



**UNIVERSITI PUTRA MALAYSIA**

**EFFECT OF COMBINATION THERAPY OF RUTHENIUM POLYPYRIDYL  
COMPLEX,  $[\text{Ru}(\text{dppz})_2(\text{PIP})]^{2+}$  AND PARP INHIBITORS AGAINST  
SEVERAL CANCER CELL LINES**

**NUR AININIE BINTI YUSOH**

**FS 2020 23**



**EFFECT OF COMBINATION THERAPY OF RUTHENIUM POLYPYRIDYL  
COMPLEX,  $[\text{Ru}(\text{dppz})_2(\text{PIP})]^{2+}$  AND PARP INHIBITORS AGAINST  
SEVERAL CANCER CELL LINES**

By

**NUR AININIE BINTI YUSOH**

**Thesis Submitted to the School of Graduate Studies, Universiti  
Putra Malaysia, in Fulfilment of the Requirements for the Degree of  
Master of Science**

**July 2020**

## COPYRIGHT

All material contained within the thesis, including without limitation text, logos, icons, photographs and all other artwork, is copyright material of Universiti Putra Malaysia unless otherwise stated. Use may be made of any material contained within the thesis for non-commercial purposes from the copyright holder. Commercial use of material may only be made with the express, prior, written permission of Universiti Putra Malaysia.

Copyright © Universiti Putra Malaysia



Abstract of thesis presented to the Senate of Universiti Putra Malaysia in fulfillment of the requirement for the degree of Master of Science

**EFFECT OF COMBINATION THERAPY OF RUTHENIUM POLYPYRIDYL COMPLEX,  $[\text{Ru}(\text{dppz})_2(\text{PIP})]^{2+}$  AND PARP INHIBITORS AGAINST SEVERAL CANCER CELL LINES**

By

**NUR AININIE BINTI YUSOH**

July 2020

**Chair : Haslina Ahmad, PhD**  
**Faculty : Science**

Ruthenium polypyridyl complexes (RPCs) have been clinically studied as promising anticancer agents in the last decades. The RPC,  $[\text{Ru}(\text{dppz})_2(\text{PIP})]^{2+}$  or RuPIP where dppz = dipyrido[3,2-a:2',3'-c]phenazine and PIP = 2-(phenyl)-imidazo[4,5-f][1,10]phenantroline has demonstrated anticancer properties where it was shown to stall DNA replication fork progression resulting in the initiation of DNA damage response (DDR) signaling which further lead to the inhibition of cell proliferation through G1/S-mediated cell cycle arrest. This has prompted us to study the rational combination of RuPIP alongside DDR inhibitors, particularly the inhibitors of poly (ADP-ribose) polymerase (PARP) to achieve synergistic effect in cancer cells. This is to enhance the therapeutic response to RuPIP in cancer cells while reducing the impact on normal cells. The cytotoxic effect of RuPIP and PARP inhibitors as single agents on several cancer cell lines (A549, MCF7, MDA-MB-231 and T24) were determined using MTT assay. RuPIP showed time-dependent reduction in the  $\text{IC}_{50}$  values meanwhile, both PARP inhibitors showed  $\text{IC}_{50} > 100 \mu\text{M}$ . All compounds showed  $\text{IC}_{50} > 100 \mu\text{M}$  on the normal NHDF cells. Drug combination study was carried out based on Chou and Talalay combination index (CI) method in which CI values were determined using Calcsyn and Compusyn software. Synergy ( $\text{CI} < 1$ ) was observed with majority of RuPIP-olaparib combinations meanwhile, RuPIP-NU1025 resulted in a range of combination indices, ranging from synergism to antagonism. Importantly, the viability of normal cells observed for any combination tested was  $> 70\%$ . Based on the average CI values, the synergistic combination ( $\text{CI} = 0.87$ ) of  $25 \mu\text{M}$  RuPIP alongside  $25 \mu\text{M}$  NU1025 or  $5 \mu\text{M}$  olaparib were chosen for further experiments. Cells ability to survive post-treatment and form colonies was investigated using clonogenic survival assay with single-agent treatments showed survival fractions (S.F)  $> 75\%$ . Interestingly, combination treatments reduced cell survival with RuPIP-olaparib (S.F.  $< 2\%$ ) showed lower survival than RuPIP-NU1025 (S.F.  $< 57\%$ ). Besides, treatments with  $25 \mu\text{M}$  RuPIP sensitize cells to olaparib where 60-fold reduction in  $\text{IC}_{50}$  value of olaparib was obtained for MCF7 (0.08 vs 4.75

