



HAL
open science

Non-targeted Stressful Effects in Normal Human Fibroblast Cultures Exposed to Low Fluences of High Charge, High-Energy (HZE) Particles: Kinetics of Biologic Responses and Significance of Secondary Radiations.

Géraldine Gonon, Jean-Emmanuel Groetz, Sonia M de Toledo, Roger W Howell, Michel Fromm, Edouard I Azzam

► **To cite this version:**

Géraldine Gonon, Jean-Emmanuel Groetz, Sonia M de Toledo, Roger W Howell, Michel Fromm, et al.. Non-targeted Stressful Effects in Normal Human Fibroblast Cultures Exposed to Low Fluences of High Charge, High-Energy (HZE) Particles: Kinetics of Biologic Responses and Significance of Secondary Radiations.. Radiation Research, 2013, epub ahead of print. 10.1667/RR3017.1 . hal-00801993

HAL Id: hal-00801993

<https://hal.science/hal-00801993v1>

Submitted on 18 Mar 2013

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.

1 **Non-Targeted Stressful Effects in Normal Human Fibroblast Cultures Exposed to**
2 **Low Fluences of High Charge, High Energy (HZE) Particles: Kinetics of Biologic**
3 **Responses and Significance of Secondary Radiations**

Géraldine Gonon^{a,b}, Jean-Emmanuel Groetz^b, Sonia M. de Toledo^a, Roger W. Howell^a,
Michel Fromm^{b,1} and Edouard I. Azzam^{a,2}

^aDepartment of Radiology, UMDNJ - New Jersey Medical School Cancer Center,
Newark, NJ 07103, USA

^bLaboratoire de Chimie Physique et Rayonnements - Alain Chambaudet (LCPR-AC),
LRC CEA, UMR CNRS 6249 Chrono-Environnement, Université de Franche-Comté,
Besançon, France

Running head: HZE-PARTICLE-INDUCED BYSTANDER EFFECTS

Key words: bystander effects, space exploration, radiation protection, hadron therapy,
HZE ion fragmentation, secondary radiation

Manuscript Category: Regular Paper

Number of Pages: 44

Number of Figures: 6

Number Tables: 2

Supplementary Figures: 1; Supplementary Tables: 4

^{1,2}Addresses for correspondence:

4 Edouard Azzam
5 Department of Radiology
6 UMDNJ – New Jersey Medical School
7 Cancer Center
8 205 South Orange Avenue
9 Cancer Center Bldg. – Room F1212
10 Newark, NJ 07103
11 Phone: 973-972-5323
12 Fax: 973-972-1865
13 E-mail: azzamei@umdnj.edu
14

15 Michel Fromm
16 Laboratoire de Chimie Physique et
17 Rayonnements - Alain Chambaudet
18 (LCPR-AC), LRC CEA, UMR CNRS
19 6249 Chrono-Environnement
20 Université de Franche-Comté,
21 16 route de Gray
22 F-25030 Besançon Cedex, France
23 Phone: (0) 33 3 81 66 65 60
24 Fax: (0) 33 3 81 66 65 22
25 E-mail: michel.fromm@univ-fcomte.fr

ABSTRACT

The induction of non-targeted stressful effects in cell populations exposed to low fluences of high charge (Z) and high energy (E) particles is relevant to estimates of the health risks of space radiation. We investigated the upregulation of stress markers in confluent normal human fibroblast cultures exposed to 1000 MeV/u iron ions (linear energy transfer (LET) ~ 151 keV/ μm) or 600 MeV/u silicon ions (LET ~ 50 keV/ μm) at mean absorbed doses as low as 0.2 cGy, wherein 1-3 % of the cells were targeted through the nucleus by a primary particle. Within 24 h post-irradiation, significant increases in the levels of phospho-TP53 (serine 15), p21^{Waf1} (CDKN1A), HDM2, phospho-ERK1/2, protein carbonylation and lipid peroxidation were detected, which suggested participation in the stress response of cells not targeted by primary particles. This was supported by *in situ* studies that indicated greater increases in 53BP1 foci formation, a marker of DNA damage, than expected from the number of primary particle traversals. The effect was expressed as early as 15 min after exposure, peaked at 1 h, and decreased by 24 h. A similar tendency occurred after exposure of the cell cultures to 0.2 cGy of 3.7 MeV α particles (LET ~ 109 keV/ μm) that targets ~ 1.6 % of nuclei, but not after 0.2 cGy from 290 MeV/u carbon ions (LET ~ 13 keV/ μm) by which, on average, ~ 13 % of the nuclei were hit, which highlights the importance of radiation quality in the induced effect. Simulations with the FLUKA multi-particle transport code revealed that fragmentation products, other than electrons, in cell cultures exposed to HZE particles comprise <1 % of the absorbed dose. Further, the radial spread of dose due to secondary heavy ion fragments is confined to approximately 10-20 μm . Thus, the latter are unlikely to significantly contribute to stressful effects in cells not targeted by primary HZE particles.

INTRODUCTION

1
2 The ionizing radiation-induced bystander effect has been broadly defined as the
3 induction of biological changes in in cells not directly targeted by radiation (1). Stressful
4 bystander effects have been extensively observed in cell populations where only a small
5 fraction of the cells is targeted by high linear energy transfer (LET) α particles. Induction
6 of genetic alterations, including sister chromatid exchanges (2), mutations (3, 4),
7 chromosomal aberrations (5) and micronuclei (6), changes in gene expression (7, 8),
8 lethality (9) and neoplastic transformation (10, 11) have been observed in bystander cells
9 of various lineages after exposure of other cells to α particles. On the other hand, the
10 characterization of bystander effects in cell cultures exposed to very low fluences of high
11 charge (Z) and high energy (E) (HZE) particles, another type of high LET radiation, are
12 only emerging, and conflicting data have been reported. In initial experiments with
13 microbeam, stressful effects were shown to be transmitted from HZE-particle-irradiated
14 cells to contiguous cells that were not targeted by the primary particle (12-14). In
15 subsequent experiments whereby HZE-particle-irradiated cells were co-cultured with
16 bystander cells in a manner that they only shared growth medium, stressful responses
17 were also induced in the bystander cells and were similar in nature to those generated in
18 the targeted cells (15-17). Furthermore, oxidative stress and DNA damage persisted in
19 distant progeny of bystander cells that had been in contiguous co-culture with HZE-
20 particle-irradiated cells (18, 19). However, other experiments involving the transfer of
21 growth medium from irradiated cultures to recipient bystander cells present in a separate
22 dish (9, 20), or the targeting of an exact number of cells in a population with energetic
23 heavy ions from a microbeam (21) did not detect an effect with a variety of endpoints and

1 cell types. Several factors may underlie the absence of observable effects in these cases,
2 including timing of endpoint measurement, dilution of the inducing factor and the
3 metabolic state/redox environment of the recipient cells.

4 Providing clear evidence for HZE-particle-induced bystander effects is pertinent
5 to space exploration during which astronauts are likely to be exposed to low fluences of
6 energetic particles (22). To gain greater knowledge of HZE-particle-induced bystander
7 effects, we investigated the expression of stress markers in density-inhibited normal
8 human diploid fibroblast cultures exposed to low fluences of iron, silicon or carbon ions,
9 and compared the results with those obtained in cultures exposed to low fluences of
10 α particles. The data showed clear evidence for modulation of p53/p21^{Waf1} and ERK1/2
11 signaling in cultures exposed to doses as low as 0.2 cGy wherein only 1-3 % of nuclei are
12 traversed by a primary particle track. An increase in protein carbonylation and lipid
13 peroxidation was also detected at 24 h after exposure, suggesting that perturbations in
14 oxidative metabolism contribute to the greater than expected stressful effects, based on
15 microdosimetric considerations of the fraction of cells traversed by a primary particle. *In*
16 *situ* immune-detection studies of 53BP1 foci formation, a marker that has been associated
17 with DNA double strand breaks (23), together with the use of culture dishes where a
18 solid-state nuclear track detector was fused to the glass bottom on which the cells grow,
19 supported the involvement of cells not targeted by primary HZE particles in the response
20 of cell cultures to radiation.

21 The microscopic structure of the primary HZE-particle-track is characterized by a
22 high frequency of interactions with the target, which result in highly localized energy
23 depositions (24, 25). Secondary radiations arise from interactions with atomic electrons

1 in target atoms and from fragmentation of the incident HZE particle and target nuclei.
2 These secondaries are produced along the primary particle track and include energetic
3 electrons (δ rays), photons, protons, neutrons, α particles and other heavier ions with
4 different LET values. In contrast to δ rays with a maximum range of $\sim 0.1 \mu\text{m}$ that are
5 produced in biological matter when traversed by the 2-10 MeV high-LET α particles that
6 are emitted during α decay of radionuclides (26), the range of δ rays produced following
7 HZE particle-traversals can extend up to several cell diameters (27, 28), thereby
8 potentially irradiating and contributing to biochemical changes in cells that are near those
9 targeted by the primary particle track. In particular, protective mechanisms induced by
10 low LET secondary radiations may mitigate stressful effects propagated from cells
11 traversed by the primary particle (29). Alternatively, cells that were thought to be
12 bystanders may be significantly irradiated by secondaries. To investigate whether
13 secondary particles are a factor in apparent HZE-particle-induced bystander effects, the
14 tracks of the secondaries were simulated with the multi-particle transport code FLUKA
15 and absorbed doses received by the monolayer of cells adjacent to the targeted cells were
16 assessed (30-32).

17 **MATERIALS AND METHODS**

18 *Cell culture*

19 AG1522 normal human diploid skin fibroblasts were obtained from the Genetic
20 Cell Repository at the Coriell Institute for Medical Research. Cells at passage 10-12 were
21 grown in Eagles' Minimum Essential Medium (MEM) (CellGro) containing 12.5 %
22 (vol/vol) heat inactivated (30 min at 56 °C) fetal bovine serum (FBS) (Sigma),
23 supplemented with 4 mM L-alanyl-L-glutamine (CellGro), 100 U/mL penicillin and

1 100 µg/mL streptomycin (CellGro). They were maintained in 37 °C humidified
2 incubators in an atmosphere of 5 % CO₂ (vol/vol) in air. For experiments, cells were
3 seeded at numbers that allowed them to reach the density-inhibited state within 5 days.
4 They were then fed twice on alternate days, and experiments were initiated 48 h after the
5 last feeding. Under these conditions, 95-98 % of cells were in G₀/G₁ phase of the cell
6 cycle. The synchronization of cells in G₀/G₁ phase, by density-inhibition of growth,
7 eliminates complications in interpretation of results that arise from changes in responses
8 to ionizing radiation at different phases of the cell cycle (33).

9 For HZE-particle-irradiation, the cells were either grown in 25 cm² polystyrene
10 flasks (Greiner) for Western blot analyses or in glass-bottomed flaskettes (Nalge Nunc
11 International) for *in situ* detection of 53BP1 foci. Cells destined for α-particle-irradiation
12 were seeded in stainless steel dishes with a circular 36-mm-diameter growing surface that
13 consists of 1.5 µm-thick replaceable polyethylene terephthalate (PET). To facilitate cell
14 attachment, the PET surface was precoated with FNC solution comprising fibronectin and
15 collagen (AthenaES™), overlaid with 2 mL of MEM and incubated at 37 °C. After
16 30 min, the medium was aspirated and the cells were seeded.

17 *Culture dishes with nuclear track detector bottom and etching*

18 To identify cells irradiated by a primary particle, a 100 µm-thick polyallyl
19 diglycol carbonate (PADC) plastic polymer (Tastrak™ from Track Analysis Systems
20 Ltd., commonly known as Columbia Resin #39 or CR-39™ plastic) was grafted to the
21 glass bottom of tissue culture dishes (Ibidi®) as shown in Supplementary Figure 1,
22 Panel B. Upon cell fixation, the PADC was etched in 10 mol/L KOH at 37 °C for 3.5 h
23 and the pits were visualized by light microscopy. *In situ* analyses of 53BP1 foci were

1 performed following etching. Images were obtained by switching from fluorescent to
2 optical imaging and changing the focal plane. Monitoring of confluent cultures during a
3 3 h period by confocal microscopy using a fixed high magnification field did not reveal
4 any movement of the cells following exposure to mean absorbed doses of 0.1-0.3 cGy of
5 α particles (34).

6 *Irradiation and dosimetry*

7 Irradiation with 1000 MeV/u $^{56}\text{Fe}^{26+}$, 600 MeV/u $^{28}\text{Si}^{14+}$ or 290 MeV/u $^{12}\text{C}^{6+}$ with
8 LET in liquid water of ~ 151 keV/ μm , ~ 50 keV/ μm and ~ 13 keV/ μm , respectively, were
9 performed at the NASA Space Radiation Laboratory (NSRL) at Brookhaven National
10 Laboratory (Upton, NY) during 2008-2011. The monolayers were positioned
11 perpendicularly to the beam in the plateau region of the Bragg curve, but were not
12 stacked (profiles of the ions' Bragg curves can be accessed at [http://www.bnl.gov/](http://www.bnl.gov/medical/NASA/CAD/Bragg_Curves.asp)
13 [medical/NASA/CAD/Bragg_Curves.asp](http://www.bnl.gov/medical/NASA/CAD/Bragg_Curves.asp)). The flasks were filled to capacity, 3 h prior to
14 irradiation, with pH and temperature-equilibrated growth medium containing 20 %
15 (vol/vol) conditioned medium that was harvested from confluent AG1522 cell cultures
16 grown for 48 h. This ensured that, during the irradiation, deviation from 37 °C was
17 attenuated and the cells were immersed in medium, which alleviates changes in
18 osmolarity and partial oxygen tension. The latter parameters greatly affect the cellular
19 responses to radiation (35, 36). The foam sample-holder produces minimal scatter or
20 fragmentation of the incoming heavy ion beam ([www.bnl.gov/medical/NASA/CAD/](http://www.bnl.gov/medical/NASA/CAD/Sample_Holder_Layout.asp)
21 [Sample_Holder_Layout.asp](http://www.bnl.gov/medical/NASA/CAD/Sample_Holder_Layout.asp)). Exposures to 0.2 or 1 cGy occurred at dose rates of 0.2 and
22 1 cGy/min, respectively. The dose of 0.2 cGy was delivered in 3 or 4 spills at a
23 minimum. Uniformity of the beam across the irradiated flasks was between 1 % and 5 %.

