Exploring the photo-toxicity of hypoxic active iridium(III)-based sensitizers in 3D tumor spheroids
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ABSTRACT: Among all molecules developed for anticancer therapies, photodynamic therapeutic agents have a unique profile. Their maximal activity is specifically triggered in tumors by light and toxicity of even systemically delivered drug is prevented in non-illuminated parts of the body. Photosensitizers exert their therapeutic effect by producing reactive oxygen species via a light-activated reaction with molecular oxygen. Consequently, the lowering of pO2 deep in solid tumors limits their treatment and makes essential the design of oxygen-independent sensitizers. In this perspective, we have recently developed Ir(III)-based molecules able to oxidize biomolecules by type I processes under free-oxygen conditions. We examine here their photo-toxicity in relevant biological models. We show that drugs, which are mitochondria-accumulated, induce upon light irradiation a dramatic decrease of the cell viabibility, even under low oxygen conditions. Finally, assays on 3D tumor spheroids highlight the importance of the light-activation step and the oxygen consumption rate on the drug activity.

Introduction

Over the last decades, photodynamic therapy (PDT) has emerged as a promising method to treat diseases in diverse areas of medicine, especially in oncology.1,2 Its features, including low systemic toxicity and minimally invasive procedure, make it an interesting alternative to conventional cancer therapies such as chemotherapy, radiotherapy and surgery.3 The photodynamic effect arises from a light-activated reaction between a photosensitizer (PS) and molecular oxygen.1,2,4 The mechanisms are complex but can be divided in two main pathways, both inducing the production of reactive oxygen species (ROS) (Fig. 1).5 On the one hand, type I processes involve a photo-induced electron transfer with biological substrates, leading after several steps to radical species such as superoxide (O2•−), hydroxyl (OH•) and hydroperoxyl (HO2•). On the other hand, type II photoreactivity consists in the production of singlet oxygen (1O2) by a direct energy transfer.

For decades, research in cancer PDT has focused on the design of efficient photosensitizers to produce more 1O2, which is the main mediator causing tissue damage.4,5 Different generations of light-activatable molecules with an increased quantum yield of 1O2 photo-production (Φo2) have been developed.6,7 Efforts have also been made to improve light-absorption of these compounds in the therapeutic window (600-1000 nm) and thereby to reach deep-seated solid tumors. Unfortunately, the lowering of tumor pO2 at distance from blood vessels remains an obstacle for the use of classical photosensitizers because of the need of PDT for molecular oxygen to initiate cell death.8-10 Recent studies have however shown that type I photoreactivity can lead to strong cytotoxic effects under low oxygen conditions.11-18 Innovative strategies, involving this pathway, have thus recently been developed to overcome the problem of tumor hypoxia.9 Nevertheless, it remains an under-explored research area and hypoxic active type I photosensitizers are still scarcely-reported.

Consequently, we have concentrated our efforts on developing novel molecules able to cause cellular damage by exploiting type I processes. We have opted for bis-cyclometalated Ir(III) complexes because they form lipophilic cations characterized by a rapid cellular uptake19-21 and tunable redox properties.22-24 Actually, we have recently reported on novel Ir(III)-based compounds with long-lived triplet excited states25 and strong photo-oxidizing powers.26 Our goal is now to examine whether the intracellular oxygen content influences their photo-cytotoxicity. Viability assays have been performed on 2D cell cultures under both normoxic and hypoxic conditions as well as on 3D tumor spheroids. These models are particularly
suited for this study, due to the development of a spontaneous hypoxic core.\[^{27}\]

**Results and discussion**

Two Ir(III) complexes, namely **Ir-pzpy** and **Ir-TAP** (Fig. 2), have been synthesized and purified as previously described (Supporting information).\[^{25, 26}\] Confocal microscopy of FaDu cancer cells (Fig. 2) reveals a rapid uptake of both compounds upon 1h incubation time. Co-localization experiments with subcellular markers show that these drugs are mainly mitochondria-accumulated (Pearson’s correlation coefficient of 0.81 and 0.93 for **Ir-pzpy** and **Ir-TAP** respectively), which is consistent with many other examples of positively-charged Ir(III) complexes, reaching these organelles by energy-dependent or independent pathways.\[^{28-31}\] Such a subcellular localization may actually constitute a key feature for Ir(III)-based molecules through the induction of mitochondrial dysfunction and associated cell death pathways, as reported for various mitochondria-targeting compounds.\[^{32, 33}\]
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Figure 2. Live confocal imaging of FaDu cancer cells after 1h incubation with 20 µM of (a) **Ir-pzpy** and (b) **Ir-TAP**. The Ir(III) photosensitizers are in green and the MitoTracker Red CMXROS is in red. A plot profile across the cell (white arrow) is also shown for each photosensitizer. Scale bars: 100 µM.

