

Study ID	Study Name	Year	Cell Line / Model	Biological Question	Genetic Perturbation	Assay / Readout	Key Findings	Significance	Notes
1	Chromosomal aberration in vivo	Heggen et al., 2022	CHO-K1	Chromosome aberration (-UV irradiation)	CCN1, CCN2, CCN3, CCN4, CCN5, CCN6	Flow cytometry, Western blot, etc.	any statistical increase at any concentration: NO	Positive	increasingly high penetrance with no deposition control, no proof of internalization, relatively short time of exposure
2	Chromosomal aberration in vivo	Heggen et al., 2022	CHO-K1	Chromosome aberration (-UV irradiation)	CCN1, CCN2, CCN3, CCN4, CCN5, CCN6	Flow cytometry, Western blot, etc.	any statistical increase at any concentration: NO	Positive	increasingly high penetrance with no deposition control, no proof of internalization, relatively short time of exposure
3	Chromosomal aberration in vivo	Heggen et al., 2022	CHO-K1	Chromosome aberration (-UV irradiation)	CCN1, CCN2, CCN3, CCN4, CCN5, CCN6	Flow cytometry, Western blot, etc.	any statistical increase at any concentration: NO	Positive	increasingly high penetrance with no deposition control, no proof of internalization, relatively short time of exposure
4	Chromosomal aberration in vivo	Heggen et al., 2022	CHO-K1	Chromosome aberration (-UV irradiation)	CCN1, CCN2, CCN3, CCN4, CCN5, CCN6	Flow cytometry, Western blot, etc.	any statistical increase at any concentration: NO	Positive	increasingly high penetrance with no deposition control, no proof of internalization, relatively short time of exposure
5	Corneal in vivo	King et al., 2011	Human cornea	Epithelial injury (UVB irradiation)	CCN1, CCN2, CCN3	Flow cytometry, Western blot, etc.	any statistical increase at any concentration: YES (+CCN)	Positive	no positive control, no proof of internalization, only DNA is reported; methodology insufficiently described, not clear how many samples there were with per concentration were analyzed; no data on stability of the particles
6	Corneal in vivo	King et al., 2011	Human cornea	Epithelial injury (UVB irradiation)	CCN1, CCN2, CCN3	Flow cytometry, Western blot, etc.	any statistical increase at any concentration: YES (+CCN)	Positive	no positive control, no proof of internalization, only DNA is reported; methodology insufficiently described, not clear how many samples there were with per concentration were analyzed; no data on stability of the particles
7	Corneal in vivo	Fan et al., 2011	Human cornea	Epithelial injury (UVB irradiation)	CCN1, CCN2, CCN3	Flow cytometry, Western blot, etc.	any statistical increase at any concentration: YES (+CCN)	Positive	no positive control, no proof of internalization, only DNA is reported; methodology insufficiently described, not clear how many samples there were with per concentration were analyzed; no data on stability of the particles
8	Corneal in vivo	Holland et al., 2014	Human cornea	Epithelial injury (UVB irradiation)	CCN1, CCN2, CCN3	Flow cytometry, Western blot, etc.	any statistical increase at any concentration: YES (+CCN)	Positive	no positive control, no proof of internalization, only DNA is reported; methodology insufficiently described, not clear how many samples there were with per concentration were analyzed; no data on stability of the particles
9	Corneal in vivo	Bashir et al., 2014	Human cornea	Epithelial injury (UVB irradiation)	CCN1, CCN2, CCN3	Flow cytometry, Western blot, etc.	any statistical increase at any concentration: YES (+CCN)	Positive	no positive control, no proof of internalization, only DNA is reported; methodology insufficiently described, not clear how many samples there were with per concentration were analyzed; no data on stability of the particles
10	Corneal in vivo	Roychoudhury et al., 2012	Human cornea	Epithelial injury (UVB irradiation)	CCN1, CCN2, CCN3	Flow cytometry, Western blot, etc.	any statistical increase at any concentration: YES (+CCN)	Positive	no positive control, no proof of internalization, only DNA is reported; methodology insufficiently described, not clear how many samples there were with per concentration were analyzed; no data on stability of the particles
11	Corneal in vivo	Roychoudhury et al., 2012	Human cornea	Epithelial injury (UVB irradiation)	CCN1, CCN2, CCN3	Flow cytometry, Western blot, etc.	any statistical increase at any concentration: YES (+CCN)	Positive	no positive control, no proof of internalization, only DNA is reported; methodology insufficiently described, not clear how many samples there were with per concentration were analyzed; no data on stability of the particles
12	Corneal in vivo	Hong et al., 2011	Human cornea	Epithelial injury (UVB irradiation)	CCN1, CCN2, CCN3	Flow cytometry, Western blot, etc.	any statistical increase at any concentration: YES (+CCN)	Positive	no positive control, no proof of internalization, only DNA is reported; methodology insufficiently described, not clear how many samples there were with per concentration were analyzed; no data on stability of the particles

