



**HAL**  
open science

## **Efficacy of ST1968 (namitecan) on a topotecan-resistant squamous cell carcinoma**

Valentina Zuco, Rosanna Supino, Enrica Favini, Monica Tortoreto, Raffaella Cincinelli, Anna Cleta Croce, Federica Bucci, Claudio Pisano, Franco Zunino

► **To cite this version:**

Valentina Zuco, Rosanna Supino, Enrica Favini, Monica Tortoreto, Raffaella Cincinelli, et al.. Efficacy of ST1968 (namitecan) on a topotecan-resistant squamous cell carcinoma. *Biochemical Pharmacology*, 2009, 79 (4), pp.535. 10.1016/j.bcp.2009.09.012 . hal-00544815

**HAL Id: hal-00544815**

**<https://hal.science/hal-00544815>**

Submitted on 9 Dec 2010

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

## Accepted Manuscript

Title: Efficacy of ST1968 (namitecan) on a topotecan-resistant squamous cell carcinoma

Authors: Valentina Zuco, Rosanna Supino, Enrica Favini, Monica Tortoreto, Raffaella Cincinelli, Anna Cleta Croce, Federica Bucci, Claudio Pisano, Franco Zunino



PII: S0006-2952(09)00766-7  
DOI: doi:10.1016/j.bcp.2009.09.012  
Reference: BCP 10326

To appear in: *BCP*

Received date: 17-7-2009  
Revised date: 7-9-2009  
Accepted date: 10-9-2009

Please cite this article as: Zuco V, Supino R, Favini E, Tortoreto M, Cincinelli R, Croce AC, Bucci F, Pisano C, Zunino F, Efficacy of ST1968 (namitecan) on a topotecan-resistant squamous cell carcinoma, *Biochemical Pharmacology* (2008), doi:10.1016/j.bcp.2009.09.012

This is a PDF file of an unedited manuscript that has been accepted for publication. As a service to our customers we are providing this early version of the manuscript. The manuscript will undergo copyediting, typesetting, and review of the resulting proof before it is published in its final form. Please note that during the production process errors may be discovered which could affect the content, and all legal disclaimers that apply to the journal pertain.

1  
2  
3  
4 **Efficacy of ST1968 (namitecan) on a topotecan-resistant squamous cell**  
5  
6  
7 **carcinoma**  
8  
9

10  
11  
12 Valentina Zuco<sup>a</sup>, Rosanna Supino<sup>a</sup>, Enrica Favini<sup>a</sup>, Monica Tortoreto<sup>a</sup>, Raffaella Cincinelli<sup>a</sup>,  
13  
14 Anna Cleta Croce<sup>b</sup>, Federica Bucci<sup>c</sup>, Claudio Pisano<sup>c</sup> and Franco Zunino<sup>a\*</sup>  
15  
16  
17  
18

19 <sup>a</sup>Fondazione IRCCS Istituto Nazionale Tumori, 20133 Milan, Italy; <sup>b</sup>Consiglio Nazionale delle  
20  
21 Ricerche, Pavia, Italy; <sup>c</sup>Sigma-Tau, 00044 Pomezia (Rome), Italy.  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31

32 **Category:** Antibiotics and chemotherapeutics  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40

41 \*Corresponding author. Fondazione IRCCS Istituto Nazionale Tumori, Via Venezian 1, 20133  
42  
43 Milan, Italy. Tel. +39-0223902267, fax +39-0223902692. E-mail address:  
44  
45 franco.zunino@istitutotumori.mi.it  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

## Abstract

ST1968 (namitecan), a novel 7-modified hydrophilic camptothecin, was found to be effective against tumor models relatively resistant to topotecan and irinotecan. Based on this observation, this study was designed to investigate the cellular and antitumor effects of ST1968 in a subline of A431, squamous cell carcinoma, selected for resistance to topotecan (A431/TPT). This model was characterized by a slow growth rate, associated with down-regulation of EGFR and topoisomerase I. In contrast to other camptothecins (SN38 and gimatecan), ST1968 was able to overcome almost completely the resistance at cellular level. The cellular pharmacokinetics indicated a comparable accumulation and retention of ST1968 in sensitive and resistant cells, in spite of expression of the efflux transporter, P-glycoprotein, in resistant cells. The uptake and retention of topotecan was dramatically reduced in both tumor cell lines, but more evident in the resistant one. In contrast to topotecan, ST1968 retained an outstanding efficacy in vivo against the resistant tumor (A431/TPT). The results are consistent with the interpretation that ST1968 was able to overcome the most relevant mechanisms associated with the development of topotecan resistance (i.e., slow proliferation and target downregulation) owing to its peculiar pharmacokinetic behaviour.

