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

Susanne Kochs[1], Sandra Schiewe[1], Milena Foerster[2], Kathrin Hillmann[3], Claudia Blankenstein[3], Martina C. Meinke[4], Josephine Kugler[1], David Kocovic[5], Andreas Luch[1], Ulrike Blume-Peytavi[3], Ines Schreiver[1,*]

[1]German Federal Institute for Risk Assessment (BfR), Department of Chemical and Product Safety, Berlin, Germany

[2]International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC), Environment and Lifestyle Epidemiology Branch, Lyon, France

[3]Charité-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

[4]Charité-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

[5]Institute for Medicines and Medical Devices of Montenegro, Center for Inspection Supervision and Market Control, Podgorica, Montenegro

Declaration of Competing Interests

The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper.

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 4-acetamidobenzoic 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.

Introduction

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 Europe and the United States are tattooed.[2,3] The European REACH (Registration, Evaluation, Authorisation and Restriction of Chemicals) restriction on tattoo and permanent make-up inks bans more than 4000 substances due to their hazard potential, thus making it the strictest regulation worldwide.[4] Substances with toxic potential found in tattoo inks include heavy metals (e.g., chromium, nickel, cobalt), primary aromatic amines (PAAs) and polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs), which may have allergic and/or carcinogenic potential.[5-12] While acute adverse reactions occur promptly after tattooing and are therefore relatively easy to correlate with them, long-term effects of tattoos, such as cancer and immunotoxicity, are not easily linked.[13] Exposure quantification is crucial to calculate safe limits and to assess population-wide risks associated with intentionally or 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

tattooing is determined by the amount of ink applied per surface area of the tattooed skin. Several studies were conducted to determine exposure levels, including weighing *ex vivo* skin before and after tattooing[15] and quantifying pigments after tattooing of *ex vivo* skin.[16] However, these data primarily refer to the initial pigment deposition rather than the soluble fraction administered, and they vary greatly (0.6 – 9.5 $mg_{pigment}/cm^2$).[16] In 2017, the European Chemicals Agency (ECHA) estimated an exposure level of 14.36 mg_{ink}/cm^2 based on a study by Engel and colleagues.[16] For a tattooed area of 300 cm^2, this would result in an equivalent to 4.308 g of ink per session.[17] However, these were *ex vivo* generated data and therefore do not consider the actual absorption of the soluble 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]

In the present study, we used an *in vivo* human quasi-experimental design to derive a reasonable worst-case exposure scenario that may be applied in future risk assessments. As most of the potentially harmful tattoo ink ingredients cannot be used in human experimental exposure studies due to their hazard potential, we added tracer substances (potassium iodide, 4-aminobenzoic acid (PABA), and 2-phenoxyethanol (PEtOH)) to tattoo inks, as hazard-free alternatives. To estimate the short-term exposure and biodistribution of tattoo inks, the tracers were quantified in blood, urine and consumable products in contact with ink of 24 subjects by using previously validated analytical 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.

Methods

Study design

The single-arm study was conducted at the Clinical Research Center for Hair and Skin Science, Charité-Universitätsmedizin Berlin (Berlin, Germany) from November 2021 to September 2022. A total of 24 subjects were tattooed by professional tattoo artists with different tattoo inks (14 black, 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 and also being used in drug products (details cf. *Supplemental Material 1*).[23-30] Iodide was chosen for its straightforward quantifiability for the determination of applied ink, PABA has structural similarities to PAAs, and PEtOH was selected as a potential preservative in tattoo inks that has similarities to the more commonly used benzyl alcohol. Tracers were added to commercial tattoo inks at a clinical pharmacy unit under sterile conditions (cf. *Supplemental Material 1*). Subjects and tattoo artists were recruited through flyers and social media. The inclusion criteria for subjects were: healthy, male, 18 – 45 years of age, 60 – 100 kg, autonomous wish for a tattoo (tattooed area $\pm$ 30%: black ~ 300 cm^2, red ~ 100 cm^2), and at least one already existing tattoo. The design of the tattoo and the tattoo artist were of subject's choice. Exclusion criteria included health restrictions, intake of certain drugs or dietary supplements containing the tracers or that might otherwise affect the study, and unwillingness to follow the behavioural and dietary rules (*Supplemental Material 2*). Since PEtOH can be present in cosmetic products, subjects were instructed to use specified cosmetic products 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 Pollock[31]) 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.

