



HAL
open science

Low doses of uranium and osteoclastic bone resorption: key reciprocal effects evidenced using new in vitro biomimetic models of bone matrix

Tatiana Gritsaenko, Valérie Pierrefite-Carle, Gaëlle Creff, Bastien Simoneau,
Agnès Hagège, Delphine Farlay, Sophie Pagnotta, François Orange, Xavier
Jaurand, Christophe Den Auwer, et al.

► **To cite this version:**

Tatiana Gritsaenko, Valérie Pierrefite-Carle, Gaëlle Creff, Bastien Simoneau, Agnès Hagège, et al..
Low doses of uranium and osteoclastic bone resorption: key reciprocal effects evidenced using new
in vitro biomimetic models of bone matrix. *Archives of Toxicology*, 2021, 95 (3), pp.1023-1037.
10.1007/s00204-020-02966-1 . hal-03108237

HAL Id: hal-03108237

<https://hal.science/hal-03108237>

Submitted on 3 Nov 2021

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
2
3
4 **Low doses of uranium and osteoclastic bone resorption: key reciprocal**
5 **effects evidenced using new *in vitro* biomimetic models of bone matrix.**
6
7
8
9

10
11 Tatiana Gritsaenko¹, Valérie Pierrefite-Carle¹, Gaëlle Creff², Bastien Simoneau¹, Agnès
12 Hagège³, Delphine Farlay⁴, Sophie Pagnotta⁵, François Orange⁵, Xavier Jaurand⁶,
13
14 Christophe Den Auwer², Georges F. Carle¹, Sabine Santucci-Darmanin^{1*}
15
16
17
18
19

- 20 1. Université Côte d'Azur, CEA, Institut Frédéric Joliot, TIRO-MATOs, 06107 Nice, France
21
22 2. Université Côte d'Azur, CNRS, Institut de Chimie de Nice, 06108 Nice, France
23
24 3. Université de Lyon, CNRS, Université Lyon 1, Institut des Sciences Analytiques, 69100
25 Villeurbanne, France
26
27 4. Université de Lyon, INSERM, Université Claude Bernard Lyon 1, LYOS UMR1033,
28 F69008, Lyon, France
29
30 5. Université Côte d'Azur, Centre Commun de Microscopie Appliquée (CCMA), 06108 Nice,
31 France
32
33 6. Université de Lyon, Université Claude Bernard Lyon 1, Centre Technologique des
34 Microstructures, 5 rue Raphaël Dubois, 69622 Villeurbanne Cedex, France
35
36
37
38

39 * **Corresponding author:** Sabine Santucci-Darmanin
40

41 Email: santucci@unice.fr
42

43 Phone: +33 4 93 37 76 29
44

45 ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5354-6988>
46

47 Postal address : UMR E4320 TIRO-MATOs, Faculté de Médecine, 28 avenue de
48 Valombrose, 06107 Nice, France
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 **Abstract**
5
6

7 Uranium is widely spread in the environment due to its natural and anthropogenic
8 occurrences, hence the importance of understanding its impact on human health. The
9 skeleton is the main site of long-term accumulation of this actinide. However, interactions of
10 this metal with biological processes involving the mineralized extracellular matrix and bone
11 cells are still poorly understood. To get a better insight of these interactions, we developed
12 new biomimetic bone matrices containing low doses of natural uranium (up to 0.85 μg per
13 cm^2 of uranium). These models were characterized by spectroscopic and microscopic
14 approaches before being used as a support for the culture and differentiation of pre-
15 osteoclastic cells. In doing so, we demonstrate that uranium can exert opposite effects on
16 osteoclast resorption depending on its concentration in the bone microenvironment. Our
17 results also provide evidence for the first time that resorption contributes to the
18 remobilization of bone matrix-bound uranium. In agreement with this, we identified, by
19 HRTEM, uranium phosphate internalized in vesicles of resorbing osteoclasts. Thanks to the
20 biomimetic matrices we developed, this study highlights the complex mutual effects
21 between osteoclasts and uranium. This demonstrates the relevance of these 3D models to
22 further study the cellular mechanisms at play in response to uranium storage in bone tissue
23 and thus better understand the impact of environmental exposure to uranium on human
24 bone health.
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

50 **Keywords :**
51
52
53

54 Uranium, Bone, Extracellular Matrix, Osteoclasts, Resorption, Biomimetic models
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 **Declarations**
5
6

7 **Acknowledgements and Funding**
8

9
10 The authors would like to thank Chantal Cros and Colette Ricort for helpful technical
11 assistance. The authors acknowledge the MARS beamline of SOLEIL synchrotron (Gif sur
12 Yvette, France) that was used to perform XAS experiments and the IRCAN's Molecular and
13 Cellular Core Imaging (PICMI) Facility which is supported by grants from the Ministère de
14 l'Enseignement Supérieur, the Région PACA, the Conseil Départemental des Alpes
15 Maritimes, INSERM, the FEDER, the GIS IBiSA, the Canceropole PACA and the foundation
16 ARC. The author's lab work was funded by Université Côte d'Azur (UCA) and grants from
17 the CEA ("Programme Transversal de Toxicologie Nucléaire") and the ANR (ANR-16-
18 CE34-0003-01). CCMA electron microscopy equipments have been funded by the Région
19 Sud PACA, the Conseil Départemental des Alpes Maritimes and the GIS-IBiSA.
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33

34 **Conflicts of interest**
35

36 The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.
37
38
39

40 **Availability of data and material**
41

42 All data generated or analyzed during this study are included in this published article [and
43 its supplementary information files] or are available from the corresponding author on
44 reasonable request.
45
46
47
48
49
50

51 **Code availability**
52

53 Not Applicable
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Introduction

Natural uranium is a radioactive heavy metal widely used in various civil and military applications, which raises a problem of environmental pollution. In most environmental systems, natural uranium is found as the uranyl ion UO_2^{2+} in the oxidation state +VI [referred as U(VI) hereafter]. Natural uranium-specific radioactivity being low, its toxic effects are mostly due to chemical damages to target organs, mainly the kidney and the skeleton (ATSDR 2013). In the skeleton, U(VI) accumulates in a dose- and time-dependent manner (Arruda-Neto et al. 2004; Larivière et al. 2013) and can be retained for several years (Leggett 1994; ATSDR 2013). The affinity of uranium for phosphate, one of the two main constituents of bone mineral, has been proposed to explain this behavior (Neuman and Neuman 1949). Since then, several studies have been conducted to examine the distribution of U(VI) in bone samples and have shown that this metal is rapidly fixed onto bone surfaces, preferentially on those undergoing active mineralization (Priest et al. 1982; Rodrigues et al. 2013; Bourgeois et al. 2015) and become buried with time by the apposition of new bone (Ellender et al. 1995; Bourgeois et al. 2015). However, to date, no mechanism explaining the biomineralization of U(VI) is formally accepted. This is probably related to the complexity of the bone matrix and the different types of chemical interactions that can occur between uranyl cations and the different mineral and organic components of the bone matrix (Vidaud et al. 2012).

Acute or chronic exposure to U(VI) has been reported to affect bone formation in animal models (Guglielmotti et al. 1984; Guglielmotti et al. 1985; Ubios et al. 1991; Díaz Sylvester et al. 2002; Bozal et al. 2005; Wade-Gueye et al. 2012). Consistent with this observation, *in vitro* investigations have shown that U(VI) affects the viability and the function of both osteoblasts and osteocytes, which are the cells in charge of bone construction and bone

1
2
3
4 remodeling regulation, respectively (Tasat et al. 2007; Milgram et al. 2008; Pierrefite-Carle
5 et al. 2016; Hurault et al. 2019). Interestingly, U(VI) could exert its toxicity in both
6 osteoblasts and osteocytes by altering the autophagic pathway, a major catabolic process
7 (Pierrefite-Carle et al. 2016; Hurault et al. 2019).
8
9