1 The dose just out of the beam (i.e. the beam-related background) is proportional to the
2 beam dose and is on the order of 0.01 % of the dose in the beam. The background
3 radiation due to activation depended on the preceding irradiation; in case our experiment
4 was preceded by a 1 h exposure to the maximum rate of protons delivered at the NSRL,
5 the γ ray dose that cells would receive would be at the rate of $\sim 10^{-5}$ cGy/min. Sham-
6 irradiated cell cultures served as control and were handled similarly as the test cultures.

7 Alpha-particle-irradiations were conducted with a 7.4 MBq ^{241}Am collimated
8 source housed in a helium-filled Plexiglas box located in a chamber at 37 °C with an
9 atmosphere of 5 % CO_2 (vol/vol) in air. To optimize uniformity of the beam, the source
10 was mounted on a rotating platform (88 rpm) and the exit window was equipped with a
11 beam delimiter. The uniformity was confirmed by etching PADC plastic exposed to the
12 beam for 4 seconds. Cells were irradiated at a mean absorbed dose rate of 2 cGy/min, and
13 irradiation of samples occurred from below through the PET growing surface. At the
14 latter surface, α particles had a measured mean energy of 3.7 MeV (0.92 MeV/u) with
15 Full Width at Half Maximum (FWHM) of 0.5 MeV. The LET corresponding to a mean
16 energy of 3.7 MeV is ~ 109 keV/ μm in liquid water. The irradiator box was fitted with a
17 photographic shutter to allow accurate delivery of the desired mean absorbed dose (37).

18 The fluence ϕ of HZE particles was determined by PMT/Scintillator-based
19 dosimetry; it was then used to calculate the mean dose to the cell population according
20 to the relation ϕ (particles/ cm^2) = $[D$ (cGy) ρ (g/ cm^3)] / $[1.602 \times 10^{-7}$ LET (keV/ μm)],
21 where D is the mean dose and ρ is the density. In case of α -particle-irradiation, the
22 fluence ϕ for a fixed dose was estimated based on previous measurements (37). The
23 average number of nuclear and cellular particle traversals was calculated by multiplying

1 the fluence with the average cross-section of an AG1522 cell nucleus (i.e. $140 \mu\text{m}^2$ (7))
2 or with the average cross-sectional area of an AG1522 whole cell (i.e. $800 \mu\text{m}^2$ (34))
3 measured in confluent cultures grown under similar conditions as in this study). The
4 calculations of fluence were confirmed after etching of PADC. Estimates of the
5 fractions of whole cells or nuclei traversed by a primary particle were calculated
6 assuming Poisson statistics and are given in Table 1. These values were determined
7 according to the method of Charlton and Sephton (38), where the probability P that a
8 given target area is traversed by N particles is given by $P(N) = e^{-x} x^N/N!$ with x being
9 the product of the fluence and the target cross-sectional area (nucleus or whole cell).

10 *Secondary radiations*

11 In this work, for studies of *in situ* detection of 53BP1 foci, the HZE particles
12 traversed first the soda-lime glass bottom of the flaskettes before reaching the cells and
13 growth medium. Some of the HZE interactions with these target materials may result in
14 fragmentation of the incident (*i.e.* primary) particle and/or of the target material.
15 Fragmentation of the incident HZE particle may produce lower-atomic number (Z)
16 fragments. The primary-particle fragments have a high probability of proceeding with the
17 same velocity as the primary particle, whereas target fragments generally have lower
18 velocity and can be scattered with respect to the incident-ion-trajectory (25). Photons and
19 secondary electrons (δ rays), generated as a result of these interactions, can travel,
20 depending on their energy, significant distances away from the primary particle track
21 (39).

22 To determine whether secondary particles impart a significant absorbed dose to
23 either directly targeted cells, or cells in the vicinity, when a mean absorbed dose of

1 0.2 cGy is delivered with either 1000 MeV/u ^{56}Fe ions, 600 MeV/u ^{28}Si ions or
2 290 MeV/u ^{12}C ions, calculations were undertaken, using FLUKA code version
3 2011.2.15 (31, 32, 40) with the default configuration 'HADROTherapy'. FLUKA is a
4 multi-purpose Monte Carlo particle transport code that considers all particle interactions
5 including electromagnetic interactions, nuclear interactions of the primary or incident
6 particles and the generated secondary particles, energy loss fluctuations and Coulomb
7 scattering.

8 Several parameters were considered in our simulations with FLUKA. They
9 included transport threshold for particles, delta ray production threshold, and restricted
10 ionization fluctuations. The RQMD model was used, since its interface was developed for
11 the processing of ion-ion interactions from 0.1 GeV/u to 5 GeV/u. The event generators
12 RQMD and DPMJET were linked to ensure ion-ion interactions above 125 MeV/u. The
13 FLUKA evaporation/fission/fragmentation module performed the fragmentation of the
14 primary heavy ions and the de-excitation of the excited fragments. Simulations were
15 undertaken with the transport cut-offs for heavy ions (primary and fragments), photons,
16 protons and α particles set at 1 keV. The transport cut-off for electrons was set at 1 keV
17 when the production threshold for δ rays was 10, 100, and 1000 keV; it was set at 150 eV
18 when the production threshold for δ rays was 1 keV. Production thresholds for δ rays
19 were set at equal value in the cover slip, cell monolayer and medium to ensure that the
20 electronic equilibrium is established (i.e. that the flux of secondary electrons leaving a
21 surface is independent of the surface thickness). This would be a sensitive parameter for a
22 very thin surface like the cell monolayer. Upon reaching the cut-off energy, the particles

1 were assumed to deposit this cut-off energy locally and their tracks were no longer
2 followed.

3 The contribution of neutrons to the absorbed was calculated but is not shown due
4 to inconsistent results, especially in the cell monolayer. Since the HADROTherapy
5 option was used, neutrons with energy below 20 MeV cannot be followed with dedicated
6 multi-group library for neutrons with that energy. Benchmarking the FLUKA code with
7 the MCNP code could generate more consistent results for the neutron dose.

8 Using FLUKA, the radial dose distribution to the AG1522 cell monolayer around
9 the track of a narrow beam of 1000 MeV/u ⁵⁶Fe ions was calculated for both the primary
10 particle and its secondaries (HADRONTherapy configuration with delta rays'
11 production thresholds set at 1, 10, 100, and 1000 keV). Every run was performed with
12 10⁵ ions, and the absorbed doses to concentric annuli (thickness 1 μm, depth 1 μm)
13 extending to a radius of 100 μm were calculated. The radial distance of 100 μm covers
14 the diameter of an AG1522 cell and extends to adjacent cells.

15 To recreate experimental conditions, the geometry and the constitutive materials
16 of the flaskettes were introduced into the FLUKA input file. The beam spot at the NSRL
17 has a uniform center of 20 cm x 20 cm. Within this area, the flaskette containing the cell
18 monolayer was recreated (Supplementary Figure 1, Panel A). The cell monolayer was
19 characterized by an area of 10 cm² and thickness of 1 μm (i.e. height up to the center of
20 the nucleus) (*41*)¹. The 1 mm-thick soda-lime glass was 19.152 cm² in area. The
21 corresponding volumes were 0.001 and 1.92 cm³, respectively, and the volume of the
22 culture medium was 18.8 cm³. The elemental mole percentages of the soda-lime glass

¹ The thickness of ~1 μm of an AG1522 cell (*41*) was estimated from studies in fixed/dehydrated cells grown on Mylar. The actual dimension of a live AG1522 cell grown on glass may be different.

1 ($\rho \sim 2.33 \text{ g/cm}^3$) were O (60 %), Si (25 %), Na (10 %), Ca (3 %), Mg (1 %) and Al (1 %).
2 The 1 mm-thick polystyrene (C_8H_8) walls of the flaskettes have a density of 1.06 g/cm^3 .
3 The cell monolayer was assumed to be composed of human skin equivalent (W&W type
4 3 (42)) with elemental mass composition of H (10.1 %), C (15.8 %), N (3.7 %), O
5 (69.5 %), S (0.2 %), Cl (0.3 %), Na (0.2 %) and K (0.1 %) and with a density of
6 $1.09 \pm 0.05 \text{ g/cm}^3$. For simplicity, the growth medium was considered to be water with a
7 thickness of 1.87 cm (flaskette is filled to capacity with culture medium). The flaskette,
8 thus modeled, was oriented vertically and its growth surface was orthogonal to the
9 incident beam. The doses calculated by FLUKA were provided as $\text{GeV/g cm}^3/\text{primary}$
10 ion. Radiation absorbed doses in cGy (Table 2 and Supplementary Tables 2-4) were
11 obtained from the FLUKA output by correcting the values for target volume and the
12 fluence. The fluence of $8323 \text{ }^{56}\text{Fe-ions/cm}^2$ was experimentally determined at BNL by
13 scintillator-based dosimetry, which relies on counting the tracks in the beam. When a
14 certain preset number of tracks with high LET characteristic was reached, the beam was
15 cut-off. This approach was also used in the FLUKA simulations for determining the mean
16 absorbed dose to the various targets from the primary and secondary radiations.

17 *Western blot analyses*

18 Following irradiation, the cells were harvested by trypsinization, pelleted, rinsed
19 in PBS, repelleted, and lysed in chilled radio-immune precipitation assay (RIPA) buffer
20 [50 mM Tris-Cl (pH 7.5), 150 mM NaCl, 50 mM NaF, 5 mM EDTA, 1 % (vol/vol)
21 NP40, 0.5 % (wt/vol) sodium deoxycholate, 0.1 % SDS] supplemented with sodium
22 orthovanadate (1 mM), and protease (1:1000, vol/vol) and phosphatase (1:1000, vol/vol)

1 inhibitor cocktails (Sigma). The extracted proteins were fractionated by SDS-PAGE and
2 immunoblotted.

3 *Protein levels:* Stress responsive proteins were quantified with antibodies against
4 p21^{Waf1} (05-345, Millipore), p-TP53ser15 (9284, Cell Signaling), p-ERK1/2 (9101, Cell
5 Signaling) and HDM2 (M4308, Sigma).

6 *Protein oxidation:* When proteins are oxidized by reactive oxygen species (ROS),
7 some amino acids are modified generating carbonyl groups. These carbonyl groups,
8 specifically of aldehydes or ketones, can react with 2,4-dinitrophenyl hydrazine (DNPH),
9 which may be recognized by anti-2,4 dinitrophenol (DNP) antibodies on immunoblots
10 (43). For experiments, the OxyBlot Protein Oxidation Detection Kit (Millipore) was used.
11 Protein samples were denaturated with 6 % (wt/vol) SDS and derivatized with DNPH.
12 Negative controls were derivatized with a Derivatization-Control solution. After 15 min
13 incubation at room temperature, neutralization solution (2 M Tris/30 % glycerol; vol/vol)
14 was added and samples were immunoblotted. The DNPH-bound proteins were detected
15 with rabbit anti-2,4-dinitrophenyl IgG (Millipore).

16 *Accumulation of 4-hydroxynonenal adducts:* Hydroxyalkenals, such as 4-
17 hydroxynonenal (4-HNE), are among the major products of lipid peroxidation (44).
18 Proteins with 4-HNE adducts were identified with goat anti-4-HNE antibody (Millipore).

19 After incubation of the nitrocellulose membranes with a specific secondary
20 antibody conjugated with horseradish peroxidase, protein bands were detected by
21 enhanced chemiluminescence system from GE Healthcare (Amersham). Luminescence
22 was determined by exposure to X ray film, and densitometry analysis was performed with

1 an EPSON scanner and National Institutes of Health Image J software (NIH Research
2 Services Branch).

3 Staining of the nitrocellulose membranes with Ponceau S Red (Sigma) was used
4 to verify equal loading of samples (loading control) (45). Experiments were repeated 2 to
5 7 times, with separate experiments performed to evaluate changes in protein levels,
6 protein oxidation and accumulation of 4-hydroxynonenal adducts. Representative data of
7 immunoblots are shown in Results. Fold changes in the levels of stress responsive
8 proteins in individual experiments together with mean \pm standard error (SE) are reported
9 in Supplementary Table 1. These changes include the responses of cells targeted by
10 primary ions and those that are not. Treated samples were compared with the control of
11 the respective time point.

12 *In situ immune-detection of 53BP1*

13 53BP1 is a marker of DNA double-strand breaks (DSB) (46). At different times
14 after irradiation, confluent cells were rinsed twice in PBS, fixed with freshly prepared
15 3.2 % (vol/vol) paraformaldehyde in PBS for 10 min, and rinsed 5 times with PBS.
16 Subsequently, the cells were permeabilized with Triton-X buffer (0.25 % Triton-X in
17 water / 0.1 % saponin in Tris-buffered saline (TBS) [25 mM Tris, pH 7.5, 150 mM NaCl,
18 2 mM KCl in water] for 10 min. The fixed and permeabilized cell monolayers were then
19 blocked for 1 h in blocking buffer [2 % (vol/vol) normal goat serum, 2 % (vol/vol) BSA,
20 0.1 % Triton X-100 (in TBS)] and reacted with rabbit anti-53BP1 antibody (A300-272A,
21 Bethyl) diluted 1:500 (vol/vol) in blocking buffer and incubated for 2 h at room
22 temperature. After incubation with Alexa Fluor 594 goat anti-rabbit secondary antibody
23 (Invitrogen), the cells were washed 3 times (5 min/wash) in buffer consisting of 0.2 %

1 normal goat serum, 0.2 % BSA, 0.1 % Triton X-100 in TBS. SlowFade® Gold antifade
2 reagent with DAPI (Invitrogen) was used in mounting the samples.

