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## CHAPTER I

## INTRODUCTION

In many countries, a trend of mortality rate due to cancers has significantly increased (1). While, the most commonly diagnosed cancers worldwide were breast, lung and colorectal cancers, breast cancer was one of the most diagnosed cancer in Thai woman (2). This incident remains the major leading causes of the loss of life influence millions of people and a lot of suffering. Currently, there are several approaches to treat cancers including surgery, chemotherapy, radiation therapy, hormone therapy and transplantation. However, each method inherits its own unavoidable flaws. These treatments can destroy or get rid of cancer cells but usually affect normal cells to a certain degree. In some cases, they also pose unwanted side effects such as blood disorder, painful and diarrhea to the patients (3). Alternative approaches based on DNA-alkylating agents, antimetabolites and natural products were studied. However, they were still insufficient in selectivity. These agents damage not only cancer cells but also normal cells (4, 5). Therefore, a new approaches or agent that can destroy only the cancer cells still definitely in need. In this research, a new type of agents was proposed and investigated. This new agent, called as CB-PP, consisted of two parts including Cecropin B (CB) and Polyproline (PP).
$C B$ is an antimicrobial peptides which have been reported to have anticancer activity against various types of cancer cells such as colon carcinoma, leaukemia. hepatocellular carcinoma, bladder cancer, breast cancer and gastric carcinoma (6-10). While PP is a group of proline, located as a part of progesterone receptor (PR), which has been reported to activate breast cancer cell proliferation by interacting with cell sarcoma (c-Src) through SH3 (11, 12). Therefore, it was expected that the PP of the CB-PP will interfere the binding between PP of the PR and the SH3 domains, thus inhibiting the proliferation of the cancer cells while the CB of the CB-PP will directly damage the cancer cells. As a result, this new conjugate can be used at low
concentration to avoid the undesired normal cell damage but it still effective against the cancer cells. Therefore, in this research, the recombinant protein CB-PP were constructed and produced in Pichia pastoris KM71H. Subsequently, the obtained recombinant protein were purified and tested for their toxocoties to human breast carcinoma cell (BT-474), human lung bronchus carcinoma cell line (ChaGo-K1), human liver hepatocellular carcinoma cell line (Hep-G2), human gastric carcinoma cell line (Kato-III), human colon carcinoma cell line (SW-620) and human lung fibroblast cell line (WI-38). The information obtained from this work could be used in order to develop a potent anticancer peptide or drug in the future.

## Objective

1. To produce recombinant protein CB and CB-PP in Pichia pastoris KM71H
2. To study cytotoxicity activity of recombinant protein against some human cancer cells

## Outcome

1. To obtain the recombinant protein $C B$ and $C B-p p$
2. To gain information on the cytotoxicity of the obtained recombinant protein to some human cancer cells

## CHAPTER II

## LITERATURE REVIEW

### 2.1 Cancer statistics

Cancer is the major public health and is one of the most leading causes of global disease. Each year, tens of millions of people around the world are diagnosed with cancer, and more than half of the patients ultimately die from it (13). In 2012, there were an estimated 14.1 million new cases of cancer in the world: 7.4 million (53\%) in males and 6.7 million ( $47 \%$ ) in females, giving a male: female ratio of 10:9. The most common causes of cancer death are cancers of lung ( 1.59 million deaths), liver (745,000 deaths), stomach ( 723,000 deaths), colorectal (694,000 deaths), breast (521,000 deaths) and oesophageal cancer (400,000 deaths) (14).

## Cancer incidence - Worldwide



Figure 2. 1 Interactive Map of Cancer Incidence, World, 2012 Estimates (Source: www.cancerresearchuk.org)

### 2.2 Cancer

According to National Cancer Institute, cancer is defined as "Cancer is the name given to a collection of related diseases. In all types of cancer, some of the body's cells begin to divide without stopping and spread into surrounding tissues." Cancer can start almost anywhere in the human body, which is made up of trillions of cells. Normally, human cells grow and divide to form new cells as the body needs them. When cells grow old or become damaged, they die, and new cells take their place. Cancer can be defined with uncontrolled cellular proliferation and dedifferentiation (15). It can occur from abnormal proliferation of the different kinds of cells in the body, thus there are more than a hundred distinctive types of cancer, which can vary extensively in their behaviour and response to treatment. Not all tumors are cancerous (16), the most important cancer issue is the distinction between benign and malignant tumors. A tumor is any abnormal proliferation of cells, which may be either benign or malignant. A benign tumor, such as a common skin wart, remains confined to its original location, invading neither surrounding normal tissue nor spreading to distant body sites. A malignant tumor, on the other hand, is competent of both invading surrounding normal tissue and spreading throughout the body via the circulatory or lymphatic systems. As a consequence, only malignant tumors are appropriately referred to as cancers, and it is their ability to invade and metastasize that makes cancer so perilous. Whereas benign tumors can usually be removed surgically, the development of malignant tumors to distant body sites generally makes them resistant to such localized treatment. Both benign and malignant tumors are categorized according to the type of cell from which they originate. Most cancers fall into one of three main groups: carcinomas, sarcomas, and leukemias or lymphomas. Carcinomas, include approximately $90 \%$ of human cancers, are malignancies of epithelial cells. Sarcomas, which are rare in humans, are solid tumors of connective tissues, such as muscle, bone, cartilage, and fibrous tissue. Leukemias and lymphomas, which account for approximately 8\% of human malignancies, arise from the blood-forming cells and from cells of the immune system, respectively. Tumors are further classified according to tissue of origin
(e.g., lung or breast carcinomas) and the type of cell involved. For example, fibrosarcomas arise from fibroblasts, and erythroid leukaemia from precursors of red blood cells (17).

### 2.2.1 Risk factors for Cancer

Development of cancer is attributed to various factors including exposure to environmental carcinogens, unhealthy lifestyle and genetic predisposition. These factors contribute to tumorigenesis by damaging genetic material, which is normally repaired or triggers senescence or elimination of the cell depending on extent damage (18).

### 2.2.2Cancer treatment and side effects

Current possible therapeutic approaches are determined by an interacting set of factors including the status of the patient, the behavior of the disorder and the cancer burden of the body. The most well-established treatment modalities for cancer elimination are surgery, radiation therapy, hormone therapy and chemotherapy. While the usage of surgery and radiation therapy is dependent on the progression of the disorder, presence of metastases and additional crucial factors chemotherapy is utilized in a substantially wider clinical spectrum. Traditional chemotherapeutic agents exhibit proven efficacy with inefficient cancer selectivity which explains their well characterized side effects on relatively fast growing normal cells (vomitus, fatigue, loss of hair). Based on the recent advent of more selective anticancer agents it can be 7 speculated that all tumor type possesses different suitable points for intervention and therefore a unique agent could be developed for the treatment of each cancer types.

### 2.3 Breast cancer

As reported by National Cancer Institute at the National Institute of Health, breast cancer is defined as, "Cancer that forms in tissues of the breast, usually the ducts (tubes that carry milk to the nipple) and lobules (glands that make milk). It occurs in both men and women, although male breast cancer is rare." Breast cancer is the leading cause of cancer related mortality in women, it is the most common malignancy among females affecting approximately one out of ten women (19). The vital signals of breast cancer may involve in a change in breast shape, a lump in the breast, dimpling of the skin, fluid coming from the nipple, or a red scaly patch of skin (20). In those with distant dissemination of the disease, there may be bone pain, swollen lymph nodes, shortness of breath, or yellow skin (21).

### 2.3.1 Risk factors for breast cancer

Breast cancer developing resulting from several risk factors comprise of female gender, age, race, obesity, lack of physical exercise, night-shift work, drinking alcohol, using hormone replacement therapy during menopause for long periods, treatment of radiation therapy with breast or chest, early age at first menstruation, do not have children or having lately, and older age (20). The breast cancer cases are owing to genetic inheritance from parents or relatives about 5-10\%, containing BRCA1 and BRCA2 among others. The development of breast cancer most ordinary occurs in cells from the lining of milk ducts and the lobules that supply the ducts with milk. Cancers progressing from the ducts are noticed as ductal carcinomas, whereas those developing from lobules are recognized as lobular carcinomas (20).
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Figure 2. 2 Incidence and Mortality Rate of Breast Cancer (GLOBOCAN 2012)
(Source: wwwglobocan.iarc.fr)

### 2.3.2 Breast cancer classification

To classify breast cancer, it can be commonly categorized into three distinct subtypes found on the presence or absence of three receptors based on cancer cells (22). First is hormone receptor (HR) positive breast cancer cell, where cancer cells express estrogen and/or progesterone receptors (ER/PR). Second, the oncogene human epidermal growth factor receptor 2 (HER-2/neu) is over-expressed. While in the third type of breast cancer, cancer cells are negative for the expression of ER, PR and HER-2/neu; this is also known as triple negative breast cancer (23).

### 2.3.3 Symptoms of breast cancer

Having a new lump or mass is the most common symptom of breast cancer. However, according to the Mayo Clinic, a lump in the breast is generally associated with breast cancer, nevertheless for the most part; a lump in the breast is not cancer. From hormonal changes in teenagers to damaged fat tissue, all breast lumps in women in their early age of 20 to early 50 are noncancerous (benign) approximately more than 90 percent. A painless, hard mass that has irregular edges is more likely to be cancerous, but breast cancers can be tender, soft, or rounded. They can even be painful. In addition, other feasible symptoms of breast cancer consist of swelling of all or part of a breast, breast or nipple pain, redness, or thickening of the nipple or breast skin, skin irritation or dimpling, nipple retraction and discharge (24, 25).

### 2.3.4 Breast cancer treatment and side effects

Treatment therapy for acute breast cancer includes excision, hormone therapy, chemotherapy and radiation therapy. For ongoing breast cancer therapy and if it is an estrogen and/or progesterone receptor-positive breast cancer; chemotherapy is included with other treatment modalities such as mastectomy, reconstruction, re-excision and radiation therapy (26). All currently available treatments have undesirable limitations. Chemotherapy is one of the advance tool used in cancer treatment, but uncompromising side effects resulting from chemotherapeutics agents are always toxic on normal cells remains an important
hindrance in clinical application (27, 28). Surgery removal is limited to patients with small tumors before metastasis. Even though tumors are removed, the inherent problem is not necessarily eliminated and deteriorate is highly possible (29). All above mentioned therapies are assorted with stern side effects such as severe nausea, bone marrow suppression, vomiting, and hair loss. Further medication usually needed for patients in an endeavor to ameliorate the side effects of their treatment, compounding patient strain in terms of treatment complexity and cost (30).

### 2.4 Progesterone receptor

The breast cancer will be progesterone-receptor-positive (PR+) if it has progesterone receptors; this means that the cancer cells may receive signals from progesterone that could promote their growth. Progesterone receptor (PR) is member of the nuclear receptor superfamily, act as ligand-activated transcription factors and initiators of $c$-Src kinase and mitogenic-activated protein kinase signaling (MAPK). This PR functions as direct activators of cytoplasmic signal transduction molecules (12) (Figure 1.3). In the amino-terminal domain of conventional PR has a specific polyproline motif (Figure 1.4) that directly interacts progestin-dependent interaction of PR with the SRC Homology 3 (SH3) domains of various cytoplasmic signaling molecules consist of c-Src tyrosine kinases. PR-SH3 domains interaction shows potential effect on rapid progestin-induced activation of Src and downstream MAPK in mammalian cells, this ability is not occur on PR transcriptional activity (11).

Moreover, PR is an effective activator of Src kinase working by SH 3 domain, this former study also revealed that PR signaling pathway via regulatory SH 3 domains was influenced on progestin-induced growth arrest of breast cancer epithelial cells. The previous reported that SH3 domains recognize short proline-rich motifs in PR which is the important sequences for PR and SH3 domains interaction and this mechanism inducing signaling pathway for cell proliferation.


Figure 2. 3 PR - scaffolding interaction, the interaction between PR and c-Src has been shown to be essential for progesterone-induced c-Src/MAPK activation (Arnold et al. 1998, Boonyaratanakornkij et al. 2001).

## PR domains



Figure 2. 4 A schematic of human PR domains including ligand binding domain (LBD), hinge (h), DNA binding domain (DBD), transcriptional activation domain 1 and 2 (AF-1, AF-2) and polyproline motis (421-428) (Boonyaratanakornkij et al. 2001)

### 2.5 Antimicrobial peptide

Antimicrobial peptides (AMPs) act as an initial role of defensing against broad spectrum of microorganisms such as bacteria, virus, yeast, parasite, and fungi (31-33). They were firstly found in invertebrates with typically small size, generally less than 150-200 amino acid residues (34), They are widely disseminated in nature, synthesized and later also found in vertebrates, including humans (35). Many previous studies reveal that AMPs directly act on the membrane of the target cell (36). The AMPs with net positive charge causes their special binding to more than one negatively charged target on bacteria, which may account for the selectivity of antimicrobial peptides (37).

Each of AMPs has its own character and unique. They can be divided into four sub-groups rely on their amino acid composition and structure. The first one is anionic antimicrobial peptides with small size ( $\sim 721-823 \mathrm{kDa}$ ) (38); they can act against Gram-positive and Gram-negative bacteria. This group of AMPs rich in glutamic and aspartic acid that are required zinc as a cofactor for antimicrobial activity such as

Maximin-H5 from amphibians (39), Dermcidin from humans (40). The second subgroup is linear cationic $\alpha$-helical peptides which lack in cysteine and containing approximately < 40 amino acid residues. They sometimes have a hinge in the middle (41) such as cecropin, magainin, CAP18 and LL37. The third sub-group is cationic peptides which are rich in proline and arginine and lack in cysteine (42) such as hymenoptaecin, bactenecins, coleoptercin and indolicidin. The fourth sub-group is anionic and cationic peptides that contain cysteine residues. They form disulphide bonds and stable $\beta$-sheet such as a diverse family of defensins, protegrin and brevinin (43).

### 2.5.1 Mechanisms of antimicrobial peptide activity

The mechanism can be divided into two mechanisms; First is intracellular antimicrobial peptide activity and another is transmembrane pore-forming, shown as table $1.1(44,45)$.

The AMPs killing mechanism in mode of intracellular antimicrobial peptide activity reveal that AMPs penetrate into the cell and bind the intracellular molecules which critical to cell living. The peptides can inhibit cell wall synthesis, nucleic acid synthesis, protein synthesis, enzymatic activity or alter cytoplasmic membrane septum formation (Figure 1.5).


Figure 2. 5 Mode of action for intracellular antimicrobial peptide activity (46)

Several AMPs play a role on bacteria using a transmembrane pore-forming mechanism via interaction with the cell membrane components leading to poreformation and bacterial cytoplasmic contents leakage. The following models are barrel-stave, carpet and toroidal-pore.

First, the barrel-stave model which is the action of peptides aggregating in the membrane by aligning parallel to the phospholipids eventually forming an ionchannel pore (47). The secondary structure conformation and amphipathic property of the peptides play a crucial role in pore formation. Peptides using this action are able to perform interacting strongly with both zwitterionic and negatively-charged membranes and are consequently non-selective (48).

Second, the carpet model involves peptides accumulate and bind parallel on the surface of the phospholipid membrane to form clusters that cover the surface with a 'carpet' of peptide and then integrate into the membrane when reaching
threshold level. The type of peptide is influence on permeation diversity, with mechanisms such as detergent-like disintegration and channel aggregate formation. The interaction between the membrane and peptides is destined by hydrophobic charges (49). The membrane integrity is disturbed and making cytoplasmic contents leak. The disturbance of the membrane potential and membrane disintegration, leads to rapid death (50).

Third, toroidal model which peptides insert perpendicularly in the bilayer, but instead of packing parallel to the phospholipid chains, peptides induce a local membrane curvature in such a way that the pore lumen is lined partly by peptides and partly by phospholipid head groups. Continuity between inner and outer leaflets is established.
(A)


Figure 2. 6 Pore-forming mechanisms of antimicrobial peptide; (A) The barrel-stave model, (B) The carpet model, and (C) The toroidal model (51, 52)

Table 2. 1 Membrane and intracellular models of antimicrobial peptide killing and lysis (52)

| Model of antimicrobial activity | Synonym | Examples of peptides |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Transmembrane pore-forming mechanisms |  |  |
| Toroidal pore | Wormhole, disc | Maginin, Protegrin, Mellitin, LL-37, MSI78 |
| Carpet |  | Dermaseptin, Mellitin, Caerin 1.1, Ovispirin and Cecropin |
| Barrel-steve | Helical-bundle model | Alamethicin |
| Modes of intracellular killing |  |  |
| Flocculation of intracellular contents |  | Anionic peptides |
| Alters cytoplasmic membrane septum formation |  | Indolicidin, PR-39, PR-26 and Microcin |
| Inhibits cell wall synthesis |  | Mersacidin |
| Inhibits protein synthesis |  | Pleurocidin, Dermaseptin, PR-39, HNP-1 and Indolicidin |
| Binds nucleic acids |  | Buforin II and Tachyplesin |
| Inhibits enzymatic activity |  | Pleurocidin, Dermaseptin, PR-39, HNP-1 and Indolicidin |

### 2.5.2 Cationic antimicrobial peptides

Cationic antimicrobial peptides (CAPs) are found in many diverse species playing a part in the innate immune system (31). CAPs are able to kill a broad spectrum of bacteria as well as fungi, enveloped viruses and protozoa (53). CAPs are generally short with around < 40 amino acids, positively charged and able to form amphipathic structures in nonpolar solvents. Little sequence conservation between these peptides are found and they are consequently categorized depend on their secondary structure (54). CAPs are offered to perform by interrupting negatively charged microbial membrane because of electrostatic interaction, leading to membrane permabilization and disruption (46). Some CAPs such as bovine lactoferricin, defensins, magainin and cecropins also display cytotoxic activity against many different types of human cancer cells directly $(55,56)$. Those CAPs can be divided into two categories based on their anticancer activity. The first group are CAPs that potent to microorganisms, cancer cells and normal mammalian cells, for example bee venom, melittin (57, 58), tachyplesin isolated from horseshoe crab (59, 60), human neutrophil defensins (61) and human LL-37 (62). Another group are CAPs highly cytotoxic to microorganisms and cancer cells, but not harmful to non-cancer cells such as magainins isolated from the frogs skin $(55,63)$, insect cecropins $(9,64)$, BMAP-28 (65), bovine lactoferricin (56) and others. Nonetheless, because of their fundamental amphipathic design, most CAPs at higher concentration become cytotoxic against normal cells $(66,67)$.

