



## Original Article

## Animal testing is still the best way to find new treatments for patients



Silvio Garattini \*, Giuliano Grignaschi

IRCCS Istituto di Ricerche Farmacologiche Mario Negri, Milan, Italy

## ARTICLE INFO

## Article history:

Received 10 November 2016

Accepted 25 November 2016

Available online 1 December 2016

## Keywords:

Animal testing

Experimental research

## ABSTRACT

Experimental research proceeds by hypotheses formulated on the basis of previous or new knowledge and then tested. If they are accepted, they serve as the basis for further hypotheses, and if they are rejected new hypotheses can be developed. In other words, when we are at the frontiers of knowledge the path is forged by “trial and error”. When a trial shows a hypothesis is wrong, this is a step toward making fewer errors.

This process also applies to drug development. There is no magic formula at present to predict - at the pre-clinical level - the therapeutic value of a drug for people with a disease. However, pre-clinical studies are needed in order to formulate hypotheses that justify clinical trials. Without these preliminary studies *in vitro* and *in vivo* in selected animal species it would be unethical to test still unproven chemicals in humans.

© 2016 European Federation of Internal Medicine. Published by Elsevier B.V. All rights reserved.

## 1. Introduction

Experimental research proceeds by hypotheses formulated on the basis of previous or new knowledge and then tested. If they are accepted, they serve as the basis for further hypotheses, and if they are rejected new hypotheses can be developed. In other words, when we are at the frontiers of knowledge the path is forged by “trial and error”. When a trial shows a hypothesis is wrong, this is a step toward making fewer errors.

This process also applies to drug development. There is no magic formula at present to predict - at the pre-clinical level - the therapeutic value of a drug for people with a disease. However, pre-clinical studies are needed in order to formulate hypotheses that justify clinical trials. Without these preliminary studies *in vitro* and *in vivo* in selected animal species it would be unethical to test still unproven chemicals in humans.

There has recently been a shift in drug development. Historically, drugs were discovered by identifying the active ingredient from traditional remedies or serendipitously. Later, series of chemicals were screened on intact cells, isolated organs and whole organisms (functional screening) to identify substances with a desirable therapeutic effect. The sequencing of the human genome has permitted rapid cloning and purification of large quantities of proteins, and it has become common to use high-throughput screening of large chemical libraries against isolated biological targets which hypothetically are disease-modifying, in a process known as reverse pharmacology (targeted screening). Hits from these screenings are then tested in cells and animals for efficacy. In recent years scientists have been able to see the

three-dimensional structure of target molecules and use that knowledge to design drug candidates.

Independently from the procedure followed, the discovery of new drugs has always been based on a series of variable interactions among data collected in patients, tissues, organs or cell culture and different animal species. However, in a large majority of cases clinical studies have been preceded by studies in mice, rats and other animal species which have led to suggestions for drugs to be tested in patients. Not always have the animal results been translated into effective drugs but the failures themselves have helped to reformulate the model or the experimental conditions or the type of chemical. The problem is selecting, for a given human target or function, the animal species that most closely resembles man, which should in principle be possible, drawing on the diversity of the animal kingdom.

The use of animals has always aroused controversy on ethical or technical grounds. Since the ethical issue is not the subject of this article, we shall analyze how animal experiments could be improved in order to increase their probability of predicting useful clinical results.

Are *in vitro* experiments alternative or complementary to animal tests?

Modern technology enables us to cultivate *in vitro* almost every kind of cell from all animal species including man. These cells can provide very useful preliminary information or help us understand how chemicals interact on the cell metabolism or functions, such as secretion of proteins, motility or enzyme activity. A few comments are necessary about whether *in vitro* tests offer an alternative and can therefore replace *in vivo* experiments.

First, drugs are easily available to cells *in vitro* while *in vivo* this is not always the case. For example, isolated cancer cells are more sensitive to an anticancer agent than *in vivo* because the complexity of a solid tumor, with the presence of inflammatory cells, inadequate vascularization,

\* Corresponding author at: Istituto di Ricerche Farmacologiche Mario Negri, Directorate, via Giuseppe La Masa 19, 20156 Milano, Italy.