$\mu\text{M}$ ) and 300-fold reduction was observed in MDA-MB-231 cells (0.06 vs 23.39  $\mu\text{M}$ ). Next, cell migration ability was investigated using cell scratch assay which revealed that RuPIP-olaparib combination significantly ( $P < 0.001$ ) reduced cell migration with 40% reduction in wound closure was observed compared to control. The flow cytometric analysis on cell cycle distribution revealed that the combination treatment resulted in enhanced cell cycle arrest at G1/S phase in A549 cells (17.1% increase compared to control). Whereas both MCF7 and MDA-MB-231 cells were arrested at G2/M phase (19.7% and 20.4% increase compared to control, respectively). Subsequently, Annexin V-FITC assay showed that the combination treatment significantly ( $P < 0.001$ ) increased the percentage of apoptotic cells with 25%, 30% and 31% increase compared to control in A549, MCF7 and MDA-MB-231 cells, respectively. These resultant cell deaths are associated with significant ( $P < 0.001$ ) increase in the accumulation of double-strand breaks (DBSs) DNA damage with 45% increase in the percentage of cells with  $\gamma\text{H2AX}$  foci compared to control. These findings established that RuPIP showed synergy with PARP inhibitors in several cancer cell lines with reduced impact on normal cells.

Abstrak tesis yang dikemukakan kepada Senat Universiti Putra Malaysia  
sebagai memenuhi keperluan untuk ijazah Master Sains

**KESAN KAEDAH RAWATAN GABUNGAN KOMPLEKS RUTENIUM  
POLIPIRIDIL,  $[\text{Ru}(\text{dppz})_2(\text{PIP})]^{2+}$  DAN PERENCAT PARP TERHADAP  
BEBERAPA JENIS SEL KANSER**

Oleh

**NUR AININIE BINTI YUSOH**

Julai 2020

**Pengerusi : Haslina Ahmad, PhD**  
**Fakulti : Sains**

Kompleks rutenium yang berasaskan ligan polipiridil (RPCs) mempunyai potensi sebagai ubat antikanser dan telah dikaji secara klinikal sejak sedekad yang lalu. Peranan RPC,  $[\text{Ru}(\text{dppz})_2(\text{PIP})]^{2+}$  atau RuPIP di mana dppz = dipirido[3,2-a:2',3'-c]fenazin dan PIP = 2-fenilimidazo[4,5-f][1,10]fenantrolin) dalam terapi antikanser telah terbukti di mana ianya dapat melengahkan perkembangan cabang pereplikaan sewaktu replikasi DNA serta mengakibatkan pengaktifan tindak balas kerosakan DNA (DDR) yang kemudiannya merencatkan pertumbuhan sel melalui penangkapan kitaran sel pada fasa G1/S. Perkara ini telah mendorong kami untuk membuat kajian secara rasional dengan menggunakan gabungan RuPIP dan perencat DDR, terutamanya perencat polimerase poli (ADP-ribosa) (PARP) untuk menghasilkan kesan sinergistik bagi memperluas kesan terapeutik RuPIP serta mengurangkan kesan sitotoksik terhadap sel normal. Kesan sitotoksik yang dihasilkan oleh RuPIP dan perencat PARP sebagai agen tunggal terhadap beberapa jenis sel kanser (A549, MCF7, MDA-MB-231, dan T24) telah dikaji menggunakan ujian MTT. RuPIP menunjukkan penurunan nilai  $\text{IC}_{50}$  yang bergantung pada tempoh inkubasi, manakala kedua-dua perencat PARP menunjukkan  $\text{IC}_{50} > 100 \mu\text{M}$ . Semua sebatian menunjukkan  $\text{IC}_{50} > 100 \mu\text{M}$  terhadap sel normal NHDF. Seterusnya, kajian gabungan ubat-ubatan telah dinilai dengan menggunakan kaedah Chou dan Talalay kombinasi indeks (CI) dan pengiraan nilai CI telah ditentukan dengan menggunakan perisian Calcosyn dan Compusyn. Majoriti daripada gabungan RuPIP dan olaparib menghasilkan kesan sinergistik ( $\text{CI} < 1$ ) terhadap semua jenis sel-sel kanser yang diuji, manakala gabungan RuPIP-NU1025 menghasilkan pelbagai kombinasi indeks; menunjukkan nilai CI antara sinergistik hingga antagonistik. Pertama sekali, daya hidup sel normal bagi semua gabungan ubat-ubatan yang dikaji adalah  $> 70\%$ . Berdasarkan pengiraan purata nilai CI, gabungan sinergi ( $\text{CI} = 0.87$ ) antara  $25 \mu\text{M}$  RuPIP beserta  $25 \mu\text{M}$  NU1025 atau  $5 \mu\text{M}$  olaparib telah dipilih untuk ujian yang selanjutnya. Keupayaan sel untuk pulih dan membahagi dengan cepat untuk membentuk