### 2.5.3 Interaction of CAPs with cancer cells

Related to bacteria, many cancer cells carry an increased net negative charge due to an elevated expression of anionic molecules, such as phosphatidylserine in the outer membrane leaflet (68-70), compared to non-malignant cells. CAPs with highly positive charge will interact with and interrupt the highly negative charged cancer cells by electrostatic interaction. Other different points between the cellular membranes of the target cells that may have a potential on the interaction of CAPs with cancer cells is membrane fluidity which is typically increased in cancer cells
relative to their healthy analogue (71, 72). The cancer cell membrane will destabilize by membrane-bound CAPs with this property. Another feasible clarification for the selective effect of the peptides is that on cancer cells surface tend to have more ample microvilli in comparison to normal cells (73). This increased the surface area of the tumorigenic cell membranes and may facilitate CAP-mediated cytotoxicity by allowing a greater number of CAP molecules to interact with the surface of the cancer cell (74). Thus, for many reasons, the cancer cells are more susceptible to CAPs compared to normal cells.

### 2.5.4 Mechanisms of cell killing by CAPs

The presence of killing mechanism was first proved in magainin and its synthetic analogues, in which irreversibly lysis of hematopoietic and solid tumor cells at concentrations having little effect on normal cells was shown (32). Several models including the carpet model, the barrel-stave model, and the toroidal model (Figure 1.6) have been suggested to describe the cytotoxic peptide-membrane interactions.

### 2.6 Cecropins

Cecropins are family of AMPs, firstly found in the immune hemolymph of silkworm pupae Hyalophora cecropia (75), insects, and mammals (76) and contribute to the innate immunity in animal. Cecropins family consist of $\mathrm{A}, \mathrm{B}, \mathrm{C}, \mathrm{D}, \mathrm{E}$ and F composed of 35 to 39 amino acids in length which is highly homologous sequences (7). The sequences of natural Cecropins are constructed with $\alpha$-helical structure which has amphipathic in N-terminal segments and hydrophobic property in Cterminal segments. These peptides have a broad spectrum with anti-bacterial, antiviral and anti-fungal activity (77-79). Because Cecropins are able to form specific amphipathic $\alpha$-helixes, they directly attach on the non-polar lipid cell membranes and form transmembrane channels. These channels permit free circulation of electrolytes, metabolites and water through the phospholipid bilayers, therefore leading to irreversible cytolysis and finally to cell death (9, 80, 81). Among the

Cecropins group, Cecropin $A$ and $B$ possess strong activity to against several Grampositive, Gram-negative bacteria in micromolar concentrations (1, 6). In addition, several previous studies have reported anticancer activity of both Cecropin $A$ and $B$ against various cancer cell lines ( $9,10,82$ ).

### 2.6.1 Cecropin B

Natural Cecropin B (CB) is compose of 35 amino acids and possess the highest anti-microbial activity among the Cecropins family (83). The structure of cecropin B predicted by sequence analysis, Nuclear Magnetic Resonance (NMR) and circular dichroism spectroscopy is superlative NH2-terminal amphipathic $\alpha$-helix, and a COOH-terminal hydrophobic $\alpha$-helix joined by a flexible hinge at positions 23 and 24 (Figure. 1.5, Gly and Pro) (9, 84, 85). Both a hydrophilic and a hydrophobic group are contained in amphipathic $\alpha$-helix (86). Cecropin B influences rapid lysis of bacterial cell membranes (87). Previous report has shown that the rate of lysis is dependent on the concentration of Cecropin B (88).

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Lys (K) - Trp (W) - Lys (K) - Val (V) - Phe (F) - Lys (K) - Lys (K) - Ile (I) - Glu (E) - Lys (K) - } \\
& \text { Met (M) - Gly (G) - Arg (R) - Asn (N) - Ile (I) - Arg (R) - Asn (N) - Gly (G) - Ile (I) - Val (V) - } \\
& \text { Lys (K) - Ala (A) - Gly (G) - Pro (P) - Ala (A) - Ile (I) - Ala (A) - Val (V) - Leu (L) - Gly (G) - } \\
& \text { Glu (E) - Ala (A) - Lys (K) - Ala (A) - Leu (L) - NH2 }
\end{aligned}
$$

Figure 2. 7 Cecropin B sequence consisting of 35 amino acids

### 2.6.2 Cytotoxicity of Cecropin B on cancer cell lines

Cecropin B are able to lyse different types of human cancer cells at peptide concentrations that are not harmful to normal eukaryotic cells (10). Since the COOHterminal $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$-helix is hydrophobic while the NH2-terminal $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$-helix of cecropin B is highly amphipathic, Cecropin B also has anticancer activity. The effect of Cecropin B on the AGS human stomach carcinoma cell line analysed by patch-clamp analysis shown that peptide treatment caused short outward currents that were consistent with the formation of transient channel-like pores (89). However, the Cecropin B3 analogue
consisting of two hydrophobic $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$-helixes, declined to induce pore-formation. Surprisingly, the Cecropin B1 analogue with two amphipathic $\alpha$ helixes shows potent cytotoxic activity against several human leukemia cell lines at peptide concentrations that do not lyse normal fibroblasts or erythrocytes (90). What's more, Cecropin B1 is a more efficient toxic than Cecropin B against HL-60 human promyelocytic leukemia cells (91). From several researches point out that the amphipathic NH2-terminal $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$ helix of Cecropin $B$ considered to interact with anionic membrane through its basic amino acid residues and enable cytotoxic activity against cancer cells. On the other hand, the hydrophobic COOH-terminal $\alpha$-helix ought to help peptide inserting into the membrane resulting in positive curvature strain on the membrane that creates an toroidal pore (92). Cecropin B may be a promising drug for using in the human cancers treatment as this anticancer peptide reveals in vivo antitumor activity in mice bearing ascetic colon adenocarcinoma cells, as well as in vitro cytotoxic activity against human breast cancer cell lines (82), ovarian cancer cell lines (10), leukemia cancer cell lines (9), bladder cancer cell lines (7), hepato carcinoma cell lines (8), stomach carcinoma AGS, lung cancer cell lines (64).

### 2.6.3 Production of Cecropin B

High potential of Cecropin B in killing microorganisms and anticancer activity induce researchers explore more activity of this peptide. Several company have synthesized ready-to-use Cecropin B powder, however the cost of synthesis peptide are still expensive. Many experiments utilize prokaryote as hosts for production (93, 94). Nevertheless, recombinant protein from prokaryote also has limited condition with post-translational modification which peptide may become malfunction because of unstable protein folding (95). According to eukaryotic organisms that have such function of post-translational modification, correct glycosylation and protein folding, peptides production in eukaryote can be the alternative way to solve this problem. From previous studies, Cecropin B was successfully produced in Pichia pastoris strain SMD 1168 and studied its bioactivity (96). Although recombinant protein Cecropin B was expressed and determined some bioactivity, however study
of anticancer activity using recombinant Cecropin B produced in eukaryotic cells should be improved for further application.

To produce the recombinant protein CB and CB-PP, the developed eukaryotic expression system in methylotrophic yeast was used to increase the production. The methylotrophic yeast is a group of yeast that has ability to use methanol as carbon source such as Pichai pastoris, Hansenula polymorphas, Cadida boidinii (97, 98) Pichia pastoris is a single-celled microorganism that is easy to manipulate and culture. However, it is also a eukaryote and capable of many of the posttranslational modifications performed by higher eukaryotic cells such as proteolytic processing, folding, disulfide bond formation and glycosylation. Pichai pastoris contains two genes which is potential inducible promoters which are ${ }_{p} A O X 1$ and ${ }_{p} A O X 2$ promoters, these promoters will introduce yeast produce more recombinant protein. Pichai pastoris has been defined into three groups; methanol utilization plus (Mut plus), methanol utilization slow (Mut slow) and methanol utilization minus (Mut minus). Mut plus are X-33 wild type strain and GS115 which needs a histidine supplement to grow, both strain have two promoters. Mut slow is KM71H, inserting with argininosucinate lyase (ARG4), AOX1 was disable resulting in slow utilize methanol. Mut minus, cannot grow in media containing methanol resulting from the two promoters were disrupted

As a result, many recombinant proteins that come to close as inactive inclusion bodies in bacterial systems such as $E$. coli are produced as biologically active molecules in Pichia pastoris instead. The Pichia pastoris system is also generally considered because it is faster, easier, and less expensive to take advantage of than other higher eukaryotic expression systems such as insect and mammalian tissue culture cell systems and usually gives higher expression levels (99)

## CHAPTER III

## MATERIALS AND METHODS

### 3.1 Equipment and chemicals

### 3.1.1 Equipment

$4^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ Freezer
Autoclave HV-50
ÄKTA start
(Panasonic, Thailand)
(Amerex Instrument, Inc., U.S.A.)
(GE healthcare, U.K.)
Automatic micropipette P2, P20, P200 and P1000 HTL LABMATEPRO
(HTL LAB SOLUTIONS, Poland)
Automatic micropipette 1-5 ml
Balance Adventure ${ }^{\text {TM }}$, ARC 120
(Thermo Scientific, U.S.A.)
(Ohaus., U.S.A)
Balance Adventure ${ }^{\text {TM }}$, ARC 2140
Biological safety cabinet, Heal force ${ }^{\circledR}$, Hfsafe-1200
Gene Pulser® Cuvette 0.2 cm
High speed micro refrigerated centrifuge MTX-150
High speed micro refrigerated centrifuge 6500
Hot plate PC-101
Incubator MIR 152
Microplate reader Multiskan Fc Type 357
Micropulser ${ }^{\text {TM }}$
(Ohaus., U.S.A)
(Shanghai Lishen, China)
(Bio-Rad Laboratories, China)
(Tony Seiko Co., Ltd., Japan)
(Kubota, Japan)
(Corning, U.S.A.)
(Sanyo Electric, Japan)
(Thermo Fisher scientific, China)
(Bio-Rad, U.S.A.)
Microwave oven National ${ }^{\circledR}$
(Matsushita Electric, Japan)
NanoDrop ${ }^{\text {™ }} 2000$ C UV-Vis Spectrophotometer
PCR
pH meter Accumet® AB15
(Thermo scientific, U.S.A)
(Bio-Rad, U.S.A.)
(Fisher scientific, Singapore)
Power supply, Power PAC3000
(Bio-RAD Laboratories, U.S.A.)
UV-Visible recording spectrophotometer UV-160
Vortex mixer KMC-1300V
(Shimadzu, Japan)
(Vision scientific, Korea)
Water proplus
(Labconco, U.S.A.)

### 3.1.2 Chemicals and reagents

3-(4, 5-dimethylthiazol-2-yl)-2, 5 Bio Basic INC diphenyltetrasolium bromide (MTT) (Bio-Basic, Canada)

Absolute ethanol
Absolute methanol
Ammonium persulfate
Glacial acid 100\% anhydrous
Agar Microbiology grade
Agarose Molecular biology grade
Bacto ${ }^{\text {TM }}$ Peptone powder
France)
Biotin
Calcium chloride anhydrous
di-Potassium hydrogen phosphate
di-Sodium hydrogen phosphate
Dimethyl sulfoxide, DMSO
Dithiothreitol, DTT
DNA ladder 1 kb, M11
D-sorbitol
Ethidium bromide
Ethylenediaminetetraacetic acid, EDTA
Fetal calf serum, FCS
Glycerol
HEPES, free acid
Hydrochloric acid 37\%
Roswell Park Memorial Institute medium, RPMI 1640 (Biochrom, U.K.)
Sodium chloride
Sodium dodecyl sulfate, SDS
Sodium hydroxide
TAE buffer free mix powder
(Merk, U.S.A.)
(Merk, U.S.A.)
(Sigma Aldrich, U.S.A.)
(Merk, Germany)
(Merk, Germany)
(Research organics, U.S.A.)
(Becton, Dickinson and company,
(Fluka, Germany)
(Merk, Germany)
(Carlo Erba Reagenti, Italy)
(Carlo Erba Reagenti, Italy)
(Fluka, Switzerland)
(Bio-Basic, Canada)
(SibEnzyme, Russia)
(Fluka, Germany)
(Bio-Basic, Canada)
(Carlo Erba Reagenti, Italy)
(Biochrom, U.K.)
(Ajex Chemicals, Australia)
(Bio-Basic, Canada)
(Merk, Germany)
(Ajex Chemicals, Australia)
(Bio-Basic, Canada)
(Ajex Finechem, Australia)
(Bio-Basic, Canada)

| Tetramethylethylenediamine, TEMED | (Bio-Rad, U.S.A.) |
| :--- | :--- |
| Tris, molecular biology grade | (Research organics, U.S.A.) |
| Tryptone powder | (Bio-Basic, Canada) |
| Yeast nitrogen base powder with ammonium sulfate, YNB (Bio-Basic, Canada) |  |
| Yeast extract powder | (Bio springer, France) |
| Zeocin™ | (Invitrogen, U.S.A.) |
| 3.1.3 Kits |  |
| E.Z.N.A. gel extraction kit | (OMEGA Biotek, Georgia) |
| 3.1.4 Enzymes |  |
| EcoR I | (Roche, Germany) |
| i-Taq DNA polymerase | (iNtRON Biotechnology, Korea) |
| Kpn I | (Roche, Germany) |
| Pst I | (Vivantis, Malasia) |
| RNase A | (New England Biolab, U.K.) |
| T4 DNA Ligase | (Promega, U.S.A.) |

### 3.1.5 Microorganisms

Escherichia coli Top10F' used as a host for recombinant plasmid construction and Pichia pastoris strains; KM71H, X-33 and GS115 purchased from Invitrogen, U.S.A.

### 3.1.6 Cell lines

Cells line were obtained from the American Type Culture Collection (Rockville, MD) Human breast carcinoma cell (BT-474), ATCC ${ }^{\circledR}$ HTB-20 ${ }^{\text {™ }}$
Human lung bronchus carcinoma cell line (ChaGo-K1), ATCC ${ }^{\oplus}$ HTB-168 ${ }^{\text {TM }}$
Human liver hepatocellular carcinoma cell line (Hep-G2), ATCC ${ }^{\circledR}$ HTB-8065™ $^{\text {™ }}$
Human gastric carcinoma cell line (Kato-III), ATCC ${ }^{\circledR}$ HTB-103 ${ }^{\text {™ }}$
Human colon carcinoma cell line (SW-620), ATCC ${ }^{\oplus}{ }^{\oplus} \mathrm{HTB}-227^{\text {TM }}$
Human lung fibroblast cell line (WI-38), ATCC ${ }^{\oplus} \mathrm{CCL}-75^{\text {TM }}$

### 3.2 General protocol

### 3.2.1 Agarose gel electrophoresis

The agarose gel was prepared by dissolving the agarose gel powder in $1 \times$ TAE buffer ( 40 mM Tris-acetate, 1 mM EDTA, pH 8.0). Then, melted the agarose gel and cooled down solution. The solution was poured into a tray equipped with comb for a well-forming. After the gel was polymerized, it was loaded into the chamber with 1× TAE running buffer. The DNA samples mixed with 1X loading dye (final concentration) ( 50 mM Tris-HCl, $2.5 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{ml}$ bromophenol blue, $2.5 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{ml}$ xylene cyanol, $60 \%$ glycerol at pH 7.6) were loaded into the wells. Next, the standard DNA markers ( 1 kb DNA ladders) were loaded into the well. The DNA was separated by electrophoresis at 100 volts for 25 min in $1 \times$ TAE buffer. The gel was stained with ethidium bromide solution for 10 minute and de-stained in the water for 2 min . The DNA bands were visualized under the UV transilluminator

### 3.2.2 Protein analysis

### 3.2.2.1 Analysis of recombinant protein by SDS-PAGE

The gel solutions for $18 \%$ separating gel ( 2.50 ml of $30 \%$ acrylamide, 1.27 ml of 1.5 M Tris-HCl pH 8.8, $50 \mu \mathrm{l}$ of $10 \%$ SDS, $50 \mu \mathrm{l}$ of $10 \%$ APS, $2 \mu \mathrm{l}$ of TEMED and 1.13 ml of distilled water) and 5\% stacking gel (500 $\mu \mathrm{l}$ of $30 \%$ acrylamide, $380 \mu \mathrm{l}$ of 1 M Tris-HCl pH 6.8, $30 \mu \mathrm{l}$ of $10 \%$ SDS, $30 \mu \mathrm{l}$ of $10 \%$ APS, $3 \mu \mathrm{l}$ of TEMED and 2.06 ml of distilled water) were prepared. The separation gel solution was poured into the glass plates with 0.75 mm spacer and covered on top with distilled water. After 30 min , the gel was completely polymerized. Then, the stacking gel solution was poured on top of the separating gel and comb was immediately put between the glass plates. After the stacking gel was polymerized, the comb was removed and the wells were rinsed with distilled water to remove excess un-polymerized acrylamide. The protein samples were prepared by resuspending the proteins in $1 \times$ SDS loading buffer (12 mM Tris-HCl, pH 6.8, 5\% glycerol, $0.4 \%$ SDS, $0.02 \%$ bromophenol blue, and 2.88 mM 2-mercaptoethanol). The samples were then boiled for 10 min and spun down. The samples and protein standard marker were loaded into gel. Electrophoresis was run
in $1 \times$ SDS running buffer ( 25 mM Tris-HCl, pH 8.3, 192 mM glycine, and $0.1 \%(\mathrm{w} / \mathrm{v}$ ) SDS) with a constant current of 25 mA per gel until the dye font search the end of the gel. After electrophoresis, the gel was stained in the Coomassie brilliant blue R250 staining solution ( $0.1 \%$ ( $\mathrm{w} / \mathrm{v}$ ) Coomassie brilliant blue R250, 10\% (v/v) acetic acid, $45 \%(\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{v})$ methanol) at room temperature with gentle shaking for 1 hour. Next, the gel was destained using the destaining solution ( $10 \%(\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{v})$ acetic acid, $10 \%(\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{v})$ methanol) and shaken at room temperature until the gel background was clear.