10
11
12
13 The third type of bone cells crucial for bone remodeling is the osteoclast, which is
14 responsible for bone resorption. Osteoclasts are large multinucleated cells resulting from
15 the fusion of hematopoietic precursors and are able to solubilize both the mineral and
16 organic components of the bone matrix. Autoradiographic and radiological analyses of
17 bones isolated from rats injected with uranium, led to the proposal that resorption
18 contributes to the distribution of uranium in the skeleton (Priest et al. 1982). Uranium could
19 be resorbed from the bone surface, returned to the bloodstream and partially re-deposited
20 in bone. A few studies then examined the effect of U(VI) on bone resorption *in vivo* (Ubios
21 et al. 1991; Bozal et al. 2005; Fukuda et al. 2006). Ubios et al (1991) observed an increase
22 in bone resorption by histomorphometric analysis of periodontal cortical bone in Wistar rats
23 14 days after intraperitoneal injection of uranyl nitrate. In mice given a lethal oral dose of
24 uranyl nitrate, histomorphometric measurements of metaphyseal bone also revealed an
25 extension of resorption surfaces compared to untreated animals (Bozal et al., 2005). On the
26 other hand, no significant modification of metaphyseal bone resorption was observed after
27 intramuscular injection of depleted uranium in rats in a later study (Fukuda et al. 2006). In
28 addition to these animal studies using different models, uranium doses, and routes of
29 administration, making the comparison difficult, an epidemiological investigation has
30 addressed the question of the effects on bone health of uranium naturally present in
31 drinking water. The authors provided evidence of a positive association (only in men)
32 between uranium exposure and serum levels of the carboxy-terminal telopeptide, an
33 indicator of bone resorption. Taken together, these *in vivo* studies led to the proposal that
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 uranium might promote resorption. At the cellular level, we have recently demonstrated that
5
6 5 μM of uranyl ion (UO_2^{2+}) in solution is sufficient to strongly inhibit osteoclastic resorption
7
8 due to an impairment of osteoclast formation and survival (Gritsaenko et al. 2017). To
9
10 better understand the mechanism underlying the apparent discrepancy between the *in vivo*
11
12 and *in vitro* effect of U(VI) on resorption and to mimic the physiological bone environment,
13
14 we decided to examine the effect of U(VI) immobilized in bone-like matrices on the behavior
15
16 and function of osteoclasts. As biomimetic material, we used a synthetic hydroxyapatite
17
18 matrix as well as a "biological" matrix synthesized by an osteoblastic cell line *in vitro*. Using
19
20 both biological and chemical approaches, these two supports were characterized and used
21
22 to further analyze the effect of U(VI) on osteoclast function and to determine whether
23
24 osteoclasts are able to remobilize the uranium trapped in the matrix via resorption, which
25
26 has never been formally demonstrated.
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Materials and Methods

Uranium exposure

The stock solution of natural uranium (isotopic composition 99.27% ^{238}U , 0.72% ^{235}U , and 0.006% ^{234}U) (100 mM, pH 4) was obtained by dissolving 85 mg of uranyl acetate ($\text{UO}_2(\text{OCOCH}_3)_2 \cdot 2\text{H}_2\text{O}$; $M = 424 \text{ g}\cdot\text{mol}^{-1}$) in 2 ml of distilled water. This stock solution was used to prepare extemporaneously working solutions, under conditions to control uranium speciation in the cell culture media of exposure, as previously described (Gritsaenko et al. 2017, 2018).

Cell culture

The Saos-2 cell line and the mouse monocyte/macrophage cell line RAW 264.7 were purchased from the American Type Culture Collection. Saos-2 cells were cultured as described by Lutter et al. (2010) with some modifications. Briefly, Saos-2 cells were maintained in McCoy's 5A medium without phenol red (HyClone, Thermo Fisher Scientific) supplemented with 15% heat-inactivated fetal bovine serum (Biowest) and antibiotics (100 IU/mL penicillin, 100 $\mu\text{g}/\text{mL}$ streptomycin, Sigma-Aldrich). RAW 264.7 cells were maintained in Dulbecco's modified Eagle medium (DMEM, Lonza) supplemented with 5% HyClone serum (HyClone, Thermo Fisher Scientific) and antibiotics (100 IU/ml penicillin and 100 $\mu\text{g}/\text{ml}$ streptomycin). Cells were grown in 75 cm^2 flasks and passed by mechanical scraping.

Biomimetic matrices

24-well Osteo assay plates that provide a synthetic inorganic bone mimetic surface (Corning Life Science) were incubated at 37°C with α MEM medium (1ml/well) containing

1
2
3
4 the indicated concentration of U(VI). After 48 hours, the medium was discarded and the
5
6 plates were used directly either for U(VI) quantification or for osteoclastic differentiation and
7
8 resorption assays.
9

10 For matrix production, 20,000 Saos-2 cells/well of complete McCoy's 5A medium were
11
12 seeded in 24-well culture plates. When the confluence reached 90%, growth medium was
13
14 replaced by differentiation medium (α -MEM, 10% heat-inactivated FBS, 300 μ M ascorbic
15
16 acid, 10 mM β -glycerol phosphate) containing either 0, 0.5, 1 or 2 μ M U(VI). Culture
17
18 medium without or with U(VI) was changed on days 3, 5 and 7 of culture. On day 10, the
19
20 resulting matrices were de-cellularized with 20 mM NH₄OH for 10 min. at room
21
22 temperature, then treated with DNase I (1 mg/ml in α -MEM) for 15 min. at 37°C, rinsed in α -
23
24 MEM medium and immediately used either for U(VI) quantification or for osteoclastic
25
26 differentiation and resorption assays.
27
28
29
30
31
32

33 **Mineralization assay**

34
35 The Saos-2 cells were seeded in 24-well plates at a density of 20.000 cells/well. When
36
37 subconfluence was reached. the growth medium was replaced with differentiation
38
39 medium containing either 0. 0.5. 1 or 2 μ M U(VI) and the culture was maintained for 10
40
41 days with a change of medium every 2-3 days.
42
43

44 For mineralization evaluation, cultures were fixed with 4% formaldehyde solution
45
46 (Sigma-Aldrich), rinsed with deionized water and stained with 1% Alizarin Red S
47
48 solution (Alfa Aesar. ThermoFisher Scientific) for 5 min. Intensive washes with
49
50 deionised water were then carried out before the plates were left to dry and
51
52 photographed. Images of each well were analyzed with ImageJ software to evaluate
53
54 the percentage of mineralized area.
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Osteoclast generation, TRAP staining and pit resorption assays

Osteoclastic differentiation and resorption were analyzed as previously described (Gritsaenko et al. 2017, 2018) with minor modifications. Briefly, RAW 264.7 pre-osteoclastic cells were seeded at a density of 5000 cells/cm² on synthetic apatite matrices (osteo assay plates) and a density of 20,000 cells/cm² on matrices produced by Saos-2 cells, in the following differentiation medium: alpha modified Minimum Essential Medium (α MEM, Lonza) with 2 mM L-Glutamine (Sigma-Aldrich), 5% HyClone fetal bovine serum, 100 IU/mL penicillin, 100 μ g/mL streptomycin (Sigma-Aldrich) and 50 ng/ml of the recombinant cytokine GST-RANKL. The medium was changed on day 3.

To analyse osteoclastogenesis, cells obtained on day 4 (for cells cultured on synthetic apatite matrice) or on day 5 (for cells cultured on Saos-2 matrices) were fixed for 2 min at room regutemperature with 3% formaldehyde and 66% acetone in 7 mM citrate solution and subjected to Tartrate-resistant acid phosphatase (TRAP) staining using Leukocyte acid phosphatase kit as described by the manufacturer (Sigma-Aldrich).

To analyse resorption, osteoclasts obtained after 4 or 5 days were removed from the bone mimetic surface by incubation with 10% bleach for 5 min at room temperature. After two washes in water, plates were incubated 2 min with an Alizarin Red S sodium salt 1% solution (Alfa Aesar), which stains calcium salts, and washed again in water. In order to evaluate the percentage of resorbed area, images of each well were analyzed with ImageJ software. The resorbed surface fraction was then measured using the "limit to threshold" algorithm. The number of experimental replicates and the number of independent experiments performed are provided in the figure legends.