**Key words:** camptothecin, ST1968, topotecan, drug resistance

## 1. Introduction

Camptothecins are among the most effective antitumor agents that stabilize the covalent binding of topoisomerase I to DNA during the enzyme catalytic process forming a reversible ternary complex [1-3]. During DNA synthesis the collision of the replication forks with the cleavable complex (topo I-DNA) converts the single-strand breaks into irreversible lethal double-strand breaks [1,4]. On the basis of this mechanism and of the reversibility of the cleavable complex, prolonged intracellular accumulation and stability of the ternary complex are required to exploit the S-phase-specific activity and therapeutic efficacy of camptothecins [4]. We have reported that the presence of highly lipophilic substituents at position 7 provides favourable features, in terms of cellular pharmacokinetics, lactone stability and ternary complex stabilization [5-7]. However, the ability to stabilize the cleavable complex is a favourable feature of several derivatives of the 7-oxyiminomethyl series [8]. In particular, the hydrophilic derivative namitecan (Fig. 1) exhibit an excellent activity, superior to that of irinotecan and topotecan (TPT), against several tumor models, including slowly growing tumors [9,10]. To better understand the basis of the peculiar profile of ST1968, we have performed a comparative study of ST1968 and topotecan in a squamous cell carcinoma model selected for resistance to topotecan (A431/TPT). The results support the ability of ST1968 to partially overcome the acquired resistance of A431/TPT cells, likely reflecting an improved uptake and persistent intracellular accumulation which allow efficient target inhibition and antitumor efficacy in spite of reduced proliferation rate and reduced topoisomerase I expression.

## 2. Materials and methods

### 2.1 Cell lines and culture conditions

The human squamous cell carcinoma A431 and its subline selected for resistance to topotecan (A431/TPT), were maintained in RPMI 1640 (Lonza, Group Ltd, Switzerland) supplemented with 10% FBS (Gibco® Invitrogen, Segrate, Italy). The A431/TPT cell line was selected by growing A431 cells for 4 months in culture medium containing 0.05  $\mu\text{M}$  topotecan (Hycamtin, GlaxoSmithKline). A431/TPT cells were subcultured in the presence of the drug every two split.

### 2.2 Drugs and Antibodies

ST1968 was synthesized as previously described [5]. For in vitro studies, ST1968, gimatecan and SN-38 were dissolved in dimethylsulfoxide. Topotecan was dissolved in sterile distilled water. For in vivo studies, ST1968 was dissolved in sodium lactate buffer (50 mM) adjusted to pH 4.0 with addition of hydrochloric acid. Topotecan was dissolved in sterile distilled water. The drugs were administered by a slow i.v. injection in a volume of 10 mL/kg body weight.

The following antibodies were used: anti-EGFR (Upstate Biotechnologies, Lake Placid, NY); anti-p-glicoprotein (MDR1) and  $\alpha$ -actin (Sigma, St. Louis, MO), anti-BCRP (Alexis Biochemicals, Lausen, Switzerland), anti-MRP-1 and anti-V-ATPase D (Santa Cruz Biotechnology, Santa Cruz, CA); anti-DNA topoisomerase I (BD Bioscience, San Josè, CA).

### 2.3 Cell sensitivity studies

Cell sensitivity to the drugs was determined by growth inhibition assay. Cells were seeded in duplicate into twelve-well plates and exposed to the drugs for 1 hour. Adherent cells were

1  
2  
3  
4 trypsinized 72 hours after treatment and counted by a cell counter (Beckam Coulter Inc.,  
5  
6 Fullerton, CA). IC<sub>50</sub> values, determined from dose-response curves, were defined as the drug  
7  
8 concentrations producing 50% inhibition of cell growth. The reported values represent the mean  
9  
10 ± standard deviation (SD) derived from at least three independent experiments.  
11  
12  
13

#### 14 15 16 *2.4 Determination of apoptosis* 17

18 Apoptosis was determined by TUNEL assay 72 hours after treatment. Cells were fixed in 4%  
19  
20 paraformaldehyde (45 min), washed and resuspended in ice-cold PBS. The “in situ cell death  
21  
22 detection” kit (Roche, Germany) was used according to the manufacturer’s instructions, and  
23  
24 samples were analyzed by flow cytometry (FACScan, Becton Dickinson, Franklin Lakes, NJ).  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29

#### 30 31 *2.5 Cellular pharmacokinetics* 32

33 Cells were seeded in six-well plates at a subconfluent density (around 100.000 cells/cm<sup>2</sup>). After  
34  
35 24 hours, samples, in triplicate, were washed with serum-free medium and exposed for 30 min., 1  
36  
37 hour or 2 hours to the drug in serum-free medium. Treated cells were washed three times with  
38  
39 PBS to remove the extracellular drug and, for retention studies, maintained in a drug-free  
40  
41 medium for further 5 hours. At different times, washed cells were resuspended in 150 µl of PBS  
42  
43 and subjected to 5 cycles of freezing in liquid nitrogen and thawing in thermostated bath at 37°C.  
44  
45 Each cycle lasted 5 min. Cell lysates were frozen at -20°C. Samples were processed by adding  
46  
47 cold 0.1% acetic acid/methanol (1:5, v:v). Analysis was performed using the 32Karat Software  
48  
49 (Beckam-coulter) with a fluorescence detector (Jasco or Shimadzu) fixed at 370 nm as excitation  
50  
51 wavelength and 510 nm as emission wavelength. ST1968 and topotecan were eluted on a  
52  
53 Discovery HS F5 column (5 mm, 100x4.6 mm, Supelco) kept at room temperature in isocratic  
54  
55 condition (0.1 M acetic acid, 0.1% TEA:CAN, 75:25, v:v) with a flow rate of 1 ml/min.  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

