

Retention of Small Organisms by 0.22 µm Durapore[®] Filter

A Study on Bacterial Retention to Determine the Worst Case Challenge Organism

Background

Incidents of microbial penetration of membrane filters rated as “0.2 or 0.22 µm sterilizing grade” have been cited in the literature.^{1,2,3} Passage has been attributed to (1) growththrough; (2) the ability of organisms to create deformable L-forms, and; (3) exceeding the inherent titre reduction of a given filter. Of specific concern are “small” microorganisms such as *Burkholderia cepacia*, *R. pickettii*, *P. luteola* and *P. fluorescens*, which have been isolated from process streams.

Several experiments were performed to examine the size of the organisms, and the ability of these organisms to penetrate Durapore[®] 0.22 µm PVDF membrane. Results show that the organisms are larger than *Brevundimonas diminuta* (*B. Diminuta*) the industry-standard organism for evaluating microbial retention of sterilizing grade filters, and show that, in process-simulation testing, 0.22 µm Durapore[®] membrane will provide complete retention of these organisms.

Small Organism and Their Sizes

In **Table 1** is a listing of bacteria, many of which were isolated from actual process streams and submitted for evaluation. Each isolate was cultured with an aim of producing small cells and was examined by scanning electron microscopy to measure cell lengths and widths.

In every case, *B. diminuta* was smaller than any of the other organisms. These data support the generally accepted conclusion that appropriately cultured *B. diminuta* is the smallest bacterium that is relevant to most pharmaceutical applications, and is therefore the challenge organism used in filter validation studies. When prepared in a saline lactose broth (SLB) medium, *B. diminuta* cells are deaggregated and very small, with a mean length 0.68 microns (0.14 micron standard

deviation) and a mean width of 0.31 microns (0.04 micron standard deviation). **However, if a smaller bacterium is found in a given process stream, the biopharmaceutical company is required to perform validation studies with the smaller challenge organism.**^{4,5,6,7}

Table 1. Sizes of Various Organisms

Organism	Reference	Media	Length (µm)	Width (µm)
<i>Brevundimonas diminuta</i>	ATCC 19146	SLB	0.68	0.31
<i>Burkholderia cepacia</i>	ATCC 35254	DI H2O	1.11	0.46
<i>Burkholderia cepacia</i>	ATCC 25416	SLB	1.15	0.42
<i>Burkholderia cepacia</i>	Process isolate	Saline	1.00	0.43
<i>Pseudomonas fluorescens</i>	Process isolate	SLB	0.90	0.53
<i>Pseudomonas fluorescens</i>	Process isolate	SLB	1.17	0.46
<i>Pseudomonas fluorescens</i>	Process isolate	DI H2O	1.02	0.22
<i>Pseudomonas luteola</i>	Process isolate	SLB	0.72	0.39
<i>Pseudomonas luteola</i>	Process isolate	DI H2O	0.86	0.33
<i>Stenotrophomonas maltophilia</i>	Process isolate	DI H2O	0.88	0.44
<i>Stenotrophomonas maltophilia</i>	Process isolate	Product	1.40	0.52
<i>Ralstonia pickettii</i>	CDC-Anderson	DI H2O	1.37	0.48
<i>Pseudomonas pseudoalcaligenes</i>	Process isolate	RPMI	1.06	0.32
<i>Pseudomonas stutzeri</i>	Process isolate	SLB	1.22	0.50
<i>Comamonas testoseroni</i>	Process isolate	SLB	0.99	0.38
<i>Xanthomonas maltophilia</i>	Process isolate	DI H2O	1.28	0.37
<i>Bacillus cereus</i>	Process isolate	Media Fill	1.19	0.36

Small Organism Contamination Concerns

Contamination episodes usually raise questions regarding retention of small organisms with a 0.2 µm or 0.22 µm sterilizing-grade filter. If there is a product contamination, the source of the contamination needs to be determined and the following issues need to be investigated:

- Is the sample truly contaminated or is there a sample handling/QC testing issue?
- Is aseptic processing achieved and maintained? For example, has the sterilization cycle (steaming or autoclaving) been validated, were the SOPs for the sterilization cycle abided by?
- Was the downstream piping compromised in any way, e.g., non-sanitary valve?
- Is the organism truly retained or not retained by the 0.2 µm or 0.22 µm “sterilizing-grade” filter?