Scanning electron microscopy and EDX analysis

1
2
3
4 For scanning electron microscopy (SEM) and energy-dispersive X-ray spectroscopy (EDX),
5
6 cellularized samples were fixed in a 1.6 % glutaraldehyde solution in 0.1 M sodium
7
8 phosphate buffer (pH 7.4) at room temperature for 1 hour and then stored at 4°C. After
9
10 being rinsed three times with distilled water, samples were dehydrated in a series of ethanol
11
12 baths (70%, 96 %, 100% three times, 15 min each). Samples were then incubated 5
13
14 minutes in hexamethyldisilazane (HMDS) and left to dried overnight. Decellularized
15
16 samples were left to dry. Samples were then mounted on SEM stubs with carbon tape and
17
18 silver paint. For SEM imaging, samples were coated with platinum (3 nm) prior to
19
20 observations with a Jeol JSM-6700F SEM at an accelerating voltage of 3 kV. For EDX
21
22 analyses, sample were carbon coated and analyses were carried with a Tescan Vega3
23
24 XMU scanning electron microscope (TESCAN FRANCE) equipped with an Oxford X-MaxN
25
26 50 EDX detector (Oxford Instruments) with a 20 kV accelerating voltage. EDX data were
27
28 processed with the Aztec software (version 3.1, Oxford Instruments).
29
30
31
32
33

34 35 **Transmission Electron Microscopy and HRTEM-EDX spectroscopy**

36
37 Samples were fixed with 1.6% glutaraldehyde in 0.1 M phosphate solution immediately after
38
39 medium removal. Cells were rinsed with 0.1 M cacodylate buffer and post-fixed for 1 h in the
40
41 same buffer containing 1% osmium tetroxide. After rinsing with distilled water and
42
43 progressive dehydration with increasing ethanol concentration solutions, cells were
44
45 embedded in epoxy resin. Ultrathin sections (70 nm) were realized and put on Formvar-
46
47 coated copper grids. Grids were stained or not with uranyl acetate and lead citrate before
48
49 examination of sections with a Jeol JEM 1400 transmission electron microscope equipped
50
51 with a SIS MORADA camera.
52
53

54
55 For high-resolution transmission electron microscopy (HRTEM), the unstained grids were
56
57 coated with an additional 10 nm-thick carbon coating performed with a turbo-pumped
58
59

1
2
3
4 carbon evaporator (Balzers MDE010), for sample conductivity. Samples were analyzed on
5
6 an HRTEM microscope (JEOL 2100F) with an acceleration voltage of 200 kV and equipped
7
8 with an energy dispersive X-ray (EDX) spectroscopy system. HRTEM images were digitally
9
10 recorded with a Gatan Ultrascan 1000 camera (Gatan), with acquisition software Gatan
11
12 Digital Micrograph. The analysis system was EDS-SDD Oxford X-Max (Oxford
13
14 Instruments). Elements P, Ca and U were quantified by using respectively $OK\alpha$, $PK\alpha$, $CaK\alpha$
15
16 and $UL\alpha$ spectral lines of these elements, and by using a Cliff-Lorimer standardless
17
18 quantification method with INCA software (Oxford Instruments).
19
20
21
22
23

24 **ICP-MS analysis**

25
26 Culture supernatants were acidified with nitric acid (HNO_3) and stored at $-20^\circ C$ until ICP-
27
28 MS analysis. Synthetic and biological matrices were dried at room temperature and rinsed 3
29
30 times using 65% concentrated HNO_3 (3 x 1 ml). Each solution was evaporated to dryness
31
32 on a hotplate after being heated to $120^\circ C$ during 3-4 h and re-dissolved into a HNO_3
33
34 solution at pH 1%. After appropriate dilution in HNO_3 1%, samples were injected via a
35
36 peristaltic pump equipped with Tygon tubing at $400 \mu L/min$ flow rate and nebulized by
37
38 means of a micro-concentric nebulizer. Quantification was performed by inductively coupled
39
40 plasma mass spectrometry (ICP-MS; 7700, Agilent Technologies) at $m/z = 238$. ICP
41
42 conditions were the following: nebulization gas flow rate: $1 L min^{-1}$, dilution gas flow rate:
43
44 $0.1 L/min$, plasma gas flow rate: $15 L/min$, auxiliary gas flow rate: $1 L/min$. Plasma power
45
46 was set to $1550 W$. Other parameters were adjusted to both maximize the analyte signal
47
48 and minimize oxide and doubly charged ions formation. The standard curve (0.4 to 40
49
50 $nmol/L$ of U) was prepared from the PlasmaCAL standard (U $1000 \mu g/mL$, SCPscience).
51
52 The detection limit calculated by the MassHunter software was $0.01 nmol/L$. Each sample
53
54 was measured in triplicate. Between analyses, the system was rinsed for 30 s min with
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 HNO₃ 1% and 30 s with ultrapure water and a blank (HNO₃ 1%) was injected to control the
5
6 absence of any memory effect.
7
8
9

10 **Extended X-Ray Absorption Fine Structure Analysis**

11
12
13 Samples for EXAFS data acquisition were prepared as solid pellets made from a mixing of
14
15 the powder sample itself and polyethylene. Data were recorded at the U L_{III}-edge on the
16
17 MARS beam line at the SOLEIL synchrotron facility (2.75 GeV; 400 mA), which is the
18
19 French bending magnet beamline dedicated to the study of radioactive materials (Sitaud et
20
21 al. 2012). All the measurements were recorded in fluorescence mode using a 13-element
22
23 high purity germanium solid-state detector. EXAFS data were processed with the Athena
24
25 code and fitted in R space with the Artemis code of Demeter package 0.9.25 (Ravel and
26
27 Newville 2005). In all the fits, only one global amplitude factor S_0^2 and one energy threshold
28
29 e_0 factor were considered for all the scattering contributions. Hanning windows with k^2
30
31 weight [2.5; 11.5 Å⁻¹] and fitting range in R space [1.0; 5.0 Å] were selected. Phases and
32
33 amplitudes were calculated with Feff7 code included in Artemis (Rehr et al. 2010) using the
34
35 crystal structure of autunite Ca[(UO₂)(PO₄)₂(H₂O)₁₁] (Locock and Burns 2003). The first two
36
37 single scattering paths correspond to the 2 axial oxygen atoms O_{ax} and to the equatorial
38
39 oxygen atoms O_{eq}. Additional single scattering path corresponding to phosphorous (U...P)
40
41 was also added. Several multiple scattering paths were also needed: quadruple path
42
43 involving axial oxygen atoms (U...O_{ax}...U...O_{ax}), and triple path involving equatorial
44
45 oxygens of phosphates (U...P...O_{eq}). During the fit procedure, the number of axial oxygen
46
47 atoms was fixed to 2 for the UO₂²⁺ oxocation. The agreement factor (in %) and reduced
48
49 quality factor χ^2_r of the fit are both provided as an indication of fit quality in the R space.
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57

58 **Statistical analysis**

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Statistical analyses were performed with Prism 7.00 (GraphPad Software). Due to the size of the samples we used non-parametric approaches. Data were submitted, as indicated, to two-sided Mann-Whitney test or two-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) with the two-stage step-up method of Benjamini, Krieger and Yekutieli to control the false discovery rate.

Results

The synthetic apatite matrix model

The first model used as mineralized matrices containing uranium, was a commercially available synthetic surface made of an inorganic crystalline calcium phosphate (COAS for Corning Osteo-Assay Surface) (Faruqi et al. 2011) that is usually used to assess osteoclast and osteoblast activity *in vitro* (Gigliotti et al. 2016; Gritsaenko et al. 2017, 2018). The plates were incubated with α -MEM medium containing uranyl acetate concentrations ranging from 0 to 100 μ M. After a 48h incubation period, the amount of U(VI) retained on the synthetic surface was measured by ICP-MS (Fig. 1a). We observed that U(VI) was successfully retained on the calcium phosphate layer in a non-linear dose-dependent manner, reaching levels of U(VI) up to 1.4 μ g/well for matrices incubated with 100 μ M U(VI) in solution.

The speciation of uranium within the inorganic calcium phosphate phase was compared to its speciation in a pure autunite sample $[\text{Ca}(\text{UO}_2)_2(\text{PO}_4)_2(\text{H}_2\text{O})_{11}]$. Among uranyl phosphates, autunite is the most stable form and it is also very similar to the uranyl phosphate phase identified into osteoblastic and osteocytic cells exposed to uranium (Pierrefite-Carle et al. 2016; Hurault et al. 2019). The EXAFS spectrum of synthetic matrices exposed to a solution of 100 μ M U(VI) for 48h was recorded at the U L_{III} edge and compared with the EXAFS spectrum of autunite. The EXAFS experimental spectra and corresponding Fourier transforms are shown in Fig. 1b and the best parameters of the fit are presented in Supplementary Table 1. In short, in the synthetic COAS matrix, the uranyl equatorial plane consists of 5.5 ± 0.6 O_{eq} at 2.40 ± 0.3 Å and 4.2 ± 1.0 P at 3.65 ± 0.4 Å compared to 4.1 ± 1.0 O_{eq} at 2.33 ± 0.5 Å and 5.7 ± 1.2 P at 3.59 ± 0.5 Å in the case of pure autunite [crystallographic data for pure autunite phase are: 4 O_{eq} at 2.28 Å and 4 P at 3.60

1
2
3
4 Å (Locock and Burns 2003)]. In both cases, phosphate contributions at about the same
5
6 distance were needed for the fit. Nonetheless, the U-O_{eq} distances in the synthetic matrix
7
8 (2.40 ± 3 Å) are slightly longer than distances in the autunite phase obtained from EXAFS
9
10 (2.33 ± 0.5 Å, this work) and significantly longer than the distances in pure autunite as
11
12 determined by X-ray crystallography (mean 2.28 Å) (Locock and Burns 2003). Altogether,
13
14 these data suggest that U(VI) in the inorganic COAS matrix exists as a phosphate phase,
15
16 with probably a more disordered equatorial plane than in the pure autunite phase (larger
17
18 equatorial coordination number and equatorial distance).
19
20
21
22
23
24