Ethics approval

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

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.

PABA, PEtOH and their metabolites were analysed in plasma, urine and ink using high performance 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 a calibration curve in the corresponding matrix (plasma or urine). In brief, sample preparation included addition of internal standards, protein precipitation by ice-cold acetonitrile (Carl Roth GmbH & Co, Karlsruhe, Germany, catalogue number: HN40.2) and centrifugation and further dilution with ultrapure water. In addition, alkaline hydrolysis was performed to determine the total PABA content in urine. For the analysis of 2-phenoxyacetic acid (PAc) in urine samples a standard addition method was used. The method is described in more detail in *Supplemental Material 3*. The cosmetic products used by the subjects were screened to confirm absence of PEtOH. No relevant concentrations were detected (*Supplemental Material 4*).

Picture analysis

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

tattooed body surface in cm^2 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]

Determination of tattoo ink, urine recovery and exposure

The amount of ink applied to the skin was calculated using two approaches (*Figure 1B,C*). Firstly, hypothetical use of ink per session (hypo) was derived by iodine quantification from consumables. The tattoo ink bottles were weighed before and after tattooing and the calculated amount of ink in the consumables was subtracted from the mass difference to obtain the amount of ink applied to the skin. Secondly, systemic exposure to ink components per session (sys) was calculated from the excreted amount of PABA or iodine in urine C-F. Since iodine has a physiological background and some individuals have a minor 4-acetamidobenzoic acid (ACD) background depending on their diet, urine A–B collected in the 24 hours before tattooing was subtracted as subject specific background. Both, hypo and sys, were divided by the derived tattooed area from the picture analysis to obtain the amount of ink per cm^2.

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 every subject.

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.

PABA metabolism after oral uptake

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

PABA metabolism in cell culture

As PAAs and PABA can be metabolised by skin, particularly through *N*-acetylation,[35,36] the metabolism of PABA was investigated in pooled human dermal fibroblasts (HDFp) from CELLnTEC advanced cell systems AG (Bern, Switzerland, catalogue number: HDfp, lot: MC1904099) and monocyte-derived 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 in 12-well plates (HDFp: 8×10^4 cells/well and MDM: 8.75×10^5 cells/well) and incubated for 24 hours before treatment with different concentrations of PABA (0, 0.1, 1, and 10 µg/ml) dissolved in Dulbecco's Modified Eagle's Medium/F12 1:1 (DMEM/F12) with L-glutamine, 1.2 g/l $NaHCO_3$ but without phenol red from PAN-Biotech GmbH (Aidenbach, Germany, catalogue number: P04-41650). After another 24 hours of incubation, the cell culture medium was collected and analysed using the above mentioned HPLC-QTOF-MS method.

Results

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 ± 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*).

Study subjects and deviations

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

Ink exposure and urine recovery of tracers

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

The average ink quantity per session (hypo) was 0.89 ± 0.48 g for both colours combined, 1.02 ± 0.52 g for black and 0.71 ± 0.33 g for red (*Table 1, Figure 2A*). The tattooed areas were subjectively estimated to be around 300 cm² for black and 100–300 cm² for red, whereby non-tattooed, empty spaces were included in the area. This was a prerequisite in subject recruitment, 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 estimated areas. We therefore used the same picture analysis method to calculate the area of the tattooed surface. The analysis of the tattooed area per session resulted in an average size of 86.4 ± 53.6 cm² for both colours, with the average being 107.8 ± 53.7 cm² for black tattoos and 56.5 ± 36.5 cm² for red tattoos (*Table 1, Figure 2B*). The estimated exposure to tattoo ink per skin area (hypo) was therefore 12.45 ± 8.85 mg_{ink}/cm^2, with 10.09 ± 5.42 mg_{ink}/cm^2 for black and 15.84 ± 11.39 mg_{ink}/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*).

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 2A–C*) with 0.89 g of ink. Overall, the data scattering was lower for the reduced data set.

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

The ink per area (sys, PABA) is more positively correlated with red tattoos than black tattoos (*Figure 2D*). Likewise, a negative correlation with tattooed area was demonstrated for both colours (*Figure 2E*). An additional multiple factor analysis showed a minor connection between ink per area (sys, 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 applied, the mean 75th percentile was 3.67 mg_{ink}/cm^2 (*Table 2*).