### 3.3 Methods

3.3.1 Construction of Cecropin B (CB) and Cecropin B-Polyproline (CB-PP) into pGEM ${ }^{\circledR}$ T Easy Vector

### 3.3.1.1 Amplification of CB and CB-PP genes

The double stand DNA of CB-PP gene was synthesize and cloned into pUC57 vector by BIO BASIC Int. (Canada) to become pUC57::CB-PP plasmid. The CB and CBPP gene was amplified by PCR using pUC57::CB-PP as template. For CB gene, CB-Fp ( $5^{\prime}$-GAA TTC AAG TGG AAG GTC TTC AAG-3') which contained EcoR I restriction site (underlined) as forward primer, CB-Rp ( $5^{\prime}$ - ATG CTG CAG TGC CTT CGC TTC GCC CAG - $3^{\prime}$ ) which contained Pst I restriction site (underlined) as reverse primer. For CBPP gene, CB-Fp ( $5^{\prime}$-GAA TTC AAG TGG AAG GTC TTC AAG-3') which contained EcoR I restriction site (underlined) as forward primer, CB-PP-Rp which contained Pst । restriction site ( $5^{\prime}-\mathrm{G}$ CTG CAG GCG GGA CGG GGT AGC GCG-3') as reverse primer. PCR reactions were performed according to the manufacturer's instruction of the $i \mathrm{Taq}^{\mathrm{TM}}$ DNA polymerase master mix (Intron Biotechnology), which the amplification procedure consisted of an initial incubation for 2 min at $94^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ followed by 30 cycles of denaturation for 30 s at $94^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, annealing for 30 s at $55^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, and extension for 30 s at $72^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. The reaction was then maintained at $72^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 7 min . The amplified PCR products were analysed using $1 \%$ agarose gel electrophoresis preparing with $1 \times$ TAE buffer.

### 3.3.1.2 Ligation of CB and CB-PP into pGEM ${ }^{\circledR}$ - T Easy Vector

PCR products of CB and CB-PP were ligated into a pGEM ${ }^{\circledR}$ - $T$ Easy Vector (Promega), with overhang T-A cloning technique. The total $20 \mu \mathrm{l}$ of ligation mixture contained $2 \mu \mathrm{l}$ of $10 \times$ T4 ligation buffer, 100 ng of $\mathrm{pGEM}{ }^{\circledR}$-T Easy Vector, 50 ng of PCR products of CB and CB-PP fragments, $1 \mu \mathrm{l}$ of T4 DNA ligase and adjusted to expected total volume with sterilized water. The reaction was incubated at $16^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 3-5 h. Afterwards, $10 \mu \mathrm{l}$ of the ligation mixture was transformed into freshly prepared E. coli Top10F' competent cells as described in the section below.
3.3.1.3Transformation of pGEM::CB and pGEM::CB-PP into competent E. coli

### 3.3.1.3.1 Preparation of fresh competent E. coli

Pick up a fresh single colony of $E$. coli (Top10F'), inoculated in 5 ml of LB broth in 250 ml Erlenmeyer flask with shaking at 200, grown for $16-20$ hours at $37^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. Transferred the culture about 0.5 ml to 100 ml LB broth, incubated the culture about 3 hours at $37^{\circ} \mathrm{C}, 200 \mathrm{rpm}$. The cell culture was transferred aseptically to a sterile ice-cold 50 ml tubes, the culture was cooled to $0{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 10 minutes. The cells was recovered by centrifugation at 4000 rpm for 10 minutes at $4{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. The media was decanted from cell pellets and resuspended each pellet in 10 ml ice-cold 0.1 M $\mathrm{CaCl}_{2}$ and store on ice. The cells was recovered again by centrifugation at 4000 rpm for 10 minutes at $4^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, decanted the supernatant and resuspended each pellet in 2 ml ice-cold $0.1 \mathrm{M} \mathrm{CaCl}_{2}$ and store on ice. A chilled, sterile pipette tip was then used to transfer $200 \mu \mathrm{l}$ of competent cells to a sterile microfuge tube, kept the competent cells until use.

### 3.3.1.3.2Transformation of $E$. coli by heat shock

The ligation reaction $10 \mu$ l was added to each tube, mix the tubes gently by swirling then stored on ice for 30 minutes. The tubes were transferred to a rack place in a circulating water bath which had been preheated to $42^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, leaved the tubes in the rack for exactly 90 seconds without shaking. After that, rapidly
transferred the tubes on ice, allow the cells to chill for 3 minutes. Adding each tube with $800 \mu \mathrm{l}$ of LB broth incubated the cultures for 45 minutes at $37^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. Transfer appropriate volume of transformed competent cells onto LB agar containing 100 $\mu g / \mathrm{ml}$ ampicillin, gently spread plate on agar plate, incubated plate at $37{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, colonies will appear in 12-16 hours. The selected clones were selected using bluewhite screening method and were sequenced using T7 promoter primer with an automated sequencer by a commercial service (Macrogen Inc., Korea), The DNA sequences were analyzed, and a BLAST search was performed using NCBI portal. The pGEM ${ }^{\circledR}$ - ${ }^{\top}$ Easy Vector fused with $C B$ and $C B-P P$ was named as $p G E M:: C B$ and pGEM::CB-PP.

### 3.3.2 Construction of $C B$ and $C B-P P$ into pPICZaA expression vector

### 3.3.2.1 Extraction and purification of plasmid DNA

CB and CB-PP in PGEM ${ }^{\circledR}$ - T Easy Vector was extracted using the protocol from molecular cloning, second edition (E.F. Fritsch, J. Sambrook and T. Maniatis, 1989)

### 3.3.2.1.1 DNA extraction

A single bacterial colony was transferred into 5 ml of LB medium containing $100 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{ml}$ ampicillin. Incubate the culture overnight at $37^{\circ} \mathrm{C}, 200 \mathrm{rpm}$. The culture was poured into a microfuge tube, centrifuged at $12,000 \mathrm{~g}$ for 30 seconds at $4^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ in a microfuge. Store the remainder of the culture at $4^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. The medium was then removed, leaving the bacterial pellet as dry as possible. The bacterial pellet was resuspended in $100 \mu$ l of ice-cold solution I by vigorous vortex. The freshly prepared solution Il was added of $200 \mu$ l, mixed by inverting the tube rapidly 5 times. The 150 $\mu \mathrm{l}$ of ice-cold solution III was added, vortexed gently or inverted for 10 seconds, stored on ice for $3-5$ minutes. Centrifuge at $12,000 \mathrm{~g}$ for 5 minutes at $4^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ in a microfuge. Transfer the supernatant to a fresh tube. Precipitate the double-stranded DNA with 2 volumes of ethanol at room temperature. Mix by vortexing Allow the
mixture to stand for 2 minutes at room temperature. Centrifuge at $12,000 \mathrm{~g}$ for 5 minutes at $4^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ in a microfuge. Remove the supernatant, rinse the pellet with 1 ml of $70 \%$ ethanol at $4{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. Remove the supernatant and allow the pellet to dry in the air for 10 minutes. Redissolve the nucleic acids in $30-50 \mu \mathrm{l}$ of TE pH 8.0 or sterile water containing DNAase free pancreatic RNAase $20 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{ml}$, vortex briefly and store the DNA at $-20^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$.

### 3.3.2.1.2 DNA purification

The plasmids or PCR products were purified from agarose gel by E.Z.N.A. gel extraction kit, OMEGA Biotek. The agarose gel band was excised from agarose gel with a clean sharp scalpel. Extra agarose was removed to minimize the size of the gel slice. The gel slice was weighted and transferred to a clean microcentrifuge tube. Assuming a density of $1 \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{mL}$ of the volume of gel is derived by adding 1 volume Binding Buffer (XP2) to the tube, incubated at $60^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 7 minutes or until the gel has completely melted. The tube was shaking every 2-3 minutes, inserted a HiBind® DNA Mini Column in 2 ml Collection Tube then added no more than $700 \mu \mathrm{l}$ DNA/agarose binding buffer to the HiBind® DNA Mini Column. The tube was centrifuged at 10,000 x g for 1 minute at room temperature, discarded the filtrate and reuse collection tube, repeated again and the sample has been transferred to the column. Binding Buffer (XP2) was added to the tube $300 \mu$ l, centrifuged at maximum speed ( $\geq 13,000$ $\times \mathrm{g}$ ) for 1 minute at room temperature. The filtrate was discarded, added $700 \mu \mathrm{~L}$ SPW Wash Buffer and centrifuged at maximum speed for 1 minute at room
temperature, discarded the filtrate. The empty HiBind® DNA Mini Column was centrifuged for 2 minutes at maximum speed to dry the column matrix. Then, transferred the HiBind $®$ DNA Mini Column to a clean 1.5 mL microcentrifuge tube, added 30-50 $\mu \mathrm{L}$ Elution Buffer or deionized water directly to the center of the column membrane and centrifuged at maximum speed for 1 minute. DNA was kept at $-20^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ until used.

### 3.3.2.1.3 Ligation and transformation of CB and CB-PP into pPICZ $\alpha A$ expression vector

The pPICZQA::CA-PP constructed by inserting Pst I site and 6-histidine after Cecropin A (CA) nucleotides sequence was used to be a host vector (constructed by Dr.Sarintip Sooksai). The pGEM::CB and pGEM:CB-PP were extracted and digested with EcoR I and Pst I to get CB and CB-PP fragments. After that, the CB and CB-PP fragments with the size of 114 and 159 bp respectively were purified, and ligated with the modified host vector, pPICZQA::CA-PP which digested with EcoR I and Pst I to generate the pPICZQA::CB and pPICZ 1 A::CB-PP plasmid. The total $20 \mu \mathrm{l}$ of ligation mixture contained $2 \mu \mathrm{l}$ of $10 \times$ T4 ligation buffer, 100 ng of EcoRI/Pst| digested pPICZQA, 200 ng of EcoRI/Pstl digested CB and CB-PP, $1 \mu \mathrm{l}$ of T4 DNA ligase and adjusted to expected total volume with sterilized water. The reaction was incubated at $16^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 3-5 hours. After that, $10 \mu \mathrm{l}$ of the ligation mixture was transformed into freshly prepared E. coli Top10F' competent cells as described in the section 3.3.1.3.1. The reaction will be transformed into E. coli Top10F' competent cells by heat shock method (described in section 3.3.1.3.2 ) and plate on low salt LB solid medium containing $25 \mu g . \mathrm{ml}^{-1}$ Zeocin. Pick up a transformant clones, growth and extract plasmids (described below) for checking the expected size by 1\% agarose gel electrophoresis, then sequenced by Macrogen (Korea). The

DNA sequences were analyzed, and a BLAST search was performed using NCBI portal. The pPICZ $\alpha A$ vector fused with $C B$ and CB-PP was named as pPICZ $\alpha A:: C B$ and pPICZ $\alpha A:: C B-P P$.

### 3.3.3 Transformation of recombinant plasmid pPICZaA::CB and pPICZaA::CB-PP into Pichia pastoris strain KM71H

### 3.3.3.1 Preparation of competent yeast

Grew Pichia pastoris strain KM71H in 5 ml YPD at $30^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, 250 rpm overnight. Inoculate 1 ml of culture in 50 ml YPD broth (see Appendix A), shaking with 250 rpm , $30^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ about 3 hours. Centrifuge at $5000 \mathrm{rpm}, 4^{\circ} \mathrm{C}, 5$ minutes. Resuspend the pellet in 10 ml YPD and 2 ml 1 M HEPES pH8.0 Add $250 \mu \mathrm{~L}$ 1M DTT, gently mix. Incubate at $30^{\circ} \mathrm{C}, 5$ minutes. Chill on ice 5 minutes. Centrifuge at $5000 \mathrm{rpm}, 4{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}, 5$ minutes. Wash with 25 ml cold sterile water. Centrifuge at $5000 \mathrm{rpm}, 4{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}, 5$ minutes. Wash with 2 ml cold 1M sorbital. Resuspend in $100 \mu \mathrm{l}$ cold 1 M sorbital.

### 3.3.3.2 Transformation of fresh competent yeast

The CB and CB-PP were linearized using Kpn I restriction enzymes then, mix $10 \mu \mathrm{l}$ DNA (approximately $5-10 \mathrm{ng}$ DNA) with $80 \mu \mathrm{l}$ competent cell and transfer to 2mm gap cuvette, held on ice 5 minutes. Pulse the cells with 2.5 kV . Add $500 \mu \mathrm{l}$ of 1 M cold sorbital to cuvette and transfer to 1.5 ml microtube. Incubate the cells at 30 ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 1 hour without shaking. Add $500 \mu \mathrm{~L}$ YPD broth and incubate at $30^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 1 hour, 200 rpm . Gently spread plate on YPD plate containing $100 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{ml}$ zeocin antibiotic. Incubate at $30^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 3 days.

### 3.3.4 Expression of recombinant protein CB and CB-PP

Fresh single colony of each Pichia pastoris KM 71 H recombinant clones was inoculated in 10 ml of BMGY medium (see Appendix A) for starter culture and growth overnight at $30^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ with shaking at 280 rpm to an $\mathrm{OD}_{600}$ of 2-6. Inoculated $10 \%$ of
starter culture in 100 ml of BMGY medium in 250 ml baffle flask and cultivate at $30^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 24 h with shaking at 280 rpm . After 24 hours, Cells were collected by centrifugation at $5,000 \times g$ for 5 minutes at room temperature, decant the media and pellets resuspend in 20 ml of BMMY expression medium (see Appendix A) for induction and $100 \%$ methanol was added to a final concentration of $0.5 \%$ methanol every 24 hours to maintain an induction. The cell cultures were took at 24, and 48 hours and analysed by SDS-PAGE analysis.

### 3.3.5 Purification of recombinant protein CB-PP

The $\mathrm{His}_{6}$-tag rCB-PP protein was purified by nickel affinity chromatography (Histrap Fast Flow column) using Akta start. First, filtrated the supernatant with 0.45 micron filter, then equilibrated protein by mixing with binding buffer ( 20 mM Sodium Phosphate buffer pH7.4 containing 0.5 M NaCl , and 5 mM imidazole) in the ratio $1: 2$ (supernatant : binding buffer). After that, the Histrap Fast Flow bead (GE Healthcare) was equilibrated with the same binding buffer for 10 column volumes and 100 ml supernatant was loaded into the column. Then, the Ni-bead was washed by the binding buffer for 10 column volumes to remove unbound proteins. Next, the recombinant protein was eluted by the elution buffer ( 20 mM Tris-HCl supplement with, $0.5 \mathrm{M} \mathrm{NaCl}, \mathrm{pH} 7.4$ ) containing 500 mM imidazole and collected the fractions. The purified fractions were analyzed by $18 \%$ SDS-PAGE. The fractions containing the expected recombinant protein were pooled and the imidazole was removed by dialysis one hundred thousand fold at $4{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ against phosphate-buffered saline (PBS), pH 7.4. The protein quantified using NanoDrop 2000C UV-Vis spectrophotometry.

### 3.3.6 Cytotoxicity assay using MTT

### 3.3.6.1 Cell lines culture and treatment condition

The cell lines including human breast carcinoma cell (BT-474), human lung bronchus carcinoma cell line (ChaGo-K1), human liver hepatocellular carcinoma cell line (Hep-G2), human gastric carcinoma cell line (Kato-III) and human colon carcinoma cell line (SW-620) were cultured in Roswell Park Memorial Institute medium (RPMI 1640) supplement with 5-10 \% fetal calf serum (FCS). While human
lung fibroblast cell line (WI-38) were cultured in Dulbecco's Modified Eagle's Medium (DMEM) supplement with 5-10 \% fetal calf serum (FCS). Cells cultured were incubating at $37^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ in a $5 \% \mathrm{CO}_{2}$ atmosphere. After $24-48$ hours incubation period, the attached cell was trypsinized by trypsin for 3-5 minutes and centrifuges a $380 \times \mathrm{g}$ for 5 minutes. The cell were counted and distributed in 96 -well plates at $5 \times 10^{3}$ cell per well for further treatment.