25 **U(VI) and osteoclast behavior on synthetic matrices**

26
27 U(VI)-loaded synthetic matrices were used as cell culture support and substrate for
28
29 osteoclastic resorption to investigate both the fate of U(VI) under different culture conditions
30
31 and the effect of U(VI) on osteoclastic resorption. To this end, we prepared several sets of
32
33 synthetic matrices exposed to increasing concentrations of U(VI) (0, 5, 10, 25, 50 and 100
34
35 µM). Set of matrices with resulting amounts of adsorbed U(VI) ranging from 0 to about 1 µg
36
37 per well, were selected, seeded with RAW 264.7 pre-osteoclastic cells and maintained in
38
39 culture during 4 days with a change of medium performed at the beginning of day 3 (D3)
40
41 (Fig. 2a). The cell cultures were carried out in the absence (RANKL-) or the presence of the
42
43 RANKL (RANKL+) cytokine, which is necessary to induce osteoclastic differentiation of
44
45 precursor cells. It is important to note that, the majority of the osteoclastic resorption occurs
46
47 between culture days 3 and 4 in RANKL+ conditions, i.e. after the culture medium change.
48
49 As shown in Supplementary Fig. 1, osteoclasts, defined as cells having more than 3 nuclei
50
51 and positive for tartrate-resistant acid phosphatase (TRAP) activity staining, were observed
52
53 in the presence of RANKL in all tested conditions. To assess whether U(VI) could be
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 remobilized in the culture medium by osteoclastic resorption, we then evaluated by ICP-MS
5
6 the amounts of U(VI) in culture supernatants on days 3 and 4 as well as in matrices at the
7
8 end of culture on day 4. As shown in Fig. 2b a large part of U(VI), 49 to 70% depending on
9
10 the conditions, was found into the culture medium collected at day 3 (D3 supernatants).
11
12 This was observed in either RANKL- or RANKL+ culture conditions, indicating that U(VI)
13
14 adsorbed on synthetic apatite was massively and passively released into the medium
15
16 during this culture period. Over the next 24 hours, 6 to 7.5% U(VI) were measured in the
17
18 culture medium (D4 supernatants) under RANKL- conditions, while this percentage was
19
20 higher (9 to 13%) under almost all RANKL+ conditions (Fig. 2b). Statistical analysis of the
21
22 amounts of U(VI) present in D4 supernatants (Fig. 2c) showed significant differences
23
24 between RANKL+ and RANKL- supernatants. These findings suggested that U(VI)
25
26 adsorbed on synthetic apatite matrices may be remobilized by osteoclastic resorption. This
27
28 was confirmed by U(VI) quantification in final matrices, showing that all matrices maintained
29
30 under RANKL+ conditions contained less U(VI) than those cultured without RANKL (Fig.
31
32 2d). This trend observed for all U(VI)-loaded matrices became significant for those initially
33
34 containing the highest amount of U(VI) (0.75 and 1 μg) (Fig. 2d).
35
36
37
38
39

40 We next assessed the resorption efficiency of the synthetic matrices as a function of their
41
42 U(VI) content. Matrices containing the highest amounts of U(VI) (0.45, 0.75 and 1 μg)
43
44 showed similar resorption efficiency to matrices without U(VI) (Fig. 3a). In contrast, we
45
46 observed significant stimulation of osteoclastic resorption for matrices containing an
47
48 average of 0.16 and 0.24 μg U(VI), respectively (Fig. 3a). To attempt to understand these
49
50 effects of U(VI) on resorption, the presence of U(VI) in the matrix but also in solution must
51
52 be considered. Indeed, due to the passive release of U(VI) by the synthetic apatite, the
53
54 concentrations of U(VI) in the culture medium reach significant levels that we have
55
56 calculated and reported in Supplementary Table 2. Therefore, it cannot be excluded that
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 the observed effects on resorption are due to uranium in solution. In an attempt to clarify
5 this issue, the direct effect of U(VI) in solution was evaluated by testing concentrations
6 close to those found in the culture supernatants of the synthetic matrices. RAW 264.7 cells
7 were seeded on synthetic matrices with U(VI) concentrations ranging from 0 to 5 μM in the
8 culture medium and in the presence of RANKL. We observed that 0.25 and 0.5 μM U(VI) in
9 the culture medium significantly increased resorption (Fig. 3b), suggesting that the
10 resorption stimulation observed with matrices containing 0.16 and 0.24 μg U(VI) may be
11 due to U(VI) release in the culture medium. In agreement with this hypothesis, we found
12 that concentrations of U(VI) (1 and 3 μM), close to those found in the culture supernatants
13 of the matrices with no effect on resorption (matrices containing 0.45 to 1 μg U(VI), Fig. 3a),
14 had themselves no effect on osteoclastic function (Fig. 3b). Finally, we also replicated our
15 previously reported results (Gritsaenko et al. 2017) showing that 5 μM U(VI) significantly
16 inhibits resorption.
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31

32
33 Taken together, our experiments demonstrate for the first time that osteoclast resorption is
34 capable of remobilizing U(VI) adsorbed on an apatite layer matrix and that low
35 concentrations of remobilized U(VI) may promote osteoclast resorption function. These
36 results also pointed out that U(VI) can have opposite effects on osteoclastic function
37 depending on its concentration.
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45

46 **The biological Saos-2 matrix model**

47
48
49 To get closer to physiological conditions, a second model was developed in the form of
50 extracellular matrices synthesized by an osteoblastic cell line (Saos-2) cultured in the
51 presence of low concentrations of U(VI). Alizarin red staining of the resulting matrices
52 revealed a decrease in mineralization in the presence of uranium [$\approx 29\%$ at 2 μM U(VI)]
53 (Fig. 4a), a result already observed for other types of osteoblastic cells (Pierrefite-Carle et
54
55
56
57
58
59

1
2
3
4 al. 2016; Hurault et al. 2019). SEM analyses showed that Saos-2 cells produces a thin
5
6 matrix with globular structures distributed on it, an architecture that was apparently not
7
8 disturbed by the presence of 2 μM U(VI) during the synthesis phase (Fig. 4b). Energy
9
10 dispersive X-ray (EDX) experiments further established that these globular structures
11
12 correspond to calcium phosphate deposits (Fig. 4c). Moreover, transmission electron
13
14 microscopy showed the presence under both conditions (0 and 2 μM) of collagen fibrils
15
16 recognizable by their band patterning (Fig. 4d). These results indicated that Saos-2 cells
17
18 were able to produce an organic and mineralized extracellular matrix in the presence or
19
20 absence of 2 μM U(VI). The ultrastructure of these matrices did not appear to be affected
21
22 by the presence of 2 μM U(VI), contrary to the level of mineralization, which is noticeably
23
24 reduced under these conditions.
25
26
27

28
29 Although U(VI) could not be detected by EDX in Saos-2 matrices (Fig. 4c) ICP-MS assays
30
31 showed that up to 1 μg U(VI) can be incorporated into a matrix synthesized by Saos-2 (Fig.
32
33 4e). This incorporation was highly reproducible and increased linearly with the amount of
34
35 U(VI) present in the culture medium during matrix synthesis. The EXAFS analyses of
36
37 biological matrix synthesized in the presence of 2 μM U(VI) were also performed. The
38
39 resulting EXAFS spectrum (Fig. 4f) and its fit (Supplementary Table 1) demonstrate the
40
41 presence of a uranyl phosphate phase. The U-O_{eq} distances in biological Saos-2-matrices
42
43 ($2.34 \pm 0.1 \text{ \AA}$) are closer to those of pure autunite as established by EXAFS ($2.33 \pm 0.5 \text{ \AA}$)
44
45 or X-ray crystallography (mean 2.28) (Locock and Burns 2003), than the distances in
46
47 synthetic COAS-matrices (2.40 ± 0.3). Although these differences are at the limit of the
48
49 uncertainties (see Supplementary Table 1), they suggested that the local arrangement
50
51 around uranium is different in the two types of matrices. This could be explained by a more
52
53 organized uranyl phosphate phase in the case of biological matrices.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

U(VI) and osteoclast behavior on biological matrices

Biological matrices prepared from Saos-2 cell culture were decellularized and used as a support for RAW 264.7 cells osteoclastic differentiation according to the protocol presented in Fig. 2a. We first evaluated the distribution of U(VI) and noticed that, as in the case of synthetic matrices, the presence of RANKL appeared to be associated with an increase in U(VI) release (Fig. 5a). This was confirmed by statistical analysis of the quantities of U(VI) present in D5 supernatants (Fig. 5b). In the presence of RANKL, D3 supernatants also contained more U(VI) compared to control samples, although this difference did not reach significance (Fig. 5b). Likewise, the presence of RANKL in the culture medium resulted in a very small and not statistically significant effect on the amount of U(VI) present in the final Saos-2 matrices, detected in the case of the matrices with the lowest initial U(VI) content (0.28 and 0.54 $\mu\text{g U(VI)/well}$) (Fig. 5c). Taken together, these data suggested that part of the U(VI) incorporated in mineralized extracellular biological matrices could be released into the culture medium via osteoclastic resorption, as shown by using the synthetic matrix model.