3 Cells with at least one 53BP1 focus were scored using a UV microscope (Leica
4 DM IL). All the images within the same data set were captured with a ProgRes® camera
5 (Jenoptik) with the same optics and exposure time and were saved for subsequent
6 evaluation. As such, bleaching of the signal was avoided. Identical criteria were followed
7 in defining foci characteristics. Nuclei with atypical size or morphology, and those with
8 very high foci counts (presumably due to replication stress), were not scored (47). The
9 data described in Results represent the excess percent increase of cells with 53BP1 foci in
10 irradiated populations relative to respective control. They were calculated as follows:

11 $\Delta F = 100 (F_{\text{irradiated}} - F_{\text{control}})$ where F is the ratio of the number of cells with
12 53BP1 foci over the total number of cells counted.

13 The results of three independent experiments for energetic iron and silicon ions
14 and α particles are reported in Results. For each experiment, 2 irradiated and 2 control
15 dishes were analyzed. For each dish, more than 3000 cells were scored by eye in 40
16 different fields. Poisson statistics was used to calculate the standard error associated with
17 the percentage of cells with foci over the total number of cells scored. The Pearson's χ^2
18 test was used to compare treatment groups versus respective controls. A value of $p \leq 0.05$
19 between groups was considered significant.

20 A significant number of cells in control samples harbored foci, which fluctuated
21 between experiments and assay times. When the control samples of all experiments were
22 pooled, the mean \pm SD of the fraction of cells harboring at least one 53BP1 focus was
23 0.26 ± 0.12 with a range of 0.05 to 0.50. The mean \pm SD of spontaneous 53BP1 foci per

1 cell nucleus was 0.35 ± 0.12 with a range of 0.06 to 0.68 foci/cell. The mean \pm SD of
2 spontaneous 53BP1 foci per cell nucleus in foci-positive cells was 1.29 ± 0.11 foci/cell
3 with a range from 1.04 to 1.35 foci/cell. These results are consistent with those of
4 Ugenskiene et al. who estimated the background level of 53BP1 foci in AG1522 cells to
5 be 1.1 foci/cell (48). A high background level of nuclear foci indicative of DNA damage
6 was also observed in various cell strains, with inter and intra-individual differences being
7 detected (47).

8 RESULTS

9 *Significant biological changes are rapidly induced in normal human cell cultures* 10 *exposed to low fluences of HZE particles*

11 We investigated stress responses in normal human cell populations exposed to
12 HZE particles under conditions where only a very small fraction of cells is traversed
13 through the nucleus by a primary particle track. To this end, confluent AG1522 cell
14 cultures were exposed to mean absorbed doses of 0.2 or 1 cGy of energetic iron or silicon
15 ions. They were also exposed, in parallel, to α particles that have been shown to induce
16 significant bystander effects (2, 4, 6, 7). We examined the phosphorylation of serine 15 in
17 TP53 (p-TP53ser15), a marker of DNA damage (49), and of the stress-responsive
18 extracellular signal-related kinases, ERK1 and ERK2 (p-ERK1/2) (50), at different times
19 after irradiation. The observed changes were compared to those in respective controls.

20 At 15 min after exposure to mean absorbed doses of 0.2 or 1 cGy from
21 1000 MeV/u ^{56}Fe ions (LET ~ 151 keV/ μm) or 600 MeV/u ^{28}Si (LET ~ 50 keV/ μm), an
22 increase in p-TP53ser15 and p-ERK1/2 levels was consistently observed (Figure 1,
23 Panel A). Fold-increases of 1.7 ± 0.4 (n=3) and 2.3 ± 0.5 (n=3) in p-TP53ser15 levels,

1 and of 1.4 ± 0.1 (n=3) and 1.4 ± 0.1 (n=3) in p-ERK1/2 levels, were detected in cell
2 cultures exposed to 0.2 cGy of ^{56}Fe or ^{28}Si ions, respectively (representative data shown
3 in Figure 1, Panel A). At a mean absorbed dose of 0.2 cGy, only ~1.2 and 3.5 % of nuclei
4 are traversed by either ion, respectively. Similarly, at 1 cGy, wherein ~6 % of nuclei are
5 traversed by an iron ion and 17.5 % by a silicon ion, respective fold-increases of 3.2 ± 1
6 (n=6) and 2.9 ± 0.5 (n=4) in p-TP53ser15 levels, and of 2.7 ± 0.3 (n=5) and 2.4 ± 0.3
7 (n=4) in p-ERK1/2 levels, were observed (representative data shown in Figure 1,
8 Panel A). Therefore, these data indicate that p-ERK1/2 and p-TP53ser15 are sensitive
9 markers that are rapidly modulated after exposure of normal human cell cultures to very
10 low mean absorbed doses of high-LET HZE radiations. The levels of p-TP53ser15 and p-
11 ERK1/2 were similarly increased at 15 min after exposure of confluent AG1522 cell
12 cultures to 0.2 cGy (1.5 ± 0.0 (n=4) and 1.2 ± 0.1 (n=3), respectively) or 1 cGy (2.1 ± 0.3
13 (n=7), and 2.2 ± 0.2 (n=6), respectively) of 3.7 MeV α particles (LET ~109 keV/ μm)
14 (representative data shown in Figure 1, Panel A). The increase in p-TP53ser15 level,
15 correlated with increases in the levels of HDM2 and p21^{Waf1} at 1 h (Figure 1, Panel B)
16 and 3 h (Figure 1, Panel C) after irradiation, suggesting activation of TP53, a central
17 protein involved in maintenance of genomic integrity. Similar increases in TP53
18 signaling were also observed at 6 and 24 h after irradiation (Figure 1, Panel D). For all
19 treatments, the results of individual experiments are described in supplementary Table 1.

20 Likewise, 3.3 ± 1.4 (n=3) and 6.5 ± 1.8 (n=3)-fold increases in overall protein
21 carbonylation were detected in extracts of cell cultures harvested 24 h after exposure to
22 0.2 and 1 cGy of 1000 MeV/u iron ions, respectively (representative data in Figure 2,
23 Panel A). The accumulation of 4-hydroxynonenal (HNE) adducts in proteins from the

1 same cultures indicates that increased lipid peroxidation was involved (representative
2 data in Figure 2, Panel B). A 1.8 ± 0.2 (n=3) and 3.8 ± 1.4 (n=3) fold increases in
3 proteins with 4-HNE adducts were detected at 24 h after exposure to 0.2 and 1 cGy of
4 1000 MeV/u iron ions, respectively.

5 The induction of stressful effects and their persistence, in low fluence-irradiated
6 cell cultures, was further revealed when confluent cultures exposed to 1 cGy from
7 1000 MeV/u ^{56}Fe ions were subcultured to lower density (1:3) in fresh medium within
8 15 min after irradiation. Relative to control, increases in the levels of p-TP53ser15,
9 p21^{Waf1} and HDM2 occurred at 8 and 24 h after subculture (Figure 3). Together, the
10 magnitude of the various changes, in confluent and growing cell populations, suggests
11 participation of a greater proportion of cells in the stress response than the 1.2-3.5 %
12 fraction traversed by a primary particle track through the nucleus at a mean dose of
13 0.2 cGy. For example, for the 3.2 ± 1.0 (n=6)-fold-increases in p-TP53ser15 detected at
14 15 min, and 2.5 ± 0.3 fold (n=5)-increases in p21^{Waf1} levels detected at 3 h after exposure
15 of cell cultures to 1 cGy of ^{56}Fe ions, to be solely due to effects in cells targeted through
16 the nucleus by a primary ion, the cells would have to increase the level of these stress-
17 responsive proteins by ~50-folds.

18 *53BP1 foci formation in AG1522 cell cultures exposed to low fluences of HZE particles*

19 To evaluate stressful effects in confluent cultures exposed to low fluences of
20 HZE-particles on a cell by cell basis, we examined 53BP1 foci formation *in situ* at
21 15 min, 1 h, 3 h and 24 h after exposure to 0.2 cGy of either 1000 MeV/u ^{56}Fe ions,
22 600 MeV/u ^{28}Si ions or 3.7 MeV α particles. Separate cell cultures that received no
23 radiation, but were sham-treated, were included for each time point and were considered

1 as respective controls (Figure 4). Whereas, only ~1.2-3.5 % of the cell nuclei are
2 traversed by a primary HZE particle (Table 1), relative to respective control, the percent
3 of cells with 53BP1 foci was increased at 15 min, 1 h and 3 h by 6.8 % ($p < 0.001$), 15 %
4 ($p < 0.001$) and 10.6 % ($p < 0.001$), respectively for ^{56}Fe ions (Figure 4, Panel A,
5 experiment #1), and by 1.9 %, 7.7 % ($p < 0.001$), and 5.3 % ($p < 0.001$), respectively, for
6 3.7 MeV α particles (Figure 4, Panel B, experiment #1). Increases of 8.2 % ($p < 0.001$),
7 11.4 % ($p < 0.001$) and 2.8 % ($p < 0.05$), at 15 min, 1 h and 3 h, respectively, were also
8 observed after exposure to 0.2 cGy of ^{28}Si ions (Figure 4, Panel C, experiment #1). By
9 24 h, the percent increase of cells with 53BP1 foci was null for ^{56}Fe ions, was increased
10 by 3.1 % ($p < 0.01$) for ^{28}Si ions, and by 2 % for α particles ($p < 0.05$). The significant
11 increases in the excess percent of cells with foci (1.9–15 %) over what would be expected
12 based on the percentage of cells irradiated through the nucleus (1.2-3.5 %) strongly
13 support the participation of cells that were not targeted by the primary particle in the
14 overall response of the cell population to irradiation by low fluences of high LET
15 particles. Although the magnitude of the response varied between experiments, the trend
16 was similar. At 1 h following irradiation by a mean absorbed dose of 0.2 cGy from iron
17 ions, the increases in 53BP1 foci observed in experiments 2 and 3 were 10.3 %
18 ($p < 0.001$) and 7.3 % ($p < 0.001$), respectively, compared to 15 % ($p < 0.001$) in
19 experiment 1 (Figure 4).

20 The fraction of cells with foci was shown to decrease by 2 h after exposure to
21 DNA damaging agents (23). Thus, the increases observed at 1-3 h over those detected at
22 15 min in cultures exposed to ^{56}Fe ions or α particles could be due to recruitment of
23 additional cells in the response. Presumably, these are bystander cells wherein signaling

1 molecules propagated from irradiated cells had time to exert effects that result in DNA
2 damage. Whereas the attenuation of the percent increase of cells with 53BP1 foci at 24 h
3 in iron ion- and α -particle-irradiated cells and at 3-24 h in silicon ion-irradiated cells may
4 reflect repair of DNA damage in bystander cells, the persistent foci detected at these later
5 times presumably reside in cells that were directly targeted by densely ionizing particles.

6 In contrast to ^{56}Fe ions (LET ~ 151 keV/ μm), ^{28}Si ions (LET ~ 50 keV/ μm) and
7 α particles (LET ~ 109 keV/ μm), exposure of confluent cultures to 0.2 cGy from
8 290 MeV/u ^{12}C ions (LET ~ 13 keV/ μm) did not result in significant increase in the
9 percentage of cells with 53BP1 foci (not shown). This suggests that low mean absorbed
10 doses of HZE particles with lower LET may be less efficient at inducing stressful effects
11 (i.e. 53BP1 foci) under the conditions used in this study.

12 *Cell culture system to identify cells irradiated with an HZE particle*

13 Solid-state track detectors fused to cell culture dishes can be used to identify the
14 position of primary HZE particle traversals. Experiments performed with such dishes
15 suggested that the induction of stress in the form of 53BP1 foci is also observed in cells
16 not traversed by primary HZE particles. We bonded a 100 μm -thick PADC solid state
17 nuclear track detector (SSNTD) to the bottom edges of the cell culture surface
18 (Supplementary Figure 1, Panel B). After etching of PADC plastic, cells that were likely
19 traversed by a particle track could be identified, and induced biological effects may be
20 assessed by suitable markers. The data in Figure 5 show 53BP1 foci in a confluent cell
21 culture exposed to 0.2 cGy of 1000 MeV/u ^{56}Fe ions followed by 15 min incubation.
22 Following cell fixation and etching of PADC, the iron ion tracks were visible as black
23 dots (Figure 5, Panel A). Exposure to 0.2 cGy generally resulted in ~ 1.5 % of cells'

1 nuclei being superimposed on pits. The formation of 53BP1 foci (Figure 5, Panel B) in
2 nuclei (revealed by DAPI staining, Figure 5, Panel C) that superimpose the black dots
3 (inverted in white for better visualization, Figure 5, Panel D) indicates that these cells
4 sustained DNA damage as would be expected from nuclear traversal by a high LET
5 particle. The two cells with foci adjacent to the traversed cell are likely affected cells that
6 were not targeted by the primary particle (Figure 5, Panel D). They may be bystander
7 cells or cells subject to secondary radiations. The absence of SSNTD pits below these
8 adjacent cells indicates lack of hot-spots; it suggests that the strategy of incorporating
9 solid state nuclear track detector would be suitable for investigating the kinetics of
10 biologic responses *in situ* in targeted and non-targeted cells.

