PHOTODYNAMIC ACTION OF CONCANAVALIN A-CHLORIN CONJUGATE e₆ ON HUMAN FIBROBLASTS

T. V. Akhlynina, P. V. Gulak, N. V. Serebryakova,

A. A. Rozenkrants, and A. S. Sobolev

UDC 615.272.6:547.963.1].017:615.831.4.015.21:615.263].07

KEY WORDS: porphyrins, chlorin e₆, photodynamic therapy, concanavalin A, human embryonic skin fibroblasts.

Photosensitizers and, in particular, certain porphyrin derivatives, which possess higher affinity for tumor tissues than for normal tissues and which exhibit low toxicity for the patient have been used for tumor therapy. During the action of light on the porphyrins, singlet oxygen ($^{1}O_{2}$), toxic for living cells, is formed [2]. The life span of $^{1}O_{2}$ in the aqueous phase is about 2 μ sec and, consequently, its action is local. It has been suggested that the probable target for the action of porphyrins is the cell membrane in which lipid peroxidation is initiated [1].

Since normal cells can also accumulate porphyrins and are eliminated from the body very slowly, complications in the form of photoreactions may arise in patients receiving such preparations intravenously: if the skin is exposed to direct sunlight burns may occur for 1-2 months after injection of the porphyrins [1]. The problem accordingly arises of reducing the active concentration of the sensitizer. One possible way of solving this problem may be to conjugate the photosensitizer with a ligand for which specific receptors, undergoing internalization exist on tumor cells. In this way the conjugated ligand can penetrate inside the cells and be targeted to a particular compartment.

In our experiments we used concanavalin A (con A), conjugated with the photosensitizer chlorin e₆ as the ligand.

EXPERIMENTAL METHOD

Human embryonic skin fibroblasts were cultured in Eagle's growth medium with 15% heat-inactivated fetal calf serum in the presence of 5% CO_2 . Chlorin e_6 was obtained from nettle leaves by Fisher's method [3]. Con A was conjugated with chlorin e_6 with the aid of cyclohexyl-3-(2-morpholinoethyl)-carbodi-imidemeto-4-toluenesulfonate [6]. The method enabled one molecule of con A to be bound with 25 molecules of chlorin e_6 . The viability of the cells was determined as incorporation of labeled thymidine [4]. Fibroblasts were seeded on Petri dishes (capacity 35 ml) with 3 H-thymidine ($^{10^4}$ Bq/ml). After formation of a monolayer the cells were incubated in growth medium with chlorin e_6 or with the Con A—chlorin e_6 conjugate at $^{10^4}$ Cor $^{$

Laboratory of Biomembranes, Institute of Applied Molecular Biology, Ministry of Health of the USSR, Moscow. (Presented by Academician of the Academy of Medical Sciences of the USSR I. P. Ashmarin.) Translated from Byulleten' Éksperimental'noi Biologii i Meditsiny, Vol. 109, No. 2, pp. 150-152, February, 1990. Original article submitted December 26, 1988.

TABLE 1. Effect of Chlorin e_6 and Con A—Chlorin e_6 on Viability of Human Embryonic Skin Fibroblasts ($M \pm m$)

Experimental conditions	Incubation tempera- ture, °C	Illumination for 2 min	3Н	Incorpora- tion of ¹⁴ C (cpm)	¹4C/³H×10³	p
Control Chlorin e ₆ Con A-chlorin e ₆ Con A-chlorin e ₆	37 37 0 37	 + +	886 614±45 925 975 233±21 313 1 030 610±109 588 906 063±62 910	1592±305 1065±129 1097±167 332+65	1,59±0,29 1,04±0,15 1,02±0,1 0,34±0,09	<0,1 <0,005 <0,001

Legend. Duration of incubation with photosensitizer was 1 h, concentration expressed as chlorin e_6 1.57 μ M.

EXPERIMENTAL RESULTS

The cells were seeded on dishes with ³H-thymidine and then incubated with the conjugate or with chlorin e₆, irradiated, and then treated with ¹⁴C-thymidine. Incorporation of ³H-thymidine characterized the number of cells remaining adherent to the substrate after the action of the damaging agent. Incorporation of ¹⁴C-thymidine demonstrated the capacity of the cells for further growth. Incorporation of ¹⁴C-thymidine, normalized for the level of incorporation of ³H-thymidine, reflected the viability of the cells remaining attached after irradiation. After exposure to light, incorporation of ¹⁴C-thymidine into cells incubated with Con A—chlorin e₆ was considerably weaker than in the control cells (Table 1). The damaging action of the conjugate was stronger than that of chlorin e₆ alone. At 0°C the ligand is known to bind with receptors on the cell surface and internalization of the ligand does not take place [7]. For that reason, in the present experiments the damaging action of con A—chlorin e₆ at 0°C was weaker. If the cells were not irradiated after incubation, no damaging effect was found.

In the experiments of series II the number of surviving cells was determined after incubation with the conjugate or with chlorin e_6 (3.14 μ M) followed by irradiation. After irradiation the cells were seeded on dishes with ³H-thymidine. Ability to adhere to the substrate is a feature of undamaged cells. After incubation with the conjugate and subsequent irradiation the cells were found to die completely, whereas after chlorin e_6 , incorporation was reduced by 10-20% below the control level. Only with chlorin e_6 in a concentration of 15.7 μ M did all the cells die, i.e., conjugation led to a fivefold increase in the effect and, correspondingly, to an equal decrease in the active concentration of chlorin e_6 .

Con A has the ability to bind with glucosides and mannosides of the surface glycoproteins of the cell [5], and then to be internalized by the cells [4]. On penetrating inside the cells con A, proceeding along endocytotic compartments, can enter lysosomes. On conjugation of con A with chlorin e_6 , the damaging action of the conjugate is stronger than that of chlorin e_6 alone, for it is the intracellular compartments of the cells that are the target for the conjugate, whereas that for chlorin e_6 is mainly the cell membranes [1, 8]. For practical purposes it is therefore evident that the photosensitizer should be conjugated with a ligand whose receptors are represented mainly on tumor cells.

LITERATURE CITED

- 1. N. F. Gamaleya and N. A. Mikhalkin, Éksp. Onkol., No. 1, 9 (1988).
- 2. G. P. Gurinovich, A. N. Sevchenko, and K. N. Solov'ev, Spectroscopy of Chlorophyll and Related Compounds [in Russian], Minsk (1968).
- 3. G. P. Gurinovich, I. T. Zhakov, G. A. Kostenich, et al., Vest. Akad. Med. Nauk SSSR, No. 12, 24 (1987).
- 4. E. Ben-Hur, M. Green, A. Prager, et al., Photochem. Photobiol., 46, 651 (1987).
- 5. G. M. Edelman, Science, 192, 218 (1976).
- 6. H. Faultich and L. Fiume, Meth. Enzymol., 112A, 225 (1985).
- 7. A. R. Robbins, R. Myerowitz, R. J. Youle, et al., J. Biol. Chem., 256, 10618 (1981).
- 8. R. Santus, C. Kohen, E. Kohen, J. P. Reyftman, et al., Photochem. Photobiol., 38, 71 (1983).