After checking the formation of osteoclasts on biological matrices (Supplementary Figure 2), we used them to analyze osteoclastic function. We found a low resorption level (Fig. 5d) compared to the one obtained on synthetic matrices (Fig. 3a) and a high inter and intra-experimental variability. In addition, none of the conditions tested led to a significant change in resorption efficiency.

U(VI) detection inside vesicles of resorbing osteoclasts

Using transmission electron microscopy, we then analyzed osteoclasts that have resorbed biological matrices containing either 0 or 1 $\mu\text{g U(VI)}$. In 100% of osteoclasts formed on matrices with U(VI) that we have examined, we noticed one (Fig. 6a) or several large

1
2
3
4 vesicles (Supplementary Fig. 3a) containing both isolated needle- or platelet-shaped
5
6 structures with irregular edges, the latter being very similar to bone apatite crystals both in
7
8 size and morphology (Kim et al. 1995; Su et al. 2003). No equivalent observations were
9
10 made when we examined osteoclasts formed on matrices without U(VI). In addition,
11
12 vesicles with the same content have not been observed on osteoclasts formed on synthetic
13
14 matrices containing or not U(VI). To determine the composition of these intra-vesicular
15
16 structures, high-resolution TEM - Energy-dispersive X-ray spectroscopy (HRTEM-EDX) was
17
18 used and showed that both needles and platelets were of composed uranium and
19
20 phosphorus without a detectable level of calcium in the vast majority of cases (Fig. 6b and
21
22 Supplementary Fig. 3b), suggesting that both of them would actually correspond to the
23
24 same structures positioned differently with respect to the section plane.
25
26
27

28 In conclusion, these data suggested that U(VI) incorporated into biological matrices can
29
30 accumulate in resorbing osteoclasts as uranyl phosphate crystal-like structures, within
31
32 vesicles whose nature and function remains to be determined.
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Discussion

In order to improve our understanding of the effects of U(VI) on osteoclastic resorption and the consequences of resorption on U(VI)-distribution into the skeleton, we developed bone biomimetic matrices containing different amounts of U(VI) and used them as support and substrate for respectively *in vitro* osteoclastic differentiation and resorption. We first obtained synthetic biomimetic matrices containing 0.16 to 1.7 μg U(VI) as determined by ICP-MS. EXAFS analyses further showed that the main speciation of uranium in these bone-like surfaces is a uranyl phosphate phase but apparently less condensed than in the pure autunite phase. We found that up to 70% of U(VI) incorporated in these synthetic matrices could be passively released into the medium after three days of culture. Although the mechanisms of immobilization of U(VI) on apatite have been intensively studied (Bostick et al. 1999; Fuller et al. 2002, 2003; Thakur et al. 2009) they are not fully understood most likely because they depend on a wide range of parameters such as U(VI) speciation, concentration, pH and temperature (Thakur et al. 2009; Mehta et al. 2016). The mechanisms governing U(VI) uptake and the exchanges between the solid and liquid phases in our culture conditions remain to be clarified. However, we considered these synthetic matrices to be relevant for our experiments because they contain U(VI) in a form previously detected inside osteoblasts and osteocytes (Pierrefite-Carle et al. 2016; Hurault et al. 2019) and which is quantifiable by ICP-MS both in the matrix and in culture supernatants, allowing its distribution to be monitored.

To better mimic bone matrix and because interaction between U(VI) and the organic part of the bone matrix is important for U(VI) incorporation (Basset et al. 2013; Qi et al. 2014; Huynh et al. 2016), we also used biological matrices synthesized *in vitro* by Saos-2

1
2
3
4 osteoblastic cells. In our experimental conditions, Saos-2 cells produced a matrix combining
5 mineral and organic phases, as expected (Lutter et al. 2010), and enclosing a maximum of
6
7 1 μg of U(VI). We found that no more than 2 to 4% of U(VI) contained in the initial matrix
8
9 was passively released after 3 days of culture, compared to 70% in the case of synthetic
10
11 surfaces. This difference in U(VI) behavior could be explained by a tighter interaction of
12
13 U(VI) with biological matrices than synthetic ones. Indeed, we hypothesize that U(VI) is
14
15 biomineralized and incorporated in biological matrices while it is simply adsorbed on the
16
17 surface of the synthetic apatite. This hypothesis is strengthened by EXAFS data, which
18
19 suggest that coordination around U(VI) is distinct in both types of matrices with a more
20
21 organized arrangement in the case of biological matrices, as supported by shorter U-O_{eq}
22
23 distances ($2.34 \pm 0.1 \text{ \AA}$ compared to $2.40 \pm 0.3 \text{ \AA}$ in the case of COAS synthetic matrices).
24
25 Interestingly, Mehta et al. (Mehta et al. 2016) found shorter bond lengths between uranium
26
27 and equatorial oxygens in samples prepared by combining U(VI), calcium, and phosphate
28
29 simultaneously (a situation comparable to that of our experiments with biological matrices)
30
31 than in those obtained by adding U(VI) to pre-formed apatite (a situation similar to that of
32
33 our experiments with synthetic matrices). In agreement with our hypothesis, the authors
34
35 proposed that these differences in U(VI) environment reflect the distinct U(VI) uptake
36
37 mechanisms occurring in the two situations: incorporation of U(VI) into the calcium
38
39 phosphate in the first case versus adsorption onto pre-formed apatite in the second case.
40
41
42 In addition, although our EXAFS data suggest that U(VI) is mainly present as a mineral
43
44 autunite-like phase in Saos-2-synthesized matrices, it cannot be excluded that part of U(VI)
45
46 is complexed with matrix proteins such as osteopontin which binds U(VI) with nanomolar
47
48 affinity, or other non-collagenous SIBLING proteins which share features favorable to the
49
50 binding of uranyl cations (Qi et al. 2014).
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 The monitoring of U(VI) distribution during cell culture, also showed that the presence of
5
6 resorbing cells (obtained when RAW 264.7 cells were cultured in the presence of RANKL)
7
8 is associated with a significant increase in the release of U(VI) from matrices. This was
9
10 observed for both synthetic and biological matrices. The results are significantly more
11
12 robust in the case of synthetic apatite, certainly due to the important level of resorption
13
14 obtained with these substrates. Indeed, by quantifying resorption, we observed that this
15
16 process was more effective on synthetic matrices (up to 47 % of the well surface) than on
17
18 biological matrices (up to 13 % of the well surface), regardless of the presence of uranium.
19
20 This could be explained by the fact that synthetic matrices are made up of a very thin layer
21
22 of very homogeneous apatite while biological ones are thicker and heterogeneous with an
23
24 organic and mineral phase. However, taken together these results provide the first direct
25
26 evidence that uranium can be remobilized via osteoclastic resorption.
27
28
29
30

31
32
33 We then sought to determine the influence of uranium on osteoclast activity. First, we found
34
35 that resorption was significantly increased for synthetic matrices containing 0.16 or 0.24 μg
36
37 of U(VI). Due to the passive release of U(VI) from the synthetic apatite, the use of these
38
39 matrices led to an accumulation of U(VI) in the culture medium which after three days of
40
41 culture reached concentrations close to 0.3 and 0.6 μM , respectively. This prompted us to
42
43 evaluate the direct effect of U(VI) in solution by testing concentrations close to those found
44
45 in the culture supernatants of the synthetic matrices. In doing so, we observed that 0.25
46
47 and 0.5 μM U(VI) in the culture medium induced significant stimulation of resorption. These
48
49 data led us to propose that the stimulation of resorption observed using the synthetic
50
51 matrices with 0.16 and 0.24 μg U(VI) was in fact due to U(VI) released into the culture
52
53 medium rather than U(VI) immobilized on the apatite. Resorption stimulation was not
54
55 observed for Saos-2 matrices, even for those containing amounts of U(VI) comparable to
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 those present in synthetic matrices with increased resorption (0.28 μg for biological
5 matrices versus 0.24 μg for synthetic matrices). This discrepancy could result from the
6 different levels of U(VI) released in the culture medium depending on the type of matrices
7 (almost 20 times more for synthetic matrices than for biological ones) and strengthens the
8 hypothesis that the observed effects on resorption are mainly due to U(VI) present in the
9 liquid phase.
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19