Metabolite profile and plasma kinetics

Several PABA metabolites were identified in the subjects' urine. ACD was quantified in all subjects, whereas 4-aminohippuric acid (PAHA) was only above the limit of detection (LOD) in 15 subjects (*Supplemental Excel File*). The quantifiable metabolites of PABA were predominantly in the form of ACD (41.76 ± 11.15%), with only a small percentage in the form of PAHA (0.79 ± 0.76%)(*Figure S2*). Additionally, metabolites that could not be quantified directly, such as 4-acetamidobenzoic acid glucuronide (ACD-GlcA) and 4-acetamidohippuric acid (ACHA), were detected based on their monoisotopic masses (355.09 g/mol for ACD-GlcA and 236.08 g/mol for ACHA) and the 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.

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.

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.

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.

Iodine 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 that the concentration of the PABA metabolite ACD was already close to the LOD, it is reasonable that neither PEtOH nor PAc could be detected, as the PEtOH concentration in the ink was six times lower when compared to PABA and detection limits of PEtOH and PAc were slightly higher.[23] Blood samples only reflect a specific time point, bearing the risk to miss the peak concentrations or any 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 not found despite previously reported as PABA metabolite.[38] In case of PEtOH, *in silico*[39] and animal experiments[40,41] suggest a variety of possible metabolites, including those formed via oxidation, 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 detected PAc.[40,41] A recent study by Eckert et al. identified 4-hydroxyphenoxyacetic acid as an additional metabolite in a lower ratio compared to PAc.[42] In our study, no metabolite other than PAc was found. However, the PEtOH concentration used was much lower compared to the study by Eckert et al., hence it may be possible that 4-hydroxyphenoxyacetic acid was formed but below identification limits.

In our study, red tattoos correlated with higher use of ink but smaller tattooed areas when compared to black tattoos. This correlation can be explained by the fact that red tattoo designs mostly consisted of filled areas rather than shading and outlines which were more prominent in black tattoos. In the picture analysis, shaded areas were not considered. Therefore, tattoo design rather than ink colour plays an important role in the degree of ink exposure. Minor correlations of ink per 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 and other biomarkers with high urine volume have been reported previously.[43,44]

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
349 physico-chemical differences, but is less likely to occur with small molecules (or ions) completely
350 dissolved in the application media.[45] Therefore, the most plausible factor responsible for the
351 discrepancies in the systemic exposure levels might be transepidermal loss by wound healing.
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. Iodine 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.

365 In the ECHA Annex XV restriction report, the 75th percentile of the available data set was used to
366 calculate a reasonable worst-case scenario, as these data reflected a high exposure situation only.[17]
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
373 concentration found was 6475 $\mu g/g_{ink}$ (about 0.65% PEtOH).[46] Assuming that our calculated exposure
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
377 concentration to preserve injected pharmaceuticals.[25] One of the highest findings of PAAs was
378 1775 $\mu g/g_{ink}$ *o*-anisidine pre-REACH.[47,48] However, PAA limits set by REACH are concentrations up to
379 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
380 when applying a REACH compliant tattoo ink preparation under reasonable worst-case conditions.[4]

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

384 would also apply to tattoo inks.[49] However, no quantitative limits for toxic substances in tattoo inks
385 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
400 genotoxic PAA (i.e., 2,4-toluenediamine) in skin and different skin cell types was previously
401 described.[18] Keratinocytes in the epidermis, which are known for their capacity to catalyse *N*-
402 acetylation,[35,36,50,51] may be in contact with the ink constituents during tattooing and in the early
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
405 contact to keratinocytes.[52] Therefore, ACD formation during tattooing might be driven by fibroblasts
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.

415 In conclusion, the present study fills the data gaps on systemic exposure to tattoo ink ingredients
416 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
419 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
424 for discussion with competent authorities to develop harmonised exposure assessments and to
425 evaluate tattoo-associated risks in the future.

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).

Ethics approval

The study was approved by the ethics committee of the Charité – Universitätsmedizin Berlin (Berlin, Germany) under the proposal number EA4/085/21.