## 2.6 Intracellular drug distribution

Subconfluent cells, grown on coverslips, were treated with ST1968 or topotecan 10  $\mu\text{g/ml}$  for up to 2 hours. Fluorescence images were acquired at different times by means of an Argus VIM 100 processor digital system (Hamamatsu Photonics Deutschland GmbH, Herrsching am Ammersee, Germany), using an high sensitive ISIT camera (Hamamatsu C2400-09) coupled to a Leica (Wetzlar, Germany) fluorescence microscope. The images were digitally stored on a magnetic mass memory support and processed by means of the Hamamatsu Argus 100 control program. For drug localization study, images under excitation at 366 nm (366 nm interference filter; T% = 40) were acquired at wavelengths  $> 440$  nm by means of a 11000v3 filter combination set (Chroma Technology Corp, Rockingham, VT). The emission spectrum of topotecan was in the range of 450-600 nm with a maximum at 520 nm. The emission spectrum of ST1968 (430-550 nm) exhibited a maximum at 480 nm.

LysoTracker Red DND-99 (LTR) (Invitrogen) was used for lysosomal staining. Sequential images were recorded from the same field at wavelengths  $> 440$  nm (covering the emission region of ST1968, in the 440-540 nm range, and of LTR in the 580-630 nm range), and  $> 570$  nm (selective for LTR signal). Images were also recorded from cells incubated with LTR alone, to determine the contribution of the dye signal to the images recorded at wavelengths  $> 440$  nm. An image analysis was performed on each couple of images, and ratio values ( $F.I._{> 440}/F.I._{> 570 \text{ nm}}$ ) were calculated pixel by pixel on the lysosomal areas. The comparison of the ratio values from the cells incubated with LTR alone and from those incubated with both ST1968 and LTR allowed the determination of the contribution of ST1968 signal to that of LTR in the lysosomes.

## 2.7 Western blot analysis

Cells were rinsed twice with PBS, added with 0.1 mM sodium orthovanadate and lysed in hot



1  
2  
3  
4 sample buffer [11]. After determination of protein concentration, whole-cell extracts were  
5  
6 separated by SDS polyacrylamide gel electrophoresis (PAGE) and transferred onto nitrocellulose  
7  
8 filters. The filters were incubated with primary antibodies overnight and with peroxidase-  
9  
10 conjugated secondary antibodies at room temperature for 1 hour. Immunoreactive bands were  
11  
12 revealed by using the enhanced chemiluminescence detection system from Amersham  
13  
14 Biosciences (Rockford, IL).  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20

### 21 *2.8 Assessment of lysosomal membrane permeability*

22

23  
24 The lysosomal acidification was determined by incubating cells with 5  $\mu$ M acridine orange  
25  
26 (Sigma-Aldrich, St. Louis, MO) for 17 min at 37°C. FL-3 fluorescence was measured by flow  
27  
28 cytometry (FACScan). The same samples were examined by a fluorescence microscope (Leica,  
29  
30 Wetzlar, Germany).  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35

### 36 *2.9 Antitumour activity in vivo*

37

38  
39 All experiments were carried out using female athymic Swiss nude mice, 6-8 weeks-old (Charles  
40  
41 River, Calco, Italy). Mice were maintained in laminar flow rooms keeping temperature and  
42  
43 humidity constant. Mice had free access to food and water. Experiments were approved by the  
44  
45 Ethics Committee for Animal Experimentation of the Fondazione IRCCS Istituto Nazionale dei  
46  
47 Tumori of Milan according to institutional guidelines and to the UK Coordinating Committee on  
48  
49 Cancer Research Guidelines [12].  
50  
51

52  
53 Exponentially growing tumor cells ( $10^7$  cells/mouse) were s.c. injected into mice flank. Tumor  
54  
55 lines were achieved by serial s.c. passages of fragments (about 2x2x6 mm) from growing tumors  
56  
57 into healthy mice, as previously described [13]. Groups of 5 to 8 mice bearing s.c. tumors  
58  
59 implanted in one or both flanks were employed. Tumor fragments were implanted on day 0 and  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3  
4 tumor growth was followed by biweekly measurements of tumor diameters with a Vernier  
5  
6 caliper. Tumor volume (TV) was calculated according to the formula:  $TV \text{ (mm}^3\text{)} = d^2 \times D / 2$  where  
7  
8  $d$  and  $D$  are the shortest and the longest diameter, respectively. Drugs were delivered i.v. every  
9  
10 fourth day for four times (q4dx4) starting when tumors were just palpable.

11  
12  
13  
14 The efficacy of the drug treatment was assessed as:

15  
16 i) Tumor volume inhibition percentage (TVI%) in treated versus control mice, calculated as:

17  
18  
19 
$$TVI\% = 100 - (\text{mean TV treated} / \text{mean TV control} \times 100).$$

20  
21 ii) Complete responses (CR), i.e. tumors not grown until the end of experiment.