20 More importantly, our findings indicate for the first time that U(VI) can exert opposite effects
21 on osteoclast behavior as a function of its concentration: 5 μM U(VI) inhibits resorption as
22 shown here and in our previous study (Gritsaenko et al. 2017), whereas 0.25 μM promotes
23 it, in our *in vitro* conditions. These data should be compared with those obtained *in vivo*,
24 which suggest an increase in resorption after exposure to U(VI) (Ubios et al. 1991; Kurttio
25 et al. 2005; Bozal et al. 2005; Fukuda et al. 2006). By decreasing the concentration of U(VI)
26 in our experiments, we may have moved closer to realistic conditions. However, it must be
27 stressed that the comparison remains complex, especially since uranium is not
28 homogeneously distributed in bones and concentrates mainly in the remodeling areas
29 (Priest et al. 1982; Ellender et al. 1995; Bourgeois et al. 2015). This raises the possibility
30 that, *in vivo*, substantial concentrations of U(VI) may be reached in bone remodeling
31 compartments, which are specialized structures providing a confined microenvironment
32 involved in the local regulation of remodeling and where exchanges of organic and mineral
33 matrix constituents are thought to take place (Hauge et al. 2001; Eriksen 2010). Our results
34 also raise the question of molecular mechanisms involved in the opposite effects of U(VI)
35 on osteoclastic function. Analysis of the different stages of osteoclastic differentiation and
36 resorption using the different methodologies and tools we have developed should clarify
37 this point.
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 During resorption, bone degradation products are internalized into osteoclasts at the level
5
6 of their apical ruffled border, packaged into transcytosis vesicles and transported through
7
8 the cell to a restricted area of the basolateral membrane (called the functional secretion
9
10 domain), where they are secreted (Ng et al. 2019). Transmission electron microscopy
11
12 experiments revealed that osteoclasts that have resorbed biological matrices containing
13
14 U(VI), have one or more vesicles up to several μm in size, in which needle and platelet-
15
16 shaped structures are homogeneously distributed. EDX spectroscopy further determined
17
18 that these structures are formed of uranium phosphate and that most of them do not
19
20 contain calcium. These results raise the possibility that during the resorption process, the
21
22 autunite-like phase identified in the matrix may be bio-transformed into a calcium-free
23
24 uranium phosphate phase, found internalized in the vesicles of resorbing osteoclasts. It has
25
26 been suggested that dissolution of autunite minerals under acidic condition leads to the
27
28 formation of uranyl-phosphate crystals (Wellman et al. 2007). During the resorption
29
30 process, the extracellular compartment formed between the osteoclast and the bone
31
32 surface is acidified via proton secretion by the V-ATPase, allowing the apatite to dissolve.
33
34 Hence, it is tempting to speculate that autunite present in the mineralized matrix could be
35
36 dissolved in this acidified resorption compartment, resulting in the formation of uranyl-
37
38 phosphate crystals potentially internalized in transcytosis vesicles (Fig. 7). U(VI), thus
39
40 conditioned, could cross osteoclasts to be secreted via the functional secreting domain
41
42 along with other degradation products.
43
44
45
46
47

48
49 Vesicles with needle and platelets were not observed in osteoclasts that have resorbed
50
51 synthetic matrix. This could be explained by the nature of this matrix, which is so thin that
52
53 resorbing osteoclasts reach very quickly the plastic surface. One hypothesis would be that
54
55 the actin ring becomes loose under such conditions, and that the degradation products
56
57 resulting from resorption are then released directly into the extracellular medium without
58
59

1
2
3
4 undergoing transcytosis.
5

6 In conclusion, this study shows that pre-osteoclasts and osteoclasts are particularly
7 sensitive cells to U(VI), whose function can be stimulated or inhibited depending on the
8 concentration of U(VI) in the environment. Our results also provide the first evidence, at the
9 cellular level, that resorption contributes to the remobilization of U(VI). Furthermore, they
10 lead us to propose that U(VI) cycling in bone would include a transition from an autunite to
11 a uranyl-phosphate phase, which could be promoted by resorption lacunae acidification.
12 Finally, we hereby report a first characterization of U(VI)-containing matrices that could be
13 used as 3D models of the bone microenvironment. These models should be helpful either
14 to further study mechanisms involved in uranium distribution in the skeleton, or to decipher
15 the cellular and molecular mechanisms at play in response to uranium presence in bone.
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

References

- Arruda-Neto JDT, Guevara MVM, Nogueira GP, et al (2004) Long-term accumulation of uranium in bones of Wistar rats as a function of intake dosages. *Radiat Prot Dosimetry* 112:385–393. <https://doi.org/10.1093/rpd/nch405>
- ATSDR (2013) ATSDR - Toxicological Profile: Uranium. <http://www.atsdr.cdc.gov/toxprofiles/TP.asp?id=440&tid=77>. Accessed 22 Jul 2016
- Basset C, Averseng O, Ferron P-J, et al (2013) Revision of the biodistribution of uranyl in serum: is fetuin-A the major protein target ? *Chem Res Toxicol* 26:645–653. <https://doi.org/10.1021/tx400048u>
- Bostick WD, Jarabek RJ, Conca JL (1999) Phosphate-induced metal stabilization: Use of apatite and bone char for the removal of soluble radionuclides in authentic and simulated DOE groundwater. Air and Waste 92nd annual meeting and exhibition proceedings
- Bourgeois D, Burt-Pichat B, Le Goff X, et al (2015) Micro-distribution of uranium in bone after contamination: new insight into its mechanism of accumulation into bone tissue. *Anal Bioanal Chem* 407:6619–6625. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00216-015-8835-7>
- Bozal CB, Martinez AB, Cabrini RL, Ubios AM (2005) Effect of ethane-1-hydroxy-1,1-bisphosphonate (EHBP) on endochondral ossification lesions induced by a lethal oral dose of uranyl nitrate. *Arch Toxicol* 79:475–481. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00204-005-0649-5>
- Díaz Sylvester PL, López R, Ubios AM, Cabrini RL (2002) Exposure to subcutaneously implanted uranium dioxide impairs bone formation. *Arch Environ Health* 57:320–325. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00039890209601415>
- Ellender M, Haines JW, Harrison JD (1995) The distribution and retention of plutonium, americium and uranium in CBA/H mice. *Hum Exp Toxicol* 14:38–48. <https://doi.org/10.1177/096032719501400109>

- 1
2
3
4 Eriksen EF (2010) Cellular mechanisms of bone remodeling. *Rev Endocr Metab Disord*
5 11:219–227. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11154-010-9153-1>
6
7
8 Faruqi AF, Rao H, Causer J, Beltzer JP (2011) Corning osteo assay surface for the study of
9 bone resorption. *Bone* 48:S47. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bone.2010.10.132>
10
11
12 Fukuda S, Ikeda M, Chiba M, Kaneko K (2006) Clinical diagnostic indicators of renal and
13 bone damage in rats intramuscularly injected with depleted uranium. *Radiat Prot*
14 *Dosim* 118:307–314. <https://doi.org/10.1093/rpd/nci350>
15
16
17
18 Fuller CC, Bargar JR, Davis JA (2003) Molecular-scale characterization of uranium sorption
19 by bone apatite materials for a permeable reactive barrier demonstration. *Environ*
20 *Sci Technol* 37:4642–4649. <https://doi.org/10.1021/es0343959>
21
22
23
24 Fuller CC, Bargar JR, Davis JA, Piana MJ (2002) Mechanisms of uranium interactions with
25 hydroxyapatite: implications for groundwater remediation. *Environ Sci Technol*
26 36:158–165. <https://doi.org/10.1021/es0108483>
27
28
29
30
31 Gigliotti CL, Boggio E, Clemente N, et al (2016) ICOS-Ligand Triggering Impairs Osteoclast
32 Differentiation and Function In Vitro and In Vivo. *J Immunol* 197:3905–3916.
33 <https://doi.org/10.4049/jimmunol.1600424>
34
35
36
37 Gritsaenko T, Pierrefite-Carle V, Creff G, et al (2018) Methods for Analyzing the Impacts of
38 Natural Uranium on In Vitro Osteoclastogenesis. *J Vis Exp*.
39 <https://doi.org/10.3791/56499>
40
41
42
43 Gritsaenko T, Pierrefite-Carle V, Lorivel T, et al (2017) Natural uranium impairs the
44 differentiation and the resorbing function of osteoclasts. *Biochim Biophys Acta-Gen*
45 *Subj* 1861:715–726. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bbagen.2017.01.008>
46
47
48
49 Guglielmotti MB, Ubios AM, Cabrini RL (1985) Alveolar wound healing alteration under
50 uranyl nitrate intoxication. *J Oral Pathol Med* 14:565–572.
51 <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1600-0714.1985.tb00530.x>
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