Acknowledgements

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

References

1. McGovern V. Metal Toxicity: Tattoos: Safe Symbols? *Environmental Health Perspectives*. 2005;113(9):A590. doi:10.1289/ehp.113-a590a
2. 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
3. Borkenhagen A, Mirastschijski U, Petrowski K, Brähler E. Tattoos in der deutschen Bevölkerung – Prävalenzen, Soziodemografie und Gesundheitsorientierung. *Bundesgesundheitsblatt - Gesundheitsforschung - Gesundheitsschutz*. 2019/09/01 2019;62(9):1077-1082. doi:10.1007/s00103-019-02999-7
4. Commission Regulation (EU) 2020/2081 of 14 December 2020 amending Annex XVII to Regulation (EC) No 1907/2006 of the European Parliament and of the Council concerning the Registration, Evaluation, Authorisation and Restriction of Chemicals (REACH) as regards substances in tattoo inks or permanent make-up.
5. 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.
6. The Danish Environmental Protection Agency. Chemical substances in tattoo ink. Survey of chemical substances in consumer products no. 116. 2012.
7. Lehner K, Santarelli F, Vasold R, et al. Black Tattoos Entail Substantial Uptake of Genotoxicpolycyclic Aromatic Hydrocarbons (PAH) in Human Skin and Regional Lymph Nodes. *PLOS ONE*. 2014;9(3):e92787. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0092787
8. Lehner K, Santarelli F, Vasold R, König B, Landthaler M, Bäumler W. Black tattoo inks are a source of problematic substances such as dibutyl phthalate. *Contact Dermatitis*. 2011;65(4):231-238. doi:10.1111/j.1600-0536.2011.01947.x
9. Regensburger J, Lehner K, Maisch T, et al. Tattoo inks contain polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons that additionally generate deleterious singlet oxygen. *Experimental Dermatology*. 2010;19(8):e275-e281. doi:10.1111/j.1600-0625.2010.01068.x
10. Lim H-H, Shin H-S. Sensitive Determination of Volatile Organic Compounds and Aldehydes in Tattoo Inks. *Journal of Chromatographic Science*. 2017;55(2):109-116. doi:10.1093/chromsci/bmw163
11. Battistini B, Petrucci F, De Angelis I, Failla CM, Bocca B. Quantitative analysis of metals and metal-based nano- and submicron-particles in tattoo inks. *Chemosphere*. 2020/04/01/ 2020;245:125667. doi:10.1016/j.chemosphere.2019.125667
12. Forte G, Petrucci F, Cristaudo A, Bocca B. Market survey on toxic metals contained in tattoo inks. *Science of The Total Environment*. 2009/11/15/ 2009;407(23):5997-6002. doi:10.1016/j.scitotenv.2009.08.034
13. Foerster M, Ezzedine K, Ribet C, Zins M, Goldberg M, Schüz J. Tattoos: a new ancient carcinogen? *ISEE Conference Abstracts*. 2022;2022(1)doi:10.1289/isee.2022.P-0359
14. Schreiver I, Hesse B, Seim C, et al. Synchrotron-based ν-XRF mapping and μ-FTIR microscopy enable to look into the fate and effects of tattoo pigments in human skin. *Scientific Reports*. 2017/09/12 2017;7(1):11395. doi:10.1038/s41598-017-11721-z
15. Arbache S, Mattos EdC, Diniz MF, et al. How much medication is delivered in a novel drug delivery technique that uses a tattoo machine? *International Journal of Dermatology*. 2019;58(6):750-755. doi:10.1111/ijd.14408
16. Engel E, Santarelli F, Vasold R, et al. Modern tattoos cause high concentrations of hazardous pigments in skin. *Contact Dermatitis*. 2008;58(4):228-233. doi:10.1111/j.1600-0536.2007.01301.x
17. European Chemicals Agengy (ECHA). Annex XV Restriction Report. Substances in tattoo inks 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
497 19. Bhaiya P, Roychowdhury S, Vyas PM, Doll MA, Hein DW, Svensson CK. Bioactivation, protein
498 haptenation, and toxicity of sulfamethoxazole and dapsone in normal human dermal fibroblasts.
499 *Toxicology and Applied Pharmacology*. 2006/09/01/ 2006;215(2):158-167.
500 doi:10.1016/j.taap.2006.02.006
501 20. Wiegand C, Hewitt NJ, Merk HF, Reisinger K. Dermal Xenobiotic Metabolism: A Comparison
502 between Native Human Skin, Four in vitro Skin Test Systems and a Liver System. *Skin Pharmacology*
503 *and Physiology*. 2014;27(5):263-275. doi:10.1159/000358272
504 21. Strandt H, Voluzan O, Niedermair T, et al. Macrophages and Fibroblasts Differentially
505 Contribute to Tattoo Stability. *Dermatology*. 2020;237(2):296-302. doi:10.1159/000506540
506 22. Baranska A, Shawket A, Jouve M, et al. Unveiling skin macrophage dynamics explains both
507 tattoo persistence and strenuous removal. *Journal of Experimental Medicine*. 2018;215(4):1115-
508 1133. doi:10.1084/jem.20171608