22  
23  
24 The toxicity of the drug treatment was determined as body weight loss and lethal toxicity.

### 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 **3. Results**

#### 33 34 35 36 37 *3.1 Pattern of cellular response to selected camptothecins*

38  
39  
40 The A431/TPT cell subline, selected for resistance to topotecan, exhibited an increased doubling  
41  
42 time as compared with the parental line (28 vs 23 h in resistant and parental cells, respectively).

43  
44  
45 The slow proliferation of resistant cells was reflected in a reduced in vivo growth rate, because  
46  
47 the doubling time of resistant subline was substantially increased as compared with the parental  
48  
49 line (5.8 vs 3.5 days). Table 1 shows the pattern of cross-resistance to topotecan, SN-38 (the  
50  
51 active metabolite of irinotecan), gimatecan and ST1968, a novel hydrophil camptothecin. The  
52  
53 comparison of antiproliferative effects of camptothecins following 1 h exposure indicated a  
54  
55 significant degree of resistance of A431/TPT to the selecting agent (TPT), SN38 and gimatecan,  
56  
57 but only a marginal resistance to ST1968.  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3  
4 To investigate the susceptibility to induction of apoptosis in response to topotecan and ST1968,  
5  
6 we have determined the extent of apoptotic cell death at 72 h after 1 h exposure to a  
7  
8 concentration required for about 80% growth inhibition (Fig. 2). In contrast to topotecan which  
9  
10 exhibited a low proapoptotic effect in resistant cells ( $21\pm6$  and  $56\pm5$ , in resistant and parental  
11  
12 cells, respectively), ST1968 induced a comparable level of apoptosis in A431 and A431/TPT  
13  
14 cells, respectively), ST1968 induced a comparable level of apoptosis in A431 and A431/TPT  
15  
16 ( $78\pm5$  and  $87\pm3\%$ , respectively). The moderate apoptotic response of A431/TPT cells to  
17  
18 topotecan at a concentration which produced a marked inhibition of cell proliferation (around  
19  
20  $IC_{80}$ ) suggested a cytostatic rather than cytotoxic effect of the drug.  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

### 26 *3.2 Biochemical features of the resistant subline*

27  
28 Since the squamous cell carcinoma cells A431 are known to be characterized by overexpression  
29  
30 of EGF receptor (EGFR), we determined the expression level of the protein in topotecan-resistant  
31  
32 cells. As shown in Fig. 3, the EGFR expression was markedly reduced in A431/TPT cells as  
33  
34 compared to the parental cells. This change could be consistent with the reduced rate of  
35  
36 proliferation. In an attempt to explore the molecular basis of the topotecan resistance, we  
37  
38 examined the expression of the intracellular target, topoisomerase I, and of ABC transporters  
39  
40 which potentially could contribute to the resistant phenotype. A431/TPT cells revealed a marked  
41  
42 reduction of topoisomerase I expression (Fig. 3). An analysis of the expression of proteins  
43  
44 usually associated with multidrug resistance (Pgp, BCRP, MRP4 and V-ATPase) indicated up-  
45  
46 regulation of only Pgp (MDR1) and V-ATPase (Fig. 4A) in topotecan-resistant cells. The  
47  
48 concomitant overexpression of the vacuolar ATP-ase has been already reported in multidrug  
49  
50 resistant cells [14,15]. Since the vacuolar-type  $H^+$ -ATPase (V-ATPase) is responsible for  
51  
52 acidification of eukaryotic intracellular organelles, the lysosomal acidification was investigated  
53  
54 by staining with acridine orange, a lysosomotropic agent which accumulates in acidic organelles  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3  
4 [15,16]. In agreement with the up-regulation of V-ATPase D, the resistant subline was  
5  
6 characterized by increased lysosomal acidification (as shown by the increase of acridine orange  
7  
8 fluorescence, Fig. 4B) and of granules in the cytosol (Fig. 4C).  
9

### 10 11 12 13 14 *3.3 Cellular pharmacokinetics*

15  
16 Drug uptake was studied after 30 min, 1 and 2 hours of drug exposure, and drug retention was  
17  
18 determined following 5 h-incubation in a drug-free medium (Fig. 5). In A431 cells treated with 1  
19  
20  $\mu\text{M}$ , the intracellular accumulation of ST1968 was time-dependent and reached a plateau at  
21  
22 around 2 h-exposure [10]. The pattern of intracellular accumulation in the resistant subline was  
23  
24 similar, but the intracellular content of ST1968 was appreciably higher than that of the parental  
25  
26 line. The analysis of the intracellular content following 5 h-incubation in drug-free medium  
27  
28 indicated a substantial retention of the camptothecin in both cell lines (about 15-25% of the drug  
29  
30 content at the end of the exposure). This behaviour, in spite of upregulation of the Pgp in the  
31  
32 resistant cells, suggested that ST1968 was a poor substrate for this efflux transporter. At the same  
33  
34 concentration (1  $\mu\text{M}$ ) the intracellular accumulation of topotecan was markedly lower in either  
35  
36 A431 and A431/TPT cells. An intracellular topotecan content comparable to that of ST1968  
37  
38 required exposure to 10  $\mu\text{M}$ . Under these conditions, the plateau of drug uptake was reached at  
39  
40 30 min-exposure. In contrast to A431 cells, a consistent reduction of intracellular accumulation  
41  
42 was observed in A431/TPT by increasing the exposure time. In both cell lines, the topotecan  
43  
44 retention following removal of extracellular drug was negligible, thus suggesting a fast drug  
45  
46 efflux.  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53

