

Research & Reviews: Journal of Pharmacology and Toxicological Studies

Review: The Truth about Toxicology Tests

Varsha KR*

Mallareddy College of Pharmacy, Dundigal, India

Research Article

Received: 26/09/2016
Accepted: 01/09/2016
Published: 10/09/2016

*For Correspondence:

Varsha Keerthi R, Department of Pharmaceutics, Mallareddy College of Pharmacy, Dundigal, India

Keywords: Toxicology tests, Blood, Post-mortem, Amphetamines

On TV wrongdoing appears the after effects of toxicology tests ^[1-5] are regurgitated out at twist speed, in some cases accessible even before the dissection is finished.

All things considered, toxicology test results take any longer.

"A portion of the tests take days, weeks, months," says Alan Hall, MD, a board-guaranteed toxicologist and specialist in Laramie, Wyo. The last toxicology report, he says, draws not just from different test outcomes and affirmation of the outcomes, additionally on the clinical experience of the toxicologists and pathologists required in the examination, and additionally field work.

Here is the thing that toxicology tests incorporate, why they take so long, and why they can be dubious.

WHAT IS TOXICOLOGY TESTING

The toxicology testing performed after a man's demise is known as forensic toxicology testing or post-mortem drug testing ^[6-11].

That is not the same as clinical toxicology ^[12,13], as indicated by the College of American Pathologists. This is the medication testing a crisis room specialist would be liable to arrange, for occasion, if a patient gives up with suggestions and side effects of medication overdose or manhandle.

Different sorts of toxicology testing incorporate working environment drug testing, which likewise screens for medications of misuse, and athletic medication testing in game projects, which recognize banned substances or medications that improve execution ^[14-17].

The toxicology report that is in the end issued in legal toxicology testing "is the consequence of the lab systems distinguishing and evaluating potential poisons, which incorporate physician recommended prescriptions and medications of misuse and understandings of the discoveries," says Howard S. Robin, MD. He is the restorative

chief of research facility administrations at Sharp Memorial Hospital in San Diego and is a board-ensured pathologist.

Toxicology testing is a piece of the post-mortem examination report, Robin says. "A complete examination ought to have some level of toxicology studies."

HOW ARE FORENSIC TOXICOLOGY TESTS DONE

At the season of the post-mortem examination, accumulation of blood ^[17-22], urine ^[22-26], and tissue tests is done in readiness for the toxicology tests, says Barbarajean Magnani, PhD, MD, executive of the Toxicology Resource board of trustees for the College of American Pathologists. She is likewise bad habit seat of the branch of pathology and research facility drug at Tufts Medical Centre, Boston.

"We gather blood from various territories, for example, the femoral vein [in the leg] and heart blood," she tells WebMD ^[27,28]. That is on the grounds that the grouping of medications can be distinctive, she says, so looking at the fixations can support precision.

"We gather urine if there is any [in the body] furthermore utilize tissues [to test]," Magnani says.

Examples taken for scientific toxicology testing routinely incorporate, notwithstanding blood and urine, tissue tests from the liver, mind, kidney, and vitreous silliness (the unmistakable "jam" found in the eyeball chamber), as per data from the College of American Pathologists. Tests of the stomach substance and bile, a digestive juice emitted by the liver, are additionally gathered routinely.

The tissue and liquid accumulation is regularly done by a pathologist or funeral home aid, Robin says, and the procedure ordinarily takes only 15 or 20 minutes.

Next, the examples are swung over to a toxicology master for testing. Testing is ordinarily done by medicinal technologists or scientific experts, for example, legal physicists with doctoral preparing who are affirmed by The American Board of Clinical Chemistry or the American Board of Forensic Toxicology, as indicated by the College of American Pathologists.

Medicinal analyst office staff can likewise direct toxicology drug testing identified with a post-mortem examination. Toxicology drug testing research centers where the examinations are done are licensed by such associations as the College of American Pathologists or state wellbeing divisions or different associations, to guarantee uniform quality benchmarks.

"The tissue is put in extraordinary compartments that avoid sullyng of the tissue," Robin says. Additives can anticipate or defer breakdown of the medications in the specimens, Magnani says ^[29-31].