koloni telah dikaji dengan menggunakan ujian klonogenik di mana rawatan sebatian sebagai agen tunggal menunjukkan kelangsungan hidup sel (S.F.) > 75%. Pertama sekali, gabungan RuPIP dan perencat PARP mengurangkan kelangsungan hidup sel di mana gabungan RuPIP-olaparib (S.F. < 2%) menunjukkan kesan pengurangan yang lebih ketara berbanding RuPIP-NU1025 (S.F. < 57%). Di samping itu, rawatan tambahan dengan 25  $\mu$ M RuPIP menyebabkan sel kanser menjadi sensitif terhadap rawatan olaparib di mana pengurangan nilai IC<sub>50</sub> untuk olaparib bagi sel MCF7 adalah sebanyak 60 kali ganda (0.08 vs 4.75  $\mu$ M), dan pengurangan nilai IC<sub>50</sub> sebanyak > 300 kali ganda bagi sel MDA-MB-231 (0.06 vs 23.39  $\mu$ M). Berikutnya, keupayaan sel untuk berhijrah telah dikaji dengan menggunakan ujian mimik luka yang menunjukkan bahawa rawatan dengan gabungan RuPIP-olaparib menyebabkan pengurangan keupayaan sel kanser untuk berhijrah yang ketara ( $P < 0.001$ ) dengan pengurangan sebanyak 40% berbanding rawatan kawalan. Seterusnya, analisis aliran sitometri untuk menganalisis kitaran sel menunjukkan bahawa rawatan gabungan menyebabkan penangkapan kitaran sel pada fasa G1/S bagi sel A549 (17.1% pertambahan berbanding rawatan kawalan). Selain itu, kedua-dua sel MCF7 dan MDA-MB-231 menyebabkan penangkapan kitaran sel pada fasa G2/M (19.7% dan 20.4% pertambahan berbanding rawatan kawalan). Selanjutnya, ujian Annexin V-FITC menunjukkan bahawa rawatan gabungan menyebabkan peningkatan kematian sel yang ketara ( $P < 0.001$ ) melalui mekanisme apoptosis (25%, 30% and 31% pertambahan berbanding rawatan kawalan masing-masing bagi sel A549, MCF7 and MDA-MB-231). Dan dapatan ini turut dikaitkan dengan peningkatan kerosakan DNA yang ketara ( $P < 0.001$ ) apabila sel kanser dirawat dengan rawatan gabungan di mana terdapat pertambahan sel yang menghasilkan fokus  $\gamma$ H2AX sebanyak 45% berbanding rawatan kawalan. Hasil dapatan kajian ini membuktikan bahawa RuPIP bersama perencat PARP dapat menghasilkan kesan sinergistik dalam pelbagai jenis sel kanser dengan kesan yang minimum terhadap sel normal.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First and foremost, I would like to express my deepest gratitude to my supervisors Assoc. Prof. Dr. Haslina Ahmad, Assoc. Prof. Dr. Chia Suet Lin and Prof. Dr. Mohd Basyaruddin Abdul Rahman for their great patience and for providing me thorough guidance throughout my studies. I also would like to thank Dr. Martin R. Gill from Swansea University, UK for his knowledgeable guidance and kind encouragement. Thank you again for everything and the knowledge that you have given to me are priceless.

Further gratitude I would like to extend towards my lab mates in the Department of Chemistry, Faculty of Science; Kak Ain, Kak Izzah, Syera, Ahza, Ellya and Gan for the advice and help that they have given to me in completing the studies. A special appreciation goes to all the lab mates in the Department of Microbiology, Faculty of Biotechnology and Biomolecular Sciences; Dr Frederick, Miera, and JoJo for all their assistance and guidance in the bioactivity studies and for giving me the time and space to conduct the experiments.

Finally, and most importantly, I would like to express my deepest gratitude and love towards my family especially my parents, Yusoh Bin Othman and Zaitun Binti Ismail for all their love and support throughout my studies. Without them, I could not have completed the studies successfully, and again, thank you very much. To my siblings, Nurmadina Binti Yusoh, Mohd Faizal Bin Yusoh and Nur Ainina Binti Yusoh, thank you for your continuous support and the endless love that you have given to me throughout my studies.