509 23. Kochs S, Schiewe S, Zang Y, et al. 4-Aminobenzoic acid, 2-phenoxyethanol and iodine used as
510 tracers in a short-term in vivo-kinetics study for tattoo ink ingredients: Mass spectrometry method
511 development and validation. *Journal of Chromatography B*. 2023/09/01/ 2023;1229:123891.
512 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
519 26. Roy J, Carrier S. Acute Hepatitis Associated with Treatment of Peyronie's Disease with
520 Potassium Para-Aminobenzoate (Potaba). *The Journal of Sexual Medicine*. 2008/12/01/
521 2008;5(12):2967-2969. doi:10.1111/j.1743-6109.2008.00918.x
522 27. Sharma RS, Joy RC, Boushey CJ, Ferruzzi MG, Leonov AP, McCrory MA. Effects of Para-
523 Aminobenzoic Acid (PABA) Form and Administration Mode on PABA Recovery in 24-Hour Urine
524 Collections. *Journal of the Academy of Nutrition and Dietetics*. 2014/03/01/ 2014;114(3):457-463.
525 doi:10.1016/j.jand.2013.07.045
526 28. Nauman J, Wolff J. Iodide prophylaxis in Poland after the chernobyl reactor accident: Benefits
527 and risks. *The American Journal of Medicine*. 1993/05/01/ 1993;94(5):524-532. doi:10.1016/0002-
528 9343(93)90089-8
529 29. Le Guen B, Stricker L, Schlumberger M. Distributing KI pills to minimize thyroid radiation
530 exposure in case of a nuclear accident in France. *Nature Clinical Practice Endocrinology &*
531 *Metabolism*. 2007/09/01 2007;3(9):611-611. doi:10.1038/ncpendmet0593
532 30. World Health Organization (WHO). Use of potassium iodide for thyroid protection during
533 nuclear 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
536 32. International Council for Harmonisation of Technical Requirements for Pharmaceuticals for
537 Human Use. ICH guideline M10 on bioanalytical method validation and study sample analysis
538 EMA/CHMP/ICH/172948/2019. https://www.ema.europa.eu/en/documents/scientific-guideline/ich-
539 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**. https://www.ema.europa.eu/en/documents/scientific-
542 guideline/guideline-bioanalytical-method-validation_en.pdf (assessed 13.03.2023).
543 34. Foerster M, Dufour L, Bäumler W, et al. Development and Validation of the Epidemiological
544 Tattoo 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/s00204-014-1218-
552 6
553 37. Aparicio-Soto M, Riedel F, Leddermann M, et al. TCRs with segment TRAV9-2 or a CDR3
554 histidine are overrepresented among nickel-specific CD4+ T cells. *Allergy*. 2020;75(10):2574-2586.
555 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
560 39. Hewitt NJ, Troutman J, Przibilla J, et al. Use of in vitro metabolism and biokinetics assays to
561 refine predicted in vivo and in vitro internal exposure to the cosmetic ingredient, phenoxyethanol,
562 for use in risk assessment. *Regulatory Toxicology and Pharmacology*. 2022/06/01/ 2022;131:105132.
563 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
569 2-phenoxyethanol after oral exposure in humans: a volunteer study. *Archives of Toxicology*.
570 2024/06/01 2024;98(6):1771-1780. doi:10.1007/s00204-024-03717-2
571 43. Johner SA, Shi L, Remer T. Higher Urine Volume Results in Additional Renal Iodine Loss.
572 *Thyroid®*. 2010/12/01 2010;20(12):1391-1397. doi:10.1089/thy.2010.0161
573 44. Pinto J, Debowska M, Gomez R, Waniewski J, Lindholm B. Urine volume as an estimator of
574 residual renal clearance and urinary removal of solutes in patients undergoing peritoneal dialysis.
575 *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
578 46. Famele M, Lavalle R, Leoni C, et al. Quantification of preservatives in tattoo and permanent
579 make-up inks in the frame of the new requirements under the REACH Regulation. *Contact Dermatitis*.
580 2022;87(3):233-240. doi:10.1111/cod.14105
581 47. Jacobsen E, Tønning K, Pedersen E, Bernt, N, Serup J, Høgsberg T, Nielsen E. Chemical
582 Substances in Tattoo Ink: Survey of Chemical Substances in Consumer Products. 2012.
583 https://www2.mst.dk/udgiv/publications/2012/03/978-87-92779-87-8.pdf (assessed on 17.05.2024).
584 48. Fels P, Lachenmeier DW, Hindelang P, Walch SG, Gutsche B. Occurrence and Regulatory
585 Evaluation of Contaminants in Tattoo Inks. *Cosmetics*. 2023;10(5):141.
586 doi:10.3390/cosmetics10050141
587 49. U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA). Modernization of Cosmetics Regulation Act of 2022
588 (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 3,3′-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