All cell lines including both normal cell line and cancer cell lines were treated with several concentration of peptide. For the first experiment, the synthetic $C B$ and recombinant protein $C B$ were used in the concentration of $0.019 \mu \mathrm{M}-10 \mu \mathrm{M}$. The second experiment, the recombinant $C B$ and CB-PP were used in the concentration of $0.039 \mu \mathrm{M}-20 \mu \mathrm{M}$. All samples were diluted by serial dilution of culture media. Cell lines were counted and distributed in 96 -well plates at $5 \times 103$ cell/well and incubate for 24 hours, then culture medium were remove from 96 -well plates and added $200 \mu$, serial dilution of peptide for each well. The plate was incubating 72 h at $37^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ in a fully humidified atmosphere of $5 \% \mathrm{CO}_{2}$ atmosphere.

### 3.3.6.2 Cytotoxicity test by MTT assay

Cytotoxicity assay was performed using tetrazolium dye MTT 3-(4,5-dimethylthiazol-2-yl)-2,5-diphenyltetrazolium bromide, a mitochondrial-based cell viability assay. This assay is a colorimetric assay for assessing the activity of mitochondrial dehydrogenase enzyme that can reduce MTT to produce insoluble formazan in living cells which has a purple colour (Figure 3.1). This reaction allows determining the viability of cells. The procedure is starting with $5 \times 10^{3}$ cells per well was plate in 96 -well plate and, after 24 hours the cell lines were treated with different concentration of peptide. The plate was incubated 72 hours at $37^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ in $5 \%$ $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ atmosphere. After 72 hours, cells were incubated with $10 \mu \mathrm{l}$ of $5 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{ml}$ MTT solution for 4 hours at $37^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ in $5 \% \mathrm{CO}_{2}$ atmosphere. The MTT solution was then discarded and $150 \mu \mathrm{l}$ of DMSO was added to each well. The absorbance of this solution was quantified by measuring with microplate reader at the wavelength of

540 nm . The percentage of cell viability was calculated according to the following formula.

$$
\text { Percentage of cell viability = OD of treated cell x } 100
$$

OD of control cells

The $\mathrm{IC}_{50}$ values were obtained by plotting the percentage of cell viability versus the peptide concentration.


Figure 3. 1 The scheme of reduction of the MTT to formazan by mitochondrial reductase enzymes.
(Source: www.interchopen.com)

## CHAPTER IV

## RESULTS

### 4.1 Construction and transformation of pGEM::CB and pGEM::CB-PP

Previously, the pUC57::CB-PP plasmid synthesized by BIO BASIC Int. (Canada) was used as a template for amplifying CB and CB-PP genes which both will have 6 histidine tag ( $6 x$ His - tag) at C-terminus. The CB gene was amplified by primer CB-Fp which introduced an EcoR I site at N-terminus, and CB-Fp which introduced a Pst I site at C-terminus. The CB-PP gene was amplified by primer CB-Fp which introduced an EcoR I site at N-terminus, and CB-PP-Rp which introduced a Pst I site at Cterminus. Size of the purified PCR products was analysed by 1\% agarose gel electrophoresis (figure 4.1). It was found that the sizes of CB and CB-PP genes were approximately 114 and 159 bp respectively.

After receiving the $C B$ and $C B-P P$ genes, $p G E M:: C B$ and $p G E M:: C B-P P$ were generated by cloning these genes into pGEM® T-easy vector. The PCR products of CB and CB-PP fragments and were directly ligated with the pGEM® T-easy vector, then transformed into E. coli Top10F'. Size of the recombinant plasmid was analysed by $1 \%$ agarose gel electrophoresis to ensure that the correct fragment was inserted into pGEM® T-easy vector as shown in figure 4.4 and 4.5 . The sizes of pGEM::CB was approximately 3129 bp and pGEM::CB-PP was approximately 3174 bp and the purified recombinant plasmid was confirmed by sequencing analysis (figure 4.2 and 4.3).


Figure 4. 1 1\% agarose gel electrophoresis of CB and CB-PP genes. The CB-Fp, CB-Rp and CB-PP-Rp were used to amplify CB and CB-PP genes. Lane $M$ is a 1 kb DNA ladder marker. Lane 1 is the CB gene with the size of 114 bp . Lane 2 is the CB-PP gene with the size of 159 bp .



Figure 4. 2 The sequence of CB gene digested with EcoR I and Pst I enzymes consist of 114 nucleotides, 38 amino acids.


Figure 4. 3 The sequence of CB gene digested with EcoR I and Pst I enzymes consist of 159 nucleotides, 53 amino acids.


Figure 4. 4 1\% agarose gel electrophoresis of pGEM::CB. The CB genes were ligated into pGEM® T-easy vector to generate the pGEM::CB and 1\% agarose gel electrophoresis was used to analysed. Lane $M$ is a 1 kb DNA ladder marker. Lane 1 is pGEM® T-easy vector with the size of 3015 bp . Lane 2 is pGEM::CB digested with Pst I and EcoR I restriction enzymes, the upper band was pGEM with the size approximately 3000 bp and the lower band was CB with the size approximately 114 bp.


Figure 4. 5 1\% agarose gel electrophoresis of pGEM::CB-PP. The CB-PP genes were ligated into pGEM® T-easy vector to generate the pGEM::CB-PP and 1\% agarose gel electrophoresis was used to analysed. Lane $M$ is a 1 kb DNA ladder marker. Lane 1 is pGEM® T-easy vector with the size of 3015 bp. Lane 2 is pGEM::CB-PP digested with Pst I and EcoR I restriction enzymes, the upper band was pGEM with the size approximately 3000 bp and the lower band was CB with the size approximately 159 bp.

### 4.2 Construction and transformation of pPICZ $\alpha A:: C B$ and pPICZ $\alpha A:: C B-P P$

The pGEM::CB and pGEM::CB-PP were digested with restriction enzymes EcoR I and Pst I to obtain CB and CB-PP fragments. These CB and CB-PP DNA fragments were ligated into the modified pPICZaA expression vector which has been modified by inserting Pstl recognition site, 6-histidine and stop codon in front of the Kpnl of the recognition site in origin pPICZaA expression vector. The recombinant plasmids pPICZaA::CB and pPICZ $\alpha A:: C B-P P$ were transformed into E. coli Top10F' competent cells by chemical method. The transformants were selected on low salt LB containing $25 \mu \mathrm{~g} . \mathrm{ml}^{-1}$ of Zeocin agar plate. Transformant clones were grown and the
recombinant plasmids, pPICZaA::CB and pPICZaA::CB-PP, were extracted. The size of the recombinant plasmid was analysed by $1 \%$ agarose gel electrophoresis to ensure that the correct fragment was inserted into the pPICZaA expression vector as shown in figure 4.6 and 4.7. The sizes of pPICZaA::CB and pPICZaA::CB-PP was found to be 3697 bp and 3742 bp respectively. Then, the purified recombinant plasmid was confirmed by sequencing analysis (Figure 4.8 and 4.9) to assure that the fragments were inserted into the expression correctly as shown in the genetic map figure 4.10 and 4.11.


Figure 4.6 1\% agarose gel electrophoresis of pPICZ $\alpha$ A::CB. The CB genes digested with EcoR I and Pst I from pGEM® T-easy vector was ligated into pPICZ $\alpha$ A expression vector which was digested with same enzymes to generate the pPICZ $\alpha$ A::CB and $1 \%$ agarose gel electrophoresis was used to analysed. Lane $M$ is a 1 kb DNA ladder marker. Lane 1 is PPICZ $\alpha$ A with the approximate size of 3600 bp. Lane 2 is pPICZ $\alpha$ A:: CB digested with Pst I and EcoR I restriction enzymes, the upper band was pPICZaA with the size approximately 3600 bp and the lower band was CB with the size approximately 114 bp .


Figure 4. 7 1\% agarose gel electrophoresis of pPICZaA::CB-PP. The CB-PP genes digested with EcoR I and Pst I from pGEM® T-easy vector was ligated into pPICZaA expression vector which was digested with same enzymes to generate the pPICZaA::CB-PP and 1\% agarose gel electrophoresis was used to analysed. Lane $M$ is a 1 kb DNA ladder marker. Lane 1 is pPICZaA with the approximate size of 3600 bp . Lane 2 is pPICZaA::CB-PP digested with Pst and EcoR I restriction enzymes, the upper band was pPICZaA with the size approximately 3600 bp and the lower band was CB-PP with the size approximately 159 bp.





CTC ATC TCA GAA GAG GAT CTG AAT AGC GCC GTC GAC CAT CAT CAT CAT CAT CAT TGA L I S E E D $\quad$ I

Figure 4. 8 The sequence of $C B$ gene in pPICZ $\alpha$ A expression vector with $\alpha$-factor signal sequence and 6-histidine tag after Pst I restriction site.

```
ATTCGA,ACG 
GCA TTA GCT GCT CCA GIC AAC ACT ACA ACA GAA GAT GAA ACG GCA CAA AIT CCG GCT 
```



```
AAG GCT GGT CCG GCT ATC GCA GTC CTG GGC GAA GCG AAG GCA CTG GGT CCG CCT
```



```
\ FstI \ Wxhistag
CCG CCT CTG CCG CCG CGC GCT ACC CCG TCC CGC CIG CAG CAT CAT CAT CAT
```



```
CTC ATC TCA GAA GAG GAT CTG AAT RGC GCC GTC GAC CAT CAT CAT CAT CAT CAT TGA
I
```

Figure 4. 9 The sequence of CB-PP gene in pPICZ $\alpha$ A expression vector with $\alpha$-factor signal sequence and 6-histidine tag after Pst I restriction site.


Figure 4. 10 Genetic map of recombinant plasmid of pPICZ $\alpha$ A::CB. The size of pPICZQA::CB is approximately 3697 bp.


Figure 4. 11 Genetic map of recombinant plasmid of pPICZaA::CB-PP. The size of pPICZ $\alpha$ A::CB-PP is approximately 3742 bp.

### 4.3 Expression and purification of recombinant protein $C B$ and CB-PP

Transformants of P. pastoris KM71H which harbour pPICZaA::CB or pPICZaA::CBPP were cultured in 100 ml BMGY medium in 500 ml baffled flasks for increase the cell population. After that cell pellet was collected and cultured in 20 ml BMMY for inducing protein expression. At every 24 h point during the expression process, $0.5 \%$ methanol was added to induce the strong expression of AOX1 promoter for 48 hours. The supernatant was collected every 0,24 and 48 hours, stored under the temperature of $-70^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ and analysed by $18 \%$ SDS-PAGE. The expected size of $r C B$ and rCB-PP were found to be 4.9 and 6.5 kDa , respectively (Figure 4.12 ). Subsequently, the SDS-PAGE bands of recombinant protein CB-PP were sent to identify by mass spectrometry (MS/MS) (Figure. 4.13). The supernatant of the recombinant protein was purified by nickel fast flow column (GE Healthcare) using Akta start (GE Healthcare). The recombinant proteins were eluted by 20 mM Tris-HCl, $0.5 \mathrm{M} \mathrm{NaCl}, \mathrm{pH} 7.4$ and 500 mM imidazole. The typical chromatogram was shown in Figure 4.14, 4.15. After that the purified recombinant protein was analyzed by 18\% SDS-PAGE, the expected size of rCB and rCB -PP were approximately 4.9 and 6.5 kDa respectively.


Figure 4. 12 18\% SDS-PAGE analysis of recombinant protein CB and CB-PP from $P$. pastoris KM71H staining with Coomassie blue. Lane M, protein marker; Lane 1, 2 and 3 , supernatant of recombinant protein CB collected in $0,24,48$ hours respectively with the expected size approximately 4.9 kDa ; Lane 4, 5 and 6, supernatant of recombinant protein CB-PP collected in $0,24,48$ hours respectively with the expected size of approximately 6.6 kDa .

## Mind Mascot Search Results

```
User : onrapak
Email : onrapak@gmail.com
Search title :
MS data file : CBPP_BB4_01_2757.mgf
Database : Swiss\overline{sProt} 2015_03 (547964 sequences; 195174196 residues)
Taxonomy : Metazoa (Animals) (103665 sequences)
Timestamp : 1 Apr 2015 at 10:10:32 GMT
Protein hits : TRYP PIG Trypsin OS=Sus Scrofa PE=1 SV=1
K2C1 HUMAN Keratin, type II cytoskeletal 1 OS=Homo sapiens GN=KRT1 PE=1 SV=6
K1C9 HUMAN Keratin, type I cytoskeletal 9 OS=Homo sapiens GN=KRT9 PE=1 SV=3
K1C9 CANFA Keratin, type I cytoskeletal 9 OS=Canis familiaris GN=KRT9 PE=3 SV=1
CECB HYACE Cecropin-B OS=Hyalophora cecropia PE=1 SV=1
5．CECB HYACE Mass：6746 Score： 31 Matches： \(1(0)\) Sequences： \(1(0)\)
Cecropin－B OS＝Hyalophora cecropia PE＝1 SV＝1
\(\square\) Check to include this hit in error tolerant search
Query Observed \(\operatorname{Mr}\)（expt） Mr （calc）Delta Miss Score Expect Rank Unique Peptide
\(\begin{array}{llllllllllll}\nabla & 137 & 548.8238 & 1095.6330 & 1095.6288 & 0.0042 & 0 & 31 & 0.5 & 1 & U & \text { K．AGPAIAVLGEAK．A }\end{array}\)
```

Figure 4． 13 Maspectromtry result of recombinant CB－PP．The recombinant CB－PP was analysed by mass spectrometry（MS／MS），then the database was searched by SwissProt program．
（http：／／mww．matrixscience．com／cgi／master＿results．pl？file＝．．／data／20150401／FTgTIbHwO．dat．）


Figure 4. 14 The chromatogram of purified rCB. 100 ml of supernatant was equilibrated with binding buffer in the ratio 1:2 then, applied to the Histrap column. Subsequently, 3 ml (twice elution) of purified recombinant protein was eluted with elution buffer.


Figure 4. 15 The chromatogram of rCB-PP. 100 ml of supernatant equilibrated with binding buffer in the ratio 1:2 then, applied to the Histrap column. Then, 3 ml of purified recombinant protein was eluted with elution buffer.

Total concentration of recombinant protein CB and CB-PP was determined using NanoDrop2000C UV-Vis spectrophotometer (Thermo scientific, U.S.A.). The concentration of recombinant protein CB and CB-PP were approximately $0.4 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{ml}$ and $0.5 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{ml}$ respectively.

### 4.4 Cytotoxicity test by MTT assay

Cytotoxicity effect of the recombinant protein $C B$ and CB-PP on the cell viability of human breast carcinoma cell line (BT-474), human lung bronchus carcinoma cell line (ChaGo-K1), human liver hepatocellular carcinoma cell line (HepG2), human gastric carcinoma cell line (Kato-III), human colon carcinoma cell line (SW-620) and human lung fibroblast cell line (WI-38) was studied. All cell lines were treated separately with each peptide in different concentration for 72 hours. Then, MTT assay was performed to determine the percentage of cell viability. The graphs of cell survival (\%) versus the protein concentration were shown in Figure 4.16 and 4.17.

In the first experiment, , six cell lines were treated with synthetic CB and rCBPP at the concentration between $0.019 \mu \mathrm{M}-10 \mu \mathrm{M}$. The results illustrated that the cell viability decreased as the concentration of protein increased. In addition, it was found that the viability of human breast carcinoma cell lines (BT-474), human lung bronchus carcinoma cell line (ChaGo-K1) and human colon carcinoma cell line (SW620), treated with $10 \mu \mathrm{M}$ of synthetic CB was lower than treated with rCB-PP at the same protein concentration. The $\mathrm{IC}_{50}$ values of cell lines could not be calculated because the protein concentration used in the experiment was not high enough. Interestingly, cell viability of human lung fibroblast cell line (WI-38) did not decreased when treated with both proteins. On the contrary, the cell numbers increased with respect to the protein concentrations as compared with untreated cells.


Figure 4. 16 Cell viability of human breast carcinoma cell (BT-474) after 72 hours treated with synthetic CB and recombinant CB-PP.


Figure 4. 17 Cell viability of human lung bronchus carcinoma cell line (ChaGo-K1) after 72 hours treated with synthetic CB and recombinant CB-PP.


Figure 4. 18 Cell viability of human liver hepatocellular carcinoma cell line (Hep-G2) after 72 hours treated with synthetic CB and recombinant CB-PP.


Figure 4. 19 Cell viability of human gastric carcinoma cell line (Kato-III after 72 hours treated with synthetic CB and recombinant CB-PP.


Figure 4. 20 Cell viability of human colon carcinoma cell line (SW-620) after 72 hours treated with synthetic CB and recombinant CB-PP.


Figure 4. 21 Cell viability of human lung fibroblast cell line (WI-38) after 72 hours treated with synthetic CB and recombinant CB-PP.

