Published in final edited form as:

J Inorg Biochem. 2015 August ; 149: 45–48. doi:10.1016/j.jinorgbio.2015.05.003.

Reduced accumulation of platinum drugs is not observed in drug-resistant ovarian cancer cell lines derived from cisplatin-treated patients

Marina Stukova^a, Matthew D. Hall^a, Samantha D. Tsotsoros^b, James P. Madigan^a, Nicholas P. Farrell^b, and Michael M. Gottesman^{a,*}

^a Laboratory of Cell Biology, Center for Cancer Research, National Cancer Institute, National Institutes of Health, Bethesda, MD

^b Department of Chemistry, Virginia Commonwealth University, Richmond, VA

Abstract

The resistance of ovarian cancer towards front-line chemotherapy, usually cisplatin or carboplatin in combination with paclitaxel or docetaxel, remains a major clinical challenge. Resistance to these agents has been largely studied using cell lines selected for resistance to agents *in vitro*. We examined a series of paired cell lines derived from patients with ovarian cancer prior to chemotherapy (PEO1, PEO4, PEO14 and PEA1), and following the acquisition of resistance to a platinum-based chemotherapy regimen (PEO6, PEO23 and PEA2, respectively). All resistant patient lines showed resistance to cisplatin (2–5-fold), but this did not correspond with lowered accumulation. No general cross-resistance was observed for oxaliplatin, paclitaxel or docetaxel, and paclitaxel accumulation was not affected. PEO1 cells carrying BRCA2 mutations were hypersensitive to the PARP inhibitors olaparib and velaparib, but all other cell lines expressing functional forms of BRCA2 were less sensitive. While reduced drug accumulation was not observed, we believe these pairs of lines are of use to researchers studying Pt drug resistance and experimental therapeutics against drug-resistant ovarian cancer.

Graphical Abstract

Synopsis

The resistance of ovarian cancer to chemotherapy remains a major clinical challenge. We examined paired ovarian cancer cell lines prior to and following chemotherapy. Resistant patient lines did not display with lowered accumulation of cisplatin.

© 2015 Published by Elsevier Inc.

* **Corresponding author:** Michael M. Gottesman, Laboratory of Cell Biology, National Cancer Institute, NIH, 37 Convent Drive, Rm. 2108, Bethesda, MD 20892 mgottesman@nih.gov, Phone: 301 496 1921, Fax: 301 402 0450.

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

Conflicts of interest: None declared

Disclosure of Potential Conflicts of Interest
None were disclosed.

Keywords

Metals in medicine; drug resistance; ovarian cancer; mechanism

The resistance of cancer cells towards chemotherapeutics is an enduring clinical challenge. For example, following surgical debulking, a front-line therapeutic regimen for treating ovarian cancer is a taxane (paclitaxel or docetaxel, day 1) in combination with a ‘platinum’ (cisplatin or carboplatin, day 2) repeated every 21 days [1]. Despite initial efficacy, patients usually relapse and those with platinum-resistant disease are often cross-resistant to other drugs [2]. In the laboratory, resistance to agents such as cisplatin or paclitaxel is examined individually by selecting cell lines *in vitro* for resistance to an agent [3], though a small number of cell lines have been generated for resistance to both a platinum and a taxane [4]. As such, our understanding of cisplatin resistance has been largely derived from studies on cell lines where the resistance has been generated *in vitro* [5], and these mechanisms have informed development of new platinum-based analogs that circumvent cisplatin resistance [6].

One important feature of both platinum [7] and taxane resistance *in vitro* is decreased accumulation [8]. This is mediated by the efflux transporter P-glycoprotein (*ABCB1*) for taxanes, and by a pleiotropic mechanism that involves decreased uptake and altered endocytic processes for platinum compounds. For both drug classes there are multiple other pathways involved in resistance acquisition, and it is not clear whether diminished accumulation is clinically relevant [5]. One study of Pt levels in frozen samples of surgically resected non-small cell lung cancer samples demonstrated a correlation between Pt levels and survival for 44 patients [9]. While extremely informative, a limitation of this study is that patients had received platinum chemotherapy on average 37 days prior to surgery, yet only a single data point exists for each patient. As such, the impact of resistance acquisition on accumulation cannot be assessed—that is, there is no way to determine whether diminished accumulation was intrinsic or acquired.