A "paper trail" records precisely who has taken care of the examples to diminish the possibility of defilement or misunderstandings.

Pretty much as essential as the accumulation and following of liquid, blood, and tissue tests is the field examination, Robin says. That includes authorities investigating the medication cupboard and around the home of the perished individual for medications he or she may have been taking, including physician endorsed drugs, over-the-counter solutions, and unlawful medications.

That pursuit could likewise turn up proof that a man was getting remedies from a few specialists.

WHO DECIPHERS FORENSIC TOXICOLOGY TESTS AND HOW

Toxicologists, scientific experts, and pathologists all should be included to effectively decipher results.

"The primary thing we would do is a fundamental screen for medications in the urine and in the blood," Magnani says. The quest would be for medications, for example, sedatives ^[32], amphetamines ^[33], pot, liquor, and barbiturates, she says

The fundamental toxicology screen ordinarily utilizes an immunoassay ^[33-39], Robin says. This sort of test searches for medications in the blood utilizing particular antibodies that distinguish different classes of medications ^[40-43]. In the case of something shows up, a more refined test is done, utilizing procedures, for example, mass spectrometry, which can recognize chemicals in substances by their mass and charge ^[44-47].

"These corroborative strategies are entirely delicate," Robin says. "You can discover lower amounts [of the substance]."

The more advanced tests can tell specialists the precise grouping of the medication or other substance, says Hall, who is likewise clinical associate educator of general wellbeing at Weatherford College in Weatherford, Texas.

Specialists additionally can figure out whether two medications discovered together may have had a synergistic impact - which happens when two medications comparative in their activities deliver an overstated impact when taken together ^[48-50]. It's much the same as "one in addition to one equivalent five," Robins says.

Specialists need to figure out whether the medication or different substances found in the examples are a helpful measurement, a dangerous dosage, or a deadly measurement - whether they added until the very end or brought on the demise ^[51-56].

WHY DO THE FORENSIC TOXICOLOGY TESTS TAKE SO LONG

Getting a complete and precise forensic toxicology ^[57-60] test result can be a long procedure for an assortment of reasons, as indicated by the College of American Pathologists and specialists met by WebMD.

There might be a ton of examples that should be tried, which implies additionally testing time. Furthermore, as an examination continues, data about the likelihood of another medication being included may surface, so considerably all the more testing might be required.

At the point when the first round of positive tests must be affirmed by the more modern strategy, this may require conveying the examples to more specific research facilities. What's more, that adds to the postponement.

"Four to six weeks is really standard," Magnani says of the course of events for measurable toxicology testing ^[61-66]. Other than the time required for careful examination and affirmation, she says, there could be an accumulation of tests that should be done at a specific research centre.

"Everyone ought to be taken care of altogether, whether they are a big name or not," she says.

HOW DOES THE TOXICOLOGY REPORT DECIDE REASON FOR DEATH

Specialists hope to check whether the grouping of medications or toxic substances is in the harmful or deadly range, Magnani says ^[66-75]. They check other data, for example, side effects before their demise.

Case in point, she reviews a man who went out and when animated by police was so combative it took a few officers to repress him. At that point he kicked the bucket all of a sudden.

No physical discoveries from the post-mortem indicated a reason for death; she says ^[75-80]. "The toxicology report demonstrated the nearness of cocaine at a level adequate to bring about death," she says. What's more, the bellicose conduct was another piece of information ^[81-86].

Be that as it may, not each toxicology report is so obvious, Robin says. Also, TV truly presents a skewed perspective of scientific toxicology testing, he and different specialists concur ^[87-90].

"Toward the end of the [TV crime] appear, they don't say it's an uncertain reason for death," he says. Be that as it may, all things considered? "2-5% of passings are vague," Robin says, referring to measurable writing.

What entangles the procedure? Medications of misuse can change continually, Robin says, with one medication getting to be prominent, for case, while others blur in prevalence. "You are continually searching for what is the new medication [of choice]," he says.