54  
55 A study of intracellular drug distribution was performed by fluorescence imaging analysis at the  
56  
57 single cell level (Fig. 6). Both ST1968 and topotecan showed a prevailing cytoplasmic  
58  
59 localization of the fluorescence signal, with darker areas corresponding to the nuclei, in the two  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3  
4 cell lines. As shown in Fig. 6A, A431 cells treated with ST1968 exhibited a perinuclear and polar  
5  
6 fluorescence signal till 30 min, followed by a prevailing localization in few organelles at around  
7  
8 60 min in comparison with A431 cells. The subcellular distribution of ST1968 in A431/TPT  
9  
10 cells was more marked in the perinuclear areas at 15 min, with a localization in the organelles  
11  
12 already at 30 min. This pattern was even more marked at longer times, with many organelles  
13  
14 being well evident because of a high fluorescence intensity. The pattern of subcellular  
15  
16 distribution of ST1968 was reminiscent of the behaviour of gimatecan [17]. Topotecan (Fig. 6B)  
17  
18 showed a diffuse distribution pattern of fluorescence signal, with a prevailing perinuclear  
19  
20 localization in both cell lines at all incubation times, and only an occasional presence in a few  
21  
22 organelles. On the basis of their shape and topological distribution inside the cells, the granular  
23  
24 structures engaged in drug intracellular accumulation and retention were likely lysosomes, as  
25  
26 supported by similar fluorescence patterns obtained with acridine orange staining (not shown).  
27  
28 This interpretation was confirmed by colocalization of a lysosome-specific dye, LysoTracker Red  
29  
30 and ST1968 (Fig. 6C).  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40

### 41 *3.4 Antitumor activity studies*

42  
43 The study of antitumor activity of topotecan and ST1968 was performed in tumor xenografts  
44  
45 obtained by s.c. inoculation of A431 and topotecan-resistant cells in athymic nude mice. For this  
46  
47 comparative study, we used the same treatment schedule (q4dx4, i.v. administration and optimal  
48  
49 doses of each drug, 10 mg/kg and 25 mg/kg, for topotecan and ST1968, respectively), i.e., well  
50  
51 tolerated doses which caused acceptable body weight loss ( $\leq 10\%$ ) and no toxic deaths. Under  
52  
53 these conditions, the activity of ST1968 was substantially higher than that of topotecan in both  
54  
55 models (Fig. 7). Topotecan caused a partial inhibition of tumor growth in A431 tumor (maximum  
56  
57 tumor growth inhibition, around 75%), but a marginal effect in A431/TPT, thus reflecting the  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3  
4 cellular drug resistance. In contrast, ST1968 produced a 100% complete response rate in the mice  
5  
6 bearing the A431 tumor, and retained a relevant activity in the topotecan-resistant tumor (TVI,  
7  
8 96%).  
9

#### 10 11 12 13 14 15 **4. Discussion** 16

17  
18  
19  
20  
21 A number of problems limit the therapeutic efficacy of camptothecins and could account  
22  
23 for the clinical resistance and low efficacy in several tumor types. As with other clinically  
24  
25 effective agents, the clinical resistance to camptothecins may be a multifactorial phenomenon  
26  
27 likely involving cellular, pharmacological and tumor-specific factors [18,19]. On the basis of the  
28  
29 peculiar features of the camptothecin structure (i.e., opening of the lactone ring) and of the  
30  
31 mechanism of action (i.e., conversion of the single-strand breaks in irreversible double-strand  
32  
33 breaks during S-phase), prolonged drug exposure is a critical requisite to overcome the  
34  
35 shortcoming related to reversibility of the cleavable complex. This is a critical aspect of the  
36  
37 clinical use of camptothecins considering the slow growth of tumors in the clinical setting as  
38  
39 compared to the preclinical tumor models.  
40  
41  
42  
43

44  
45 The role of intracellular drug accumulation and retention as a determinant of cellular  
46  
47 sensitivity and tumor responsiveness is supported by the observations reported in our study  
48  
49 performed on a topotecan-resistant subline of the A431 tumor. This variant selected following  
50  
51 continuous exposure to topotecan was characterized by i) a reduced proliferation rate both in  
52  
53 vitro and in vivo, ii) a decreased expression of topoisomerase I and iii) upregulation of MDR1.  
54  
55 Although several factors have been implicated in the mechanisms of cellular resistance to  
56  
57 camptothecins [18], the alterations associated with the development of resistance to topotecan  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3  
4 and the pattern of cross-resistance to other camptothecins in our model may be relevant as  
5  
6 determinants of clinical resistance, because the features of A431/TPT cells are expected to  
7  
8 influence cellular sensitivity on the basis of the recognized mechanism of action of  
9  
10 camptothecins.  
11  
12