11 *The significance of secondary radiations in biological responses of cell cultures exposed*
12 *to low fluence HZE particles*

13 Secondary radiations resulting from the interaction of primary HZE particles with
14 the target materials may have had a role in the apparent bystander effects. To shed
15 additional light on this possibility, the contribution of secondary particles to the mean
16 absorbed dose was calculated by simulations using the FLUKA multi-particle transport
17 code (Table 2 and supplementary Tables 2-4). Estimates of the doses from heavy ions
18 (primary and fragments), electrons, photons, protons and α particles to the AG1522 *cell*
19 *monolayer* following exposure to a mean absorbed dose of 0.2 cGy from 1000 MeV/u
20 ^{56}Fe ions, 600 MeV/u ^{28}Si ions or 290 MeV/u ^{12}C ions are described in Table 2. When
21 exposed to any of the primary ions, secondary radiations consisting of HZE fragments,
22 photons, protons and α particles, with a production threshold and a transport cut-off set at
23 1 keV, constituted <1 % of the total absorbed dose (Table 2). In contrast, electrons with a

1 production threshold set at 1 keV and transport cut-off set at 150 eV contributed ~37-
2 40 % of the total dose. The mean absorbed dose deposited in the cell monolayer by
3 HZE fragments was very small (0.0007 cGy, 0.0004 cGy and 0.0005 cGy following
4 exposure to ^{56}Fe ions, ^{28}Si ions or ^{12}C ions, respectively) (Table 2). The dose contributed
5 by photons, protons and α particles was minimal in all cases (Table 2).

6 Estimates of the mean absorbed doses to the glass cover-slip, cell monolayer and
7 growth medium due to secondary radiations when the production threshold of δ rays was
8 set at 1, 10 100 or 1000 keV and the transport cut off was set at 1 keV are described in
9 Supplementary Tables 2-4. As the production threshold of the δ rays increased, the
10 contribution of secondary electrons to the total mean absorbed dose delivered to the *cell*
11 *monolayers* decreased and that of primary ions increased. Specifically, when the δ rays'
12 production threshold was set at 1000 keV, the contribution of primary ions to the total
13 mean absorbed dose to a *cell monolayer* exposed to 1000 MeV/u ^{56}Fe ions increased to
14 ~97 % and that of electrons decreased to ~2 % (supplementary Table 2). In case of
15 600 MeV/u ^{28}Si ions and 290 MeV/u ^{12}C ions, the secondary electrons represented,
16 respectively, 0.96 % and almost nil of the total mean absorbed dose to the *cell monolayer*
17 (Supplementary Tables 3 and 4).

18 Quantifying the radial distribution of the secondary particles is essential before
19 attributing stressful effects, observed in cells that surround directly targeted cells to a
20 bystander effect. The data in Figure 6 represent the radial dose distributions (heavy ions,
21 electrons and the total dose) in a 1 μm -thick cell culture layer exposed to an orthogonal
22 narrow beam of 1000 MeV/u ^{56}Fe ions. Panel A shows that the heavy ions deposit their
23 energy mainly in the first 10 μm , while the electron dose extends out to ~100 μm radius

1 around the track of the primary ion. Panel B describes the radial distribution of dose from
2 δ rays with 1-, 10-, 100 or 1000 keV-production-thresholds. Panels C and D permit
3 visualization of the radial dose deposited by heavy ions or electrons, respectively, around
4 the primary track pit revealed by etching of PADC and staining nuclei with DAPI as
5 described in Figure 5 (Panel D). It is noteworthy that the magnitude of the total radial
6 dose distribution, calculated in our studies, is in accord with previous results (51).

7 In the FLUKA code, the ionization energy losses are processed as continuous
8 energy loss or as discrete ionization events. Above the pre-set threshold, the ionization is
9 modeled as production of δ rays, based on scattering of the projectile with a free electron.
10 This threshold of δ ray production is an important parameter in this type of simulation. At
11 radial distances less than 20 μm from the track, the calculated absorbed dose depends
12 strongly on the threshold value (1, 10 or 100 keV) (Figure 6, Panel B). As expected, low
13 thresholds should be used to accurately simulate radial dose distributions around the track
14 core with μm and sub- μm spatial resolution (52).

15 The data in Figure 6 therefore imply that, in our experiments, the chance for
16 heavy fragments to hit neighboring cells is negligible. However, this is not the case for
17 secondary electrons which can travel significant distances from the track. Energy
18 deposition by δ rays is a stochastic process, and the possibility exists that some cells in
19 the vicinity of cells targeted by a primary ion may receive a biologically relevant dose.

20 **DISCUSSION**

21 The lack of clear knowledge about non-targeted responses has been singled out by
22 the US National Academies (53) as one of the important factors limiting the prediction of
23 radiation health risks associated with space exploration. During deep space missions,

1 every cell nucleus in an astronaut's body would be hit by a proton or secondary electron
2 every few days and by an HZE ion about once a month (54); the rest would be
3 bystanders. Human epidemiological studies would be ideal to predict the health risks of
4 exposure to low fluences of space particulate radiations; however, given the relatively
5 insignificant number of humans exposed to such radiations, mechanistic studies in cell
6 culture systems and animals are critical to help estimate corresponding risks to humans.

7 Using molecular, biochemical, physical and computational approaches, here we
8 provide evidence for the amplification of HZE-particle-induced stressful effects in
9 normal human fibroblast cultures following exposure to doses as low as 0.2 cGy of
10 1000 MeV/u iron ions or 600 MeV/u silicon ions (Figures 1-5). Consistent with previous
11 results in cell cultures exposed to low fluences of α particles, another type of radiation
12 with similar quality (i.e. high LET character), increases in the levels of proteins that
13 participate in TP53 and ERK1/2 signaling pathways (55) were observed. These increases
14 were detected as early as 15 min after irradiation and persisted for at least 24 h. Relative
15 to control, higher levels of p-TP53ser15, a marker of DNA damage, was detected in
16 confluent AG1522 fibroblasts exposed to a mean absorbed dose of 0.2 cGy that targets,
17 on average, only 1-3 % of the cells through the nucleus. This was associated 1-3 h later
18 (Figure 1, Panels B and C) with increased level of p21^{Waf1}, a p53 effector and key
19 component of the DNA damage induced G₁ checkpoint. The induction of these stress
20 markers persisted for at least 24 h (Figure 1, Panel D) and was associated with an
21 increase in protein carbonylation and in accumulation of 4-HNE protein adducts
22 (Figure 2, Panels A and B). Interestingly, 4-HNE reactive aldehydes originate from
23 peroxidation of membrane lipids where key proteins that mediate stress-induced

1 bystander effects, including connexins, cyclooxygenase-2 and NAD(P)H oxidase, reside
2 (56). The accumulation of such protein adducts may modulate transport properties of the
3 plasma membrane, gene expression, including signal transduction pathways affecting
4 DNA damage sensing and repair, cell survival and cell proliferation (57). The occurrence
5 of such appreciable oxidative effects, long after exposure, is consistent with excess ROS
6 generation due to perturbations in oxidative metabolism and/or persistent activation of
7 oxidases (58, 59). It suggests the involvement of a greater fraction of cells than those
8 targeted by a primary particle in the overall response leading to oxidative stress. Whereas
9 the persistence of stress may be due to sustained changes in the targeted and non-targeted
10 cells that were affected early after exposure, it could also result from induction of stress
11 in additionally recruited cells that were not-targeted by a primary particle. This does not
12 preclude, however, the restitution of damage and return to the basal state in certain
13 affected non-targeted and targeted cells.

14 The DNA DSB is a serious threat to the integrity of eukaryotic genomes (60).
15 Following exposure to DNA damaging agents, a battery of damage sensing and repair
16 proteins localize at the site of DNA breaks. Among these proteins, 53BP1 forms discrete
17 foci within minutes after exposure (23, 46, 61). Here, we used the formation of 53BP1
18 foci as a biomarker to investigate the evolution of α - and HZE-particle-induced
19 propagation of signaling events leading to DNA damage in cells that were not targeted by
20 a primary particle. We used the same microscope optics and exposure time, and scored by
21 eye to accurately differentiate foci; we also used separate controls for each time point.
22 Utilizing these criteria, the results from cultures exposed to a dose by which only 1-3 %
23 of cells are traversed through the nucleus by a primary energetic ion strongly supported

1 the participation of cells other than those targeted by the primary particles in the
2 response. At 15 min after exposure to 0.2 cGy from α particles, ^{56}Fe ions or ^{28}Si ions, the
3 fraction of cells with 53BP1 foci was higher than predicted based on the percentage of
4 nuclei directly targeted by primary ions (Figure 4). Whereas secondary radiation may
5 have contributed to the effects observed in the HZE-particle irradiated cell cultures, this
6 cannot be the case in the studies using our α particle irradiator. The ranges of δ rays
7 produced by the interaction of these α particles (3.7 MeV, 0.5 MeV FWHM) with the
8 cells are very small compared with the nuclear diameter. Hence, the effects observed in
9 α -particle-irradiated cell cultures (Figure 4) clearly support the spread of stressful effects
10 to unirradiated bystander cells.

11 In general, it is thought that 53BP1 foci formation is transient. Following uniform
12 exposure of cell cultures to an absorbed dose of 1 Gy from ^{137}Cs γ rays, the fraction of
13 cells with foci peaked at 20 min and remained elevated for 2 h after irradiation; it
14 decreased exponentially and returned to basal level 16 h later (23). In our study with cell
15 cultures where only 1.2-3.5 % of nuclei were irradiated with α particles, iron ions or
16 silicon ions, the maximum increase in the fraction of cells with 53BP1 foci was detected
17 at 1 h. The persistent elevation in foci formation at 3 h may be due to the induction of
18 DNA damage in non-directly targeted cells. At 3 h after exposure, foci formation in iron
19 ion- and α -particle-irradiated cultures was increased not only over control but also
20 compared to cultures examined at 15 min after irradiation ($p < 0.001$). Whereas, the
21 increases in the fraction of cells with foci at 1 and 3 h may reflect the spread of stressful
22 effects to additional cells than those targeted by radiation, they may also reflect

1 development of foci in affected cells (irradiated and bystander) that required time to
2 become visible by microscopy.

3 In contrast to ^{56}Fe ions, ^{28}Si ions and α particles, no excess 53BP1 foci formation
4 has been detected after exposure of cell cultures to 0.2 cGy from 290 MeV/u carbon ions
5 (LET ~ 13 keV/ μm) at any time between 15 min and 24 h after irradiation. This may be
6 due to less complex DNA damage being induced in the targeted cells, which may affect
7 the nature of the propagated signaling events. At a mean absorbed dose of 0.2 cGy to the
8 exposed cultures from 290 MeV/u carbon ions, ~ 0.015 cGy are deposited in the nucleus
9 from a single particle traversal; in comparison, ~ 17.25 cGy, 5.7 cGy and 12.45 cGy are
10 deposited by single traversals of 1000 MeV/u Fe, 600 MeV/u silicon and 3.7 MeV
11 α particles², respectively. Thus, the dose absorbed by the targeted nuclei likely plays an
12 important role in the induction of stressful effects leading to DNA damage. Different
13 targeted and non-targeted effects may however occur following cellular hits with multiple
14 carbon ions. The use of microbeams would greatly facilitate such experiments and would
15 be informative of the effects of absorbed dose and radiation quality.

16 Culture dishes that incorporate nuclear track etch detectors were developed in
17 order to identify cells and cell nuclei traversed by primary HZE particles. Our
18 preliminary experiments suggest that the induction of stress in the form of 53BP1 foci is
19 also observed in cells that were not traversed by a primary ^{56}Fe ion. The strategy of using
20 culture dishes with nuclear track detector to examine biological changes in HZE-particle-
21 irradiated cultures expanded our previous studies with α particles (34), and permitted
22 irradiation of cell cultures grown in dishes with sealable-lid in presence of pH-

² The absorbed dose (d) per traversal to the thin disk-shaped cell nucleus of the AG1522 cell was calculated according to the relation $d = (0.16 \text{ LET}) / (A \rho)$, where A is the cross-sectional area of the cell nucleus (i.e. an average of $\sim 140 \mu\text{m}^2$), and ρ is the density of the cell.

1 equilibrated culture medium with a horizontal broadbeam. Time-course experiments
2 using these dishes, together with determination of the metrology of distance propagation
3 as we have previously done with low fluence α -particle-irradiated cell cultures (34),
4 would be highly informative of the kinetics of induction and decay of biological changes
5 in cell cultures exposed to low fluences of HZE particle. In such studies careful
6 characterization of the positional accuracy of the primary track is essential. A typical
7 10 μm spatial deviation may have to be considered due to scattering of the incident ion as
8 it crosses the polymer material of the nuclear track etch detector.

9 To evaluate the possibility of whether the stressful effects expressed in presumed
10 bystander cells in low fluence HZE-particle-irradiated cultures may be due to secondary
11 particles generated from fragmentation of the incident beam in the target material
12 (Table 2, Supplementary Tables 2-4), we performed computational simulations using the
13 FLUKA multi-particle transport code. The capabilities of this code have been
14 demonstrated in simulations for microdosimetric purposes and tissue equivalent
15 proportional counters (51, 62). Our simulations showed that, using glass-bottomed
16 flaskettes, the total dose to the monolayer due to HZE fragments is negligible.
17 Importantly, the radial dose due to these fragments is confined to $\sim 10 \mu\text{m}$ around the
18 primary track. In contrast, the dose due to δ rays may be substantial. Depending on
19 energy, the range of the δ rays can be extensive (e.g., $\sim 130 \mu\text{m}$ for 100 keV δ rays) (63,
20 64), thus likely targeting all cells in the exposed culture (Figure 6). Whereas, the
21 biological effects induced by δ rays may be stressful, they can also attenuate damaging
22 effects propagated from cells targeted with primary and HZE fragments. In case of cells
23 exposed to 3.7 MeV α particles, the complications in interpreting the apparent bystander

1 effects (Figures 1 and 4) are diminished, as these particles do not produce secondary
2 radiation that cross-irradiate neighboring cells (26).