E-mail address: [silvio.garattini@marionegri.it](mailto:silvio.garattini@marionegri.it) (S. Garattini).

fibrosis and other factors, limits the drug penetration into the cancer cells. Old studies already demonstrated that several anticancer agents are not distributed evenly in a growing tumor, reaching higher concentrations on the surface than in the center. More recent studies have shown that paclitaxel distributes unevenly in *ex vivo* slices of tumor, indicating that not all the targets may be available to the drug [1]; this situation is different from *in vitro* conditions where the drug is distributed more uniformly. The difference is extremely important when deciding about the probable efficacy of an anticancer agent and therefore its potential as a candidate for clinical trials.

*Second*, when a drug is given *in vivo* it encounters a number of barriers that are hard to reproduce *in vitro*. The blood-brain barrier is an example - it is supposed to protect the brain from exposure to exogenous chemicals. The barriers can sometimes be overcome because there are transport mechanisms. Another example is the intestinal barrier for drugs that are taken orally. In this case too it is difficult to mimic intestinal absorption *in vitro*. The drug may interact with the microbiome, affect intestinal motility, or be absorbed by fibers in food, metabolized by cytochrome P45 (Cyp) in the intestine, transported or rejected by the multidrug resistance (MDR) complex.

*Third*, when a drug is absorbed by the intestine it may bind to circulating proteins and distribute to various organs. The first pass is in the liver, where drugs can be profoundly metabolized to form several metabolites, depending on the Cyp system. These metabolites may have similar or different activities and in some cases they may be toxic or even counteract the action of the parent drug. Therefore *in vivo*, in contrast to the *in vitro* condition, the action of a drug may be related not just to a single chemical species but to a mixture of effects depending on other chemical species formed (the metabolites) and their interactions. To summarize, *in vitro* drugs are faced with a static system, but *in vivo* they are subject to a very dynamic condition where absorption, distribution, metabolism and excretion change with time.

*Fourth*, cells or tissue cultures cannot mimic the complexity of a living organism where cells are assembled in organs, under the influence of nerve, hormonal, immunological and circulatory systems. In particular, interactions between drugs and functional activities such as blood pressure, sleep or cognitive activities cannot at present be studied *in vitro*.

*Fifth*, the animal species employed for preclinical tests have many features similar to man. They have similar organs: brain, lung, heart, liver, etc., similar functions such as circulation, hormonal set-up, peripheral nervous system, immunological functions. The genomic organization too is common, although with different degrees of complexity; animal proteins are in most cases homologous to man; metabolic processes are similar.

All the reasons that distinguish the complexity of living animals from *in vitro* conditions also apply to the various animal species and strains, which can differ in their absorption, transport, distribution, metabolism and excretion as well as in the way in which they respond to the same drug. All these considerations imply that while cells or tissue culture are useful for studying drug activity they are complementary, not alternative, to *in vivo* studies. At present, animals are still the best model - however imperfect - to predict activity in man.

Why does translation from animals to man sometimes fail?

Hackman and Redelmeier [2] analyzed this question in a quantitative manner. Out of 76 animal studies retrieved from top journals, 37% were replicated in clinical randomized trials, 18% were contradicted and 45% remained untested. It is logical to assume that for therapies against bacterial, fungal or viral infections the translation from animals to man is more likely to be effective. Vaccines against poliomyelitis, meningitis and rotaviruses are outstanding examples, as are a number of antibiotics and the recent agents against HIV and hepatitis C viruses. They illustrate the striking concordance between animal results and human benefits. Translation has also been fairly good with agonists or antagonists of chemical mediators. Beta-adrenergic blockers for the treatment of tachycardia, alpha-adrenergic blockers for hypertension,

and beta-adrenergic agonists for asthma are also good examples of concordant results between animals and man. Similarly, serotonin antagonists have antiemetic activity and serotonin-uptake inhibitors act on some symptoms of human depression. Antihistamines are useful for the treatment of allergic reactions. Drugs acting on metabolism, such as insulin, oral anti-diabetic agents and cholesterol-lowering drugs have been successfully translated from animals to man. The history of today's therapeutic armamentarium has always involved animal testing.

At the other extreme, however, we cannot overlook the poor correlations between results in animals and man in several diseases such as stroke, amyotrophic lateral sclerosis (ALS) and Alzheimer disease. A recent study found that the success rate of new drugs entering phase 1 clinical trials for diseases of the central nervous system is only 8% [2,3].