13  
14 The novel hydrophilic camptothecin of the 7-oxyiminomethyl series ST1968 exhibited  
15  
16 ability to overcome, at least in part, the mechanisms implicated in the development of resistance  
17  
18 in A431/TPT. In contrast to a substantial resistance to topotecan, ST1968 retained a good  
19  
20 antitumor efficacy *in vivo*, in spite of the slow growth of the tumor. The cytotoxic and  
21  
22 proapoptotic effects of ST1968 in topotecan-resistant cells were comparable to those observed in  
23  
24 parental cells in spite of the marked reduction of topoisomerase I protein levels. A plausible  
25  
26 explanation for the efficacy of ST1968 against this model could be its peculiar cellular  
27  
28 pharmacokinetics characterized by a marked intracellular accumulation and retention and a  
29  
30 peculiar subcellular distribution. This behaviour, already observed in other squamous cell  
31  
32 carcinoma systems, is expected to ensure prolonged drug effects as suggested by the persistence  
33  
34 of DNA damage [10]. It is conceivable that the persistence of intracellular drug may compensate  
35  
36 the effects of the alterations which were likely responsible for the development of resistance to  
37  
38 topotecan. Indeed, an unexpected finding of this study was a similar cellular pharmacokinetics of  
39  
40 ST1968 in resistant and parental cells, in spite of overexpression of the transport system, Pgp, in  
41  
42 the resistant subline. This finding suggested that ST1968 was a poor substrate for Pgp (MDR1),  
43  
44 as already found for other derivatives of the 7-oxyiminomethyl series [20]. However, taking into  
45  
46 account the concomitant expression of the vacuolar-ATPase in resistant cells, it is conceivable  
47  
48 that both v-ATPase and Pgp are implicated in drug subcellular distribution, because the drug  
49  
50 localization in cytoplasmic organelles (presumably lysosomes) was more fast and marked in the  
51  
52 resistant subline. The acidic environment of the lysosomes may favour the stabilization of the  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3  
4 lactone form of the drug and lysosomal localization could represent a store allowing intracellular  
5  
6 release of the active drug [17]. Topotecan exhibited a different subcellular localization. However  
7  
8 the implications of the different behaviour of the two camptothecin at subcellular level remain  
9  
10 uncertain.  
11

12  
13  
14 The dramatic reduction of uptake and retention of topotecan by A431 was consistent with  
15  
16 reduced cytotoxic potency in vitro and limited antitumor efficacy. The defects in cellular  
17  
18 accumulation of topotecan were enhanced in the resistant subline which also exhibited a reduced  
19  
20 responsiveness in vivo (maximum TV inhibition, 30 and 75% in A431/TPT and A431 tumor,  
21  
22 respectively). In a cellular context characterized by low level of topoisomerase expression and a  
23  
24 slow proliferation, it is conceivable that the intracellular concentration of topotecan was  
25  
26 inadequate to cause sufficient lethal lesions. In contrast the favourable pharmacokinetic  
27  
28 behaviour of ST1968 might overcome the resistance mediated by these changes, as a  
29  
30 consequence of drug persistence inside the cell. If this interpretation is correct, the peculiar  
31  
32 features of ST1968 may have relevant therapeutic implications in clinical development of the  
33  
34 novel camptothecin, because the slow growth of human tumor in patients and the reversibility of  
35  
36 drug effects are critical limitations of the efficacy of conventional camptothecins [4].  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42

43 Our study indicating the efficacy of ST1968 against topotecan-resistant tumors provide  
44  
45 further support to the therapeutic interest of the novel camptothecin. Additional advantages of  
46  
47 ST1968 over conventional camptothecins are the improvement of the therapeutic index and  
48  
49 efficacy in a wide range of well-tolerated doses [9]. In spite of its cytotoxic potency (higher than  
50  
51 that of topotecan, Table 1), ST1968 was well tolerated in vivo at doses substantially higher than  
52  
53 those of topotecan (25-30 mg/kg vs 10-12 mg/kg). A favourable pharmacokinetics characterized  
54  
55 by a prolonged retention in tumor tissue as compared with normal tissue may account for the  
56  
57 improvement of the therapeutic index reflecting an increased tumor selectivity of the drug  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65



1  
2  
3  
4 (unpublished data). The molecular basis of the improved pharmacological profile of ST1968  
5  
6 remains to be defined. We have reported that ST1968, characterized by the presence of a free  
7  
8 amino group, induces a markedly stable ternary complex [8]. Thus the molecular and  
9  
10 pharmacokinetic features could contribute to improve antitumor efficacy and selectivity of the  
11  
12 novel camptothecin.  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18

### 19 **Acknowledgements**

20  
21  
22 This work was partially supported by the Associazione Italiana per la Ricerca sul Cancro, Milan,  
23  
24 and by the Ministero della Salute, Rome, Italy.  
25  
26  
27  
28

### 29 **Disclosure of Potential Conflicts of interest**

30  
31  
32 Claudio Pisano and Federica Bucci are employees of Sigma-Tau. The other authors disclosed no  
33  
34 potential conflicts of interest.  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