CONCLUSION

Action in the field of Forensic Toxicology is related to the discovery, distinguishing proof and evaluation of xenobiotic in organic and non-natural matter ^[91-93]. A summary of such logical stages prompts the understanding of results through a thorough evaluative criteriology in connection to various administrative ranges.

The two primary zones where the examination of organic material applies are forensic Toxicology of the dead and forensic Toxicology of the living person.

Forensic Toxicology of the dead is dedicated to decide the nearness of xenobiotic in fluids and tissues and assess the conceivable causal or concausal part in the determination and flow of the demise ^[94-96].

Forensic Toxicology of the living individual is resolved to decide the nearness of xenobiotics in the organic example (blood, urine, air breathed in, hair, and so on.) and in assessing the conceivable causal or concausal part of inadequacy and/or deviations in conduct (see appropriateness to drive, WDT, doping, and so on.), or rather mischief to the individual.

Commitment in the aforementioned regions is mind boggling as a result of pre-analytical and analytical variables. Among the pre-explanatory variables are: amount of dosage ingested, recurrence and method for ingestion, interim amongst admission and test taking, the example gathering methodology, the interim between test taking and examination.

Among the explanatory variables are: hoisted number of analytes, vast assortment of concoction structures, of instability, utilitarian gatherings, hydrophilic/lipophilic proportions, estimations of pKa or pKb; wide scopes of fixation in fluids and organic tissues, subject to dosage allow; the way the examples are put away; the conceivable absence of pharmacokinetic and pharmacodynamics examines; the differing qualities of natural lattices and potential systematic obstructions delivered by exogenous, endogenic and putrefactive substances.

The multifaceted nature of those variables guarantees that each investigation might be given as an individual case for which there are no principles appropriate to all xenobiotic and all circumstances.

With the dispersion of ecological poisons and the furtive medication advertise, the scientific toxicology research center is additionally dedicated to the investigation of non-organic material. In this connection, Forensic Toxicology ^[97-100] can give to establishments and society data and mindfulness on the presence of new medications; distinguishing proof of the significant diverts of medication dissemination in the neighborhood and national underground market; ID of the methods embraced by traffickers to sidestep frameworks of control; data on substances utilized as a part of the cutting or treatment of the medication; proposals for auspicious administrative adjustments.

With the fundamental goal of giving experimentally based confirmation, the intricacy of all the above sketched out parts of scientific toxicology involves the requirement for the selection of value affirmation frameworks, ascertainment procedures and assessment criteriologies.

REFERENCES

1. Wikoff DS, et al. The Role of Systematic Review in the Practice of Toxicology and Risk Assessment—An Appreciation for the Primary Tool in Evidence-Based Practice. *Toxicol open access*. 2016;2:110.