Our interest in accumulation changes in ovarian cancer led us to examine three sets of ovarian cancer cell lines derived from patients prior to and following chemotherapy (Figure 1) [10]. PEO1 cells were collected from a patient 22 months after cisplatin, 5-fluorouracil and chlorambucil treatment and the patient continued to show response to cisplatin therapy. PEO4 cells were taken from the same patient after relapse occurred 10 months later, and PEO6 cells were collected from that patient 3 months later, following further cisplatin treatment that had produced no benefit [11]. PEA1 cells were collected from a different patient prior to treatment, and PEA2 cells from the same patient after cisplatin and prednimustine treatment failed. PEO14 cells were collected from a third patient prior to treatment, and PEO23 cells collected from the same patient after cisplatin and chlorambucil treatment failed. Treatments reflect the chemotherapy regimens utilized prior to the introduction of paclitaxel to the clinic. All cell lines have mutant p53, a hallmark of high-grade serous ovarian carcinoma. PEO1 was shown to carry germ-line BRCA2-inactivating mutations, rendering the cells sensitive to DNA-damaging agents (PEA1 and PEO14 are BRCA2 wild-type) [11]. PEO4 and PEO6 both carry a secondary BRCA2 mutation acquired by the tumor cells in the patient prior to isolation of PEO4 that results in functional restoration of BRCA2 [12]. None of the patients received radiation therapy. Following the initial characterization, it has been shown that PEO1 contained two separate clones with BRCA2 inactivation mutations – one carrying a BRCA2 stop mutation (PEO1-stop) and another carrying a BRCA2 missense mutation (PEO1-mis) [13]. It has been shown that PEO4 and PEO6 cells are resistant to platinum agents and 5-FU compared with PEO1 [14, 15].

Our aim was to characterize the patterns of drug sensitivity and resistance of the three sets of cell lines, and to learn whether there was a relationship between sensitivity and drug accumulation in lines obtained from cisplatin-resistant patients, as has been repeatedly observed in previous *in vitro* studies.

We first assessed the cytotoxicity of agents: cisplatin and oxaliplatin as cytotoxic platinum, paclitaxel and docetaxel as taxanes currently used against ovarian cancer, and the PARP inhibitors olaparib and veliparib, as BRCA-mutant cells are deficient in DNA-repair and are known to be hypersensitive to PARP inhibition (and to DNA damaging agents) (see Supplementary Methods for details) [16]. It appears that olaparib will soon be granted first-in-class medicine status for treating BRCA-mutant ovarian cancer sufferers [17].

The cell lines from the patients after they had had received cisplatin chemotherapy were all more resistant to cisplatin than the initial lines (first column, Table 1, see Figure 1 as a guide for cell line names and their lineage). The two PEO1 lines (Mis and Stop) were more sensitive to cisplatin than PEA1 and PEO14, consistent with non-functional BRCA2 [18]. The remaining results, looking at sensitivity to drugs that the patients had not seen, showed no clear patterns. The PEO1/4/6 and PEO14/23 cells demonstrated cross-resistance to oxaliplatin, but PEA2 cells ($IC_{50} = 124.1 \pm 12.9 \mu M$) were hypersensitive to oxaliplatin compared with PEA1 ($IC_{50} = 30.2 \pm 9.7 \mu M$), which is not normally observed in cisplatin-resistant cells [19]. Docetaxel and taxol gave variable data. PEA2 and PEO23 were hypersensitive to the taxanes, consistent with observations from *in vitro* resistant cells and clinical studies [20]. In contrast, the PEO1 cells were less sensitive to docetaxel, PEO4 was

sensitized, and PEO6 was strongly resistant. Olaparib and veliparib both demonstrated greater cytotoxicity against the BRCA2 mutant PEO1 cells compared with other lines, consistent with the hypersensitivity to PARP inhibition expected in cells with mutant BRCA2 [21]. Interestingly, the PEO1-Mis line (BRCA2 missense mutation) was more sensitive to both PARP inhibitors than the PEO1-Stop line (BRCA2 stop codon mutation), and cisplatin had the same effect. It may be that the missense mutation is more deleterious than the stop mutation, though little work exists on this topic, but it is known that factors other than BRCA2 status can impact sensitivity to PARP inhibitors [22]. Our interpretation of these results is that the established cell lines retain the cisplatin resistance phenotype of the tumors from which they were derived, but patterns of cross-resistance to other drugs are not predictable.