3 Experimental systems that allow deciphering the nature of biological effects due
4 to δ rays and to the primary HZE fragments would be highly informative towards
5 understanding the spectrum of biological changes induced following exposure to low
6 fluences of HZE particles. In this context, co-culture systems that allow investigation of
7 HZE-particle-induced non-targeted effects in the absence of secondary fragmentation
8 products, or δ rays, generated strong evidence for the propagation from irradiated cells of
9 signaling events leading to oxidative stress and DNA damage in bystander cells, an effect
10 that persisted in their progeny (18). Importantly, the expansion of HZE-particle-induced
11 non-targeted effects to *in vivo* systems (65), together with characterization of the
12 magnitude of effects due to fragmentation products, the modulating effect of δ rays, and
13 of the underlying mechanisms, is of importance to human space exploration and hadron
14 therapy (66). In particular, exposure of biological specimens at very low dose-rate to
15 simulate more closely the doses received during space travel (54) would be essential.
16 During a 24 h period, these doses are significantly lower than the lowest dose of 0.2 cGy
17 used in our studies.

18 CONCLUSION

19 The data reported here highlight the manifestation of stressful effects in confluent
20 normal human cell cultures exposed to low fluences of HZE particles by several
21 endpoints. The results show that propagation of the signaling events leading to stressful
22 effects in cells not targeted by a primary particle is rapid, but the reaction to the
23 propagated signal(s) may require time to be expressed depending on the endpoint

1 investigated. The phenotype (e.g. redox environment) of both, the signal emitting cells
2 and the recipient cells may greatly affect the kinetics of expression of biological changes.
3 Indeed, studies have shown that the DNA repair capacity of non-targeted cells (67, 68),
4 their anti-oxidant potential (69), and their genotype (70) modulate bystander effects. The
5 results with 53BP1 foci formation showed that by 24 h after exposure to 1000 MeV/u
6 ⁵⁶Fe ions, the excess formation of foci was greatly reduced. This may suggest that the
7 induction of DNA damage in presumed bystander cells is transient; however,
8 accumulating data from experiments involving co-cultures of HZE-particle-irradiated
9 cells with unirradiated bystander cells show that the latter experience genomic instability
10 that manifests in perturbations in oxidative metabolism (18) and excess chromosomal
11 damage in their progeny (11, 19).

12 Additional FLUKA calculations to determine both the fraction of cells that were
13 not targeted by fragmentation products and the fraction of cells that were hit by these
14 products together with the doses received are necessary to enhance our understanding of
15 low fluences HZE particle- induced bystander effects. This approach will require a
16 different model, with individual cells being considered under the same experimental
17 conditions. Depending on cell culture conditions (e.g. glass versus polystyrene platform
18 for cell growth, thickness of platform, cell thickness etc.) the yield and nature of
19 fragmentation products may vary, which may impact the signaling pathways leading to
20 enhancement or attenuation of stressful effects expressed in the exposed cell cultures.
21 The physical and physico-chemical events resulting from irradiation with primary or
22 secondary fragments (71-73), including yield, lifetime and spatial distribution of the
23 generated radiolytic species may induce prominent biochemical and genetic changes that

1 affect intercellular communication between irradiated and bystander cells, which may
2 modulate the magnitude of the induced stress response and determine long-term
3 biological effects. Together, these studies may greatly contribute to the efforts by NASA
4 to develop risk based radiation exposure guidelines that minimize adverse health effects
5 in astronauts.

6 **ACKNOWLEDGMENTS**

7 We thank Dr. Peter Guida and his team at the NASA Space Radiation Laboratory
8 for their support during the experiments. We are grateful to Drs. Adam Rusek, Michael
9 Sivertz and I-Hung Chang for dosimetry support. We thank Drs. Hatsumi Nagasawa, Les
10 Braby and John Ford for their gift of polyethylene terephthalate. We also thank Gary
11 Moss from Track Analysis Systems Ltd. for his input in developing the dishes with
12 Tastrak™-bottom. The input of Manuela Buonanno, Narongchai Autsavapromporn and
13 Jie Zhang in the course of the experiments is greatly appreciated. This research was
14 supported by NASA Grant NNN06HD91G and by Grant CA049062 from the National
15 Institute of Health; RWH is supported by grant CA83838 from the National Institute of
16 Health.

17 **REFERENCES**

- 18 1. Little JB. Genomic instability and bystander effects: a historical perspective.
19 Oncogene 2003; 22:6978-87.
- 20 2. Nagasawa H, Little JB. Induction of sister chromatid exchanges by extremely low
21 doses of α -particles. Cancer Res 1992; 52:6394-6.

- 1 3. Nagasawa H, Little JB. Unexpected sensitivity to the induction of mutations by
2 very low doses of alpha-particle irradiation: Evidence for a bystander effect.
3 Radiat Res 1999; 152:552-7.
- 4 4. Zhou H, Randers-Pehrson G, Waldren CA, Vannais D, Hall EJ, Hei TK.
5 Induction of a bystander mutagenic effect of alpha particles in mammalian cells.
6 Proc Natl Acad Sci USA 2000; 97:2099-104.
- 7 5. Ponnaiya B, Jenkins-Baker G, Bigelow A, Marino S, Geard CR. Detection of
8 chromosomal instability in alpha-irradiated and bystander human fibroblasts.
9 Mutat Res 2004; 568:41-8.
- 10 6. Azzam EI, de Toledo SM, Little JB. Direct evidence for the participation of gap-
11 junction mediated intercellular communication in the transmission of damage
12 signals from alpha-particle irradiated to non-irradiated cells. Proc Natl Acad Sci
13 USA 2001; 98:473-8.
- 14 7. Azzam EI, de Toledo SM, Gooding T, Little JB. Intercellular communication is
15 involved in the bystander regulation of gene expression in human cells exposed to
16 very low fluences of alpha particles. Radiat Res 1998; 150:497-504.
- 17 8. Hickman AW, Jaramillo RJ, Lechner JF, Johnson NF. Alpha-particle-induced p53
18 protein expression in a rat lung epithelial cell strain. Cancer Res 1994; 54:5797-
19 800.
- 20 9. Sowa MB, Goetz W, Baulch JE, Pyles DN, Dziegielewska J, Yovino S, et al. Lack
21 of evidence for low-LET radiation induced bystander response in normal human
22 fibroblasts and colon carcinoma cells. Int J Radiat Biol 2010; 86:102-13.

- 1 10. Sawant SG, Randers-Pehrson G, Geard CR, Brenner DJ, Hall EJ. The bystander
2 effect in radiation oncogenesis: I. Transformation in C3H 10T1/2 cells in vitro
3 can be initiated in the unirradiated neighbors of irradiated cells. *Radiat Res* 2001;
4 155:397-401.
- 5 11. Buonanno M, de Toledo SM, Azzam EI. Increased frequency of spontaneous
6 neoplastic transformation in progeny of bystander cells from cultures exposed to
7 densely-ionizing radiation. *PloS one* 2011; 6: art. no. e21540.
- 8 12. Shao C, Furusawa Y, Kobayashi Y, Funayama T, Wada S. Bystander effect
9 induced by counted high-LET particles in confluent human fibroblasts: a
10 mechanistic study. *FASEB J* 2003; 17:1422-7.
- 11 13. Hamada N, Ni M, Funayama T, Sakashita T, Kobayashi Y. Temporally distinct
12 response of irradiated normal human fibroblasts and their bystander cells to
13 energetic heavy ions. *Mutat Res* 2008; 639:35-44.
- 14 14. Harada K, Nonaka T, Hamada N, Sakurai H, Hasegawa M, Funayama T, et al.
15 Heavy-ion-induced bystander killing of human lung cancer cells: role of gap
16 junctional intercellular communication. *Cancer Sci* 2009; 100:684-8.
- 17 15. Fournier C, Becker D, Winter M, Barberet P, Heiss M, Fischer B, et al. Cell
18 cycle-related bystander responses are not increased with LET after heavy-ion
19 irradiation. *Radiat Res* 2007; 167:194-206.
- 20 16. Yang H, Anzenberg V, Held KD. The time dependence of bystander responses
21 induced by iron-ion radiation in normal human skin fibroblasts. *Radiat Res* 2007;
22 168:292-8.

- 1 17. Yang H, Anzenberg V, Held KD. Effects of heavy ions and energetic protons on
2 normal human fibroblasts. *Radiatsionnaia biologii, radioecologii / Rossiiskaia*
3 *akademiia nauk* 2007; 47:302-6.
- 4 18. Buonanno M, De Toledo SM, Pain D, Azzam EI. Long-term consequences of
5 radiation-induced bystander effects depend on radiation quality and dose and
6 correlate with oxidative stress. *Radiat Res* 2011; 175:405-15.
- 7 19. Ponnaiya B, Suzuki M, Tsuruoka C, Uchihori Y, Wei Y, Hei TK. Detection of
8 chromosomal instability in bystander cells after Si490-ion irradiation. *Radiat Res*
9 2011; 176:280-90.
- 10 20. Groesser T, Cooper B, Rydberg B. Lack of bystander effects from high-LET
11 radiation for early cytogenetic end points. *Radiat Res* 2008; 170:794-802.
- 12 21. Fournier C, Barberet P, Pouthier T, Ritter S, Fischer B, Voss KO, et al. No
13 evidence for DNA and early cytogenetic damage in bystander cells after heavy-
14 ion microirradiation at two facilities. *Radiat Res* 2009; 171:530-40.
- 15 22. Cucinotta FA, Chappell LJ. Non-targeted effects and the dose response for heavy
16 ion tumor induction. *Mutat Res* 2010; 687:49-53.
- 17 23. Schultz LB, Chehab NH, Malikzay A, Halazonetis TD. p53 binding protein 1
18 (53BP1) is an early participant in the cellular response to DNA double-strand
19 breaks. *J Cell Biol* 2000; 151:1381-90.
- 20 24. Goodhead DT. The initial physical damage produced by ionizing radiations. *Int J*
21 *Radiat Biol* 1989; 56:623-34.
- 22 25. Ponomarev AL, Cucinotta FA. Nuclear fragmentation and the number of particle
23 tracks in tissue. *Radiat Prot Dosimetry* 2006; 122:354-61.

- 1 26. Hamm RN, Turner JE, Ritchie RH, Wright HA. Calculation of heavy-ion tracks in
2 liquid water. *Radiat Res* 1985; 104:S20-S6.
- 3 27. Cucinotta F, Nikjoo H, Goodhead DT. The effect of delta rays on the number of
4 particle traversals per cell in laboratory and space exposures. *Radiat Res* 1998;
5 150:115-19.
- 6 28. Metting NF, Rossi HH, Braby LA, Kliauga PJ, Howard J, Zaider M, et al.
7 Microdosimetry near the trajectory of high-energy heavy ions. *Radiat Res* 1988;
8 116:183-95.
- 9 29. Elmore E, Lao XY, Kapadia R, Redpath JL. Threshold-type dose response for
10 induction of neoplastic transformation by 1 GeV/nucleon iron ions. *Radiat Res*
11 2009; 171:764-70.
- 12 30. Aiginger H, Andersen V, Ballarini F, Battistoni G, Campanella M, Carboni M, et
13 al. The FLUKA code: new developments and application to 1 GeV/n iron beams.
14 *Adv Space Res* 2005; 35:214-22.
- 15 31. Battistoni G, Muraro S, Sala PR, Cerutti F, Ferrari A, Roesler S, et al., The
16 FLUKA code: Description and benchmarking. In *Proceedings of the Hadronic*
17 *Shower Simulation Workshop 2006* (A. Albrow RR, Ed.), pp. 31-49. AIP
18 Conference Proceeding, Fermilab, 2007.
- 19 32. FLUKA: A Multi-Particle Transport Code. Geneva: CERN European
20 organization for nuclear research; 2005.
- 21 33. Terasima T, Tolmach LJ. Changes in x-ray sensitivity of HeLa cells during the
22 division cycle. *Nature* 1961; 190:1210-11.

- 1 34. Gaillard S, Pusset D, de Toledo SM, Fromm M, Azzam EI. Propagation distance
2 of the alpha-particle-induced bystander effect: the role of nuclear traversal and
3 gap junction communication. *Radiat Res* 2009; 171:513-20.
- 4 35. Gray LH, Conger AD, Ebert M, Hornsey S, Scott OC. The concentration of
5 oxygen dissolved in tissues at the time of irradiation as a factor in radiotherapy.
6 *Br J Radiol* 1953; 26:638-48.
- 7 36. Rueckert RR, Mueller GC. Effect of oxygen tension on HeLa cell growth. *Cancer*
8 *Res* 1960; 20:944-9.
- 9 37. Neti PV, de Toledo SM, Perumal V, Azzam EI, Howell RW. A multi-port low-
10 fluence alpha-particle irradiator: fabrication, testing and benchmark
11 radiobiological studies. *Radiat Res* 2004; 161:732-8.
- 12 38. Charlton DE, Sephton R. A relationship between microdosimetric spectra and cell
13 survival for high-LET irradiation. *Int J Radiat Biol* 1991; 59:447-57.
- 14 39. Cucinotta FA, Katz R, Wilson JW. Radial distribution of electron spectra from
15 high-energy ions. *Radiat Environ Biophys* 1998; 37:259-65.
- 16 40. FLUKA. Version 2011.2.12. Battistoni G, Broggi F, Brugger M, Campanella M,
17 Carboni M, Empl A, et al. 2011.
- 18 41. Cornforth MN, Schillaci ME, Goodhead DT, Carpenter SG, Wilder ME, Sebring
19 RJ, et al. Radiobiology of ultrasoft X rays. III. Normal human fibroblasts and the
20 significance of terminal track structure in cell inactivation. *Radiat Res* 1989;
21 119:511-22.
- 22 42. Woodard HQ, White DR. The composition of body tissues. *Br J Radiol* 1986;
23 59:1209-18.