2. Officioso A, et al. Nutritional Aspects of Food Toxicology: Mercury Toxicity and Protective Effects of Olive Oil Hydroxytyrosol. *J Nutr Food Sci.* 2016;6:539.
3. Saganuwan AS. Toxicology: The Basis for Development of Antidotes. *Toxicol open access.* 2015;1:e101.
4. Durisova M. Model Based Description of the Pharmacokinetic Behavior of Pentobarbital in Fasted Male Volunteers after Oral Administration of 10 mg of Pentobarbital. *Clin Exp Pharmacol.* 2016;6:200.
5. Kendall RJ. Wildlife Toxicology: Where We Have Been and Where We Are Going. *J Environ Anal Toxicol.* 2016;6:348.
6. Baniak N, et al. Vitreous Humor: A Short Review on Post-mortem Applications. *J Clin Exp Pathol.* 2015;5:199.
7. Jiang K, et al. Drusen and Proinflammatory Mediators in the Post-Mortem Human Eye. *J Clinic Experiment Ophthalmol.* 2012;3:208.
8. Ruan X, et al. The Debate on Urine Drug Testing in Pain and Addiction Management: Coverage or Non-Coverage? *J Pain Relief.* 2015;4:188.
9. Foster LI, et al. Modelling Effects of Drug Testing Procedures on Performance Trends in the Shot Put. *J Sports Med Doping Stud.* 2014;4:151.
10. Lornejad-Schäfer MR, et al. Reflection Coefficient S11 Related Measurement System for Label-Free Cell Seeding Analysis and Drug Testing in a Three-Dimensional (3D) Cell Culture Model. *J Biosens Bioelectron.* 2014;5:151.
11. Eswaran S, et al. Niacin, the Internet, and Urine Drug Testing: A Cause of Acute Liver Failure. *J Clin Toxicol.* 2013;3:167.
12. Tuladhar BS. Trends of Clinical Toxicology Cases in Nepal. *J Forensic Res.* 2014;5:217.
13. Shams N, et al. Metal-Induced Oxidative Stress in Egyptian Women with Breast Cancer. *J Clinic Toxicol.* 2012;2:141.
14. Hiranita T. Medications Discovery: Importance of Assessment of Drug Self Administration Dose-Effect Curves. *J Alcohol Drug Depend.* 2015;3:e121.
15. Altaei T. Safety and Efficacy of Medications in Researches. *J Ost Arth.* 2016;1:e102.
16. Labban L. Can Physical Activity Reduce the Need of Medications for Diabetes Mellitus Management? *J Diabetes Metab.* 2015;S13:015.
17. Tanna S, et al. (2015) LC-HRMS Analysis of Dried Blood Spot Samples For Assessing Adherence to Cardiovascular Medications. *J Bioanal Biomed* 7:001-005.
18. Saith SE, et al. All-cause Mortality of High-normal Random Blood Glucose using Basic Demographics. *J Cardiovasc Dis Diagn.* 2016;4:248.
19. Taira J, et al. Relationship between the Status of Blood Supply in the Non-hypervascular Hepatocellular Nodules among Chronic Liver Diseases and the Hypervascular Change. *J Liver.* 2016;5:197.
20. Kolawole AK. Effect of Organic Turmeric Supplemented-diet in Rabbits Acutely Exposed to Ultraviolet Radiation: Oxidative Stress in the Blood. *Anat Physiol.* 2016;6:229.
21. Ojo BA, et al. Assessment of Blood CD4 Count and Antibigram Profile of Bacteria Isolated from HIV Patients. *HIV Curr Res.* 2016;1:107.
22. Carr BI, et al. An HCC Aggressiveness Index and Blood GTP, Bilirubin and Platelet Levels. *J Integr Oncol.* 2016;5:172.