The capacity of both Ir(III)-based drugs to initiate cell death has been assessed on FaDu and HT-29 cancer cells, under normoxic (21% O\(_2\)) and hypoxic (1% O\(_2\)) conditions. The IC\(_{50}\) values (Table 1), obtained by plotting viability vs. log concentration (Fig. S1), show that whereas the dark toxicity of both complexes is relatively low in the studied concentration range, cell viability decreases dramatically upon light excitation (light dose = 2.83 J/cm\(^2\)). This light-triggered cytotoxic effect though reduced at lower pO\(_2\) due to the inhibition of type II photoprocesses, is still significant for both compounds under hypoxia, which supports possible contribution of oxygen-independent type I processes. Interestingly, lowering pO\(_2\) affects in a different way the photo-cytotoxicity of both sensi-

tizers, with hypoxia/normoxia IC\(_{50}\) ratio amounting to 3.3-4.8 for **Ir-pzpy** and 2.0-2.4 for **Ir-TAP** upon light excitation. A possible explanation for this phenomenon arises from the longer excited state lifetime of **Ir-pzpy** in water (\(\tau_{\text{Ir-pzpy}} = 297\) ns) as compared to **Ir-TAP** (\(\tau_{\text{Ir-TAP}} = 56\) ns) and thus its stronger sensitivity towards the amount of dissolved oxygen. This result reflects the better capacity of **Ir-pzpy** to generate O\(_2\) through a type II photoreaction and is consistent with the O\(_2\) quantum yields, determined for each complex in water (\(\Phi_O\), **Ir-pzpy** = 0.68, \(\Phi_O\) **Ir-TAP** = 0.08) (Fig. S2 and Table S1). These data support a model wherein the anticancer activity of **Ir-pzpy** relies more on a classical type II PDT pathway than the one of **Ir-TAP**, which exhibits thus a stronger cytotoxic activity in the absence of oxygen.

**Table 1. IC\(_{50}\) values\[^{[a]}\]** determined from dose-dependent growth inhibitory curves of **Ir-pzpy** and **Ir-TAP** on FaDu and HT-29 cancer cells, in the dark and upon light activation, under normoxic (21% O\(_2\)) and hypoxic (1% O\(_2\)) conditions. Cells were treated during 1h with the desired concentration of complex, before being irradiated or not for 30 min with 405nm-LEDs (light dose = 2.83 J/cm\(^2\)). The amount of viable cells was determined 24h later by WST-1 viability assays.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cell type</th>
<th><strong>Ir-pzpy</strong> / µM</th>
<th><strong>Ir-TAP</strong> / µM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Light / (Dark)</td>
<td>p[^{[b]}]</td>
<td>Light / (Dark)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FaDu Normoxia</td>
<td>3.8±0.4 (69.4±6.2)</td>
<td>18.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hypoxia</td>
<td>18.1±1.8 (79.6±7.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HT-29 Normoxia</td>
<td>8.7±0.7 (&gt;100)</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hypoxia</td>
<td>28.6±2.3 (96.2±6.2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[^{[a]}\] The data obtained in three independent experiments (4 wells/condition) are expressed as mean ± standard deviation. \[^{[b]}\] PI = photoindex = IC\(_{50}\) / dark IC\(_{50}\) light

The above hypothesis has been confirmed by photocleavage experiments carried out on a supercoiled pBR322 plasmid (Fig. 3). While both drugs are inactive in the dark, **Ir-pzpy** shows a strong cleavage activity upon 30 min irradiation with 405nm-LEDs (Fig. 3). Indeed, at concentrations exceeding 10 µM, the bands attributed to the supercoiled form disappear whereas open-circular as well as linear plasmid conformations appear (lane 5-10) (Fig. 3a). However, as expected from the model described above, the addition of a singlet oxygen scavenger (NaN\(_3\)) decreases dramatically the cleavage activity of **Ir-pzpy**. Only the open-circular conformation is obtained and it coexists with the supercoiled form, even at the highest complex concentrations. By contrast, the photocleavage activity of **Ir-TAP** though reduced due to its shorter excited state lifetime, is less affected by the addition of sodium azide. With or without the singlet oxygen scavenger, the supercoiled conformation is always present and only the open-circular form can be obtained (Fig. 3b). This result is consistent with its lower O\(_2\) quantum yield as compared to **Ir-
pzpy. Finally, it is worth noting that these experiments demonstrate unambiguously that the PDT activity of both complexes does not only rely on $^{15}O_2$ sensitization but also involves type I processes.