- 1 43. Stadtman ER. Oxidation of free amino acids and amino acid residues in proteins
2 by radiolysis and by metal-catalyzed reactions. *Annu Rev Biochem* 1993; 62:797-
3 821.
- 4 44. Voulgaridou GP, Anestopoulos I, Franco R, Panayiotidis MI, Pappa A. DNA
5 damage induced by endogenous aldehydes: current state of knowledge. *Mutat Res*
6 2011; 711:13-27.
- 7 45. Romero-Calvo I, Ocon B, Martinez-Moya P, Suarez MD, Zarzuelo A, Martinez-
8 Augustin O, et al. Reversible Ponceau staining as a loading control alternative to
9 actin in Western blots. *Anal Biochem* 2010; 401:318-20.
- 10 46. Rappold I, Iwabuchi K, Date T, Chen J. Tumor suppressor p53 binding protein 1
11 (53BP1) is involved in DNA damage-signaling pathways. *J Cell Biol* 2001;
12 153:613-20.
- 13 47. Wilson PF, Nham PB, Urbin SS, Hinz JM, Jones IM, Thompson LH. Inter-
14 individual variation in DNA double-strand break repair in human fibroblasts
15 before and after exposure to low doses of ionizing radiation. *Mutat Res* 2010;
16 683:91-7.
- 17 48. Ugenskiene R, Prise K, Folkard M, Lekki J, Stachura Z, Zazula M, et al. Dose
18 response and kinetics of foci disappearance following exposure to high- and low-
19 LET ionizing radiation. *Int J Radiat Biol* 2009; 85:872-82.
- 20 49. Canman CE, Lim DS, Cimprich KA, Taya Y, Tamai K, Sakaguchi K, et al.
21 Activation of the ATM kinase by ionizing radiation and phosphorylation of p53.
22 *Science* 1998; 281:1677-9.

- 1 50. Valerie K, Yacoub A, Hagan MP, Curiel DT, Fisher PB, Grant S, et al. Radiation-
2 induced cell signaling: inside-out and outside-in. *Molecular Can Ther* 2007;
3 6:789-801.
- 4 51. Bohlen TT, Dosanjh M, Ferrari A, Gudowska I, Mairani A. FLUKA simulations
5 of the response of tissue-equivalent proportional counters to ion beams for
6 applications in hadron therapy and space. *Phys Med Biol* 2011; 56:6545-61.
- 7 52. Bohlen TT, Cerutti F, Dosanjh M, Ferrari A, Gudowska I, Mairani A, et al.
8 Benchmarking nuclear models of FLUKA and GEANT4 for carbon ion therapy.
9 *Phys Med Biol* 2010; 55:5833-47.
- 10 53. *Managing Space Radiation Risk in the New Era of Space Exploration.*
11 Washington, D.C.: The National Academies Press; 2008.
- 12 54. Cucinotta F, Durante M. Cancer risk from exposure to galactic cosmic rays:
13 implications for space exploration by human beings. *Lancet Oncol* 2006; 7:431-5.
- 14 55. Azzam EI, de Toledo SM, Little JB. Oxidative metabolism, gap junctions and the
15 ionizing radiation-induced bystander effect. *Oncogene* 2003; 22:7050-7.
- 16 56. Anderson RG, Jacobson K. A role for lipid shells in targeting proteins to
17 caveolae, rafts, and other lipid domains. *Science* 2002; 296:1821-5.
- 18 57. Poli G, Schaur RJ, Siems WG, Leonarduzzi G. 4-hydroxynonenal: a membrane
19 lipid oxidation product of medicinal interest. *Med Res Rev* 2008; 28:569-631.
- 20 58. Petkau A. Role of superoxide dismutase in modification of radiation injury. *Br J*
21 *Cancer Suppl* 1987; 8:87-95.

- 1 59. Spitz DR, Azzam EI, Li JJ, Gius D. Metabolic oxidation/reduction reactions and
2 cellular responses to ionizing radiation: a unifying concept in stress response
3 biology. *Cancer Metastasis Rev* 2004; 23:311-22.
- 4 60. Iliakis G. The role of DNA double strand breaks in ionizing radiation-induced
5 killing of eukaryotic cells. *Bioessays* 1991; 13:641-8.
- 6 61. Asaithamby A, Uematsu N, Chatterjee A, Story MD, Burma S, Chen DJ. Repair
7 of HZE-particle-induced DNA double-strand breaks in normal human fibroblasts.
8 *Radiat Res* 2008; 169:437-46.
- 9 62. Northum JD, Guetersloh SB, Braby LA. FLUKA capabilities for microdosimetric
10 analysis. *Radiat Res* 2012; 177:117-23.
- 11 63. Hamm RN, Wright HA, Katz R, Turner JE, Ritchie RH. Calculated yields and
12 slowing-down spectra for electrons in liquid water: implications for electron and
13 photon RBE. *Phys Med Biol* 1978; 23:1149-61.
- 14 64. Howell RW. Radiation spectra for Auger-electron emitting radionuclides: Report
15 No. 2 of AAPM Nuclear Medicine Task Group No. 6. *Med Phys* 1992; 19:1371-
16 83.
- 17 65. Jain MR, Li M, Chen W, Liu T, De Toledo SM, Pandey BN, et al. In vivo space
18 radiation-induced non-targeted responses: late effects on molecular signaling in
19 mitochondria. *Curr Mol Pharmacol* 2011; 4:106-14.
- 20 66. Blakely EA. New measurements for hadrontherapy and space radiation: biology.
21 *Phys Med* 2001; 17 Suppl 1:50-8.

- 1 67. Little JB, Nagasawa H, Li GC, Chen DJ. Involvement of the nonhomologous end
2 joining DNA repair pathway in the bystander effect for chromosomal aberrations.
3 Radiat Res 2003; 159:262-7.
- 4 68. Mothersill C, Seymour RJ, Seymour CB. Bystander effects in repair-deficient cell
5 lines. Radiat Res 2004; 161:256-63.
- 6 69. Azzam EI, de Toledo SM, Spitz DR, Little JB. Oxidative metabolism modulates
7 signal transduction and micronucleus formation in bystander cells from alpha-
8 particle-irradiated normal human fibroblast cultures. Cancer Res 2002; 62:5436-
9 42.
- 10 70. Lorimore SA, Chrystal JA, Robinson JI, Coates PJ, Wright EG. Chromosomal
11 instability in unirradiated hemaopoietic cells induced by macrophages exposed in
12 vivo to ionizing radiation. Cancer Res 2008; 68:8122-6.
- 13 71. Cucinotta FA, Plante I, Ponomarev AL, Kim MH. Nuclear interactions in heavy
14 ion transport and event-based risk models. Radiat Prot Dosimetry 2011; 143:384-
15 90.
- 16 72. Meesungnoen J, Jay-Gerin J-P, Radiation chemistry of liquid water with heavy
17 ions: Monte Carlo simulation studies. In *Charged Particle and Photon*
18 *Interactions with Matter Recent Advances, Applications, and Interfaces* (Hatano
19 Y, Katsumura Y, Mozumder A, Eds.), pp. 355-400. Taylor and Francis, Boca
20 Raton, FL, 2011.
- 21 73. Turner JE, Magee JL, Wright HA, Chatterjee A, Hamm RN, Ritchie RH. Physical
22 and chemical development of electron tracks in liquid water. Radiat Res 1983;
23 96:437-49.
- 24

FIGURE LEGENDS

1

2 **Figure 1.** Western blot analyses of p-TP53ser15, p-ERK1/2, p21^{Waf1} and HDM2 in
3 AG1522 cell populations at [A] 15 min, [B] 1 h, [C] 3 h, [D] 6 and 24 h after exposure to
4 an absorbed dose of 0, 0.2 or 1 cGy from 1000 MeV/u ⁵⁶Fe ions, 600 MeV/u ²⁸Si ions or
5 3.7 MeV α particles. Staining with Ponceau S Red was used as loading control. Each
6 immunoblot is representative of 2-7 experiments. Fold change represents relative change
7 compared to the control (i.e. 0 cGy).

8 **Figure 2.** Oxidative stress in confluent AG1522 cells harvested 24 h after exposure to
9 low mean absorbed doses of 1000 MeV/u ⁵⁶Fe ion. Immunoblot analyses of [A] protein
10 carbonylation, and [B] lipid peroxidation (measured by 4-HNE protein adduct
11 accumulation). In the case of protein carbonylation, the relative intensity (i.e. fold-
12 change) in oxidation of the overall spectrum of proteins (~30-130 kDa) in irradiated cells
13 was compared to that in control cells. For 4-HNE protein adduct accumulation, the
14 relative intensity refers to the level of the band with arrow relative to control. Staining
15 with Ponceau S Red was used as loading control. Each immunoblot is representative of
16 3 experiments.

17 **Figure 3.** Western blot analyses of p21^{Waf1}, p-TP53ser15 and HDM2 in AG1522 cell
18 populations exposed to 1000 MeV/u ⁵⁶Fe ions. Confluent cells were exposed to a mean
19 absorbed dose of 1 cGy and subcultured in fresh medium (1:3). Samples were harvested
20 for analyses 8 and 24 h after irradiation. Staining with Ponceau S Red was used as
21 loading control. Each immunoblot is representative of 3-5 experiments. Fold change
22 represents relative change compared to the control.

23

1 **Figure 4.** Kinetics of 53BP1 foci formation in confluent AG1522 cell cultures exposed to
2 0.2 cGy from 1000 MeV/u ^{56}Fe ions (Panel A), 3.7 MeV α particles (Panel B) or
3 600 MeV/u ^{28}Si ions (Panel C). The data represent the excess percent increase (ΔF) of
4 cells with 53BP1 foci in irradiated cell populations relative to the respective control
5 calculated as $\Delta F = 100 (F_{\text{irradiated}} - F_{\text{control}})$ where F is the ratio of the number of cells with
6 53BP1 foci over the total number of cells counted. Each graph is representative of
7 3 different experiments. χ^2 test was performed on the total number of cells compared with
8 respective control in irradiated populations . (*: $p < 0.05$; **: $p < 0.01$; ***: $p < 0.001$).

9 **Figure 5.** Representative images of etched tracks and 53BP1 foci in AG1522 cell cultures
10 grown on dishes with CR-39-nuclear track detector bottom. The cultures were fixed for
11 analyses at 15 min after exposure to 0.2 cGy of 1000 MeV/u ^{56}Fe ions: (A) visualization
12 of etched tracks; (B) 53BP1 immuno-detection (red); (C) stained with DAPI; (D) images
13 in A-C are super-imposed with the black dots representing etched tracks in (A) converted
14 to white for better visualization.

15 **Figure 6.** FLUKA simulation of radial distribution of dose, per primary irradiating
16 particle, in 1 μm -thick cell culture layer exposed to 0.2 cGy of 1000 MeV/u ^{56}Fe ions.
17 [A] Radial distribution of dose of ^{56}Fe ions, heavy ions, 1 keV-threshold electrons and the
18 total dose. [B] Radial distribution of dose of electrons with various δ ray-thresholds (1,
19 10 and 100 keV and 1 MeV). Panels [C] and [D] illustrate radial distribution of dose from
20 heavy ions (primary and secondary) and electrons, respectively, by superimposing the
21 radial dose area over Panel D in Figure 5, where cells traversed by a primary ^{56}Fe ion-
22 track were identified.

1 **Supplementary Figure 1.** Schematics of tissue culture systems used in experiments. [A]
2 Glass-bottomed flaskette (Nalge Nunc International). [B] Tissue culture dish with
3 polyallyl diglycol carbonate (PADC, commonly known as Columbia Resin #39) plastic
4 polymer bottom for HZE-particle-irradiation. Incorporation of a 100 μm -thick PADC
5 film below the glass bottom of the sealable-dish permits visualization of HZE-particle-
6 tracks without interfering with microscopic examination of biological changes. The
7 dishes filled to capacity with pH- and temperature-equilibrated growth medium can be
8 positioned perpendicularly to the incident beam.
9

FOOTNOTES


1

2 ¹ The thickness of $\sim 1 \mu\text{m}$ of an AG1522 cell (41) was estimated from studies in
3 fixed/dehydrated cells grown on Mylar. The actual dimension of a live AG1522 cell
4 grown on glass may be different.

5 ² The absorbed dose (d) per traversal to the thin disk-shaped cell nucleus of the AG1522
6 cell was calculated according to the relation $d = (0.16 \text{ LET}) / (A \rho)$, where A is the cross-
7 sectional area of the cell nucleus (i.e. an average of $\sim 140 \mu\text{m}^2$), and ρ is the density of the
8 cell.