23. Fischer D, et al. Tracking Syngeneic Leukocytes after Transfusion of Nonleukoreduced Blood in a Murine Model. *J Hematol Thrombo Dis*. 2016;4:247.
24. Sjodin B, et al. Blood-Brain-Barrier-Penetrating 6-Halogenopurines Suitable as Pro-Probes for Positron Emission Tomography are Substrates for Human Glutathione Transferases. *J Pharma Reports*. 2016;1:114.
25. Jain RB. Associated Complex of Urine Creatinine, Serum Creatinine, and Chronic Kidney Disease. *Epidemiology (Sunnyvale)*. 2016;6:234.
26. Sato Y, et al. Anesthetic Management of A Patient who Underwent Emergent Cesarean Section after Sudden Disturbance of Consciousness Caused by Disseminated Intravascular Coagulation due to Severe Urine Infection and Septic Shock. *J Anesth Clin Res*. 2016;7:613.
27. Eto K, et al. Chronological Progress of Calcified Lesion in the Iliofemoral Vein in a Patient with Chronic Renal Failure. *J Vasc Med Surg*. 2015;3:180.
28. Taute BM, et al. Spectral Doppler Waveform Analysis of Common Femoral Veins for the Detection of Right Ventricular Dysfunction in Acute Pulmonary Embolism. *J Cardiovasc Dis Diagn*. 2015;3:187.
29. Sailey CJ, et al. Comparison of Illumigene, Verigene, and Amplivue for Rapid Molecular Detection of *Clostridium Difficile* in Pediatric Stool Specimens. *J Med Microb Diagn*. 2015;4:201.
30. Stepaniuk SV, et al. Evaluation of a Multiplex One-Step TaqMan Real-Time Reverse Transcription-PCR Assays for the Detection of H5N1 Avian Influenza Viruses in Clinical Specimens. *J Infect Dis Ther*. 2015;3:236.
31. Smaoui S, et al. Evaluation of the BACTEC MGIT 960 TB with Solid Media for Recovery of Mycobacteria from Extrapulmonary Specimens in South Tunisia. *J Med Diagn Meth*. 2015;4:171.
32. Dixon CM, et al. Cerebral Oxygenation Using Near-infrared Spectroscopy (NIRS) before, during and after Therapeutic Hypothermia: A Comparison of Cerebral Saturations between those Infants on Sedatives and Anti-Epileptics and those who are not, all of whom are Undergoing Cooling. *Neonat Pediatr Med*. 2016;2:107.
33. Klos J, et al. Pilot Study of the Estimation of Amphetamines Consumption in the Polish City of Poznan. *J Forensic Res*. 2013;4:203.
34. Justiz-Vaillant A, et al. Two New Immunoassays to Study the Binding Capacity of Staphylococcal Protein A (SpA) or Streptococcal Protein G (SpG) to Sera from Four Mammalian Species Including Wild and Domestic Animals. *J Anal Bioanal Tech*. 2015;6:235.
35. Fujiwara Y, et al. A New Chemiluminescent Enzyme Immunoassay for Plasma Tissue Factor Detection. *Biosens J*. 2014;3:111.
36. Dixit CK. Surface Regeneration of Gold-Coated Chip for Highly- Reproducible Surface Plasmon Resonance Immunoassays. *J Biosens Bioelectron*. 2014;5:149.
37. Wang Z, et al. An Organic Nanoparticle based High Signal Amplification Immunoassay with Improvement of Nonspecific Binding. *J Nanomed Nanotechnol*. 2014;5:207.
38. Fu Y. Metallic Nanoparticles-Based Biochip with Multi-Channel for Immunoassay. *J Biochips Tiss Chips*. 2014;4:108.
39. Kumar VS. Nanoparticles-Based Naked-Eye Colorimetric Immunoassays for *In Vitro* Diagnostics. *J Nanomed Nanotechnol*. 2014;5:e133.

40. Saber MM. The Clinical Significance of Both IgM and IgG Anticardiolipin Antibodies in Non-Hodgkin's Lymphoma. *J Clin Cell Immunol*. 2016;7:436.
41. Tao D, et al. Human Monoclonal Fab Antibodies Against West Nile Virus and its Neutralizing Activity Analyzed *in Vitro* and *in Vivo*. *J Antivir Antiretrovir*. 2009;1:036-042.
42. Sugi H, et al. Evidence against the Swinging Lever Arm Mechanism in Muscle Contraction Based on the Effect of Antibodies to Myosin Head. *J Nanomed Nanotechnol*. 2016;7:377.
43. Goettsche KR, et al. Catatonia and Positive Serum Antibodies against N-Type Calcium Channel. *J Clin Case Rep*. 2016;6:747.
44. Evans AM, et al. High Resolution Mass Spectrometry Improves Data Quantity and Quality as Compared to Unit Mass Resolution Mass Spectrometry in High-Throughput Profiling Metabolomics. *Metabolomics*. 2014;4:132.
45. Kumar TM, et al. Evaluation of the Isotopic Abundance Ratio in Biofield Energy Treated Resorcinol Using Gas Chromatography-Mass Spectrometry Technique. *Pharm Anal Acta*. 2016;7:481.
46. Pillay AE, et al. Deep-UV Laser Ablation Technology [213 nm] Coupled with Plasma Quadrupole Mass Spectrometry for Rapid Determination of Nickel/Vanadium Ratios in Asphaltenes. *Mass Spectrom Purif Tech*. 2016;2:115.
47. Ye L, et al. Comparison of A-type Proanthocyanidins in Cranberry and Peanut Skin Extracts Using Matrix Assisted Laser Desorption Ionization-Time Of Flight Mass Spectrometry. *J Mol Genet Med*. 2016;10:209.
48. Patil PA, et al. Screening of Most Effective Nano Metal between AgNP, CuNP and Ag-Cu NP's Synergistic by *In vitro* Antibacterial Comparison. *J Nanomed Nanotechnol*. 2016;7:353.
49. Koren E, et al. Synergistic Aspects to Explain the Pathophysiology of Sepsis and Septic Shock-An Opinion. *J Infect Dis Ther*. 2015;3:254.
50. Liu G. Nonviral Reprogramming Genes Accelerate Formation of Neurons from Murine Embryonic Brain Cells: Synergistic Effect of Brain Derived Neurotrophic Factor Gene Therapy. *Transl Med*. 2016;6:163.
51. Mayer B. How much nicotine kills a human? Tracing back the generally accepted lethal dose to dubious self-experiments in the nineteenth century. *Arch Toxicol*. 2014; 88:5-7.
52. Nath SS, et al. A near fatal case of high dose peppermint oil ingestion- Lessons learnt. *Indian J Anaesth*. 2012; 56:582-584.
53. Lachenmeier DW, et al. Comparative risk assessment of alcohol, tobacco, cannabis and other illicit drugs using the margin of exposure approach. *Sci Rep*. 2015; 5:8126.
54. Finkelstein Y, et al. Colchicine poisoning: the dark side of an ancient drug. *Clin Toxicol (Phila)*. 2010;48:407-14.
55. Kalant H. The pharmacology and toxicology of "ecstasy" (MDMA) and related drugs. *CMAJ*. 2001; 165:917-928.
56. Lin EC. Radiation Risk From Medical Imaging. *Mayo Clin Proc*. 2010; 85:1142-1146.
57. Gunja N. The clinical and forensic toxicology of Z-drugs. *J Med Toxicol*. 2013;9:155-62.
58. Van Bocxlaer JF, et al. Liquid chromatography-mass spectrometry in forensic toxicology. *Mass Spectrom Rev*. 2000;19:165-214.
59. Palmer RB. Fentanyl in postmortem forensic toxicology. *Clin Toxicol (Phila)*. 2010;48:771-84.