In order to explore the cell death mechanism initiated by Ir(III) complexes upon light excitation, flow cytometric analyses of FaDu cancer cells double-labeled with Annexin V-FITC and propidium iodide have been performed (Fig. S3-S4). As shown in the supporting information, no-treated cells remain viable, with cell mortality inferior to 10%. By contrast, treatments with Ir-pzpy and Ir-TAP induce cytotoxicity, which increases with the drug dose as well as over the time after the irradiation step. For both drugs, at intermediate concentrations, early apoptosis is detected, which suggests that cell mortality mainly occurs by apoptotic pathways.
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Figure 3. Agarose (0.8%) gel electrophoresis of supercoiled pBR322 plasmid DNA (260 ng) exposed to (a) Ir-pzpy for 30 min and (b) Ir-TAP for 120 min. Lane 1: pBR322 control dark, Lane 2: pBR322 control + NaN$_3$ (10 mM) dark, Lane 3: pBR322 + Ir (25 µM) dark, Lane 4: pBR322 + Ir (25 µM) + NaN$_3$ (10 mM) dark, Lane 5-10: pBR322 + Ir (0, 5, 10, 15, 20, 25 µM) light, Lane 11-16: pBR322 + Ir (0, 5, 10, 15, 20, 25 µM) + NaN$_3$ (10 mM) light.

In addition to the experiments conducted on 2D cancer cell monolayers, the oxygen-dependence of the Ir(III) complexes anticancer activity has also been examined in 3D tumor spheroids. As proven in the supporting information (Fig. S5), FaDu tumor spheroids are characterized by the development of a spontaneous hypoxic core surrounded by a normoxic continuum, thereby recapitulating the different compartments, with lower or higher oxygen levels, observed in a tumor in vivo. Moreover, matrix and cell-cell interactions within these 3D multicellular aggregates make them particularly suited to study drug penetration and, in the specific context of photosensitizers, to evaluate the capacity of light to reach them deep in the tissues.27, 34

Viability assays performed on 3D tumor spheroids confirm the primary conclusions drawn from the experiments conducted on 2D cell cultures. Whereas the cytotoxicity of both drugs is weak in the dark (Fig. 4a and Fig. S7), the light activation (light dose = 2.83 J/cm$^2$) induces a dramatic decrease in cancer cell viability (Fig. 4b and Fig. S8). Importantly, the effects of both complexes are consistent with results obtained with cell monolayers under hypoxia. Indeed, Ir-TAP shows larger growth inhibitory effects towards tumor spheroids than Ir-pzpy, which supports a pronounced activity of the former when hypoxia is present in the system. The cell death associated to the photo-toxicity of Ir-pzpy is actually limited to surface cell layers and does not vary a lot with the drug concentration (Fig. 4b-4e and Fig. S7). By contrast, the cytotoxic effects, arising from light-activated Ir-TAP, are detected deep in the 3D cellular aggregates, even in strong hypoxic areas (Fig. 4b-4c and Fig. S8).

A lack of light penetration cannot account for the failure of Ir-pzpy to inhibit the spheroid growth. Indeed, although both complexes possess the same absorption properties on the excitation wavelength ($\lambda_{abs max} = \pm 800$ M$^{-1}$cm$^{-1}$ for both compounds) (Fig. S11), Ir-TAP (20 µM) can induce the complete destruction of the spheroidal structure and has therefore a stronger photo-activity than Ir-pzpy at the same concentration. In addition, a problem of drug penetration can be excluded because luminescent signals arising from each Ir(III) complex have been observed at different depths in the 3D multicellular aggregates. These luminescent signals are actually homogeneously distributed in the different z-stacks analyzed by confocal microscopy (Fig. S12), but also over whole deep-seated sections obtained by physical slicing of FaDu tumor spheroids (Fig. 4d-4e).