598

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

Subject	Session duration [min]	Tattooed area [cm²]	Ink per session (hypo) [g]	Ink per area (hypo) [mg_{ink}/cm^2]	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
$Median_{all}$	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.

602

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

Basis of calculation	Sample size	Ink per session [g]		Ink per area [mg_{ink}/cm^2]	
		Mean	75th p.	Mean	75th p.
Ink per session (hypo)	n= 22	0.89	1.25	12.45	17.44
	(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

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

607 Figure 1. Study sampling and exposure calculation. (A) Overview of sampling times for blood and urine during the 48 h–
608 study period. (B) Calculation of the hypothetical ink amount used per session (hypo) based on ink weighing and iodine
609 quantification in the consumables. (C) Calculation of the systemic ink amount per session (sys) calculated by excreted
610 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

619 Figure 3. Pictures of tattoos from the study. Wound dressing of a red study subject displays exudation of black and red
620 tattoo 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.

626


A
0 h
start of tattooing process
urine A
-24/-12 h
urine B
-12/0 h
urine C
0/4 h
urine D
4/8 h
urine E
8/12 h
urine F
12/24 h
time periods for urine collection and canister swap
time points for blood samples [h]
0 1 2 3 4 6 8 24
B
Bottle weight before tattooing
Bottle weight after tattooing
Ink quantification in consumables via known iodine concentration in ink
Hypothetically applied ink per session (hypo)
C
Urine C-F
Total excreted amount of tracer
Calculation of ink via known tracer concentration in ink
Systemic amount of ink per session (sys)


A
Ink per session
(hypo)
0.89 g
1.02 g
0.71 g
m_ink total [g]
all
black
red
B
Tattooed area
86.41 cm²
107.78 cm²
56.49 cm²
tattoo area [cm²]
all
black
red
C
Ink per area
(hypo)
12.45 mg/cm²
10.09 mg/cm²
15.84 mg/cm²
ink [mg/cm²]
all
black
red
D
Ink per area [mg_ink / cm²]
Ink per session [g_ink]
Tattoo colour
black
red
E
Ink per area [mg_ink / cm²]
Tattooed area [cm²]
F
Mean recovery [%]
Recovery [%]
tracer substance
Iod
PABA
PEtOH

A



4-Aminobenzoic acid
(PABA)



4-Aminobenzoic acid-D-GlcA
(PABA-GlcA)



4-Acetamidobenzoic acid
(ACD)



4-Acetamidobenzoic acid-D-GlcA
(ACD-GlcA)



4-Aminohippuric acid
(PAHA)



4-Acetamidohippuric acid
(ACHA)

B

Tattooing (n = 3)



0.77% PAHA
3.20% ACHA
63.56% ACD
30.43% ACD-GlcA 180
2.05% ACD-GlcA 356

total PABA recovery in urine:
22.63%

Peroral (n = 3)



1.42% PAHA
18.83% ACHA
44.13% ACD
32.44% ACD-GlcA 180
3.18% ACD-GlcA 356

total PABA recovery in urine:
94.75%