9

In confluent cell cultures



In confluent cell cultures


Oxidative Stress Dose Response to ^{56}Fe ions




In proliferating cells

Dose (cGy)	8 h		24 h	
	⁵⁶ Fe			
	0	1	0	1
p-TP53ser15				
Fold change	1	1.4	1	1.5
p21^{Waf1}				
Fold change	1	2.4	1	1.8
HDM2				
Fold change	1	1.8	1	1.5
Ponceau S Red staining				


[A] 1000 MeV/u ⁵⁶Fe ions (LET ~151 keV/μm)








[B] 3.7 MeV α particles (LET ~109 keV/μm)




[C] 600 MeV/u ²⁸Si ions (LET ~50 keV/μm)







[A] Glass-bottomed flaskette



[B] Tissue culture dish with 100 μm -thick PADC plastic grafted




Table 1: Estimates^a of particle traversals when confluent AG1522 normal human fibroblasts are exposed to mean absorbed dose of 0.2 cGy from radiations that differ in their energy and linear energy transfer (LET)

Ion ^b	Energy (MeV/u)	LET (keV/μm)	Dose (cGy)	Fluence (particles/cm ²)	Average number of traversals		Fraction of cell nuclei traversed by 0, 1 or more than 1 particles		
					Cell	Nucleus	P(0)	P(1)	P(≥2)
⁵⁶ Fe ²⁶⁺	1000	151	0.2	8.27×10^3	0.066	0.012	0.988	0.011	0.001
			1.0	4.13×10^4	0.331	0.058	0.944	0.055	0.001
²⁸ Si ¹⁴⁺	600	50	0.2	2.50×10^4	0.200	0.035	0.966	0.033	0.001
			1.0	1.25×10^5	0.999	0.175	0.840	0.147	0.013
¹² C ⁶⁺	290	13	0.2	9.60×10^4	0.768	0.134	0.874	0.118	0.008
			1.0	4.80×10^5	3.841	0.672	0.511	0.343	0.146
⁴ He ²⁺ (α)	0.92	109	0.2	1.15×10^4	0.092	0.016	0.984	0.016	0.000
			1.0	5.72×10^4	0.458	0.080	0.923	0.074	0.003

^a These estimates do not take into account secondary radiations.

^b Note that the primary ions are stripped of electrons. The charge is implied, but not designated, elsewhere in this publication.

Table 2: Contribution of primary and secondary particles to the mean absorbed dose in the *cell monolayer* (0.001 cm³) when 1000 MeV/u ⁵⁶Fe, 600 MeV/u ²⁸Si, or 290 MeV/u ¹²C ions are used to deliver 0.2 cGy to the AG1522 cell culture.

Particles ^a	⁵⁶ Fe		²⁸ Si		¹² C	
	Absorbed Dose ^b (cGy)	Contribution to total dose (%)	Absorbed Dose ^b (cGy)	Contribution to total dose (%)	Absorbed Dose ^b (cGy)	Contribution to total dose (%)
HZE primary	0.1221	59.87	0.1232	60.96	0.1268	62.06
HZE fragments	0.0007	0.35	0.0004	0.20	0.0002	0.09
Electrons	0.0807	39.57	0.0777	38.44	0.0755	36.94
Photons	2.2013 x 10 ⁻⁶	0.00	1.1169 x 10 ⁻⁶	0.00	8.7095 x 10 ⁻⁷	0.00
Protons	2.3514 x 10 ⁻⁴	0.12	4.7413 x 10 ⁻⁴	0.23	1.0729 x 10 ⁻³	0.53
Alpha	5.1070 x 10 ⁻⁵	0.03	1.4144 x 10 ⁻⁴	0.07	3.5004 x 10 ⁻⁴	0.17
Total	0.2039	100.00	0.2021	100.00	0.2043	100

^a Production thresholds for δ rays were set at 1 keV. Transport cut-offs were set at 150 eV for electrons and 1 keV for HZE particles, protons, photons and α particles.

^b Errors in the absorbed doses are detailed in Supplementary Tables 2-4.

Supplementary Table 1: Results of Western Blot analyses of p-TP53ser15, p-ERK1/2, p21^{Waf1}, HDM2, protein carbonylation and lipid peroxidation related to the data in [A] Figure 1, [B] Figure 2 and [C] Figure 3, after exposure of AG1522 cells to an absorbed dose of 0, 0.2 or 1 cGy from 1000 MeV/u ⁵⁶Fe ions, 600 MeV/u ²⁸Si ions or 3.7 MeV α particles.

The number of individual experiment, averaged data and associated errors are noted.

[A] In confluent cell cultures

<i>Particles</i>	<i>Dose</i>	<i>Time</i>	<i>Protein</i>	<i>Fold increase relative to control</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Standard Error (SE)</i>
3.7 MeV α particles	0.2 cGy	15 min	p-TP53ser15	1.5/1.4/1.4/1.5	4	1.5	0.0
	0.2 cGy	15 min	p-ERK1/2	1.3/1.2/1.1	3	1.2	0.1
	0.2 cGy	3 h	p21 ^{Waf1}	1.4/2/1.6	3	1.7	0.2
	1 cGy	15 min	p-TP53ser15	3.3/1.8/2/1.5/2.8/1.7/1.6	7	2.1	0.3
	1 cGy	15 min	p-ERK1/2	1.6/2/2.2/1.8/2.9/2.4	6	2.2	0.2
	1 cGy	3 h	p21 ^{Waf1}	3/1.6/3.6/2.6/2.4/3	6	2.7	0.3
1000 MeV/u ⁵⁶ Fe ions	0.2 cGy	15 min	p-TP53ser15	1.2/1.3/2.5	3	1.7	0.4
	0.2 cGy	15 min	p-ERK1/2	1.6/1.2/1.3	3	1.4	0.1
	0.2 cGy	1 h	HDM2	2.4/1.5/2.2	3	2.0	0.3
	0.2 cGy	1 h	p21 ^{Waf1}	3/3.2/1.5	3	2.6	0.5
	0.2 cGy	1 h	p-TP53ser15	1.6/1.5/1.4	3	1.5	0.1
	0.2 cGy	3 h	p21 ^{Waf1}	2.8/1.7/1.2/1.6/1.3	5	1.7	0.3
	0.2 cGy	6 h	p-TP53ser15	1.8/1.2	2	1.5	0.3
	0.2 cGy	6 h	p21 ^{Waf1}	2.2/1.2/1.7	3	1.7	0.3
	0.2 cGy	24 h	p21 ^{Waf1}	1.6/1.2/1.4	3	1.4	0.1
	0.2 cGy	24 h	p-TP53ser15	1.3/1.4/1.4	3	1.4	0.0
	1 cGy	15 min	p-TP53ser15	1.8/2.4/1.8/7.9/2.8/2.6	6	3.2	1.0
	1 cGy	15 min	p-ERK1/2	2.5/2.9/2.2/4/2.1	5	2.7	0.3
	1 cGy	1 h	HDM2	3.5/2.3/2.2/2.5/2.5/1.4	6	2.4	0.3
	1 cGy	1 h	p21 ^{Waf1}	5.6/1.8/1.6	3	3.0	1.3
	1 cGy	1 h	p-TP53ser15	1.8/1.6/2.6	3	2	0.3
	1 cGy	3 h	p21 ^{Waf1}	3.7/2/2.5/1.7/2.4	5	2.5	0.3
	1 cGy	6 h	p-TP53ser15	2/2.3	2	2.2	0.2
	1 cGy	6 h	p21 ^{Waf1}	3.2/2.4/1.3	3	2.3	0.6
1 cGy	24 h	p21 ^{Waf1}	6/3.7/5	3	4.9	0.7	
1 cGy	24 h	p-TP53ser15	2.3/5.1/2.2	3	3.2	1.0	
600 MeV/u ²⁸ Si ions	0.2 cGy	15 min	p-TP53ser15	2.5/3.1/1.3	3	2.3	0.5
	0.2 cGy	15 min	p-ERK1/2	1.4/1.5/1.2	3	1.4	0.1
	0.2 cGy	3 h	p21 ^{Waf1}	1.8/1.2/1.1	3	1.4	0.2
	1 cGy	15 min	p-TP53ser15	3.4/2.4/1.6/4	4	2.9	0.5
	1 cGy	15 min	p-ERK1/2	3.1/2.1/2.8/1.6	4	2.4	0.3
	1 cGy	3 h	p21 ^{Waf1}	2.5/2.3/2.2	3	2.3	0.1

[B] In confluent cell cultures

<i>Particles</i>	<i>Dose</i>	<i>Time</i>	<i>Protein</i>	<i>Fold increase relative to control</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Standard Error (SE)</i>
1000 MeV/u ⁵⁶ Fe ions	0.2 cGy	24 h	Protein Carbonylation	2.3/6/1.5	3	3.3	1.4
	0.2 cGy	24 h	Lipid peroxydation	1.7/1.4/2.2	3	1.8	0.2
	1 cGy	24 h	Protein Carbonylation	4.1/10/5.5	3	6.5	1.8
	1 cGy	24 h	Lipid peroxydation	6.6/2.1/2.8	3	3.8	1.4

[C] In proliferating cells

<i>Particles</i>	<i>Dose</i>	<i>Time</i>	<i>Protein</i>	<i>Fold increase relative to control</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Standard Error (SE)</i>
1000 MeV/u ⁵⁶ Fe ions	1 cGy	8 h	p-TP53ser15	1.4/1.2/1.5/1.9	4	1.5	0.1
	1 cGy	8 h	p21 ^{Waf1}	2.4/1.3/1.4/1.8/1.8	5	1.7	0.2
	1 cGy	8 h	HDM2	1.8/1.7/1.6	3	1.7	0.1
	1 cGy	24 h	p-TP53ser15	1.5/1.2/2.3/1.3	4	1.6	0.2
	1 cGy	24 h	p21 ^{Waf1}	1.8/2.1/1.5/1.1	4	1.6	0.2
	1 cGy	24 h	HDM2	1.5/2.5/1.1/2.7/1.3	5	1.8	0.3

Supplementary Table 2: Contribution of primary and secondary particles to the mean absorbed dose in the glass coverslip, cell culture and medium when 1000 MeV/u ^{56}Fe ions were used to deliver 0.2 cGy to the AG1522 cell culture. The production thresholds of δ rays were set at [A] 1 keV, [B] 10 keV, [C] 100 keV, [D] 1 MeV. The transport cut-off was set at 1 keV for HZE particles, protons, photons, and α particles. For electrons, it was set at 150 eV (Panel A) or 1 keV (Panels B, C and D).

[A]

1 keV	Glass coverslip (1.9152 cm ³)	Cell Monolayer (0.001 cm ³)		Medium (water) (18.799 cm ³)
Particles	Absorbed Dose (cGy)	Absorbed Dose (cGy)	Contribution to total dose %	Absorbed Dose (cGy)
Total heavy ions	0.1000 ± 0.0007	0.1228 ± 0.0022	60.22 0.35	0.1185 ± 0.0022
^{56}Fe ions	0.0997 ± 0.0007	0.1221 ± 0.0022	59.87	0.1114 ± 0.0022
Electrons	0.0623 ± 0.0004	0.0807 ± 0.0014	39.57	0.0756 ± 0.0014
Photons	3.2609 x 10 ⁻⁶ ± 0.69 %	2.2013 x 10 ⁻⁶ ± 82.22 %	0.00	2.3844 x 10 ⁻⁶ ± 1.11 %
Protons	1.2438 x 10 ⁻⁴ ± 8.72 %	2.3514 x 10 ⁻⁴ ± 21.97 %	0.12	5.1421 x 10 ⁻⁴ ± 2.57 %
Alpha	4.3250 x 10 ⁻⁵ ± 16.40 %	5.1070 x 10 ⁻⁵ ± 102.92 %	0.03	1.5104 x 10 ⁻⁴ ± 3.47 %
Total	0.1626 ± 0.0012	0.2039 ± 0.0036	100	0.1950 ± 0.0036

[B]

10 keV	Glass coverslip (1.9152 cm ³)	Cell Monolayer (0.001 cm ³)		Medium (water) (18.799 cm ³)
Particles	Absorbed Dose (cGy)	Absorbed Dose (cGy)	Contribution to total dose %	Absorbed Dose (cGy)
Total heavy ions	0.1206 ± 0.0011	0.1452 ± 0.0020	71.67 0.44	0.1404 ± 0.0019
^{56}Fe ions	0.1202 ± 0.0011	0.1443 ± 0.0020	71.23	0.1320 ± 0.0018
Electrons	0.0412 ± 0.0004	0.0569 ± 0.0009	28.08	0.0529 ± 0.0007
Photons	2.7719 x 10 ⁻⁶ ± 0.92 %	1.9991 x 10 ⁻⁶ ± 14.62 %	0.00	2.1064 x 10 ⁻⁶ ± 1.35 %
Protons	1.6855 x 10 ⁻⁴ ± 7.96 %	2.8335 x 10 ⁻⁴ ± 16.52 %	0.14	6.1175 x 10 ⁻⁴ ± 3.49 %
Alpha	5.7126 x 10 ⁻⁵ ± 16.36 %	9.6370 x 10 ⁻⁵ ± 57.56 %	0.05	1.7112 x 10 ⁻⁴ ± 4.38 %
Total	0.1622 ± 0.0015	0.2025 ± 0.0029	100	0.1943 ± 0.0026

[C]

100 keV	Glass coverslip (1.9152 cm ³)	Cell Monolayer (0.001 cm ³)		Medium (water) (18.799 cm ³)
Particles	Absorbed Dose (cGy)	Absorbed Dose (cGy)	Contribution to total dose %	Absorbed Dose (cGy)
Total heavy ions	0.1420 ± 0.0008	0.1698 ± 0.0018	84.94 0.48	0.1642 ± 0.0018
⁵⁶ Fe ions	0.1416 ± 0.0008	0.1688 ± 0.0018	84.46	0.1546 ± 0.0016
Electrons	0.0198 ± 0.0.001	0.0294 ± 0.0004	14.72	0.0301 ± 0.0003
Photons	1.5099 x 10 ⁻⁶ ± 0.79 %	1.0620 x 10 ⁻⁶ ± 74.71 %	0.00	1.3329 x 10 ⁻⁶ ± 2.33 %
Protons	1.8447 x 10 ⁻⁴ ± 8.36 %	3.5205 x 10 ⁻⁴ ± 12.33 %	0.18	7.0077 x 10 ⁻⁴ ± 2.84 %
Alpha	5.6496 x 10 ⁻⁵ ± 13.10 %	1.5287 x 10 ⁻⁴ ± 98.28 %	0.08	1.9140 x 10 ⁻⁴ ± 4.40 %
Total	0.1622 ± 0.0009	0.1999 ± 0.0021	100	0.1954 ± 0.0021

[D]

1 MeV	Glass coverslip (1.9152 cm ³)	Cell Monolayer (0.001 cm ³)		Medium (water) (18.799 cm ³)
Particles	Absorbed Dose (cGy)	Absorbed Dose (cGy)	Contribution to total dose %	Absorbed Dose (cGy)
Total heavy ions	0.1633 ± 0.0008	0.1922 ± 0.0027	97.66 0.61	0.1858 ± 0.0016
⁵⁶ Fe ions	0.1628 ± 0.0008	0.1910 ± 0.0028	97.05	0.1751 ± 0.0016
Electrons	0.0016 ± 0.72 %	0.0040 ± 0.0001	2.03	0.0069 ± 0.0001
Photons	3.0758 x 10 ⁻⁷ ± 2.36 %	4.9817 x 10 ⁻⁸ ± 75.16 %	0.00003	1.7904 x 10 ⁻⁷ ± 14.80 %
Protons	2.0372 x 10 ⁻⁴ ± 7.36 %	3.4352 x 10 ⁻⁴ ± 8.05 %	0.17	7.4120 x 10 ⁻⁴ ± 3.54 %
Alpha	6.1595 x 10 ⁻⁵ ± 12.03 %	1.1259 x 10 ⁻⁴ ± 78.06 %	0.05	2.0916 x 10 ⁻⁴ ± 4.68 %
Total	0.1653 ± 0.0008	0.1968 ± 0.0029	100	0.1939 ± 0.0016

Errors represent standard deviations of the mean. When the standard deviation is < 0.0001 cGy, it is expressed and noted in % as it can represent a high deviation. The term “total heavy ion” refers to the primary 1000 MeV/u ⁵⁶Fe ions and the fragments.