The second experiments, cell lines were treated with recombinant protein CB and CB-PP with the protein concentration between $0.078 \mu \mathrm{M}-20 \mu \mathrm{M}$ for 72 hours. The results showed that the cell viability of cancer cells decreased when the protein concentrations increased. Five cancer cell lines treated with recombinant protein CB and CB-PP showed $\mathrm{IC}_{50}$ values at various protein concentrations. The $50 \%$ inhibitory concentration $\left(\mathrm{IC}_{50}\right)$ was calculated as shown in table 4.1. While the cell number of human lung fibroblast cell line (WI-38) did not decrease even though it was treated with the same protein concentration. The pictures of cells after 72 hours treated with recombinant protein CB and CB-PP compared with cells did not treated with protein were shown in the figure 4.22-4.27. The results of the morphological change of six cell lines treated with rCB and rCB-PP under the microscope were observed with respect to control. According to the picture, it was found that the morphology of treated cancer cells was different from untreated cells. The treated cancer cells became apoptotic. The picture showed that the amount of five cancer cell lines after treated with $20 \mu \mathrm{M}$ of rCB and rCB-PP were decreased compared with control, however the amount of Wi-38 cells before and after treated with rCB and rCB-PP were not change because the growing of Wi-38 was slower than other cell lines.


Figure 4. 22 Cell viability of human breast carcinoma cell line (BT-474) after 72 hours treated with recombinant CB and $\mathrm{CB}-\mathrm{PP}$.


Figure 4. 23 Cell viability of human lung carcinoma cell line (Chago-K1) after 72 hours treated with recombinant $C B$ and CB-PP.


Figure 4. 24 Cell viability of human liver carcinoma cell line (Hep-G2) after 72 hours treated with recombinant CB and $\mathrm{CB}-\mathrm{PP}$.


Figure 4. 25 Cell viability of human gastric carcinoma cell line (Kato-III) after 72 hours treated with recombinant CB and CB-PP


Figure 4. 26 Cell viability of human colon carcinoma cell line (SW-620) after 72 hours treated with recombinant CB and $\mathrm{CB}-\mathrm{PP}$.


Figure 4. 27 Cell viability of human lung fibroblast cell line (Wi-38) after 72 hours treated with recombinant CB and CB-PP.

Table 4. 1 Cytotoxicity of rCB and rCB-PP against various cell lines

|  |  | $50 \%$ inhibition concentration $\left(\mathrm{IC}_{50}\right)^{*}$ |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Type of cell lines | $\mathrm{rCB}(\mu \mathrm{M})$ | $\mathrm{rCB}-\mathrm{PP}(\mu \mathrm{M})$ |  |
| BT-474 | 20 | 20 |  |
| ChaGo-K1 | 14.80 | 16.20 |  |
| Hep-G2 | 17.15 | 14.45 |  |
| Kato-III | 16.59 | 18.97 |  |
| SW-620 | 16.20 | 14.01 |  |
| Wi-38 | $>20$ | $>20$ |  |

*The $50 \%$ inhibition concentration ( $\mathrm{IC}_{50}$ ) of the recombinant protein; rCB and $\mathrm{rCB}-\mathrm{PP}$ against cell lines were determined using the MTT assay.


Figure 4. 28 Human breast carcinoma cell (BT-474) after 72 hours; (a) cells without treating with protein, (b) cells treated with $20 \mu \mathrm{MrCB}$ and (c) cells treated with 20 $\mu M$ rCB-PP.


Figure 4. 29 Human lung bronchus carcinoma cell line (ChaGo-K1) after 72 hours;
(a) cells without treating with protein, (b) cells treated with $20 \mu \mathrm{MrCB}$ and (c) cells treated with $20 \mu \mathrm{M}$ rCB-PP.


Figure 4. 30 Human liver hepatocellular carcinoma cell line (Hep-G2) after 72 hours; (a) cells without treating with protein, (b) cells treated with $20 \mu \mathrm{MrCB}$ and (c) cells treated with $20 \mu \mathrm{M}$ rCB-PP.


Figure 4. 31 Human gastric carcinoma cell line (Kato-III), after 72 hours; (a) cells without treating with protein, (b) cells treated with $20 \mu \mathrm{MrCB}$ and (c) cells treated with $20 \mu \mathrm{M}$ rCB-PP


Figure 4. 32 Human colon carcinoma cell line (SW-620), after 72 hours; (a) cells without treating with protein, (b) cells treated with $20 \mu \mathrm{MrCB}$ and (c) cells treated with $20 \mu \mathrm{M}$ rCB-PP.


Figure 4. 33 Human lung fibroblast cell line (WI-38), after 72 hours; (a) cells without treating with protein, (b) cells treated with $20 \mu \mathrm{M} \mathrm{rCB}$ and (c) cells treated with 20 $\mu \mathrm{M}$ rCB-PP.

## CHAPTER V DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

Cancers have had massive impact on many people worldwide because they cause million deaths, burden of money and many severe incidents. Although current treatments are able to treat various types of cancer, however these solutions also have many harmful side effects which remain the major factors of patient distress and most of them passed away. Although, the chemical therapeutic drugs are designed to specifically target to cancer cells, they can act on both normal cells and other rapidly dividing cells. In contrast, many investigations reported that most anticancer peptides specifically acted on cancer cells rather than noncancerous cells. Therefore, anticancer peptides are one of the promising alternative drugs for cancer treatment. Among the anticancer peptides reported, Cecropin B is the choice of interest since it has been reported to effect only on several cancer cells. Therefore, to obtain a large amount of CB, an effective production method must be developed. One approach is to produce CB as a recombinant protein by yeast.

In this study, we produced recombinant protein Cecropin B (rCB) and Cecropin B-Polyproline (rCB-PP) in vitro. We also exhibited the cytotoxic effect of on six cell lines including human breast carcinoma cell lines (BT-474), human lung bronchus carcinoma cell line (ChaGo-K1), human liver hepatocellular carcinoma cell line (Hep-G2), human gastric carcinoma cell line (Kato-III), human colon carcinoma cell line (SW-620) and human lung fibroblast cell line (WI-38). From all previous reports, the cytotoxicity activity against many cancer cell lines were assayed with synthetic purified CB. Therefore, to obtain the large amount of CB, recombinant protein expression is one of the best ways to study. Thus, Pichia pastoris strain KM71H was used as the host for recombinant protein production.

The rCB and rCB-PP were successfully produced in Pichia pastoris, 0.4 and 0.5 $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{ml}$ of purified rCB and rCB-PP were obtained. After that, the cytotoxicity was tested using MTT assay. In the preliminary study, the comparative cytotoxicity assay of synthetic CB and rCB-PP at different concentrations on six cell lines was
performed to investigate whether the rCB-PP was more effective than synthetic CB. The growth ability of cancer cell lines including BT-474, ChaGo-K1 and SW-620 started to decrease significantly at $10 \mu \mathrm{M}$ of synthetic CB and $r C B$ with the percentage of cell viability between 60\% - 80\%. Interestingly, Hep-G2 and Kato-III were killed more than $50 \%$ at $1.25 \mu \mathrm{M}$ concentration of rCB-PP. The normal cells treated with synthetic CB and rCB-PP at the concentration between $0.019 \mu \mathrm{M}-10 \mu \mathrm{M}$ still had growing ability more than 100\%. These results revealed that the cytotoxicity of both peptides was not significantly different because the length of PP in CB might be short.

Later, we also used the protein from the same production technique, which were rCB and $\mathrm{rCB}-$ PP obtained from Pichia pastoris strain KM71H to treat the same series of cell lines at 72 hours as well as the first experiment, protein concentration between $0.078 \mu \mathrm{M}-20 \mu \mathrm{M}$ were used. The result of cell viabilities show that five cancer cells treated with the range of above concentration of rCB and rCB-PP showed $\mathrm{IC}_{50}$ values at various protein concentrations on each cells. However, Wi-38 showed more than $80 \%$ viability even it was treated with rCB and rCB-PP at $20 \mu \mathrm{M}$. The $\mathrm{IC}_{50}$ values of tested cells were not significantly different since the amount of PP in CB was not high enough to play the outstanding role.

In case of BT-474, the $\mathrm{IC}_{50}$ of rCB and rCB -PP on this cell lines were $20 \mu \mathrm{M}$, compared with human breast cancer cell lines (MDA-MB-231) treating with synthetic CB. The anticancer efficiency of synthetic CB was significant at least $60 \mu \mathrm{M}$ (82). The cytotoxicity effect of ChaGo-K1 treated with rCB and $\mathrm{rCB}-\mathrm{PP}$ showed the $\mathrm{IC}_{50}$ at 14.80 $\mu \mathrm{M}$ and $16.20 \mu \mathrm{M}$ respectively. The rCB and $\mathrm{rCB}-P P$ also killed human liver hepatocellular carcinoma cell lines (Hep-G2) at $20 \mu \mathrm{M}$ and exhibited outstanding $\mathrm{IC}_{50}$ values at $17.15 \mu \mathrm{M}$ and $14.45 \mu \mathrm{M}$, while cytotoxicity of synthetic CB on human hepatocellular carcinoma BEL-7402 cell lines revealed $\mathrm{IC}_{50}$ values at $25 \mu \mathrm{M}$ (8). The cytotoxicity of rCB and rCB-PP against Kato-III showed $\mathrm{IC}_{50}$ values at $16.59 \mu \mathrm{M}$ and $18.97 \mu \mathrm{M}$ respectively while Chan SC, Hui L and Chen HM studied antitumor activity of synthetic CB against gastric carcinoma cells, they showed $\mathrm{IC}_{50}$ values at $13 \mu \mathrm{M}(74)$. The $\mathrm{IC}_{50}$ values for human colon carcinoma cell lines (SW-620) performed with rCB and rCB-PP were $16.20 \mu \mathrm{M}$ and $14.01 \mu \mathrm{M}$ respectively, however; in 1994, Moore and
his colleagues studied anticancer activity of synthetic CB against murine ascetic colon adenocarcinoma and exhibited $\mathrm{IC}_{50}$ values at $3.2 \mathrm{\mu M}$ (10). While human lung fibroblast cell lines (WI-38) still alive more than $80 \%$ at $20 \mu \mathrm{M}$ protein concentration. Many previous studies also showed cytotoxicity against leukemia cell lines by including in 1997, Hueih Min Chen and his colleagues found that synthetic CB, CB-1 (possess two N -terminals) and CB-2 (identical to CB-1 except insertion of some amino acids in the sequences), had the potential to harm leukemia cancer cells (HL-60, K562, Jurkat E6-1 and CCRF-CEM) and showed $\mathrm{IC}_{50}$ of CB at $8 \mu \mathrm{M}-17 \mu \mathrm{M}, \mathrm{CB}-1$ at 2 $\mu \mathrm{M}-10 \mu \mathrm{M}$ and CB-2 at $3 \mu \mathrm{M}-11 \mu \mathrm{M}$, respectively. Nonetheless the cytotoxicity needed more than $50 \mu \mathrm{M}$ concentration of these peptide to toxic to normal fibroblast cells (9). The cytotoxicity activity o CB-1 was also studied on leukemia cell lines and fibroblast cells by S. Srisailam and team in 2000. This experiment introduced erythrocytes to treat with CB-1 and the result showed that CB-1 must be used more than $100 \mu \mathrm{M}$ to gain the $\mathrm{IC}_{50}$ value (101). The antitumor activity against bladder cancer cells was studied by Ulrike Suttmann and colleagues in 2008. They found that at least $50 \mu \mathrm{M}$ of lyophilized synthetic CB had antitumor activity against bladder cancer cells while high concentration of CB was needed to treat mouse and human fibroblast cells to against proliferative of these normal cells (7).

The percentages of cell cytostasis of ChaGo-K1, Hep-G2, Kato-III and SW-620 treated with rCB and rCB-PP were seem to be satisfied since they show low percentage of alive cells. These outcomes have clearly proved that rCB and rCB-PP had anticancer activity against cancer cells and did not harmful to the tested mammalian normal cell lines. Currently, the mechanism by which CB kills cells are not clearly understood, however the one feasible reported mechanism is that CB demonstrated membrane disruption and attacked cell membranes with electrostatic action using its positive net charge (7, 102). According to cholesterol which is the major components of eukaryotic cell membranes, it may protect membranes from peptide intervention (54) but having a high population of the irregular microvilli on the cell surface could help increasing peptide attraction before lysis in membrane bilayers can be efficiently initiated (74). Furthermore, the mechanism by which CB is
operational is also relying on amphipathicity, hydrophobicity as well as its concentration.

To consider the difference between anticancer efficiency of rCB and rCB-PP. The study did not reveal the significantly difference of these peptides. It could be explained by the reason that polyproline may be too short. Therefore, more copies of polyproline should be inserted to show effectively activity against cancer cells. However, the results revealed that cancer cell lines are much more sensitive to rCB and rCB-PP than the normal cell lines.

The cytotoxicity activity of rCB and rCB-PP compared with other anticancer peptide such as maginin, melittin or LL-37 were also different. The previous studies found that the those anticancer peptides showed cytotoxicity activity against not only cancer cells but also damage normal cells at the same protein concentrations (64). While Cecropin B needed more concentration of protein to toxic to normal cells.

To summarize, the recombinant protein $C B$ and CB-PP were successfully constructed, cloned and expressed in Pichia pastoris expression system in soluble form. They showed toxicity activity against BT-474, ChaGo-K1, Hep-G2, Kato-III and SW-620 but not harmful to normal human lung fibroblast cell line (WI-38). The anticancer activity results indicated that to obtain wide range of cytotoxicity activity, so more concentrations of protein were needed. Therefore, to gain high protein concentration, optimization of recombinant protein production and purification will be needed for further experiment. Moreover, more copies of polyproline should be introduced into the recombinant protein for increasing a chance of peptide to inhibit engagement between progesterone receptor and c-Src in breast cancer proliferation pathway.
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## APPENDIX A

## Culture Media

## 1. Low salt LB medium

- $1 \%$ Tryptone
- 0.5\% Yeast extract
- $0.5 \%$ Sodium chloride ( NaCl )
- 2\% Agar (Solid medium)

Adjust the pH value to 7.5 with 1 N NaOH and sterilized by autoclave at $121^{\circ} \mathrm{C}, 15{\mathrm{lb} . \mathrm{in}^{-2}}^{2}$ for 20 minutes. Low salt LB with Zeocin ${ }^{\text {TM }}$, cool the solution to $\sim$ $50^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ and add Zeocin ${ }^{T M}$ to a final concentration of $25 \mu \mathrm{~g} . \mathrm{mL}^{-1}$ and store at $+4^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ in the dark.
2. Luria-Bertani (LB) medium

- 1\% Tryptone
- 0.5\% Yeast extract
- $1 \%$ Sodium chloride ( NaCl )
- $2 \%$ Agar (Solid medium)

Adjust the pH value to 7.5 with 1 M NaOH and sterilized by autoclave at $121^{\circ} \mathrm{C}, 15 \mathrm{lb} . \mathrm{in}^{-2}$ for 20 minutes. Store at $+4^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$.
3. Buffered complex Glycerol Medium (BMGY)
(1 liter)

- $1 \%$ yeast extract
- $2 \%$ peptone
- 100 mM potassium phosphate, pH 6.0
- $1.34 \%$ YNB $0.00004 \%$ biotin
- $1 \%$ glycerol or $0.5 \%$ methanol

Dissolve 10 g of yeast extract, 20 g peptone in 700 ml water. Autoclave 20 minutes on liquid cycle, then cool to room temperature, add the following and
mix well: 100 ml 1 M potassium phosphate buffer, pH 6.0100 ml 10X YNB 2 ml 500X B 100 ml 10X GY For BMMY, add 100 ml 10X M instead of glycerol and store media at +4

## 4. Buffered complex Methanol Medium (BMMY)

(1 liter)

- $1 \%$ yeast extract
- 2\% peptone
- 100 mM potassium phosphate, pH 6.0
- $1.34 \%$ YNB $0.00004 \%$ biotin
- $0.5 \%$ methanol

Dissolve 10 g of yeast extract, 20 g peptone in 700 ml water. Autoclave 20 minutes on liquid cycle, then cool to room temperature, add the following and mix well: 100 ml 1 M potassium phosphate buffer, pH 6.0100 ml 10X YNB 2 ml 500X B $100 \mathrm{ml}, 100 \mathrm{ml}$ 10X M instead of glycerol and store media at +4

## Stock solution preparation

- $10 \times$ YNB; $13.4 \%$ YNB w/o amino acid w/ ammonium sulfate, 100 mL
- YNB without amino acid $W$ ammonium sulfate powder 13.4 g

Dissolved with sterilized double distilled water and adjust the volume to 100 mL using volumetric flask. Sterilized by filtration (membrane, pore size $0.22 \mu \mathrm{~m})$ and stored at $+4^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$.

- $500 \times$ Biotin; $0.02 \%$ Biotin, 50 mL
- Biotin powder 10 mg

Dissolved with sterilized double distilled water and adjust the volume to 50 mL using volumetric flask. Sterilized by filtration (membrane, pore size $0.22 \mu \mathrm{~m})$ and stored at $+4^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$.

- 100xHistidine; 0.4\% Histidine, 100 mL
- Histidine powder 0.4 g

Dissolved with sterilized double distilled water and adjust the volume to 100 mL using volumetric flask. Sterilized by filtration (membrane, pore size $0.22 \mu \mathrm{~m})$ and stored at $+4^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$.