## References

1. Pommier Y. Topoisomerase I inhibitors: camptothecins and beyond. *Nature Rev* 2006; 6:789-802.
2. Thomas CJ, Rahier NJ, Hecht SM. Camptothecin: current perspectives. *Bioorg Med Chem* 2004; 12:1585-604.
3. Teicher BA. Next generation topoisomerase I inhibitors: rationale and biomarker strategies. *Biochem Pharmacol* 2008; 75:1262-71.
4. Beretta GL, Zunino F. Relevance of extracellular and intracellular interactions of camptothecins as determinants of antitumor activity. *Biochem Pharmacol* 2007; 74:1437-44.
5. Dallavalle S, Delsoldato T, Ferrari A, Merlini L, Penco S, Carenini N, et al. Novel 7-substituted camptothecins with potent antitumor activity. *J Med Chem* 2000; 43:3963-9.
6. De Cesare M, Pratesi G, Perego P, Carenini N, Tinelli S, Merli L, et al. Potent antitumor activity and improved pharmacological profile of ST1481, a novel 7-substituted camptothecin. *Cancer Res* 2001; 61:7189-95.
7. Dallavalle S, Ferrari A, Biasotti B, Merlini L, Penco S, Gallo G, et al. Novel 7-oxyiminomethyl derivatives of camptothecin with potent in vitro and in vivo antitumor activity. *J Med Chem* 2001; 44:3264-74.
8. De Cesare M, Beretta GL, Tinelli S, Benedetti V, Pratesi G, Penco S, et al. Preclinical efficacy of ST1976, a novel camptothecin analog of 7-oxyiminomethyl series. *Biochem. Pharmacol* 2007; 73:656-64.
9. Pisano C, De Cesare M, Beretta GL, Zuco V, Pratesi G, Penco S, et al. Preclinical profile of antitumor activity of a novel hydrophilic camptothecin, ST1968. *Mol Cancer Ther* 2008;

- 1  
2  
3  
4 7:2051-9.  
5  
6  
7 10. Pisano C, Zuco V, De Cesare M, Benedetti V, Vesci L, Foderà R, et al. Intracellular  
8  
9 accumulation and DNA damage persistence as determinant of human squamous cell  
10  
11 carcinoma hypersensitivity to the novel camptothecin ST1968. *Eur J Cancer* 2008; 44:1332-  
12  
13 40.  
14  
15  
16 11. Zuco V, Zanchi C, Cassinelli G, Lanzi C, Supino R, Pisano C, et al. Induction of apoptosis  
17  
18 and stress response in ovarian carcinoma cell lines treated with ST1926, an atipica retinoid.  
19  
20 *Cell Deat Diff.* 2004; 11:280-9.  
21  
22  
23 12. Workman P, Twentyman P, Balkwill F, Balmain A, Chaplin D, Double J, et al. United  
24  
25 Kingdom Coordinating Committee on Cancer Research (UKCCCR) guidelines for the  
26  
27 welfare of animals in experimental neoplasia (second edition). *Br J Cancer* 1998; 77:1-10.  
28  
29  
30 13. Polizzi D, Pratesi G, Tortoreto M, Supino R, Riva A, Bombardelli E. A novel taxane with  
31  
32 improbe tolerability and therapeutic activity in a panel of human tumor xenograft. *Cancer Res*  
33  
34 1999; 59:1036-40.  
35  
36  
37 14. Ouar Z, Bens M, Vignes C, Paulais M, Pringel C, Fleury J, et al. Inhibitors of vacuolar H<sup>+</sup>-  
38  
39 ATPase impair the preferential accumulation of daunomycin in lysosomes and reverse the  
40  
41 resistance to anthracyclines in drug-resistant renal epithelial cells. *Biochem J* 2003; 370:185-  
42  
43 93.  
44  
45  
46 15. Petrangolini G, Supino R, Pratesi G, Dal Bo L, Tortoreto M, Croce AC, et al. Effect of a  
47  
48 novel vacuolar-H<sup>+</sup>-ATPase inhibitor on cell and tumor response to camptothecins. *J*  
49  
50 *Pharmacol Exp Ther* 2006; 318:939-36.  
51  
52  
53 16. Antunes F, Cadenas E, Brunk UT. Apoptosis induced by exposure to a low steady-state  
54  
55 concentration of H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub> is a consequence of lisosoma rupture. *Biochem J* 2001; 356:549-55.  
56  
57  
58 17. Croce AC, Bottiroli G, Supino R, Favini E, Zuco V, Zunino F. Subcellular localization of the  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

- 1  
2  
3  
4 camptothecin analogues, topotecan and gimatecan. *Biochem Pharmacol* 2004; 67:1035-45.  
5  
6  
7 18. Beretta GL, Perego P, Zunino F. Mechanisms of cellular resistance to camptothecins. *Curr*  
8  
9 *Med Chem* 2006; 13:3291-3305.  
10  
11 19. Rasheed ZA, Rubin EH. Mechanisms of resistance to topoisomerase I-targeting drugs.  
12  
13 *Oncogene* 2003; 22:7296-04.  
14  
15  
16 20. Marchetti S, Oostendorp RL, Pluim D, van Eijndhoven M, van Tellingen O, Schinkel AH, et  
17  
18 al. In vitro transport of gimatecan (7-t-butoxyiminomethylcamptothecin) by breast cancer  
19  
20 resistance protein, P-glycoprotein, and multidrug resistance protein 2. *Mol Cancer Ther* 2007;  
21  
22 6:3307-13.  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