The incomplete destruction of spheroids by Ir-pzpy is likely to be associated to its stronger sensitivity to oxygen and its subsequent higher dependence on type II processes. In 3D multicellular models, such a phenomenon has already been reported on several well-known PDT sensitizers, including Photofrin, 5-aminolevulinic acid (ALA) and hypericin.35-38 Actually, whereas the supply of oxygen is limited in tumor spheroids, the photo-production of $^{15}O_2$ by these compounds induces a rapid depletion of pO$_2$ inside the 3D structure. Consequently, the anticancer activity of strong type II sensitizers, such as those mentioned above and Ir-pzpy, decreases dramatically. Usually, a reduction of the light dose leads to the recovery of their antiproliferative effect by diminishing the oxygen consumption rate. Fractional photodynamic therapy may also be considered for these compounds.39 However, as reported by Evans et al.,40 the use of type I sensitizers represents another promising approach. Indeed, thanks to their lower oxygen consumption rate and their ability to induce cellular damage at low pO$_2$, they show a great activity in 3D tumor spheroids. Such a behavior is verified herein with Ir-TAP, which is characterized by a high photo-oxidizing power as well as a low $^{15}O_2$ quantum yield and which presents an exquisite therapeutic effect in spontaneously hypoxic spheroid models.
Figure 4. (a) Dark and (b) light-induced cytotoxic effect of Ir-pzpy and Ir-TAP on tumor spheroids (diameter: 350-400 µm) obtained from 3D cultures of FaDu cancer cells. A timeline summarizing this experiment is given in Fig. S6. The volume growth of spheroids is plotted as a function of time. At day 5, the spheroids were incubated without drugs or with Ir-pzpy or Ir-TAP for 24h. They were then exposed (t = 1h) or not to 405nm-LEDs for 30 min (light dose = 2.83 J/cm²). (c) Representative pictures of 3D FaDu tumor spheroids 24 h after the irradiation step. (d-e) Representative picture of sections (5 µm), obtained by physical slicing of FaDu tumor spheroids after 24h incubation with 20 µM of (d) Ir-pzpy and (e) Ir-TAP. The Ir(III)-based photosensitizers are in green and nuclei were stained with Draq5 in blue. Scale bars: 100 µm.

In order to increase the growth inhibitory effect of Ir-pzpy, fractional PDT with two irradiation steps (light dose/irradiation = 2.83 J/cm²) at 24h interval has been carried out. As expected, an additional reduction in the spheroid volume has been observed due to tissue reoxygenation (Fig. 5a-5b and Fig. S10). In addition, it is worth noting that the combination of two separated irradiation steps at a lower drug concentration (10 µM) has been found to be more efficient than a single irradiation step at a higher concentration (20 µM). A similar experiment has also been performed using Ir-TAP as photosensitizer. In this case, fractional PDT has allowed us to decrease the drug concentration used from 20 µM to 10 µM, whilst keeping an important cytotoxic effect and inducing the complete destruction of the 3D multicellular aggregates (Fig. 5a-6b and Fig. S10).

Figure 5. (a) Cytotoxic effect of Ir-pzpy and Ir-TAP on tumor spheroids (diameter: 350-400 µm) obtained from 3D cultures of FaDu cancer cells. A timeline summarizing this experiment is given in Fig. S9. The volume growth of spheroids is plotted as a function of time. At day 5, spheroids were incubated without drugs or with Ir-pzpy or Ir-TAP for 24h. They were then exposed once (t = 1h) (light dose = 2.83 J/cm²) or twice (t = 1h and 24h) (light dose = 5.66 J/cm²) to 405nm-LEDs for 30 min. (b) Representative pictures of 3D FaDu tumor spheroids at different time.

Conclusion
In conclusion, we showed that photo-oxidizing iridium(III) complexes represent an attractive family of photosensitizers to treat tumors. Indeed, as reported for other Ir(III)-based compounds, they are characterized by a rapid cellular uptake and the capacity to penetrate deep into 3D tumor spheroids.41-43 In addition, thanks to their subcellular localization, they are able to induce rapid apoptotic cell death upon light excitation. Between the two Ir(III)-based drugs studied here, Ir-TAP has emerged as the most promising candidate by combining a low 1O₂ quantum yield and the capacity to initiate type I oxygen-independent processes. A complete destruction of 3D tumor spheroids has been observed at a concentration of 20 µM, but also at 10 µM in combination with two irradiation steps at 24h interval. By contrast, the therapeutic activity of the second compound, Ir-pzpy, remains limited in such models. Actually, this phenomenon has been attributed to its rapid consumption of all the oxygen available in the spheroid, as previously proven for other strong 1O₂ sensitizers. However, thanks to fractional PDT, an increased growth inhibitory effect could be obtained with Ir-pzpy.

These results open the door to future studies investigating the anticancer effect of both drugs in vivo. Nevertheless, in this context, the short activation wavelength (405 nm) of our drugs might be an issue when it comes to light penetration in living tissues. Consequently, the use of two-photon excitation will also be examined. Indeed, several recent studies have shown that photo-cytotoxic Ir(III) complexes could be excited through the absorption of two low-energy photons instead of one high-energy photon.44-50
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