- 1
2
3
4 Guglielmotti MB, Ubios AM, de Rey BM, Cabrini RL (1984) Effects of acute intoxication with
5 uranyl nitrate on bone formation. *Experientia* 40:474–476.
6 <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01952392>
7
8
9
10 Hauge EM, Qvesel D, Eriksen EF, et al (2001) Cancellous bone remodeling occurs in
11 specialized compartments lined by cells expressing osteoblastic markers. *J Bone*
12 *Miner Res* 16:1575–1582. <https://doi.org/10.1359/jbmr.2001.16.9.1575>
13
14
15
16 Hurault L, Creff G, Hagège A, et al (2019) Uranium Effect on Osteocytic Cells In Vitro.
17 *Toxicol Sci* 170:199–209. <https://doi.org/10.1093/toxsci/kfz087>
18
19
20
21 Huynh T-NS, Vidaud C, Hagège A (2016) Investigation of uranium interactions with calcium
22 phosphate-binding proteins using ICP/MS and CE-ICP/MS. *Metallomics* 8:1185–
23 1192. <https://doi.org/10.1039/c6mt00147e>
24
25
26
27 Kim HM, Rey C, Glimcher MJ (1995) Isolation of calcium-phosphate crystals of bone by
28 non-aqueous methods at low temperature. *J Bone Miner Res* 10:1589–1601.
29 <https://doi.org/10.1002/jbmr.5650101021>
30
31
32
33 Kurttio P, Komulainen H, Leino A, et al (2005) Bone as a possible target of chemical toxicity
34 of natural uranium in drinking water. *Environ Health Persp* 113:68–72
35
36
37
38 Larivière D, Tolmachev SY, Kochermin V, Johnson S (2013) Uranium bone content as an
39 indicator of chronic environmental exposure from drinking water. *J Environ Radioact*
40 121:98–103. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvrad.2012.05.026>
41
42
43
44 Leggett RW (1994) Basis for the ICRP's age-specific biokinetic model for uranium. *Health*
45 *Phys* 67:589–610
46
47
48 Locock AJ, Burns PC (2003) The crystal structure of synthetic autunite,
49 $\text{Ca}[(\text{UO}_2)(\text{PO}_4)]_2(\text{H}_2\text{O})_{11}$. *Am Mineral* 88:240–244. [https://doi.org/10.2138/am-](https://doi.org/10.2138/am-2003-0128)
50 2003-0128
51
52
53
54 Lutter A-H, Hempel U, Wolf-Brandstetter C, et al (2010) A novel resorption assay for
55 osteoclast functionality based on an osteoblast-derived native extracellular matrix. *J*
56 *Cell Biochem* 109:1025–1032. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jcb.22485>
57
58
59

- 1
2
3
4 Mehta VS, Maillot F, Wang Z, et al (2016) Effect of Reaction Pathway on the Extent and
5 Mechanism of Uranium(VI) Immobilization with Calcium and Phosphate. *Environ Sci*
6 *Technol* 50:3128–3136. <https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.est.5b06212>
7
8
9
10 Milgram S, Carrière M, Thiebault C, et al (2008) Cytotoxic and phenotypic effects of
11 uranium and lead on osteoblastic cells are highly dependent on metal speciation.
12 *Toxicology* 250:62–69. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tox.2008.06.003>
13
14
15
16 Neuman WF, Neuman MW (1949) The deposition of uranium in bone; adsorption studies in
17 vitro. *J Biol Chem* 179:325–333
18
19
20
21 Ng PY, Brigitte Patricia Ribet A, Pavlos NJ (2019) Membrane trafficking in osteoclasts and
22 implications for osteoporosis. *Biochem Soc Trans* 47:639–650.
23 <https://doi.org/10.1042/BST20180445>
24
25
26
27 Pierrefite-Carle V, Santucci-Darmanin S, Breuil V, et al (2016) Effect of natural uranium on
28 the UMR-106 osteoblastic cell line: impairment of the autophagic process as an
29 underlying mechanism of uranium toxicity. *Arch Toxicol* 91:1903-1914.
30 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00204-016-1833-5>
31
32
33
34
35 Priest ND, Howells GR, Green D, Haines JW (1982) Uranium in bone: metabolic and
36 autoradiographic studies in the rat. *Hum Toxicol* 1:97–114
37
38
39 Qi L, Basset C, Averseng O, et al (2014) Characterization of UO₂(2+) binding to
40 osteopontin, a highly phosphorylated protein: insights into potential mechanisms of
41 uranyl accumulation in bones. *Metallomics* 6:166–176.
42 <https://doi.org/10.1039/c3mt00269a>
43
44
45
46
47 Ravel B, Newville M (2005) ATHENA, ARTEMIS, HEPHAESTUS: data analysis for X-ray
48 absorption spectroscopy using IFEFFIT. *J Synchrotron Radiat* 12:537–541.
49 <https://doi.org/10.1107/S0909049505012719>
50
51
52
53 Rehr JJ, Kas JJ, Vila FD, et al (2010) Parameter-free calculations of X-ray spectra with
54 FEFF9. *Phys Chem Chem Phys* 12:5503–5513. <https://doi.org/10.1039/b926434e>
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

- 1
2
3
4 Rodrigues G, Arruda-Neto JDT, Pereira RMR, et al (2013) Uranium deposition in bones of
5 Wistar rats associated with skeleton development. *Appl Radiat Isotopes* 82:105–
6 110. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apradiso.2013.07.033>
7
8
9
10 Sitaud B, Solari PL, Schlutig S, et al (2012) Characterization of radioactive materials using
11 the MARS beamline at the synchrotron SOLEIL. *J Nucl Mater* 425:238–243.
12 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jnucmat.2011.08.017>
13
14
15
16 Su X, Sun K, Cui FZ, Landis WJ (2003) Organization of apatite crystals in human woven
17 bone. *Bone* 32:150–162. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S8756-3282\(02\)00945-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S8756-3282(02)00945-6)
18
19
20
21 Tasat DR, Orona NS, Mandalunis PM, et al (2007) Ultrastructural and metabolic changes in
22 osteoblasts exposed to uranyl nitrate. *Arch Toxicol* 81:319–326.
23 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00204-006-0165-2>
24
25
26
27 Thakur P, Moore RC, Choppin GR (2009) Sorption of U(VI) species on hydroxyapatite.
28 *Radiochim Acta* 93:385–391. <https://doi.org/10.1524/ract.2005.93.7.385>
29
30
31 Ubios AM, Guglielmotti MB, Steimetz T, Cabrini RL (1991) Uranium inhibits bone formation
32 in physiologic alveolar bone modeling and remodeling. *Environ Res* 54:17–23.
33 [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0013-9351\(05\)80191-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0013-9351(05)80191-4)
34
35
36
37 Vidaud C, Bourgeois D, Meyer D (2012) Bone as target organ for metals: the case of f-
38 elements. *Chem Res Toxicol* 25:1161–1175. <https://doi.org/10.1021/tx300064m>
39
40
41
42 Wade-Gueye NM, Delissen O, Gourmelon P, et al (2012) Chronic exposure to natural
43 uranium via drinking water affects bone in growing rats. *Biochim Biophys Acta-Gen*
44 *Subj* 1820:1121–1127. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bbagen.2012.04.019>
45
46
47
48 Wellman DM, Gunderson KM, Icenhower JP, Forrester SW (2007) Dissolution kinetics of
49 synthetic and natural meta-autunite minerals, $X_{3-n}(n)^+ [(UO_2)(PO_4)]_2 \cdot xH_2O$,
50 under acidic conditions. *Geochem Geophys Geosy* 8.
51 <https://doi.org/10.1029/2007GC001695>
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 **Figure Captions**
5
6
7

8
9 **Fig. 1** U(VI) in synthetic apatite matrix. **a** 24-well COAS plates were incubated for 48 hours
10 with alpha-MEM medium containing the indicated concentrations of uranyl acetate. U(VI)
11 retained on matrix was quantified by ICP-MS. Data represent the mean \pm SD obtained of 5
12 independent experiments each performed in duplicate or triplicate. **b** (Upper panel)
13 Experimental (straight line) and adjusted (dots) EXAFS spectra at the U LIII edge of U(VI)-
14 synthetic matrix. The experimental EXAFS spectrum of autunite model is also shown for
15 comparison; (lower panel) corresponding Fourier transforms
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