Several analyses have set out to understand why in many cases the results in animals and man differ. One obvious reason is the difference not so much in organ composition and functions but the greater complexity of man compared to all the animal species that could be used. For logistic and economic reasons mice and rats are the most widely used laboratory animals partly because their genomic, proteomic and metabolomic profiles as well as their organic functions and behavior are better known than for other species. The significant number of rodent strains extends the range of experimental testing. In addition, mice can be genetically mutated so we can investigate the functional role of single and combined genes. Mutated human genes responsible for or involved in human diseases can be transferred into mice, and recently "humanized" mice have been developed, which are useful models to reproduce some aspects of neonatal sepsis [4,5]. All these and future improvements may enable researchers to reproduce at least some features of most human diseases awaiting better treatments.

It must be admitted that an important area of discrepancy is the poor quality of some animal investigations [6]. For instance, amlodipine was tested in 22 trials of cerebral hemorrhage in man, with negative results - in apparent contrast with animal findings. However, when the animal results were systematically reviewed, it became clear that there was no benefit, indicating that animal findings did in fact overlap those in man. Similarly, out of nine drugs found effective in an animal model of ALS only one, riluzole, actually appeared to prolong patients' survival - to a limited extent. But then, when these nine drugs were tested in mice by the ALS Therapy Development Institute, all of them, with the partial exception of riluzole, were inactive. Therefore, the discrepancy was due to the fact that the borderline results had been interpreted optimistically. In general, there is a regrettable tendency to over-rate the value of products that in fact show only marginal efficacy for a pathology that has no treatment.

It must be stressed that the progress made in controlling bias in clinical trials has not been translated to animal trials. Although animal publications far exceed the number of clinical trials, systematic reviews and meta-analyses are ten times less frequent for animals than for clinical research. Bias related to randomization, double blinding, surrogate end-points, calculation of sample size, statistical analysis, and non-publication of negative results still greatly limits the extrapolation of animal findings to man. The over-enthusiastic attitude of scientists, together with economic interests, have in several cases led to premature clinical tests.

In some cases the treatment schedule is inadequate, or blood and tissue concentrations are too low to affect a target or too high to be tolerated in man. In addition, the target in man may not follow the same pathway of events, with a different functional effect from that seen in pre-clinical studies. Frequently, for instance in experimental cancer research, treatments are preventive or are tried at too early a stage of tumor development - differently from the clinical condition. Therefore the inadequacy of the model or the time and doses of the treatment - as well as a critical evaluation of results - may explain the discrepancy rather than the translation itself.

How could we improve *in vivo* studies? There may be at least four essential approaches.

First, we need to intensify studies and develop techniques to improve and reduce the use of animals, following the 3R rule. For instance, identification of the insulin structure abolished the need to measure insulin's potency on blood glucose in rabbits (R = replacement). Powerful analytical techniques such as the various types of mass spectrometry now permit drug measurements in very small amounts of blood while before rats and mice had to be killed to obtain large enough samples. Nuclear magnetic resonance and other non-invasive diagnostic tools in small animals have enabled us to follow the progression of a disease in the same group of animals (R = reduction).

Human organoids can now be developed using different kinds of stem cells and may serve to study normal and diseased organs in order to verify the therapeutic and toxic effects of drugs as an intermediate step between *in vitro* and *in vivo* tests [7]. In general, any technological development may open the way to new methods to improve the value of *in vitro* studies and/or reduce, refine or replace the need to use animals.

Second, animal testing needs to be improved by incorporating all the rules developed to improve clinical trials in order to minimize bias. As already indicated, systematic reviews and meta-analyses of preclinical studies show up publication bias in laboratory animals. An analysis of 76 animal studies published in top journals between 1980 and 2000 and relevant to translation from animals to the clinic rated only 49% as having good methodological quality, and regrettably the quality did not improve with time [2]. In another analysis, random allocation was used only in 12% of the tests and blinded outcome assessment only in 14% [8].

It is important to bear in mind that the objective of experimental research is to establish therapeutic value. For instance, in a meta-analysis on the tests to study statins there was a redundancy of publications on the lowering of cholesterol and other lipids but only very few studies on therapeutic targets such as myocardial infarction or stroke [9].