in vitro	Microtubules test in vitro	Eggenard et al., 2023	D23	T146 (epithelial cell carcinoma from human buccal cells)	<p>Preparation: TCC 75, untreated, 21 hrs, from Epine-Albinch, Sami Quenlin</p> <p>Parental media:</p> <p>Type of assay: microtubule assay in vitro</p> <p>Cell culture: no</p> <p>Exposure time: 2 h + 22 h</p> <p>Concentration: 0, 10 or 100 µg/ml</p> <p>Cell treatment: 2 h + 22 h</p> <p>Cell harvest: 0</p> <p>Cell harvest: 0</p> <p>Biological medium for cell preparation: water</p> <p>Preparation of medium: Cells required to 25 µM of etoposide in a petri dish (control, n = 5, 50 or 100 µg/ml of total gdw TCC 81 TCC and TCC 100) incubated for 24 h. Cells were then washed with PBS and incubated in fresh culture medium for 24 h. Absorbance assay. TCC measured immediately or within 48 h.</p> <p>Positive control: etoposide 10 µM</p> <p>Methodology: No cytochrome block. Immunofluorescence staining (anti-α-tubulin). Immunostained cells were scored in at least 100 cells per sample. Positive control.</p> <p>Statistical analysis: one-way ANOVA analysis of variance (ANOVA) followed by the appropriate post hoc test.</p> <p>Additional measurements: 1171 particle translocation in vivo through the Jig bar of mouse and in vitro on human buccal T146 cells, antibodies (control against gammaH2AX and 1397) (DNA damage biomarker).</p> <p>Positive stress</p>	MICROCYTOTOXIC	TCC 75, untreated, 21 hrs, from Epine-Albinch, Sami Quenlin	<p>Preparation stability: in culture water (pH 7.2) and TCC cell culture medium (DMEM F12, pH 7.54)</p> <p>Cell characterization: TEM, ngCCDFP analysis combining 5C, 5TM and 5MS imaging, confocal microscopy</p> <p>Setting: untreated in ultraclean water (2 µg/ml) placed in an ice bath for 1 min at 4°C, centrifuged (VCC FDS 203 V, Sorbus Materials) to obtain a stable dispersion of TCC particles for 15 days at 4°C.</p>	<p>Confirmed by TEM, ngCCDFP analysis combining 5C, 5TM and 5MS imaging, confocal microscopy</p> <p>any statistical increase at any concentration: no</p> <p>result: negative</p> <p>result for positive control: 2.8 fold increase</p> <p>cytotoxicity: In proliferating cells, the tested TCC samples induced a significant cytotoxic activity at all tested concentrations compared to untreated cells, with a dose-response tendency. In contrast, after cell differentiation, no viability drop was observed in any tested condition.</p> <p>TEER: Regardless of the time point tested during the 48 h after treatment, no alterations were detected at any dose, suggesting that epithelial barrier permeability and microtubule integrity were not affected.</p> <p>Information: Electron dense (TCC) particles were isolated or recovered as small aggregates and then larger aggregates of submicron sized particles mixed with NP into the cytoplasm. Confirmed by ngCCDFP analysis.</p>	Negative	0	no number of cells scored	yes	positive																											
in vitro	Microtubules test in vitro	Eggenard et al., 2023	D23	T146 (epithelial cell carcinoma from human buccal cells)	<p>Preparation: TCC 75, untreated, 21 hrs, from Epine-Albinch, Sami Quenlin</p> <p>Parental media:</p> <p>Type of assay: microtubule assay in vitro</p> <p>Cell culture: no</p> <p>Exposure time: 2 h + 22 h</p> <p>Concentration: 0, 10 or 100 µg/ml</p> <p>Cell treatment: 2 h + 22 h</p> <p>Cell harvest: 0</p> <p>Cell harvest: 0</p> <p>Biological medium for cell preparation: water</p> <p>Preparation of medium: Cells required to 25 µM of etoposide in a petri dish (control, n = 5, 50 or 100 µg/ml of total gdw TCC 81 TCC and TCC 100) incubated for 24 h. Cells were then washed with PBS and incubated in fresh culture medium for 24 h. Absorbance assay. TCC measured immediately or within 48 h.</p> <p>Positive control: etoposide 10 µM</p> <p>Methodology: No cytochrome block. Immunofluorescence staining (anti-α-tubulin). Immunostained cells were scored in at least 100 cells per sample. Positive control.</p> <p>Statistical analysis: one-way ANOVA analysis of variance (ANOVA) followed by the appropriate post hoc test.</p> <p>Additional measurements: 1171 particle translocation in vivo through the Jig bar of mouse and in vitro on human buccal T146 cells, antibodies (control against gammaH2AX and 1397) (DNA damage biomarker).</p> <p>Positive stress</p>	MICROCYTOTOXIC	TCC 75, untreated, 21 hrs, from Epine-Albinch, Sami Quenlin	<p>Preparation stability: in culture water (pH 7.2) and in TRIS cell culture medium (DMEM F12, pH 7.54)</p> <p>Cell characterization: TEM, ngCCDFP analysis combining 5C, 5TM and 5MS imaging, confocal microscopy</p> <p>Setting: untreated in ultraclean water (2 µg/ml) placed in an ice bath for 1 min at 4°C, centrifuged (VCC FDS 203 V, Sorbus Materials) to obtain a stable dispersion of TCC particles for 15 days at 4°C.</p>	<p>Confirmed by TEM, ngCCDFP analysis combining 5C, 5TM and 5MS imaging, confocal microscopy</p> <p>any statistical increase at any concentration: no</p> <p>result: negative</p> <p>result for positive control: 2.8 fold increase</p> <p>cytotoxicity: In proliferating cells, the tested TCC samples induced a significant cytotoxic activity at all tested concentrations compared to untreated cells, with a dose-response tendency. In contrast, after cell differentiation, no viability drop was observed in any tested condition.</p> <p>TEER: Regardless of the time point tested during the 48 h after treatment, no alterations were detected at any dose, suggesting that epithelial barrier permeability and microtubule integrity were not affected.</p> <p>Information: Electron dense (TCC) particles were isolated or recovered as small aggregates and then larger aggregates of submicron sized particles mixed with NP into the cytoplasm. Confirmed by ngCCDFP analysis.</p>	Negative	0	no number of cells scored	yes	positive																											