Supplementary Table 3: Contribution of primary and secondary particles to the mean absorbed dose in the glass coverslip, cell culture and medium when 600 MeV/u ²⁸Si ions were used to deliver 0.2 cGy to the AG1522 cell culture. The production thresholds of δ rays were set at [A] 1 keV, [B] 10 keV, [C] 100 keV, [D] 1 MeV. The transport cut-off was set at 1 keV for HZE particles, protons, photons, and α particles. For electrons, it was set at 150 eV (Panel A) or 1 keV (Panels B, C and D).

[A]

1 keV	Glass coverslip (1.9152 cm ³)	Cell Monolayer (0.001 cm ³)	Medium (water) (18.799 cm ³)
Particles	Absorbed Dose (cGy)	Absorbed Dose (cGy)	Contribution to total dose %
Total heavy ions	0.1006 ± 0.0003	0.1236 ± 0.0012	61.16 0.20
²⁸ Si ions	0.1003 ± 0.0010	0.1232 ± 0.0012	60.96
Electrons	0.0611 ± 0.0006	0.0777 ± 0.0012	38.44
Photons	3.1033 x 10 ⁻⁶ ± 1.40 %	1.1169 x 10 ⁻⁶ ± 82.11 %	0.00
Protons	2.7759 x 10 ⁻⁴ ± 5.06 %	4.7413 x 10 ⁻⁴ ± 26.76 %	0.23
Alpha	1.0644 x 10 ⁻⁴ ± 13.94 %	1.4144 x 10 ⁻⁴ ± 73.98 %	0.07
Total	0.1622 ± 0.0016	0.2021 ± 0.0024	100

[B]

10 keV	Glass coverslip (1.9152 cm ³)	Cell Monolayer (0.001 cm ³)	Medium (water) (18.799 cm ³)
Particles	Absorbed Dose (cGy)	Absorbed Dose (cGy)	Contribution to total dose %
Total heavy ions	0.1218 ± 0.0008	0.1467 ± 0.0014	73.11 0.26
²⁸ Si ions	0.1215 ± 0.0008	0.1462 ± 0.0014	72.85
Electrons	0.0392 ± 0.0003	0.0531 ± 0.0009	26.44
Photons	2.5971 x 10 ⁻⁶ ± 0.75 %	1.0276 x 10 ⁻⁶ ± 54.41 %	0.00
Protons	3.4229 x 10 ⁻⁴ ± 7.30 %	5.7103 x 10 ⁻⁴ ± 22.19 %	0.28
Alpha	1.2456 x 10 ⁻⁴ ± 8.93 %	1.0788 x 10 ⁻⁴ ± 82.28 %	0.05
Total	0.1617 ± 0.0010	0.2007 ± 0.0023	100

[C]

100 keV	Glass coverslip (1.9152 cm ³)	Cell Monolayer (0.001 cm ³)		Medium (water) (18.799 cm ³)
Particles	Absorbed Dose (cGy)	Absorbed Dose (cGy)	Contribution to total dose %	Absorbed Dose (cGy)
Total heavy ions	0.1434 ± 0.0004	0.1708 ± 0.0011	86.74 0.31	0.1671 ± 0.0014
²⁸ Si ions	0.1431 ± 0.0012	0.1702 ± 0.0011	86.43	0.1616 ± 0.0013
Electrons	0.0175 ± 0.0001	0.0250 ± 0.0003	12.70	0.0241 ± 0.0002
Photons	1.3178 x 10 ⁻⁶ ± 0.90 %	6.7873 x 10 ⁻⁷ ± 157.79 %	0.00	1.0610 x 10 ⁻⁶ ± 2.89 %
Protons	3.9845 x 10 ⁻⁴ ± 7.79 %	7.0894 x 10 ⁻⁴ ± 14.22 %	0.36	1.3842 x 10 ⁻³ ± 1.63 %
Alpha	1.3043 x 10 ⁻⁴ ± 12.69 %	1.8740 x 10 ⁻⁴ ± 67.54 %	0.10	3.4464 x 10 ⁻⁴ ± 4.14 %
Total	0.1616 ± 0.0014	0.1969 ± 0.0013	100	0.1933 ± 0.0016

[D]

1 MeV	Glass coverslip (1.9152 cm ³)	Cell Monolayer (0.001 cm ³)		Medium (water) (18.799 cm ³)
Particles	Absorbed Dose (cGy)	Absorbed Dose (cGy)	Contribution to total dose %	Absorbed Dose (cGy)
Total heavy ions	0.1633 ± 0.0012	0.1938 ± 0.0041	98.43 0.36	0.1887 ± 0.0030
²⁸ Si ions	0.1630 ± 0.0122	0.1931 ± 0.0409	98.07	0.1827 ± 0.0296
Electrons	0.0007 ± 0.0000	0.0019 ± 0.0001	0.96	0.0027 ± 0.0000
Photons	1.4358 x 10 ⁻⁷ ± 5.34 %	1.8106 x 10 ⁻⁸ ± 210.82 %	0.00	6.5495 x 10 ⁻⁸ ± 20.30 %
Protons	3.7917 x 10 ⁻⁴ ± 9.00 %	6.5103 x 10 ⁻⁴ ± 14.40 %	0.48	1.4250 x 10 ⁻³ ± 3.29 %
Alpha	1.3149 x 10 ⁻⁴ ± 11.76 %	1.1953 x 10 ⁻⁴ ± 38.38 %	0.06	3.8005 x 10 ⁻⁴ ± 4.26 %
Total	0.1647 ± 0.0012	0.1969 ± 0.0041	100	0.1937 ± 0.0031

Errors represent standard deviations of the mean. When the standard deviation is <0.0001 cGy, it is expressed and noted in % as it can represent a high deviation. The term “total heavy ion” refers to the primary 600 MeV/u ²⁸Si ions and the fragments.

Supplementary Table 4: Contribution of primary and secondary particles to the mean absorbed dose in the glass coverslip, cell culture and medium when 290 MeV/u ¹²C ions are used to deliver 0.2 cGy to the AG1522 cell culture. The production thresholds of δ rays were set at [A] 1 keV, [B] 10 keV, [C] 100 keV, [D] 1 MeV. The transport cut-off was set at 1 keV for HZE particles, protons, photons and α particles. For electrons, it was set at 150 eV (Panel A) or 1 keV (Panels B, C and D).

[A]

1 keV	Glass coverslip (1.9152 cm ³)	Cell Monolayer (0.001 cm ³)		Medium (water) (18.799 cm ³)
Particles	Absorbed Dose (cGy)	Absorbed Dose (cGy)	Contribution to total dose %	Absorbed Dose (cGy)
Total heavy ions	0.1024 ± 0.0001	0.1270 ± 0.0013	62.15 0.09	0.1265 ± 0.0001
¹² C ions	0.1023 ± 0.0006	0.1268 ± 0.0013	62.06	0.1249 ± 0.0011
Electrons	0.0613 ± 0.0004	0.0755 ± 0.0015	36.94	0.0710 ± 0.0006
Photons	3.0082 x 10 ⁻⁶ ± 0.93 %	8.7095 x 10 ⁻⁷ ± 138.13 %	0.00	1.9454 x 10 ⁻⁶ ± 2.67 %
Protons	6.0239 x 10 ⁻⁴ ± 10.79 %	1.0729 x 10 ⁻³ ± 34.90 %	0.53	2.2658 x 10 ⁻³ ± 4.59 %
Alpha	2.6778 x 10 ⁻⁴ ± 15.20 %	3.5004 x 10 ⁻⁴ ± 84.32 %	0.17	7.1590 x 10 ⁻⁴ ± 4.49 %
Total	0.1649 ± 0.0011	0.2043 ± 0.0029	100	0.2011 ± 0.0018

[B]

10 keV	Glass coverslip (1.9152 cm ³)	Cell Monolayer (0.001 cm ³)		Medium (water) (18.799 cm ³)
Particles	Absorbed Dose (cGy)	Absorbed Dose (cGy)	Contribution to total dose %	Absorbed Dose (cGy)
Total heavy ions	0.1256 ± 0.0010	0.1525 ± 0.0019	74.89 0.21	0.1521 ± 0.0019
¹² C ions	0.1254 ± 0.0010	0.1521 ± 0.0020	74.68	0.1501 ± 0.0019
Electrons	0.0378 ± 0.0003	0.0490 ± 0.0009	24.05	0.0443 ± 0.0005
Photons	2.4343 x 10 ⁻⁶ ± 1.24 %	9.3402 x 10 ⁻⁷ ± 105.77 %	0.00	1.6359 x 10 ⁻⁶ ± 4.67 %
Protons	7.7265 x 10 ⁻⁴ ± 14.18 %	1.3566 x 10 ⁻³ ± 36.62 %	0.67	2.7321 x 10 ⁻³ ± 4.26 %
Alpha	3.5199 x 10 ⁻⁴ ± 13.32 %	2.3531 x 10 ⁻⁴ ± 98.87 %	0.12	7.0770 x 10 ⁻⁴ ± 5.66 %
Total	0.1648 ± 0.0013	0.2037 ± 0.0030	100	0.2007 ± 0.0024

[C]

100 keV	Glass coverslip (1.9152 cm ³)	Cell Monolayer (0.001 cm ³)		Medium (water) (18.799 cm ³)
Particles	Absorbed Dose (cGy)	Absorbed Dose (cGy)	Contribution to total dose %	Absorbed Dose (cGy)
Total heavy ions	0.1489 ± 0.0001	0.1787 ± 0.0033	88.92 0.20	0.1772 ± 0.0015
¹² C ions	0.1486 ± 0.0012	0.1783 ± 0.0032	88.72	0.1749 ± 0.0016
Electrons	0.0148 ± 0.001	0.0198 ± 0.0006	9.86	0.0183 ± 0.0002
Photons	1.1053 x 10 ⁻⁶ ± 1.82 %	3.7904 x 10 ⁻⁷ ± 170.03 %	0.00	7.8355 x 10 ⁻⁷ ± 5.69 %
Protons	8.5832 x 10 ⁻⁴ ± 14.21 %	1.5021 x 10 ⁻³ ± 21.36 %	0.75	3.0876 x 10 ⁻³ ± 4.44 %
Alpha	3.4244 x 10 ⁻⁴ ± 15.08 %	4.6763 x 10 ⁻⁴ ± 59.71 %	0.23	9.3214 x 10 ⁻⁴ ± 6.61 %
Total	0.1653 ± 0.0013	0.2009 ± 0.0031	100	0.2004 ± 0.0018

[D]

1 MeV	Glass coverslip (1.9152 cm ³)	Cell Monolayer (0.001 cm ³)		Medium (water) (18.799 cm ³)
Particles	Absorbed Dose (cGy)	Absorbed Dose (cGy)	Contribution to total dose %	Absorbed Dose (cGy)
Total heavy ions	0.1654 ± 0.0013	0.1971 ± 0.0038	98.30 0.15	0.1958 ± 0.0014
¹² C ions	0.1652 ± 0.0014	0.1910 ± 0.0038	98.15	0.1934 ± 0.0013
Electrons	5.0037 x 10 ⁻⁷ ± 73.15 %	7.0334 x 10 ⁻⁷ ± 83.07 %	0.00	1.7944 x 10 ⁻⁶ ± 26.38 %
Photons	3.2179 x 10 ⁻⁷ ± 101.49 %	0.0000 ± 0.0000	0.00	1.6590 x 10 ⁻¹¹ ± 78.71 %
Protons	7.5727 x 10 ⁻⁵ ± 11.64 %	1.5147 x 10 ⁻⁴ ± 26.84 %	0.08	2.8089 x 10 ⁻⁴ ± 3.62 %
Alpha	3.4659 x 10 ⁻⁴ ± 16.25 %	6.5669 x 10 ⁻⁴ ± 0.0006	0.33	9.9823 x 10 ⁻⁴ ± 7.15 %
Total	0.1670 ± 0.0014	0.2005 ± 0.0037	100	0.2010 ± 0.0013

Errors represent standard deviations of the mean. When the standard deviation is <0.0001 cGy, it is expressed and noted in % as it can represent a high deviation. The term “total heavy ion” refers to the primary 290 MeV/u ¹²C ions and the fragments.