More comparative studies are needed on the metabolic, inflammatory, immunological and hormonal pathways in order to select the animal species closest to man for each pathway. Multicentric studies are needed, similar to clinical trials, to establish the reproducibility of results. An example is available concerning a new potential drug for stroke [10]. For more realistic pre-clinical studies it may also be possible to organize trials that test new drugs in pet animals with chronic diseases. Another way to reduce the number of animals is to establish bio-banks to store blood and organs from a given experiment: should it be necessary to do further biochemical analysis later, there will be no need to repeat the same experiment. It is also worth recalling that new drugs are often tested in animals against placebo, while comparative trials should really be done with already known drugs in order to establish what kind of evidence suggests the translation from animals to man.

Third, further research is needed to improve the translation of animal research to patients. The NIH recently launched a program to train pre-clinical scientists to plan their experimental trials better by applying the same rules as for clinical trials. The NIH has also invited applications to develop a Data Discovery Index where investigators can make primary data available independently from journal publication [11]. There is, however, a pressing need for responsibility in the scientific community not only among scientists but also in the editorial boards of journals and funding bodies to focus more on the quality of articles and research proposals dealing with animal investigation. There must be a firmer attitude toward insisting on complete review (with systematic reviews and meta-analyses) of animal testing before embarking in clinical trials. Similarly, ethics committees and authorities should always closely examine the validity and quality of *in vivo* studies in animals before approving the use of a drug for human research. Scientific journals must make sure of the quality of animal studies by requiring the application of guidelines such as ARRIVE [12]. In general all stakeholders must make efforts to minimize the bias inherent to all animal testing just like in clinical trials.

Fourth, the difficulty of translating findings from animals to man should not come as a surprise. Once bias has been taken care of, the

difficulties remain for each specific demand for therapy – symptomatic, preventive or curative – of finding the animal species that best mimics the human condition. There is no magic recipe – only trial and error. In the past – and probably in the future too – animals with specific pathology such as diabetes, hypercholesterolemia and hypertension have helped us develop antidiabetic, hypocholesterolemic and antihypertensive drugs which have been effective in man and are widely used. More studies are needed in aged animals to mimic the condition of elderly people with co-morbidities, requiring several drugs. Different chemical mediators may be important tools for discovering new drugs once they have been found to exert similar effects in a given animal species and man. Adrenaline, noradrenaline, dopamine, serotonin, acetylcholine and angiotensin – just to mention a few – have been used to find agonists and antagonists that play an important role in human and animal therapies. TNF- $\alpha$  antagonism through monoclonal antibodies has led to the development of new drugs against rheumatoid arthritis and Crohn disease.

Another very important tool in screening for new drugs is antagonism toward drugs causing side effects. For instance, the reserpine test was used to discover new antidepressant agents, and the hypermotility induced by d-amphetamine was exploited to yield new antipsychotic drugs. However, for amphetamine, we needed strains of mice that are sensitive because some strains such as DBA2 do not react even to high doses [13]. Using several strains of mice may be one way to explore the whole set of effects of a given drug. Adriamycin was nephrotoxic in rats [14] and this was a starting point to establish the nephroprotective effect of some ACE inhibitors in non-diabetic renal patients [15]. Recent techniques using “nude” – immunologically depressed – mice to grow single human tumors *in vivo* certainly offer an advance toward personalized therapies.

As already mentioned, disclosure of the genome has helped enormously in generating new experimental models of diseases by knocking out specific genes or transferring mutated human genes. There is, however, a caveat in this kind of research because some failures have resulted from our ignorance of the complexity of the regulation and redundancy of certain single genes. For instance, in cancer research the failure to achieve significant results with VEGF antagonism, the factor regulating the growth of vessels in tumors, probably depends on the array of factors that have positive or negative effects on the action of VEGF, with the result of a risk of resistance. Such redundant factors are obviously not present *in vitro*.