60. Goullé JP, et al. Current role of ICP-MS in clinical toxicology and forensic toxicology: a metallic profile. *Bioanalysis*. 2014;6:2245-59.
61. Kramer MG. The Future of Toxicity Testing for Environmental Contaminants. *Environ Health Perspect*. 2009; 117: A283.
62. Chinedu E, et al. A New Method for Determining Acute Toxicity in Animal Models. *Toxicol Int*. 201; 20: 224-226.
63. Raunio H. In Silico Toxicology – Non-Testing Methods. *Front Pharmacol*. 2011;2:33.
64. Agrawal YP, et al. Pharmacogenomics and the future of toxicology testing. *Clin Lab Med*. 2012;32:509-23.
65. Bhalla A. Bedside point of care toxicology screens in the ED: Utility and pitfalls. *Int J Crit Illn Inj Sci*. 2014;4:257-260.
66. Sharma P, et al. Chemistry, Metabolism, and Toxicology of Cannabis: Clinical Implications. *Iran J Psychiatry*. 2012;7:14-156.
67. Muir T. Societal costs of exposure to toxic substances: economic and health costs of four case studies that are candidates for environmental causation. *Environ Health Perspect*. 2001;109: 885-903.
68. Garrett TL. The law of toxic substances. *Environ Health Perspect*. 1979;32:279-284.
69. Schaefer M. Children and toxic substances: confronting a major public health challenge. *Environ Health Perspect*. 1994;102:155-156.
70. Fullerton PM. Toxic chemicals and peripheral neuropathy: clinical and epidemiological features. *Proc R Soc Med*. 1969;62:201-204.
71. Barrett JR. Chemical Exposures: The Ugly Side of Beauty Products. *Environ Health Perspect*. 2005;113:A24.
72. Mattison DR. Effects of toxic substances on female reproduction. *Environ Health Perspect*. 1983;48:43-52.
73. Wong MH, et al. Persistent toxic substances: sources, fates and effects. *Rev Environ Health*. 2012;27:207-13.
74. Howe HL. Predicting public concern regarding toxic substances in the environment. *Environ Health Perspect*. 1990; 87:275-281.
75. Shy CM. Toxic substances from coal energy: an overview. *Environ Health Perspect*. 1979; 32:291-295.
76. Gitto L, et al. Can post-mortem computed tomography be considered an alternative for autopsy in deaths due to hemopericardium? *J Geriatr Cardiol*. 2014;11:363-367.
77. Roberts ISD, et al. Post-mortem imaging as an alternative to autopsy in the diagnosis of adult deaths: a validation study. *Lancet*. 2012;379:136-142.
78. Palmiere C. Postmortem diagnosis of diabetes mellitus and its complications. *Croat Med J*. 2015;56:181-93.
79. Costache M, et al. Clinical or Postmortem? The Importance of the Autopsy; a Retrospective Study. *Maedica (Buchar)*. 2014;9:261-265.
80. Finn RS, et al. Postmortem findings of malignant pleural mesothelioma: a two-center study of 318 patients. *Chest*. 2012;142:1267-73.
81. Walker E, et al. Cytopathology in the post mortem room. *J Clin Pathol*. 1994 Aug;47:714-717.
82. Ridpath AD, et al. Postmortem Diagnosis of Invasive Meningococcal Disease. *Emerg Infect Dis*. 2014;20:453-455.