Table 1. Pattern of cross-resistance of A431/TPT cells<sup>a</sup>

Drug	IC <sub>50</sub> (μM) <sup>b</sup>		RI <sup>c</sup>
	A431	A431/TPT	
Topotecan	1.00±0.13	3.13±0.97	3.1
ST1968	0.21±0.10	0.29±0.11	1.4
SN-38	0.11±0.04	0.34±0.13	3.1
Gimatecan	0.022±0.012	0.083±0.023	3.8

<sup>a</sup>Drug sensitivity was measured by growth inhibition assay after 1 h exposure.

<sup>b</sup>IC<sub>50</sub>, drug concentration causing a 50% decrease in cell growth.

<sup>c</sup>RI, resistance index, ratio between the IC<sub>50</sub> of topotecan-resistant and –sensitive cells.

## Legends to Figures

Figure 1. Chemical structure of ST1968.

Figure 2. Apoptosis induced by equitoxic concentrations of ST1968 and topotecan (TPT). Cells were exposed 1 hour to 2.3  $\mu\text{M}$  ST1968 corresponding to the  $\text{IC}_{80}$  value in both cell lines or to TPT 4 or 10  $\mu\text{M}$  corresponding to the  $\text{IC}_{80}$  value in A431 and A431/TPT, respectively. Apoptosis was detected by TUNEL assay and determined by FACS analysis.

Figure 3. Expression of EGFR and DNA topoisomerase I in A431 and A431/TPT cells. Protein expression was analyzed on whole cell lysates by Western blotting with the specific antibodies. Actin is shown as control for protein loading.

Figure 4. Expression of ABC transporters. (A) MDR, V-ATPase-D, BCRP and MRP-4 expression was analyzed on whole-cell lysates by Western blotting with the specific antibodies.  $\beta$ -tubulin is shown as control for protein loading. (B) Acridine orange staining used as marker of lysosomal acidification. Cells were incubated with 5  $\mu\text{M}$  acridine orange for 17 min at 37°C and intracellular red fluorescence was measured by flow cytometry. Grey profile:A431; white profile: A431/TPT. (C) acridine orange staining as by fluorescence microscopy.


Figure 5. Cellular pharmacokinetics of ST1968 and topotecan (TPT). Drug uptake was determined after 0.5, 1 or 2 h-exposure to 1  $\mu\text{M}$ . In the case of topotecan, intracellular drug

1  
2  
3  
4 content was measured also after exposure to 10  $\mu$ M. Drug retention was determined after drug  
5  
6 removal and 5 h-incubation in drug-free medium.  
7  
8  
9


10  
11 Figure 6. Intracellular drug distribution. Fluorescence images of A431 and A431/TPT cells  
12  
13 incubated with 10  $\mu$ M ST1968 (A) or topotecan (B) for the indicated times were acquired by  
14  
15 means of a processor digital system using a high-sensitivity ISIT camera coupled to a  
16  
17 fluorescence microscope under excitation at 366 nm and emission  $>$  440 nm. Pictures were  
18  
19 adjusted to comparable gray levels to allow an easier comparison of the fluorescence patterns. (C)  
20  
21 Lysosomal localization of ST1968. A431/TPT cells were exposed to ST1968 (10  $\mu$ M) and to  
22  
23 LysoTracker Red (LTR) (1  $\mu$ M) for 1 h. Fluorescence images were acquired at wavelength  $>$  440  
24  
25 nm (ST1968 + LTR) and at wavelength  $>$  570 nm (LTR) under excitation at 366 nm (366 nm  
26  
27 interference filter, T%=40, mounted in a 110000v3 filter set cube provided by Chroma  
28  
29 Technology Corp. (Rockingham, VT). The imaging analysis resulted in ratio values (F.I.  $>$  440 /  
30  
31 F.I.  $>$  570) of  $3.43\pm 0.42$  for LTR alone and  $5.20\pm 0.6$  for the lysosomal areas observed in cells  
32  
33 incubated with both ST1968 and LTR.  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42

43 Figure 7. Comparison of the antitumor activity of ST1968 and topotecan against A431 and  
44  
45 A431/TPT tumor xenografts in nude mice. Drugs were delivered i.v. every fourth day for four  
46  
47 times (q4dx4) starting when tumors were just palpable. Circle: control; Square: 10 mg/kg TPT;  
48  
49 triangle: 25 mg/kg ST1968.  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65


Figure 1




Topotecan



SN 38



ST1968 (Namitecan)



Gimatecan

Fig. 1  
Zuco et al.






Fig. 2  
Zuco et al.




Fig. 3  
Zuco et al.




Fig. 4  
Zuco et al.






Fig. 5  
Zuco et al.

**A** Figure 6



**B**



**C**




Fig. 6  
Zuco et al.




Fig. 7  
Zuco et al.