Retention of Small Organisms with Durapore® 0.22 µm Filters

The bacterial retention results of small microorganisms with 0.22 µm hydrophilic Durapore® membrane are shown in Table 2.

Table 2. Retention Test Results for Small Organisms and Durapore® 0.22 µm Membrane

Challenge Organism	Media	LRV	No. of Tests
<i>B. cepacia</i>	SLB	>9.35	15
<i>P. fluorescens</i>	SLB	>8.45	3
<i>P. fluorescens</i>	Product	>8.50	3
<i>R. pickettii</i>	SLB	>9.67	15
<i>P. stutzeri</i>	SLB	>8.34	3
<i>P. stutzeri</i>	Product	>8.52	3

Table 2 shows that under the operating conditions studies, 0.22 µm Durapore® membrane is completely retentive of these small microorganisms which have been thought to be potentially smaller than *B. diminuta*.

Bacterial Concerns During Extended Processing

“Growththrough” is one hypothesis used to explain the presence of microorganisms downstream of 0.2 µm or 0.22 µm rated filters that have been in service for an

extended period of time. Although there is no reliable evidence to support this hypothesis, the possibility of growththrough is of concern to regulatory agencies. Regulatory agencies state that appropriate time limitations be set forth for sterilizing filtration steps.^{4, 5, 6, 7}

Bacterial Retention During Extended Processing with Durapore® 0.22 µm Filters

Durapore® filters have been studied under simulated conditions of extended processing. Studies have shown⁸ that Durapore® filters do not permit growththrough when tested with *B. diminuta* under the following conditions:

- Up to 96 hours of continuous processing (10⁷ cfu/cm²)
- Up to 7 days of intermittent processing (10⁴ cfu/cm²)
- Up to 5 days with *B. diminuta* suspended in specific aqueous pharmaceuticals (10⁷ cfu/cm²).

Support Services

Our Validation Services laboratories can perform:

- Filter retention testing for process isolates in specific drug products
- Filter retention testing under extended processing conditions

References

1. Christian, D.A. et al., “The penetration of membranes by organisms growththrough and its related problems., Ultrapure Water. May/June 1986. pp. 39-44
2. Howard, G. et al., “A case of penetration of 0.2 µm rated filters by bacteria”, J. Parenteral Sci., March/April 1980
3. Cole, S., “Filter Penetration, Growththrough or Downstream Contamination”, BFS News, Sept. 1996
4. FDA Guidance for Industry. Sterile Drug Products Produced by Aseptic Processing – Current Good Manufacturing Practice.
5. European Guidelines to Good Manufacturing Practice, Volume 4 Medicinal Products for Human and Veterinary Use, ANNEX 1 Manufacture of Sterile Medicinal Products
6. Chinese Guidance of Good Manufacturing Practices for drug, Annex 1 Sterile Medicinal Products, Chapter 12, Sterilization method, Article 75
7. Japanese Guidance on the Manufacture of Sterile Pharmaceutical Products by Aseptic Processing
8. Bacterial Grow through of Durapore (GVPP) Disk Filters; Millipore Pharmaceutical Application note (Doc. #MA0002), May 1991.

MilliporeSigma
400 Summit Drive
Burlington, MA 01803
EMDMillipore.com

For more information, visit:

[EMDMillipore.com/validation-services](https://www.emdmillipore.com/validation-services)

To submit a request for a quote, visit:

[EMDMillipore.com/validation-quote-request](https://www.emdmillipore.com/validation-quote-request)