- 1 M potassium phosphate buffer, pH 6.0

Combine 132 mL of $1 \mathrm{M} \mathrm{K2HPO4}, 868 \mathrm{~mL}$ of $1 \mathrm{M} \mathrm{KH2PO4}$ and confirm that the $\mathrm{pH}=6.0 \pm 0.1$ (if the pH needs to be adjusted, use phosphoric acid or $\mathrm{KOH})$. 2. Sterilize by autoclaving and store at room temperature.

## 5. Yeast Peptone Dextrose (YPD) medium

- $1 \%$ Yeast extract
- 2\% Peptone
- 2\% Dextrose (Glucose)
- 2\% Agar (Solid medium)

Sterilized by autoclave at $121^{\circ} \mathrm{C}, 15{\mathrm{lb} . \mathrm{ln}^{-2} \text { for } 20 \text { minutes. In case of YPD with }}^{2}$ Zeocin ${ }^{\text {TM }}$, add Zeocin ${ }^{\text {TM }}$ to a final concentration of $100 \mu \mathrm{~g} . \mathrm{mL}^{-1}$ and store at $+4^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ in the dark.

## APPENDIX B

## Solutions Preparation

## 1. 1\% Agarose for agarose gel electrophoresis

- Agarose (molecular grade)
- $10 \times$ TAE buffer solution

1 g 10 mL

- Double distilled water

90
mL
Melt the agarose solution by microwave oven until the gel completely melted.
Cool the solution to $+50^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ and pour the gel to the gel boxes, inserts the combs and wait for the gel has been set.
2. $0.1 \mathrm{M} \mathrm{CaCl}_{2}$ for fresh competent $E$. coli preparation

- $\mathrm{CaCl}_{2} \cdot \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ powder $\quad\left(\mathrm{MW}=147.02 \mathrm{~g} \cdot \mathrm{~mole}^{-1}\right) 14.702 \mathrm{~g}$

Dissolved in double distilled water and adjust the volume to 100 mL using volumetric flask. The solution was sterilized by autoclave and stored at $+4^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$.
3. $1 \mathrm{M} D T T$, Yeast competent cells preparation

- DTT powder (MW = 154.25 g.mole ${ }^{-1}$ ) 0.2314 g

Dissolved in sterilized double distilled water and adjust the volume to 1.5 mL and sterilize by filtration (pore size $0.22 \mu \mathrm{~m}$ ). Store at $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$.
4. 1 M HEPES buffer ( pH 8.0 ), Yeast competent cells preparation

- HEPES free acid powder $\left(M W=238.30\right.$ g.mole $\left.e^{-1}\right) 2.383 \mathrm{~g}$
- Dissolved in sterilized double distilled water and adjust the pH value to 8.0 with 5 M NaOH . Adjust the volume to 10 mL and sterilize by filtration (pore size $0.22 \mu \mathrm{~m}$ ). Store at $+4^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$.

5. Lysis by alkali for plasmid extraction

## Solution I

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { - } 50 \mathrm{mM} \text { glucose (Glucose monohydrate; MW = } 198.17 \text { g.mole }{ }^{-1} \text { ) } \\
& \text { - } 25 \mathrm{mM} \text { Tris.Cl (pH 8.0), (Tris base; MW = } 121.1 \text { g.mole }{ }^{-1} \text { ) }
\end{aligned}
$$

- 10 mM EDTA (pH 8.0), (EDTA; MW = $292.25 \mathrm{~g} . \mathrm{mole}^{-1}$ )
autoclaved for 15 minutes and stored at $+4^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$.


## Stock solution preparation

- 1 M Glucose, 100 mL
- Glucose monohydrate powder 19.817 g

Adjust the volume to 100 mL by sterilized double distilled water using volumetric flask. Stored at $+4^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$.

- 0.5 M Tris•Cl (pH 8.0), 100 mL
- Tris.base powder 6.055 g

Dissolved with sterilized double distilled water and adjust the pH to 8.0 with 1 M HCl . Adjust the volume to 100 mL by double distilled water using volumetric flask. Stored at $+4^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$.

- 0.5 EDTA (pH 8.0), 100 mL
- EDTA powder 14.6125 g

Dissolved with sterilized double distilled water and adjust the pH to 8.0 with 5 M NaOH . Adjust the volume to 100 mL by double distilled water using volumetric flask. Stored at $+4^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$.

Compositions of Solution I from stock solution as the following

- 1 M Glucose
- 0.5 M Tris•Cl (pH 8.0)
- 0.5 EDTA (pH 8.0)

5 mL
5 mL
2 mL

- Adjust the volume with double distilled water to 100 mL

Solution II (freshly prepared before use)

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\text { - } & 0.2 \mathrm{~N} \mathrm{NaOH} \\
\text { - } & 1 \% \mathrm{SDS}
\end{array} \quad\left(\mathrm{NaOH} ; \mathrm{MW}=40 \mathrm{~g} \cdot \mathrm{~mole}^{-1}\right)
$$

Dilute with sterilized double distilled water.

## Stock solution preparation

- $2 \mathrm{~N} \mathrm{NaOH}, 100 \mathrm{~mL}$
- NaOH pellet 4 g

Dissolved with sterilized double distilled water and adjust the volume to 100 mL using volumetric flask and stored at $+4^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$.

- $10 \%$ SDS, 100 mL
- SDS powder 28.84 g

Dissolved with sterilized warm double distilled water and adjust the volume to 100 mL and stored at $+4^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$.

Compositions of Solution II from stock solution

- $2 \mathrm{~N} \mathrm{NaOH} \quad 1 \mathrm{~mL}$
- $10 \%$ SDS 1 mL
- Sterilized double distilled water 8 mL


## Solution III

- 5 M Potassium acetate $\left(M W=98.14\right.$ g.mole $\left.{ }^{-1}\right) 60 \mathrm{~mL}$
- Glacial acetic acid
11.5 mL
- Double distilled water
28.5 mL


## Stock solution preparation

- 5 M Potassium acetate, 100 mL
- Potassium acetate powder 49.07 g

Dissolved with double distilled water and adjust the volume to 100 mL using volumetric flask. Sterilized by autoclave and stored at $+4^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$.

Compositions of Solution III from stock solutions above

- 5 M Potassium acetate (Sterilized) 60 mL
- Glacial acetic acid 11.5 mL
- Sterilized double distilled water 28.5 mL


## 6. 0.01 M Phosphate Buffer Saline (PBS), pH 7.4

- 200 mM Phosphate buffer, pH 7.41 L
- Sodium chloride ( NaCl ) 175.2 g
- Double distilled water 18 L


## Stock solution preparation

- Stock solutions, 200 mM each for 1 L
- Stock A: $\mathrm{NaH}_{2} \mathrm{PO}_{4} \cdot \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}\left(\mathrm{MW}=137.99 \mathrm{~g} \cdot \mathrm{~mole} \mathrm{e}^{-1}\right) \quad 27.6 \mathrm{~g}$
- Stock B: $\mathrm{Na}_{2} \mathrm{HPO}_{4} \cdot 12 \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}\left(\mathrm{MW}=358.135\right.$ g.mole $\left.{ }^{-1}\right) \quad 71.63 \mathrm{~g}$
- Each $\mathrm{NaH}_{2} \mathrm{PO}_{4} \cdot \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ and $\mathrm{Na}_{2} \mathrm{HPO}_{4} \cdot 12 \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ powder was separately dissolved in double distilled water and adjusts the volume to 1 L using volumetric flask. Stored at $+4^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$.
- 200 mM Sodium phosphate buffer (pH 7.4), 1 L
- Stock A (774 mL) and B (226 mL) were mixed together and adjust the pH value to 7.4 by titration with 5 M HCl . Store at room temperature.


## 7. Tris-EDTA (TE) buffer pH 8.0

- 10 mM Tris•Cl (pH 8.0); Stock solution 0.5 M Tris•Cl (pH 8.0) from Solution I
- 1 mM EDTA (pH 8.0); Stock solution 0.5 M EDTA (pH 8.0) from Solution I

Compositions of TE buffer (pH 8.0) from stock solutions above

- 0.5 M Tris $\cdot \mathrm{Cl}(\mathrm{pH} 8.0) \quad 20 \mathrm{~mL}$
- 0.5 EDTA (pH 8.0) 2 mL

Adjust the volume with double distilled water to 1000 mL Sterilize by autoclave and store at $+4^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$.
8. 1 M D -Sorbitol

- D-Sorbital (D-Sorbital; MW = 182.18 g.mole ${ }^{-1}$ ) 18.2 g

Dissolved in sterilized double distilled water and adjust the volume to 100 mL using volumetric flask. Sterilize by filtration ( $0.22 \mu \mathrm{~m}$, membrane) and store at $+4^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ in the dark.

## 9. Binding and elution buffer for fast flow nickel column

Stock solution

- 5 M Imidazole 1.702 g imidazole add to 5 ml water

Sterilize by filtration ( $0.22 \mu \mathrm{~m}$, membrane) and store at $+4^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$.

- $5 \mathrm{M} \mathrm{NaCl} \quad 146.1 \mathrm{~g} \mathrm{NaCl}$

Mix 146.1 g of NaCl with 450 ml of $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ by stirring, add $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ until final volume is 500 ml . Sterilize by autoclave, store at room temperature.

- 1 M Sodium phosphate buffer pH 7.4

Mixing $1 \mathrm{M} \mathrm{NaH}{ }_{2} \mathrm{PO}_{4}$ (monobasic) and $1 \mathrm{M} \mathrm{Na}_{2} \mathrm{HPO}_{4}$ (dibasic) stock solutions in the volumes of 22.6 and 77.4 ml respectively. To prepare for stock solution; dissolve 138 g of $\mathrm{NaH}_{2} \mathrm{PO}_{4} \cdot \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}(\mathrm{mw}=138)$ in sufficient $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ to make a final volume of 1 L and dissolve 142 g of $\mathrm{Na}_{2} \mathrm{HPO}_{4}(\mathrm{mw}=142)$ in sufficient $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ to make a final volume of 1 L .

## APPENDIX C

## Cytotoxicity test using MTT assay

The cell lines treated with synthetic CB and recombinant CB-PP

| rCB4.9 kDa | $\begin{aligned} & 20 \mu_{\mathrm{M}=98} \\ & \mu_{\mathrm{g} / \mathrm{ml}} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 10 \boldsymbol{\mu} \mathrm{M}=49 \\ & \boldsymbol{\mu}_{\mathrm{g} / \mathrm{ml}} \end{aligned}$ | $5 \mu \mathrm{M}=24.5$ <br> $\mu_{\mathrm{g} / \mathrm{ml}}$ | $2.5 \mu \mathrm{M}=12.25$ <br> $\mu_{\mathrm{g} / \mathrm{ml}}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.25 \mu \mathrm{M}=6.125 \\ & \boldsymbol{\mu}_{\mathrm{g} / \mathrm{ml}} \end{aligned}$ | $\left\lvert\, \begin{aligned} & 0.625 \mu \mathrm{M}=3.063 \\ & \mu_{\mathrm{g} / \mathrm{ml}} \end{aligned}\right.$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.312 \mu \mathrm{M}=1.53 \\ & \mu_{\mathrm{g} / \mathrm{ml}} \end{aligned}$ | $0.156 \mu \mathrm{M}=0.76$ <br> $\mu_{\mathrm{g} / \mathrm{ml}}$ | $0.078 \mu \mathrm{M}=0.38$ <br> $\mu_{\mathrm{g} / \mathrm{ml}}$ | $0.039 \mu \mathrm{M}=0.19$ $\mu_{\mathrm{g} / \mathrm{ml}}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| rCB-PP 6.5 kDa | $\begin{aligned} & 20 \mu_{\mathrm{M}=65} \\ & \mu_{\mathrm{g} / \mathrm{ml}} \end{aligned}$ | $10 \boldsymbol{\mu}=65$ <br> $\mu_{\mathrm{g} / \mathrm{ml}}$ | $5 \mu \mathrm{M}=32.5$ <br> $\mu_{g / \mathrm{ml}}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2.5 \mu_{\mathrm{M}=16.25} \\ & \boldsymbol{\mu}_{\mathrm{g} / \mathrm{ml}} \end{aligned}$ | $1.25 \mu \mathrm{M}=8.13$ <br> $\mu_{\mathrm{g} / \mathrm{ml}}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.625 \mu_{\mathrm{M}}=4.06 \\ & \mu_{\mathrm{g} / \mathrm{ml}} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.312 \mu_{\mathrm{M}}=2.03 \\ & \mu_{\mathrm{g} / \mathrm{ml}} \end{aligned}$ | $0.156 \mu \mathrm{M}=1.02$ <br> $\mu_{\mathrm{g} / \mathrm{ml}}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.078 \mu \mathrm{M}=0.5 \mu \\ & \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{ml} \end{aligned}$ | $0.039 \mu \mathrm{M}=0.25$ <br> $\mu_{\mathrm{g} / \mathrm{ml}}$ |
| BT474 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| rCB | ${ }_{20} \mu_{\text {M }}$ | ${ }_{10} \mu_{\text {M }}$ | $5 \mu_{\text {M }}$ | 2.5 M | $1.25 \mu \mathrm{M}$ | $0.625 \mu \mathrm{M}$ | $0.312 \mu \mathrm{M}$ | $0.156 \mu \mathrm{M}$ | $0.078 \mu_{\mathrm{M}}$ | Control |
| 1 | 0.6851 | 1.0211 | 0.9347 | 0.9029 | 0.9967 | 1.1204 | 1.0327 | 0.8529 | 0.8979 | 1.37511 .4953 |
| 2 | 0.7562 | 0.8873 | 0.8451 | 0.8455 | 1.0684 | 0.8818 | 0.9913 | 1.3544 | 1.5601 | 1.39031 .9471 |
| 3 | 0.5969 | 0.8842 | 1.2425 | 1.4418 | 1.2044 | 1.3501 | 1.4675 | 1.2981 | 1.8167 | 1.02341 .7951 |
| Average | 0.6794 | 0.9309 | 1.0074 | 1.0634 | 1.0898 | 1.1174 | 1.1638 | 1.1685 | 1.4249 | 1.13031 .3230 |
| SD | 0.0798 | 0.0782 | 0.2084 | 0.3290 | 0.1055 | 0.2342 | 0.2638 | 0.2747 | 0.4741 | 0.97211 .1885 |
| \% Viability | 50.47 | 69.47 | 75.18 | 79.35 | 81.33 | 83.39 | 86.85 | 87.20 | 106.16 | 1.18541 .1588 |
| \% Cytostasis | 49.53 | 30.53 | 24.82 | 20.65 | 18.67 | 16.61 | 13.15 | 12.80 | 0.00 | Average= 1.34 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | SD $=0.30$ |
| rCB-PP | $20 \mu \mathrm{M}$ | ${ }_{10} \mu_{M}$ | ${ }_{5} \mu \mathrm{M}$ | $2.5 \mu \mathrm{M}$ | $1.25 \mu \mathrm{M}$ | $0.625 \mu \mathrm{M}$ | $0.312 \mu \mathrm{M}$ | $0.156 \mu \mathrm{M}$ | $0.078 \mu \mathrm{M}$ |  |
| 4 | 0.7563 | 0.8141 | 1.1040 | 0.8558 | 1.0128 | 1.1515 | 1.4280 | 1.3788 | 1.1982 |  |
| 5 | 0.6718 | 0.9757 | 1.0452 | 1.3274 | 1.1873 | 1.0588 | 1.1598 | 1.2327 | 1.6002 |  |
| 6 | 0.6465 | 0.8918 | 1.0461 | 1.1316 | 1.1579 | 1.3775 | 1.0507 | 1.1472 | 1.1585 |  |
| Average | 0.6915 | 0.8939 | 1.0651 | 1.1049 | 1.1193 | 1.1959 | 1.2128 | 1.2529 | 1.3190 |  |
| SD | 0.0575 | 0.0808 | 0.0337 | 0.2369 | 0.0934 | 0.1639 | 0.1942 | 0.1171 | 0.2444 |  |
| \% Viability | 51.6 | 66.7 | 79.49 | 82.45 | 83.53 | 89.25 | 90.5 | 93.5 | 98.45 |  |
| \% Cytostasis | 48.4 | 33.3 | 20.51 | 17.55 | 16.47 | 10.75 | 9.5 | 6.5 | 1.55 |  |