The accumulation of platinum in all cell lines treated with cisplatin and oxaliplatin was assessed by ICP-MS. Briefly, cells were incubated with drug (20 μ M) for 24 h, lysed for Pt measurement, and the measured Pt levels were normalized to protein content (measured by Bradford assay [23]) (Figure 2). The only statistically significant difference was that PEO4 cells accumulated more Pt than the PEO1 and PEO6 lines. The same was true of oxaliplatin, and PEO23 cells accumulated more Pt than PEO14 – both changes were contrary to the cellular sensitivity patterns for these drugs. The accumulation of [3 H]taxol (1 μ Ci/mL) was assessed after 45 min by trypsinization of cells and scintillography [24], and normalized against cell count (Figure 3). PEO6 cells accumulated twice the taxol of PEO1/4 cells, and PEO23 cells accumulated almost 10-fold less taxol than PEO14 cells. Again, the accumulation changes in cells did not correlate with cellular sensitivity to taxol.

This assessment of the accumulation of cisplatin (Pt levels), oxaliplatin (Pt levels) and taxol shows no relationship between accumulation of platinum drugs and their cytotoxicity (cisplatin $R^2 = 6.4 \times 10^{-3}$, oxaliplatin $R^2 = 0.089$) and a weak correlation for taxol ($R^2 = 0.68$), suggesting that factors other than accumulation are responsible for Pt resistance in these cell lines. By way of comparison, when KB cells are generated to be resistant to cisplatin *in vitro*, there is a 50-75% reduction in accumulation of Pt (cisplatin or carboplatin) compared with parent cells, and a linear relationship between Pt accumulation and cellular sensitivity [25]. A strong correlation between short-term drug cellular accumulation and long-term drug cytotoxicity assays has been demonstrated [26].

Genomic analysis of the evolution of PEO cell lines has suggested that the genetic divergence of PEO1/4/6 and PEA1/2 had occurred prior to the isolation of the sensitive lines, so while the resistance relationship and origin were confirmed, the resistant lines are not directly descended from the first line, though all lines share a common ‘ancestor’ [11]. The low-level resistance observed in cell lines derived from chemotherapy-intractable ovarian cancer (2-5-fold) is consistent with other observations on clinical drug resistance [3] and appears to indicate that drug-resistant ovarian cancer cells (subsequently cultured *in vitro*) do not display a consistent Pt accumulation phenotype. The same conclusion may not be drawn for taxol, as the patients from whom the cell lines were established had not received taxol chemotherapy.

While we did not observe differences in accumulation, these studies point to the importance of alterations in intracellular trafficking and DNA repair processes in resistant cancers. Studies in mice have demonstrated that Pt concentrations in tumor tissue do not correlate with tumor regression activity [27]. It is interesting to note that drug-resistant cells from taxane-naïve patients were hypersensitive to taxanes [28]. This is reflective of the clinical finding that survival was prolonged in relapsed patients receiving platinum plus paclitaxel versus platinum alone [29]. In conclusion, we have found that these paired clinical cell lines provide a different perspective of clinical aspects of platinum agents, and that reduced accumulation is not a component of the phenotype seen in all cell lines derived from clinical samples, the first time ‘paired’ clinical lines have been assessed. Our accumulation findings are in contrast to the large amount of literature demonstrating that cisplatin-resistant cell lines generated *in vitro* demonstrate a significant reduction in Pt accumulation. We believe these cells are useful for studying cross-resistance to experimental therapeutics targeted towards ovarian cancer.

Supplementary Material

Refer to Web version on PubMed Central for supplementary material.

Acknowledgements

This research was supported by the Intramural Research Program of the National Institutes of Health (National Cancer Institute). We thank George Leiman for editorial assistance. NPF acknowledges support of National Institutes of Health RO1CA78754.

