculated from mass difference of ink bottle weight and subtracted ink residues from consumables. The box and 614 whisker plots show median (line) and mean (+) for all, black or red tattooed subjects. (D) The amount of tattoo ink per area 615 is positively correlated with the ink use per session (systemic, sys, based on excretion of 4-aminobenzoic acid, PABA) and is 616 higher for red tattoos. (E) Ink per area (sys, PABA) is negatively correlated with the tattooed area. (F) Correlation plot of 617 tracer recovery to mean recovery calculated for each subject.

618

Figure 3. Pictures of tattoos from the study. Wound dressing of a red study subject displays exudation of black and redtattoo ink within the first hours after tattooing.

621

- 622 Figure 4. Analysis of 4-aminobenzoic acid and its metabolites. (A) Structural formulas of known PABA metabolites. (B)
- 623 Comparison of the metabolite distributions in total urine (urine C–F) calculated from raw peak area ratios. Data are
- 624 displayed for three tattoo study subjects (Black 8, Black 10, Red 5) and the three peroral PABA subjects for the first 24 h 625 after tattooing.