83. Lemos NP, et al. Cannabinoids in postmortem toxicology. *J Anal Toxicol.* 2011;35:394-401.
84. Lintas C, et al. Association of autism with polyomavirus infection in postmortem brains. *J Neurovirol.* 2010;16:141-9.
85. Tan SZ, et al. Characterisation of the metabolome of ocular tissues and post-mortem changes in the rat retina. *Exp Eye Res.* 2016;149:8-15.
86. Cherner M, et al. Neurocognitive dysfunction predicts postmortem findings of HIV encephalitis. *Neurology.* 2002;59:1563-7.
87. Ruha AM. The case report: A tool for the toxicologist. *J Med Toxicol.* 2009; 5:1-2.
88. Melnick R, et al. Summary of the National Toxicology Program's report of the endocrine disruptors low-dose peer review. *Environ Health Perspect.* 2002;110: 427-431.
89. Coecke S, et al. Metabolism: a bottleneck in in vitro toxicological test development. The report and recommendations of ECVAM workshop 54. *Altern Lab Anim.* 2006 Feb;34:49-84.
90. Kappus H, et al. Tolerance and safety of vitamin E: a toxicological position report. *Free Radic Biol Med.* 1992;13:55-74.
91. Cribb AE, et al. The endoplasmic reticulum in xenobiotic toxicity. *Drug Metab Rev.* 2005;37:405-42.
92. Zhang JY, et al. Xenobiotic-metabolizing enzymes in human lung. *Curr Drug Metab.* 2006;7:939-48.
93. Macé K, et al. Characterisation of xenobiotic-metabolising enzyme expression in human bronchial mucosa and peripheral lung tissues. *Eur J Cancer.* 1998;34:914-20.
94. Standaert FG. Absorption and distribution of xenobiotics. *Environ Health Perspect.* 1988;77: 63-71.
95. Ek CJ, et al. Expression of tight junction proteins and transporters for xenobiotic metabolism at the blood-CSF barrier during development in the nonhuman primate (*P. hamadryas*). *Reprod Toxicol.* 2015;56:32-44.
96. Ierapetritou MG, et al. Tissue-Level Modeling of Xenobiotic Metabolism in Liver: An Emerging Tool for Enabling Clinical Translational Research. *Clin Transl Sci.* 2009; 2:228-237.
97. Schulz M, et al. Therapeutic and toxic blood concentrations of more than 500 drugs. *Die Pharmazie.* 1997;52:895-911.
98. Spratt E, et al. LC/MS with a particle beam interface in forensic toxicology. *Clinics in Laboratory Medicine.* 1998;18:651-63.
99. Galey FD. Diagnostic and forensic toxicology. *The Veterinary Clinics of North America. Equine Practice.* 1995;11:443-454.
100. Chaturvedi AK. Postmortem Aviation Forensic Toxicology: An Overview. *Journal of Analytical Toxicology.* 2009;34:169-176.