References

1. Markman M. *Gynecol. Oncol.* 2013; 131:241–245. [PubMed: 23726888]
2. Jayson GC, Kohn EC, Kitchener HC, Ledermann JA. *Lancet.* 2014; 384:1376–1388. [PubMed: 24767708]
3. McDermott M, Eustace AJ, Busschots S, Breen L, Crown J, Clynes M, O'Donovan N, Stordal B. *Front. Oncol.* 2014; 4:40. [PubMed: 24639951]
4. Armstrong SR, Narendrula R, Guo B, Parissenti AM, McCallum KL, Cull S, Lanner C. J. *Ovarian Res.* 2012; 5:40. [PubMed: 23194409]
5. Shen DW, Pouliot LM, Hall MD, Gottesman MM. *Pharmacol. Rev.* 2012; 64:706–721. [PubMed: 22659329]
6. Kelland L. *Nat Rev Cancer.* 2007; 7:573–584. [PubMed: 17625587]
7. Loh SY, Mistry P, Kelland LR, Abel G, Harrap KR. *Br. J. Cancer.* 1992; 66:1109–1115. [PubMed: 1457352]
8. Hall MD, Okabe M, Shen DW, Liang XJ, Gottesman MM. *Annu. Rev. Pharmacol. Toxicol.* 2008; 48:495–535. [PubMed: 17937596]
9. Kim ES, Lee JJ, He G, Chow CW, Fujimoto J, Kalhor N, Swisher SG, Wistuba II, Stewart DJ, Siddik ZH. *J. Clin. Oncol.* 2012; 30:3345–3352. [PubMed: 22891266]
10. Langdon SP, Lawrie SS, Hay FG, Hawkes MM, McDonald A, Hayward IP, Schol DJ, Hilgers J, Leonard RC, Smyth JF. *Cancer Res.* 1988; 48:6166–6172. [PubMed: 3167863]
11. Cooke SL, Ng CK, Melnyk N, Garcia MJ, Hardcastle T, Temple J, Langdon S, Huntsman D, Brenton JD. *Oncogene.* 2010; 29:4905–4913. [PubMed: 20581869]
12. Sakai W, Swisher EM, Jacquemont C, Chandramohan KV, Couch FJ, Langdon SP, Wurz K, Higgins J, Villegas E, Taniguchi T. *Cancer Res.* 2009; 69:6381–6386. [PubMed: 19654294]

13. Ng CK, Cooke SL, Howe K, Newman S, Xian J, Temple J, Batty EM, Pole JC, Langdon SP, Edwards PA, Brenton JD. *J. Pathol.* 2012; 226:703–712. [PubMed: 22183581]
14. Chu E, Lai GM, Zinn S, Allegra CJ. *Mol. Pharmacol.* 1990; 38:410–417. [PubMed: 2402230]
15. Roberts D, Schick J, Conway S, Biade S, Laub PB, Stevenson JP, Hamilton TC, O'Dwyer PJ, Johnson SW. *Br. J. Cancer.* 2005; 92:1149–1158. [PubMed: 15726096]
16. Dhillon KK, Swisher EM, Taniguchi T. *Cancer Sci.* 2011; 102:663–669. [PubMed: 21205087]
17. Agency EM. European Medicines Agency. 2014
18. Muggia F, Safra T. *Anticancer Res.* 2014; 34:551–556. [PubMed: 24510983]
19. Raymond E, Faivre S, Chaney S, Woynarowski J, Cvitkovic E. *Mol. Cancer Ther.* 2002; 1:227–235. [PubMed: 12467217]
20. Stordal B, Pavlakis N, Davey R. *Cancer Treat. Rev.* 2007; 33:688–703. [PubMed: 17881133]
21. Lee JM, Ledermann JA, Kohn EC. *Ann. Oncol.* 2014; 25:32–40. [PubMed: 24225019]
22. Stordal B, Timms K, Farrelly A, Gallagher D, Busschots S, Renaud M, Thery J, Williams D, Potter J, Tran T, Korpanty G, Cremona M, Carey M, Li J, Li Y, Aslan O, O'Leary JJ, Mills GB, Hennessy BT. *Mol. Oncol.* 2013; 7:567–579. [PubMed: 23415752]
23. Hall MD, Amjadi S, Zhang M, Beale PJ, Hambley TW. *J. Inorg. Biochem.* 2004; 98:1614–1624. [PubMed: 15458824]
24. Kannan P, Brimacombe KR, Zoghbi SS, Liow JS, Morse C, Taku AK, Pike VW, Halldin C, Innis RB, Gottesman MM, Hall MD. *Drug Metab. Dispos.* 2010; 38:917–922. [PubMed: 20212014]
25. Liang XJ, Shen DW, Chen KG, Wincovitch SM, Garfield SH, Gottesman MM. *J. Cell. Physiol.* 2005; 202:635–641. [PubMed: 15546142]
26. Pereira E, Garnier-Suillerot A. *Biochem. Pharmacol.* 1994; 47:1851–1857. [PubMed: 8204102]
27. Boven E, van der Vijgh WJ, Nauta MM, Schluper HM, Pinedo HM. *Cancer Res.* 1985; 45:86–90. [PubMed: 4038381]
28. Stordal B, Hamon M, McEneaney V, Roche S, Gillet JP, O'Leary JJ, Gottesman M, Clynes M. *PLoS One.* 2012; 7:e40717. [PubMed: 22792399]
29. Parmar MK, Ledermann JA, Colombo N, du Bois A, Delaloye JF, Kristensen GB, Wheeler S, Swart AM, Qian W, Torri V, Floriani I, Jayson G, Lamont A, Trope C, Icon, A.G.O. Collaborators. *Lancet.* 2003; 361:2099–2106. [PubMed: 12826431]
30. Hall MD, Telma KA, Chang KE, Lee TD, Madigan JP, Lloyd JR, Goldlust IS, Hoeschele JD, Gottesman MM. *Cancer Res.* 2014; 74:3913–3922. [PubMed: 24812268]
31. Brimacombe K, Hall M, Auld D, Inglese J, Austin C, Gottesman M, Fung K. *Assay Drug Dev. Technol.* 2009; 7:233–249. [PubMed: 19548831]