Chago-K1

| rCB | $20 \mu \mathrm{M}$ | $10 \mu \mathrm{M}$ | $5 \mu \mathrm{M}$ | $2.5 \mu \mathrm{M}$ | ${ }_{1.25} \mu_{\text {M }}$ | $0.625 \mu \mathrm{M}$ | $0.312 \mu \mathrm{M}$ | $0.156 \mu \mathrm{M}$ | $0.078 \mu \mathrm{M}$ | Control |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 0.4823 | 0.8112 | 0.7874 | 0.7227 | 0.9715 | 0.9381 | 1.3875 | 1.4283 | 1.7068 | 1.23951 .7455 |
| 2 | 0.5455 | 0.7429 | 0.7957 | 1.1545 | 1.1046 | 1.2476 | 1.2789 | 1.5429 | 1.4075 | 1.60181 .3012 |
| 3 | 0.4843 | 0.6714 | 1.1502 | 0.9392 | 0.9211 | 1.0108 | 0.9754 | 1.0114 | 1.1484 | 1.54941 .0740 |
| Average | 0.5040 | 0.7418 | 0.9111 | 0.9388 | 0.9991 | 1.0655 | 1.2139 | 1.3275 | 1.4209 | 1.31911 .2011 |
| SD | 0.0359 | 0.0699 | 0.2071 | 0.2159 | 0.0948 | 0.1618 | 0.2136 | 0.2797 | 0.2794 | 1.23021 .4204 |
| \% Viability | 37.06 | 54.54 | 66.99 | 69.03 | 73.46 | 78.35 | 89.26 | 97.61 | 104.48 | $1.2851 \quad 1.3518$ |
| \% Cytostasis | 62.94 | 45.46 | 33.01 | 30.97 | 26.54 | 21.65 | 10.74 | 2.39 | 0 | Average $=1.3599$ |


| rCB-PP | $20 \mu \mathrm{M}$ | $10 \mu \mathrm{M}$ | $5 \mu \mathrm{M}$ | $2.5 \mu \mathrm{M}$ | $1.25 \mu \mathrm{M}$ | $0.625 \mu \mathrm{M}$ | $0.312 \mu \mathrm{M}$ | $0.156 \mu \mathrm{M}$ | $0.078 \mu \mathrm{M}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 4 | 0.5230 | 0.7015 | 0.8322 | 1.0843 | 0.8788 | 1.2923 | 1.0881 | 1.0076 | 1.1695 |
| 5 | 0.4610 | 0.7494 | 1.1807 | 0.9828 | 1.1421 | 0.9415 | 1.4247 | 1.1357 | 1.1995 |
| 6 | 0.4651 | 0.7993 | 0.8134 | 1.0822 | 1.3117 | 1.1600 | 0.9564 | 1.5557 | 1.6940 |
| Average | 0.4830 | 0.7501 | 0.9421 | 1.0498 | 1.1109 | 1.1313 | 1.1564 | 1.2330 | 1.3543 |
| SD | 0.0347 | 0.0489 | 0.2068 | 0.0580 | 0.2181 | 0.1772 | 0.2415 | 0.2867 | 0.2945 |
| \% Viability | 35.51 | 55.15 | 69.27 | 77.19 | 81.68 | 83.18 | 85.03 | 90.66 | 99.58 |
| \% Cytostasis | 64.49 | 44.85 | 30.73 | 22.81 | 18.32 | 16.82 | 14.97 | 9.34 | 0.42 |

Hep-G2

| rCB | $20 \mu \mathrm{M}$ | $10 \mu \mathrm{M}$ | $5 \mu \mathrm{~m}$ | $2.5 \mu \mathrm{M}$ | $1.25 \mu \mathrm{M}$ | $0.625 \mu \mathrm{M}$ | $0.312 \mu \mathrm{~m}$ | $0.156 \mu \mathrm{M}$ | $0.078 \mu \mathrm{~m}$ | Control |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 0.6810 | 0.9021 | 0.8520 | 1.1743 | 1.1247 | 1.0539 | 1.1740 | 1.0132 | 1.5108 | 1.43221 .8105 |
| 2 | 0.5547 | 0.9093 | 1.0445 | 1.1583 | 1.2550 | 1.0631 | 1.4630 | 1.7125 | 1.4556 | 1.37731 .6255 |
| 3 | 0.6786 | 1.0094 | 1.0634 | 1.1903 | 0.8101 | 1.7985 | 1.3150 | 1.3612 | 1.5235 | 1.33721 .2155 |
| Average | 0.6381 | 0.9403 | 0.9866 | 0.9866 | 1.1743 | 1.3052 | 1.3173 | 1.0633 | 1.4966 | 1.57571 .6872 |
| SD | 0.0722 | 0.0600 | 0.1170 | 0.0160 | 0.2287 | 0.4273 | 0.1445 | 0.3497 | 0.0361 | 1.91951 .3861 |
| \% Viability | 40.97 | 60.38 | 66.80 | 68.50 | 69.33 | 83.81 | 84.58 | 89.86 | 96.10 | 1.62041 .6994 |
| \% Cytostasis | 59.03 | 39.62 | 33.20 | 31.50 | 30.67 | 16.19 | 15.42 | 10.14 | 3.90 | Average 1.5573 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | SD $=0.2098$ |
| rCB-PP | ${ }^{20} \mu \mathrm{M}$ | ${ }_{10} \mu \mathrm{M}$ | $5 \mu \mathrm{M}$ | $2.5 \mu \mathrm{M}$ | $1.25 \mu \mathrm{M}$ | ${ }^{0.625 \mu M}$ | $0.312 \mu \mathrm{M}$ | $0.156 \mu \mathrm{M}$ | $0.078 \mu \mathrm{M}$ |  |
| 4 | 0.5111 | 0.8615 | 0.8546 | 1.0576 | 0.9135 | 1.5114 | 1.4801 | 1.4373 | 1.6837 |  |
| 5 | 0.5132 | 0.8971 | 0.9627 | 1.0279 | 1.0182 | 0.8262 | 1.0649 | 1.3154 | 1.5416 |  |
| 6 | 0.6040 | 0.9634 | 1.0776 | 0.8406 | 1.4497 | 1.1563 | 1.6386 | 1.6885 | 1.6840 |  |
| Averase | 0.5428 | 0.9073 | 0.9650 | 0.9754 | 1.1271 | 1.1646 | 1.3945 | 1.4804 | 1.6364 |  |
| SD | 0.0530 | 0.0517 | 0.1115 | 0.1177 | 0.2842 | 0.3427 | 0.2963 | 0.1902 | 0.0821 |  |
| \% Viability | 34.85 | 58.27 | 61.96 | 62.63 | 72.37 | 74.78 | 89.54 | 95.06 | 105.07 |  |
| \% Cytostasis | 65.15 | 41.73 | 38.04 | 37.37 | 27.63 | 25.22 | 10.46 | 4.94 | 0 |  |

KATO-III

| rCB | $20 \mu \mathrm{M}$ | $10 \mu \mathrm{M}$ | $5 \mu \mathrm{M}$ | $2.5 \mu \mathrm{M}$ | $1.25 \mu \mathrm{M}$ | $0.625 \mu \mathrm{M}$ | $0.312 \mu \mathrm{M}$ | $0.156 \mu \mathrm{M}$ | $0.078 \mu \mathrm{M}$ | Control |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 0.6369 | 1.1535 | 0.9118 | 1.1323 | 1.1510 | 1.5599 | 1.6458 | 1.4057 | 2.1709 | 1.08752 .1363 |
| 2 | 0.5321 | 0.9499 | 1.3594 | 1.9360 | 1.6115 | 1.5054 | 1.5762 | 1.7779 | 1.6360 | 1.38382 .0315 |
| 3 | 0.4566 | 1.5306 | 1.0645 | 1.0577 | 1.5345 | 1.2595 | 1.1501 | 1.1914 | 1.7979 | 1.38541 .5971 |
| Average | 0.5419 | 1.2113 | 1.1119 | 1.3753 | 1.4323 | 1.4416 | 1.4574 | 1.4583 | 1.8683 | 1.38541 .5971 |
| SD | 0.0905 | 0.2946 | 0.2275 | 0.4870 | 0.2467 | 0.1600 | 0.2684 | 0.2968 | 0.2743 | 1.36681 .8025 |
| \% Viability | 34.19 | 70.15 | 76.42 | 86.77 | 90.37 | 90.95 | 91.95 | 92.01 | 115.98 | 1.50621 .7930 |
| \% Cytostasis | 65.81 | 23.58 | 29.85 | 13.23 | 9.63 | 9.05 | 8.05 | 7.99 | 0 | Average $=1.5849$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $S D=0.3038$ |
| rCB-PP | $20 \mu \mathrm{M}$ | $10 \mu \mathrm{M}$ | $5 \mu \mathrm{M}$ | $2.5 \mu \mathrm{M}$ | $1.25 \mu \mathrm{M}$ | $0.625 \mu \mathrm{M}$ | $0.312 \mu \mathrm{M}$ | $0.156 \mu \mathrm{M}$ | $0.078 \mu \mathrm{M}$ |  |
| 4 | 0.4566 | 1.5306 | 1.5345 | 1.0645 | 1.1914 | 1.1501 | 1.0577 | 1.2595 | 1.7979 |  |
| 5 | 0.6752 | 1.0664 | 1.2955 | 1.3588 | 1.5301 | 1.2929 | 1.4865 | 1.7203 | 1.6792 |  |
| 6 | 0.6060 | 1.1635 | 1.5308 | 1.1692 | 1.4079 | 1.5937 | 1.3868 | 1.4726 | 1.6780 |  |
| Average | 0.6406 | 1.1150 | 1.4132 | 1.2640 | 1.4690 | 1.4433 | 1.4367 | 1.5965 | 1.6786 |  |
| SD | 0.1117 | 0.2448 | 0.1369 | 0.1492 | 0.1715 | 0.2264 | 0.2244 | 0.2306 | 0.0689 |  |
| \% Viability | 42.33 | 70.82 | 77.24 | 89.51 | 89.99 | 90.47 | 91.63 | 95.26 | 105.83 |  |
| \% Cytostasis | 57.67 | 29.18 | 22.76 | 10.49 | 10.01 | 9.53 | 8.37 | 4.74 | 0 |  |

SW620

| rCB | $20 \mu \mathrm{M}$ | $10 \mu \mathrm{M}$ | $5 \mu \mathrm{M}$ | $2.5 \mu \mathrm{M}$ | $1.25 \mu \mathrm{M}$ | $0.625 \mu \mathrm{M}$ | $0.312 \mu \mathrm{M}$ | $0.156 \mu \mathrm{M}$ | $0.078 \mu \mathrm{M}$ | Control |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 0.4500 | 1.0689 | 1.1049 | 0.9719 | 1.5660 | 1.2252 | 1.4159 | 0.9176 | 1.6264 | 1.36431 .2123 |
| 2 | 0.4382 | 0.8662 | 1.1376 | 1.1331 | 1.1601 | 1.3468 | 1.3598 | 1.1536 | 1.3341 | 1.29221 .7463 |
| 3 | 0.5437 | 0.8935 | 0.9274 | 1.3427 | 1.0063 | 1.5045 | 1.3920 | 2.1100 | 1.4507 | 1.21391 .5792 |
| Average | 0.4773 | 0.9429 | 1.0566 | 1.1492 | 1.2441 | 1.3588 | 1.3892 | 1.3937 | 1.4704 | 1.67341 .8723 |
| SD | 0.0578 | 0.1100 | 0.1131 | 0.1859 | 0.2892 | 0.1400 | 0.0282 | 0.6314 | 0.1471 | 1.44591 .0135 |
| \% Viability | 32.57 | 64.34 | 72.10 | 78.42 | 84.90 | 92.73 | 94.80 | 95.11 | 100.34 | 1.67001 .4999 |
| \% Cytostasis | 67.43 | 35.66 | 27.90 | 21.58 | 15.10 | 7.27 | 5.20 | 4.89 | 0 | Average $=1.4653$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $S D=0.2551$ |
| rCB-PP | $20 \mu \mathrm{M}$ | $10 \mu \mathrm{M}$ | $5 \mu \mathrm{M}$ | $2.5 \mu \mathrm{M}$ | $1.25 \mu \mathrm{M}$ | $0.625 \mu \mathrm{M}$ | $0.312 \mu \mathrm{M}$ | $0.156 \mu \mathrm{M}$ | $0.078 \mu \mathrm{M}$ |  |
| 4 | 0.4674 | 0.7472 | 1.4312 | 1.3504 | 1.4087 | 1.4884 | 1.7632 | 1.6721 | 1.4801 |  |
| 5 | 0.4772 | 0.9695 | 0.7338 | 0.9993 | 0.9852 | 1.1957 | 1.3873 | 1.5788 | 1.2838 |  |
| 6 | 0.4569 | 0.9369 | 0.9281 | 0.7765 | 0.8687 | 1.3093 | 1.3510 | 1.1851 | 2.1420 |  |
| Average | 0.4672 | 0.8845 | 1.0310 | 1.0421 | 1.0875 | 1.3311 | 1.5005 | 1.4787 | 1.6353 |  |
| SD | 0.0102 | 0.1200 | 0.3599 | 0.2893 | 0.2842 | 0.1476 | 0.2282 | 0.2585 | 0.4497 |  |
| \% Viability | 31.88 | 60.36 | 70.36 | 71.11 | 74.21 | 90.84 | 102.4 | 100.91 | 111.6 |  |
| \% Cytostasis | 68.12 | 39.64 | 29.64 | 28.89 | 25.79 | 9.16 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |

Wi-38

| rCB | $20 \mu \mathrm{M}$ | $10 \mu \mathrm{M}$ | $5 \mu \mathrm{M}$ | $2.5 \mu \mathrm{M}$ | $1.25 \mu \mathrm{M}$ | $0.625 \mu \mathrm{M}$ | $0.312 \mu \mathrm{M}$ | $0.156 \mu \mathrm{M}$ | $0.078 \mu \mathrm{M}$ | Control |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 0.6922 | 0.7972 | 1.0087 | 0.7813 | 1.0581 | 0.6943 | 0.9750 | 0.8610 | 0.6995 | 0.93101 .1107 |
| 2 | 0.6586 | 0.6626 | 0.6819 | 0.8130 | 0.6480 | 0.7013 | 1.0055 | 1.0273 | 1.3151 | 0.64750 .8847 |
| 3 | 0.6770 | 0.7764 | 0.7294 | 0.9177 | 0.8192 | 1.1317 | 0.8715 | 1.1449 | 1.1505 | 0.78490 .6846 |
| Average | 0.6759 | 0.7454 | 0.8067 | 0.8373 | 0.8418 | 0.8424 | 0.9507 | 1.0111 | 1.0550 | 0.72610 .9191 |
| SD | 0.0168 | 0.0725 | 0.1766 | 0.0714 | 0.2060 | 0.2505 | 0.0702 | 0.1426 | 0.3187 | 0.69830 .7340 |
| \% Viability | 76.36 | 91.88 | 99.44 | 103.21 | 103.77 | 103.84 | 117.19 | 124.64 | 130.05 | 0.75340 .8616 |
| \% Cytostasis | 23.64 | 8.12 | 0.56 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Average $=0.8112$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | SD $=0.1336$ |
| rCB-PP | $20 \mu \mathrm{M}$ | $10 \mu \mathrm{M}$ | $5 \mu \mathrm{M}$ | $2.5 \mu \mathrm{M}$ | $1.25 \mu \mathrm{M}$ | $0.625 \mu \mathrm{M}$ | $0.312 \mu \mathrm{M}$ | $0.156 \mu \mathrm{M}$ | $0.078 \mu \mathrm{M}$ |  |
| 4 | 0.6860 | 0.8212 | 0.7768 | 0.8739 | 0.8293 | 0.8227 | 0.7806 | 0.8141 | 0.9720 |  |
| 5 | 0.7332 | 0.8244 | 0.9048 | 0.9115 | 0.8444 | 0.7693 | 0.9696 | 1.1724 | 0.9899 |  |
| 6 | 0.6989 | 0.8234 | 0.7756 | 0.6920 | 0.8187 | 0.9356 | 0.8360 | 0.7429 | 1.0384 |  |
| Average | 0.7060 | 0.8230 | 0.8191 | 0.8258 | 0.8308 | 0.8425 | 0.8621 | 0.9098 | 1.0001 |  |
| SD | 0.0244 | 0.0016 | 0.0742 | 0.1174 | 0.0129 | 0.0849 | 0.0972 | 0.2302 | 0.0344 |  |
| \% Viability | 87.03 | 101.45 | 100.97 | 101.79 | 102.41 | 103.85 | 106.27 | 112.15 | 123.28 |  |
| \% Cytostasis | 12.97 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |

The cell lines treated with recombinant CB and CB-PP

| synthetic CB <br> 3.8 kDa | $10 \boldsymbol{\mu}=38$ <br> $\mu_{\mathrm{g} / \mathrm{ml}}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 5 \mu \mathrm{M}=19 \\ & \mu_{\mathrm{g} / \mathrm{ml}} \end{aligned}$ | $2.5 \mu \mathrm{M}=9.5$ <br> $\mu_{\mathrm{g} / \mathrm{ml}}$ | $1.25 \mu \mathrm{M}=4.75$ <br> $\mu_{\mathrm{g} / \mathrm{ml}}$ | $0.625 \mu \mathrm{M}=2.38$ <br> $\mu_{\mathrm{g} / \mathrm{ml}}$ | $0.312 \boldsymbol{\mu}=1.2$ <br> $\mu_{\mathrm{g} / \mathrm{ml}}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.156 \mu \mathrm{M}=0.6 \\ & \mu_{\mathrm{g} / \mathrm{ml}} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.078 \mu \mathrm{M}=0.3 \\ & \boldsymbol{\mu}_{\mathrm{g} / \mathrm{ml}} \end{aligned}$ | $0.039 \mu \mathrm{M}=0.1$ <br> $5 \mu_{\mathrm{g} / \mathrm{ml}}$ | $\left\lvert\, \begin{aligned} & 0.019 \boldsymbol{\mu}=0.07 \\ & \boldsymbol{\mu}_{\mathrm{g} / \mathrm{ml}}\end{aligned}\right.$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| CB-P | $10 \mu \mathrm{M}=$ | 5 | $2.5 \mu \mathrm{M}=16.2$ | $1.25 \mu \mathrm{M}=8.13$ | $0.625 \mu \mathrm{M}=4.06$ | $0.312 \boldsymbol{\mu} \mathrm{M}=2.0$ | $0.156 \mu \mathrm{M}=1.02$ | $0.078 \mu$ | $039 \mu \mathrm{M}=0.2$ | . 019 |
| 6.5 kDa | $\mu_{3 / \mathrm{ml}}$ | $5 \mu_{\mathrm{g} / \mathrm{ml}}$ | $5 \mu_{\mathrm{g} / \mathrm{ml}}$ | $\mu \mathrm{g} / \mathrm{ml}$ | $\mu_{\mathrm{g} / \mathrm{ml}}$ | $3 \mu_{\mathrm{g} / \mathrm{ml}}$ | $\mu_{\mathrm{g} / \mathrm{ml}}$ | $\mu_{\mathrm{g} / \mathrm{ml}}$ | $5 \mu_{\mathrm{g} / \mathrm{ml}}$ | $\mu_{\mathrm{g} / \mathrm{ml}}$ |