## 2. Concluding remarks

The pressure of public opinion, particularly of organized groups of “animalists”, obliges preclinical and clinical scientists to come out of their “ivory tower” to explain the complexity of translating research results from animals to man. At the same time it cannot be stressed enough that animal studies have led to the production of drugs that have affected the epidemiology of human pathology, contributing to prolonging life. Public opinion must be made aware that hypotheses in the biomedical field are just as likely to fail as in any other field of research. Only continuing trial- and-error to understand errors will show the best way to reach a goal. Limitations to the use of animals, particularly other than rodents, are an obstacle to obtaining a wider spectrum of activity across species which may help in deciding when a treatment is suitable for patients. Nevertheless, there is certainly ample room for substantial improvement in the protocols of animal tests to boost their credibility and reproducibility. The validity of animal testing is not limited to translation to man, but also to their value for the treatment of animal pathology: a large number of drugs employed in animals are the same as those used in man [16].

Given the limited usefulness of computer and *in vitro* models, for the time being animal models remain the best alternative and their use must continue, considering that patients cannot just wait for better tests to cure their suffering.

## Conflict of interests

I have no conflict of interest as regards the manuscript submitted.

## References

- [1] Morosi L, Spinelli P, Zucchetti M, Pretto F, Carra A, D'Incalci M, et al. Determination of paclitaxel distribution in solid tumors by nano-particle assisted laser desorption ionization mass spectrometry imaging. *PLoS One* 2013;8(8), e72532.
- [2] Hackam DG, Redelmeier DA. Translation of research evidence from animals to humans. *JAMA* Oct 11, 2006;296(14):1731–2.
- [3] Akhtar AZ, Pippin JJ, Sandusky CB. Animal models in spinal cord injury: a review. *Rev Neurosci* 2008;19(1):47–60.
- [4] Ernst W, Zimara N, Hanses F, Mannel DN, Seelbach-Gobel B, Wege AK. Humanized mice, a new model to study the influence of drug treatment on neonatal sepsis. *Infect Immun* May 2013;81(5):1520–31.
- [5] Lin JH. Applications and limitations of genetically modified mouse models in drug discovery and development. *Curr Drug Metab Jun* 2008;9(5):419–38.
- [6] Hawkes N. Poor quality animal studies cause clinical trials to follow false leads. *BMJ* 2015;351:h5453.
- [7] Lancaster MA, Knoblich JA. Organogenesis in a dish: modeling development and disease using organoid technologies. *Science Jul* 18, 2014;345(6194):1247125.
- [8] Kilkenny C, Parsons N, Kadyszewski E, Festing MF, Cuthill IC, Fry D, et al. Survey of the quality of experimental design, statistical analysis and reporting of research using animals. *PLoS One* 2009;4(11), e7824.
- [9] Pecoraro V, Moja L, Dall'Olmo L, Cappellini G, Garattini S. Most appropriate animal models to study the efficacy of statins: a systematic review. *Eur J Clin Invest Sep* 2014;44(9):848–71.
- [10] Llovera G, Hofmann K, Roth S, Salas-Perdomo A, Ferrer-Ferrer M, Perego C, et al. Results of a preclinical randomized controlled multicenter trial (pRCT): anti-CD49d treatment for acute brain ischemia. *Sci Transl Med Aug* 5 2015;7(299):299ra121.
- [11] Collins FS, Tabak LA. Policy: NIH plans to enhance reproducibility. *Nature Jan* 30 2014;505(7485):612–3.
- [12] Kilkenny C, Browne WJ, Cuthill IC, Emerson M, Altman DG. Improving bioscience research reporting: the ARRIVE guidelines for reporting animal research. *PLoS Biol* 2010;8(6), e1000412.
- [13] Jori A, Rutzynski M. A genetic analysis of the hyperthermic response to D-amphetamine in two inbred strains of mice. *Psychopharmacology Oct* 31 1978; 59(2):199–203.
- [14] Bertani T, Poggi A, Pozzoni R, Delaini F, Sacchi G, Thoua Y, et al. Adriamycin-induced nephrotic syndrome in rats: sequence of pathologic events. *Lab Invest Jan* 1982; 46(1):16–23.
- [15] Ruggenenti P, Remuzzi G. Angiotensin-converting enzyme inhibitor therapy for non-diabetic progressive renal disease. *Curr Opin Nephrol Hypertens Sep* 1997; 6(5):489–95.
- [16] AAVV, editor. *Prontuario Terapeutico Veterinario - Medicina del cane e del gatto, Medicina degli animali esotici*. Edizioni Veterinarie: Cremona; 2014.