Highlights

- Patient-derived ovarian cancer cell lines retain their drug resistance phenotype.
- A drug accumulation-deficient phenotype is not observed in the cell lines.
- Oxaliplatin was less efficacious against ovarian cell lines than cisplatin.
- BRCA2 status corresponded to PARP inhibitor sensitivity.

Figure 1.

Top: structures of cisplatin, oxaliplatin, paclitaxel (taxol) and docetaxel. Bottom: scheme demonstrating the timeline for establishment of each cell line studied in this paper, including chemotherapeutic regimens used for each patient. Information incorporated into scheme derived from [10, 11].

Figure 2.

Normalized cisplatin and oxaliplatin accumulation (nmol Pt/μg protein) for each cell line shown in Table 1. Cells were incubated with drug (20 μM) for 24 h, then lysed. Triplicate values were averaged and normalized against protein content of lysate. All data is presented as mean ± SD.

Figure 3. Normalized ^3H taxol uptake (disintegrations per minute, DPM/1 $\times 10^6$ cells) for each cell line. Cells were incubated with ^3H taxol for 1 h in all cell lines. Triplicate ^3H DPM were averaged and normalized against number cell count. All data is presented as mean $\pm$ SD.

Table 1

Cytotoxicity (IC₅₀) of compounds against ovarian cancer cell lines

Cell Line	Cisplatin (μM)	Oxaliplatin (μM)	Docetaxel (nM)	Taxol (nM)	Olaparib (μM)	Veliparib (μM)	BRCA2	TP53
PEO1-Mis	3.2 ± 1.4	3.0 ± 0.9	33 ± 13	6.5 ± 0.9	25 ± 3	33 ± 1	Mutated	Mutated
PEO1-STOP	2.0 ± 0.7	3.8 ± 0.7	29 ± 4	13 ± 2	4.3 ± 0.4	22 ± 5	Mutated	Mutated
PEO4	9.1 ± 2.1	13 ± 2	14 ± 1	15 ± 1	46 ± 2	111 ± 6	Functional	Mutated
PEO6	12 ± 1	51 ± 5	137 ± 8	23 ± 8	258 ± 48	92 ± 14	Functional	Mutated
PEA1	9.6 ± 1.5	124 ± 13	261 ± 84	58 ± 20	141 ± 82	41 ± 1	Wild-type	Mutated
PEA2	16 ± 4	30 ± 10	87 ± 13	15 ± 1	245 ± 8	105 ± 2	Wild-type	Mutated
PEO14	4.8 ± 0.1	40 ± 3	262 ± 160	69 ± 2	59 ± 15	111 ± 22	Wild-type	Mutated
PEO23	10 ± 1	71 ± 7	122 ± 90	33 ± 18	51 ± 2	75 ± 18	Wild-type	Mutated

Cells were cultured in RPMI 1640 supplemented with 10% fetal bovine serum, L-glutamine and antibiotics. All compounds were dissolved in DMSO as 20 mM stock solutions, except cisplatin (saline, 3.3 mM) and oxaliplatin (water, 12.6 mM) [30], and cytotoxicity of agents was assessed using the 3-(4,5-dimethylthiazol-2-yl)-2,5-diphenyltetrazolium bromide (MTT) assay [31]