BT474
(Breast)


| rCB-PP | $10 \mu \mathrm{M}$ | $5 \mu \mathrm{M}$ | $2.5 \mu \mathrm{M}$ | $1.25 \mu \mathrm{M}$ | $0.625 \mu \mathrm{M}$ | $0.312 \mu \mathrm{M}$ | $0.156 \mu \mathrm{M}$ | $0.078 \mu \mathrm{M}$ | $0.039 \mu \mathrm{M}$ | $0.019 \mu \mathrm{M}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| E | 0.7764 | 0.9404 | 0.8229 | 0.8665 | 0.6385 | 0.7802 | 0.7686 | 1.0563 | 0.8312 | 1.0698 |
| F | 0.7400 | 0.5922 | 0.7807 | 0.8077 | 1.0192 | 1.3134 | 0.8240 | 1.1253 | 1.5531 | 1.3203 |
| G | 0.8043 | 0.6482 | 0.8434 | 0.6169 | 0.7463 | 0.4555 | 0.8867 | 0.8412 | 1.0792 | 0.8628 |
| H | 0.7936 | 0.9476 | 0.6676 | 0.9018 | 0.8245 | 0.6702 | 0.7421 | 0.8686 | 0.9938 | 0.8066 |
| Average | 0.7786 | 0.7821 | 0.7787 | 0.7982 | 0.8071 | 0.8048 | 0.8054 | 0.9729 | 1.1143 | 1.0149 |
| SD | 0.0282 | 0.1884 | 0.0785 | 0.1270 | 0.1606 | 0.3649 | 0.0641 | 0.1395 | 0.3101 | 0.2330 |
| \% Viability | 83.74 | 84.12 | 83.75 | 85.85 | 86.81 | 86.56 | 86.63 | 104.64 | 119.85 | 109.16 |
| \% Cytostasis | 16.26 | 15.88 | 16.25 | 14.15 | 13.19 | 13.44 | 13.37 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |

Chago-K1
(Lung)

Hep-G2 (Liver)

| synthetic CB | $10 \mu \mathrm{M}$ | $5 \mu \mathrm{M}$ | $2.5 \mu \mathrm{M}$ | $1.25 \mu \mathrm{M}$ | $0.625 \mu \mathrm{M}$ | $0.312 \mu \mathrm{M}$ | $0.156 \mu \mathrm{M}$ | $0.078 \mu \mathrm{M}$ | $0.039 \mu \mathrm{M}$ | $0.019 \mu \mathrm{M}$ | Control |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 1.0256 | 1.3486 | 1.2885 | 1.3319 | 1.2016 | 0.8351 | 1.4430 | 1.1406 | 1.5720 | 1.3460 | 1.6453 | 1.2595 |
| 2 | 0.8602 | 1.2807 | 1.3306 | 1.1981 | 1.7146 | 1.5565 | 1.4036 | 1.1435 | 1.4901 | 1.4003 | 1.4379 | 1.6861 |
| 3 | 1.0347 | 1.0858 | 1.0860 | 1.3091 | 1.1105 | 1.4515 | 1.4705 | 1.5600 | 1.2642 | 1.4503 | 1.4182 | 2.2226 |
| 4 | 1.4645 | 1.1991 | 1.1943 | 1.2290 | 1.1232 | 1.5440 | 1.1659 | 1.8428 | 1.5472 | 1.7527 | 1.6053 | 1.6969 |
| Average | 1.0962 | 1.1751 | 1.2235 | 1.2670 | 1.3149 | 1.3467 | 1.3707 | 1.4217 | 1.4863 | 1.4873 | 1.8257 | 1.6576 |
| SD | 0.2583 | 0.1131 | 0.1087 | 0.0637 | 0.2876 | 0.3443 | 0.1393 | 0.3430 | 0.1404 | 0.1820 | 2.4503 | 1.1583 |
| \% Viability | 67.35 | 72.19 | 75.17 | 77.84 | 80.78 | 82.74 | 84.21 | 87.34 | 91.31 | 91.37 | 1.3701 | 1.3972 |
| \% Cytostasis | 32.65 | 27.81 | 24.83 | 22.16 | 19.22 | 17.26 | 15.79 | 12.66 | 8.69 | 8.63 | 1.6342 | 1.5767 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Average $=1.6276$ |  |
|  |  |  |  | SD=0.3304 |


| rCB-PP | $10 \mu \mathrm{M}$ | $5 \mu \mathrm{M}$ | $2.5 \mu \mathrm{M}$ | $1.25 \mu \mathrm{M}$ | $0.625 \mu \mathrm{M}$ | $0.312 \mu \mathrm{M}$ | $0.156 \mu \mathrm{M}$ | $0.078 \mu \mathrm{M}$ | $0.039 \mu \mathrm{M}$ | $0.019 \mu \mathrm{M}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 5 | 0.9892 | 1.0631 | 1.1239 | 0.7608 | 0.9632 | 1.1601 | 1.0332 | 1.3218 | 1.4729 | 1.5040 |
| 6 | 0.6664 | 1.0345 | 1.1227 | 1.3576 | 0.9568 | 1.0523 | 1.0950 | 0.8749 | 1.1416 | 1.0217 |
| 7 | 0.7634 | 0.7405 | 0.9855 | 1.1202 | 1.3785 | 1.5345 | 0.7145 | 1.4807 | 1.4372 | 1.4680 |
| 8 | 0.8236 | 0.7512 | 1.1567 | 1.2945 | 1.2570 | 1.1934 | 1.8855 | 1.0539 | 1.1676 | 1.5997 |
| Average | 0.8106 | 0.8973 | 1.0972 | 1.1332 | 1.1388 | 1.2350 | 1.1744 | 1.1828 | 1.3048 | 1.3983 |
| SD | 0.1355 | 0.1754 | 0.0761 | 0.2678 | 0.2124 | 0.2085 | 0.4977 | 0.2705 | 0.1744 | 0.2572 |
| \% Viability | 49.8 | 55.13 | 67.41 | 69.62 | 69.96 | 75.87 | 72.15 | 72.67 | 80.16 | 85.91 |
| \% Cytostasis | 50.13 | 44.87 | 32.59 | 30.38 | 30.04 | 24.13 | 27.85 | 27.33 | 19.84 | 14.09 |

KATO-III
(Stamach)


| rCB-PP | $10 \mu \mathrm{M}$ | $5 \mu \mathrm{M}$ | $2.5 \mu \mathrm{M}$ | $1.25 \mu \mathrm{M}$ | $0.625 \mu \mathrm{M}$ | $0.312 \mu \mathrm{M}$ | $0.156 \mu \mathrm{M}$ | $0.078 \mu \mathrm{M}$ | $0.039 \mu \mathrm{M}$ | $0.019 \mu \mathrm{M}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 5 | 0.6805 | 1.1162 | 1.1324 | 1.0807 | 1.2299 | 1.4670 | 1.1944 | 1.3431 | 1.8086 | 2.5472 |
| 6 | 0.9634 | 0.8645 | 0.8749 | 1.1288 | 1.2052 | 0.9979 | 1.1278 | 1.4776 | 1.6335 | 1.0364 |
| 7 | 0.8443 | 0.8020 | 0.7439 | 1.1310 | 1.2853 | 0.7912 | 1.4972 | 1.7750 | 1.3119 | 1.2773 |
| 8 | 0.9910 | 1.0641 | 1.0483 | 0.9916 | 1.0146 | 1.7789 | 1.5778 | 1.2465 | 1.0906 | 1.1294 |
| Average | 0.8698 | 0.9617 | 0.9499 | 1.0830 | 1.1838 | 1.2588 | 1.3493 | 1.4606 | 1.4612 | 1.4976 |
| SD | 0.1413 | 0.1520 | 0.1742 | 0.0652 | 0.1176 | 0.4474 | 0.2215 | 0.2301 | 0.3215 | 0.7067 |
| \% Viability | 38.88 | 42.99 | 42.46 | 48.41 | 52.91 | 56.27 | 60.31 | 65.29 | 65.31 | 66.94 |
| \% Cytostasis | 61.12 | 57.01 | 57.54 | 51.59 | 47.09 | 43.73 | 39.69 | 34.71 | 34.69 | 33.06 |

SW620
(Colon)

| synthetic CB | $10 \mu \mathrm{M}$ | $5 \mu \mathrm{M}$ | $2.5 \mu \mathrm{M}$ | ${ }_{1.25} \mu_{\text {M }}$ | ${ }^{0.625} \mu \mathrm{M}$ | $0.312 \mu \mathrm{M}$ | $0.156 \mu \mathrm{M}$ | $0.078 \mu \mathrm{M}$ | $0.039 \mu \mathrm{M}$ | $0.019 \mu \mathrm{M}$ | Control |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 0.8495 | 1.5108 | 1.3298 | 1.1672 | 1.1715 | 0.9374 | 1.2049 | 1.2079 | 1.1277 | 1.2972 | 1.3824 | 1.7592 |
| 2 | 0.9456 | 0.9544 | 1.4200 | 1.3726 | 1.4543 | 1.8455 | 1.1746 | 1.5392 | 2.1706 | 1.8302 | 1.2897 | 1.4329 |
| 3 | 0.9724 | 0.9270 | 1.2427 | 1.2800 | 1.3274 | 1.6872 | 1.8768 | 1.7466 | 1.8943 | 2.5134 | 1.4734 | 1.4413 |
| 4 | 1.0701 | 1.9313 | 1.4296 | 1.6035 | 2.0755 | 1.5928 | 1.6357 | 1.9740 | 1.8748 | 1.9337 | 2.4775 | 1.3141 |
| Average | 0.9594 | 1.3309 | 1.3555 | 1.3558 | 1.5072 | 1.5157 | 1.4730 | 1.6169 | 1.7669 | 1.8936 | 2.5456 | 1.4913 |
| SD | 0.0907 | 0.4823 | 0.0876 | 0.1853 | 0.3961 | 0.3994 | 0.3418 | 0.3254 | 0.4470 | 0.4985 | 1.8318 | 1.0086 |
| \% Viability | 58.90 | 81.72 | 83.23 | 83.24 | 92.54 | 93.06 | 90.44 | 99.28 | 108.49 | 116.27 | 1.6962 | 1.4459 |
| \% Cytostasis | 41.06 | 18.28 | 16.77 | 16.76 | 7.46 | 6.94 | 9.56 | 0.72 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.7340 | 1.7343 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Average= | . 6286 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | SD=0.4 |  |
| rCB-PP | ${ }_{10}{ }^{\text {M }}$ | ${ }_{5} \mu \mathrm{M}$ | $2.5 \mu \mathrm{M}$ | ${ }^{1.25} \mu \mathrm{M}$ | ${ }^{0.625} \mu \mathrm{M}$ | $0.312 \mu \mathrm{M}$ | $0.156 \mu \mathrm{M}$ | $0.078 \mu \mathrm{M}$ | $0.039 \mu \mathrm{M}$ | $0.019 \mu \mathrm{M}$ |  |  |
| 5 | 1.1415 | 1.4471 | 1.2595 | 1.2111 | 1.0872 | 1.7355 | 1.2538 | 1.3369 | 1.6521 | 1.4491 |  |  |
| 6 | 0.8454 | 1.8272 | 1.1959 | 1.2591 | 1.3681 | 1.9609 | 1.6548 | 1.2257 | 1.6186 | 1.3991 |  |  |
| 7 | 0.9414 | 1.1413 | 1.1446 | 1.3007 | 1.8782 | 1.0421 | 1.4898 | 1.7248 | 1.9684 | 1.7055 |  |  |
| 8 | 1.2153 | 0.7827 | 1.7078 | 1.7574 | 1.1544 | 0.9560 | 1.4630 | 1.6014 | 1.0939 | 1.8702 |  |  |
| Average | 1.0359 | 1.2996 | 1.3270 | 1.3821 | 1.3720 | 1.4236 | 1.4654 | 1.4722 | 1.5833 | 1.6060 |  |  |
| SD | 0.1718 | 0.4444 | 0.2582 | 0.2529 | 0.3581 | 0.5001 | 0.1646 | 0.2306 | 0.3623 | 0.2215 |  |  |
| \% Viability | 63.6 | 79.79 | 81.48 | 84.86 | 84.24 | 87.41 | 89.97 | 90.39 | 97.21 | 98.61 |  |  |
| \% Cytostasis | 36.32 | 20.21 | 18.52 | 15.14 | 15.76 | 12.59 | 10.03 | 9.09 | 7.29 | 1.39 |  |  |

Wi-38 (Fibroblast
from lung tissue)

| synthetic CB | $10 \mu \mathrm{M}$ | $5 \mu \mathrm{M}$ | $2.5 \mu \mathrm{M}$ | $1.25 \mu \mathrm{M}$ | $0.625 \mu \mathrm{M}$ | $0.312 \mu \mathrm{M}$ | $0.156 \mu \mathrm{M}$ | $0.078 \mu \mathrm{M}$ | $0.039 \mu \mathrm{M}$ | $0.019 \mu \mathrm{M}$ | Control |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 0.2390 | 0.3320 | 0.3241 | 0.3220 | 0.2975 | 0.3101 | 0.3085 | 0.3188 | 0.3334 | 0.3253 | 0.2111 | 0.1914 |
| 2 | 0.2893 | 0.3299 | 0.3220 | 0.2815 | 0.3026 | 0.2426 | 0.3049 | 0.2937 | 0.3033 | 0.3152 | 0.2135 | 0.2113 |
| 3 | 0.3076 | 0.2959 | 0.3032 | 0.2670 | 0.2568 | 0.2985 | 0.2793 | 0.2826 | 0.2932 | 0.3000 | 0.2560 | 0.2106 |
| 4 | 0.2523 | 0.3014 | 0.2723 | 0.2698 | 0.2200 | 0.2760 | 0.2130 | 0.2621 | 0.2619 | 0.3008 | 0.2272 | 0.2061 |
| Average | 0.2721 | 0.3148 | 0.3054 | 0.2851 | 0.2692 | 0.2818 | 0.2764 | 0.2893 | 0.2980 | 0.3103 | 0.3050 | 0.1991 |
| SD | 0.0319 | 0.0188 | 0.0240 | 0.0254 | 0.0387 | 0.0297 | 0.0442 | 0.0236 | 0.0295 | 0.0122 | 0.3106 | 0.2240 |
| \% Viability | 124.00 | 143.00 | 139.00 | 130.00 | 123.00 | 128.00 | 126.00 | 132.00 | 136.00 | 141.00 | 0.2414 | 0.2088 |
| \% Cytostasis | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0997 | 0.1864 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Average $=$ | 2188 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | SD=0.4 |  |


| rCB-PP | $10 \mu \mathrm{M}$ | $5 \mu \mathrm{M}$ | $2.5 \mu \mathrm{M}$ | $1.25 \mu \mathrm{M}$ | $0.625 \mu \mathrm{M}$ | $0.312 \mu \mathrm{M}$ | $0.156 \mu \mathrm{M}$ | $0.078 \mu \mathrm{M}$ | $0.039 \mu \mathrm{M}$ | $0.019 \mu \mathrm{M}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 5 | 0.6338 | 0.4094 | 0.3512 | 0.3634 | 0.3812 | 0.2927 | 0.2532 | 0.2844 | 0.2744 | 0.3096 |
| 6 | 0.4088 | 0.4462 | 0.4143 | 0.4967 | 0.4018 | 0.2349 | 0.2672 | 0.2576 | 0.2633 | 0.2994 |
| 7 | 0.4348 | 0.4464 | 0.3745 | 0.3285 | 0.2832 | 0.2988 | 0.2679 | 0.2705 | 0.2707 | 0.2810 |
| 8 | 0.4968 | 0.4513 | 0.3737 | 0.3798 | 0.3483 | 0.2791 | 0.2489 | 0.2650 | 0.2694 | 0.2981 |
| SD | 0.1009 | 0.0386 | 0.0289 | 0.0796 | 0.0537 | 0.0297 | 0.0286 | 0.0160 | 0.0046 | 0.0122 |
| \% Viability | 227.0 | 206.0 | 107.0 | 173.0 | 159.0 | 127.0 | 113.0 | 121.0 | 123.0 | 136.0 |
| \% Cytostasis | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
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