27 **Fig. 2** U(VI) release from synthetic matrices. **a** Schematic illustration of the protocol. Series
28 of matrices containing different amounts of U(VI) were prepared. A part of them were used
29 for initial U quantification (initial ECM) and another part was seeded on day 0 (D0) with
30 RAW 264.7 cells in the absence or presence of RANKL. On day 3, culture supernatants (D3
31 supernatant) were harvested to quantify, by ICP/MS, U(VI) potentially released from the
32 matrices and cells were refed with fresh medium (thus free of uranium). On day 4 or 5,
33 culture media were again collected (D4 or D5 supernatant) to measure U(VI) that could
34 have been released since the change of medium at D3, the matrices were de-cellularized
35 and also subjected to U(VI) quantification (final ECM). **b** A bar graph shows the release of
36 U(VI) in culture D3 and D4 supernatants as the percent of U(VI) contained in initial matrices
37 Data are from 2–3 experiments each done in duplicate and given as mean \pm SD if n= 3, or
38 as mean if n= 2. **c** Box plot representations showing minima, first quartile, median, third
39 quartile and maxima of U(VI) quantification in D4 supernatants, according to the presence
40 of RANKL. U(VI) concentrations used to pre-incubate the matrices are indicated in μ M and
41 the average amounts of U(VI) contained in the resulting matrices are given in μ g/well. Data
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 are from 2–3 experiments each done in duplicate or triplicate. Each dot represents a
5
6 replicate. **d** Box plot representations of the quantification of U(VI) remaining in synthetic
7
8 matrices at the end of the culture and after decellularization. (n=3 independent experiments
9
10 in triplicate). P values were determined using two-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) with
11
12 two-stage step-up method of Benjamini, Krieger, and Yekutieli to control the false discovery
13
14 rate. *p <0.05; **p <0.01; na, not applicable (data from 2 experiments); ns, not significant
15
16
17
18
19

20 **Fig. 3** Impact of (U(VI)) on osteoclastic resorption. **a** To analyze osteoclasts behavior on
21
22 synthetic matrices containing U(VI), RAW 264.7 cells were cultured for 4 days in the
23
24 presence of RANKL on synthetic apatite matrices containing, on average, the indicated
25
26 amount of U(VI). Representative processed images of resorbed matrices are shown
27
28 (resorbed area is in black). Box plot representations show minima, first quartile, median,
29
30 third quartile and maxima of the relative quantification of resorbed area with median
31
32 resorbed area in control condition as 100%. n=3-4 independent experiments done in 2-3
33
34 replicates. **b** To determine the effect of low U(VI) concentrations in solution on osteoclasts
35
36 resorptive activity, RAW 264.7 cells were cultured for 4 days on synthetic apatite matrix, in
37
38 the presence of RANKL and the indicated concentrations of U(VI) in the culture medium.
39
40 Representative images of resorbed synthetic matrices and box plot representations of the
41
42 relative quantification of resorbed area are shown. n=3-4 independent experiments each
43
44 done in 2-4 replicates. P values were calculated using a two-sided Mann-Whitney test,
45
46 compared to control condition: 0 μ M U(VI). * p<0,05 ; ns : not significant
47
48
49
50
51
52
53

54 **Fig. 4** U(VI)-containing biological Saos-2 matrix. Saos-2 cells were cultured in the presence
55
56 of the indicated concentrations of U(VI) and under mineralization conditions for 10 days. **a**
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 (Left panel) Representative photograph of calcium deposition as assessed by Alizarin red S
5 staining. (Right panel) Box plots showing the quantification of calcium deposition. n=2
6
7 independent experiments with 4 matrices analyzed per experiment and per condition. **b**
8
9 Representative scanning electron micrographs of decellularized Saos-2 matrix synthesized
10 in the absence (left panel) or in the presence (right panel) of U(VI) in the culture medium. **c**
11
12 Higher magnification of globular-shaped structures found in Saos-2 matrix in the absence of
13 presence of U(VI). EDX analyses indicating calcium and phosphate composition of these
14 structures are shown. **d** Transmission electronic images showing, in both conditions (0 and
15 2 μM [U(VI)], collagen fibrils (black arrow heads) with their characteristic banding pattern. **e**
16
17 Saos-2 matrices produced in the presence of indicated concentrations of U(VI) (0, 0.5, 1
18 and 2 μM) were decellularized after a 10-day culture period and U(VI) incorporated therein
19 was quantified by ICP-MS. Data represent the mean \pm SD of 4 independent experiments,
20 each performed in duplicate or triplicate. **f** (Upper panel) Experimental (straight line) and
21 adjusted (dots) EXAFS spectra at the U LIII edge of U(VI)-biological matrix shown with the
22 experimental EXAFS spectrum of autunite model; (lower panel) corresponding Fourier
23 transforms.

24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44 **Fig. 5** U(VI) release and osteoclasts behavior on Saos-2 extracellular matrices. De-
45 cellularized Saos-2 matrices containing the indicated amounts of U(VI) were seeded with
46 RAW 264.7 cells \pm RANKL. On D3, culture supernatants were harvested and the cells were
47 refed with fresh medium. On D5 the culture medium was again collected and the matrices
48 were subjected to U(VI) quantification. **a** A bar graph shows the release of U(VI) in D3 and
49 D5 supernatants as the percent of U(VI) contained in initial matrices. **b** Box plots show
50 U(VI) quantification in D3 (left panel) and D5 (right panel) supernatants according to the
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 presence of RANKL. **c** Box plots presenting the quantification of U(VI) remaining in Saos-2
5
6 matrices at the end of the culture and after decellularization. n=4 independent experiments
7
8 each done in duplicate or triplicate. P values were determined using two-way analysis of
9
10 variance (ANOVA) with two-stage step-up method of Benjamini, Krieger, and Yekutieli to
11
12 control the false discovery rate. **d** RAW 264.7 cells were cultured with RANKL onto de-
13
14 cellularized Saos-2 extracellular matrix, prepared in the presence of the indicated
15
16 concentration of U(VI) and containing, on average, the indicated amount of U(VI).
17
18 Representative processed images of resorbed Saos-2 matrix are shown. Box plot
19
20 representations show the relative quantification of resorbed area with median resorbed area
21
22 in control condition as 100%. n=5 independent experiments each done in 2-3 replicates. P
23
24 values were calculated using a two-sided Mann-Whitney test, compared to control
25
26 condition: 0 μ M U(VI). * p<0,05; ***p <0.001; ns : not significant
27
28
29
30
31
32



33 **Fig. 6** TEM and HRTEM-EDX analysis of osteoclasts on a Saos-2 matrix containing U(VI).
34
35 **a** TEM micrographs at different magnifications of an osteoclast with a vesicle (white arrow)
36
37 containing needle- (black arrowheads) and platelet-like structures (white arrowheads) are
38
39 shown. **b** High-resolution transmission electron microscopy images of a vesicle are
40
41 presented. The square areas shown on the central panels have been used for the X-ray
42
43 microanalysis presented on the left panels showing the components of platelet (spectre 1)
44
45 and needle (spectre 2) structures or an area of the vesicle free of needles and platelets
46
47 (spectre 3).
48
49
50
51
52

53 **Fig. 7** Hypothetic scheme of the uranium cycle in resorbing osteoclast. Uranium is present
54
55 in an autunite form in the new mineralized matrix by Saos-2 cells. During the resorption
56
57 phase, the osteoclast acidifies the actin ring sealed compartment via the V-ATPase action,
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65


1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

and the low pH could favor the transition of autunite to a U-phosphate form. The degradation products including the U-phosphate platelets and needles would than move across the osteoclast in transcytosis vesicles prior to be released in the external media. The osteoclast resorption function can be stimulated or repressed depending on the U(VI) concentration present in the external media.

Figure_1



a










Figure 3


a




[U(VI)] (μM)	0	5	10	25	50	100
U(VI) ($\mu\text{g/well}$)	0	≈ 0.16	≈ 0.24	≈ 0.45	≈ 0.75	≈ 1




b




[U(VI)] μM	0	0,25	0,5	1	3	5
-----------------------	---	------	-----	---	---	---



a




0 0.5 1 2
 0 ≈0.28 ≈0.54 ≈1




b

[U(VI)] = 0 μM











100 μm



[U(VI)] = 2 μM



100 μm


C[U(VI)] = 0 μM 100 μm [U(VI)] = 2 μM 100 μm **d**[U(VI)] = 0 μM 

500 nm


[U(VI)] = 2 μM 


500 nm

e




f





d



[U(VI)] (μM)	0	0.5	1	2
U(VI) ($\mu\text{g}/\text{well}$)	0	~ 0.28	~ 0.54	~ 1





Figure 6

a



b




Figure 7