This thesis was submitted to the Senate of Universiti Putra Malaysia and has been accepted as fulfilment of the requirement for the degree of Master of Science. The members of the Supervisory Committee were as follows:

**Haslina binti Ahmad, PhD**

Associate Professor  
Faculty of Science  
Universiti Putra Malaysia  
(Chairman)

**Mohd Basyaruddin bin Abdul Rahman, PhD**

Professor  
Faculty of Science  
Universiti Putra Malaysia  
(Member)

**Chia Suet Lin, PhD**

Associate Professor  
Faculty of Biotechnology and Biomolecular Sciences  
University Putra Malaysia  
(Member)

---

**ZALILAH MOHD SHARIFF, PhD**

Professor and Dean  
School of Graduate Studies  
Universiti Putra Malaysia

Date:

## Declaration by graduate student

I hereby confirm that:

- this thesis is my original work;
- quotations, illustrations and citations have been duly referenced;
- this thesis has not been submitted previously or concurrently for any other degree at any other institutions;
- intellectual property from the thesis and copyright of thesis are fully-owned by Universiti Putra Malaysia, as according to the Universiti Putra Malaysia (Research) Rules 2012;
- written permission must be obtained from supervisor and the office of Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Research and Innovation) before thesis is published (in the form of written, printed or in electronic form) including books, journals, modules, proceedings, popular writings, seminar papers, manuscripts, posters, reports, lecture notes, learning modules or any other materials as stated in the Universiti Putra Malaysia (Research) Rules 2012;
- there is no plagiarism or data falsification/fabrication in the thesis, and scholarly integrity is upheld as according to the Universiti Putra Malaysia (Graduate Studies) Rules 2003 (Revision 2012-2013) and the Universiti Putra Malaysia (Research) Rules 2012. The thesis has undergone plagiarism detection software.

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Name and Matric No.: Nur Aininie Binti Yusoh, GS51359

## Declaration by Members of Supervisory Committee

This is to confirm that:

- the research conducted and the writing of this thesis was under our supervision;
- supervision responsibilities as stated in the Universiti Putra Malaysia (Graduate Studies) Rules 2003 (Revision 2012-2013) are adhered to.

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_  
Name of Chairman  
of Supervisory  
Committee: Haslina Ahmad

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_  
Name of Member of  
Supervisory  
Committee: Mohd Basyaruddin Abdul Rahman

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_  
Name of Member of  
Supervisory  
Committee: Chia Suet Lin

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
<b>ABSTRACT</b>		i
<b>ABSTRAK</b>		iii
<b>ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS</b>		v
<b>APPROVAL</b>		vi
<b>DECLARATION</b>		viii
<b>LIST OF TABLES</b>		xiii
<b>LIST OF FIGURES</b>		xiv
<b>LIST OF SCHEMES</b>		xviii
<b>LIST OF EQUATIONS</b>		xix
<b>LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS</b>		xx
<b>CHAPTER</b>		
<b>1</b>	<b>INTRODUCTION</b>	<b>1</b>
	1.1 Research background	1
	1.2 Problem statement	4
	1.3 Research objectives	4
<b>2</b>	<b>LITERATURE REVIEW</b>	<b>5</b>
	2.1 The global burden of cancer	5
	2.2 DNA damaging anticancer agents	6
	2.2.1 Platinum metal-based anticancer drugs	7
	2.2.2 The limitations of platinum metal-based anticancer drugs	7
	2.2.3 The development of ruthenium metal-based anticancer drugs	9
	2.2.4 Combination therapy as promising anticancer strategy	12
	2.3 DNA damage response (DDR) signaling pathways	14
	2.3.1 PARP inhibitors as anticancer agents	15
	2.3.2 PARP inhibitors NU1025 and olaparib in cancer therapy	18
	2.4 Analysis of drug interactions	19
	2.5 Methods for synergy detection of drug combinations	20
	2.5.1 Isobologram method	20
	2.5.2 Chou and Talalay combination index (CI) method	21
<b>3</b>	<b>MATERIALS AND METHODOLOGY</b>	<b>24</b>
	3.1 Synthesis of RuPIP complex	24
	3.1.1 Synthesis of 1,10-phenantroline-5,6-dione (phendione)	24
	3.1.2 Synthesis of dipyrido[3,2- <i>a</i> :2',3'- <i>c</i> ]-phenazine (dppz)	25
	3.1.3 Synthesis of Ru(dppz) <sub>2</sub> Cl <sub>2</sub> ·2H <sub>2</sub> O	25

3.1.4	Synthesis of 2-phenylimidazo[4,5-f]-[1,10]phenanthroline (PIP)	26
3.1.5	Synthesis of [Ru(dppz) <sub>2</sub> (PIP)] <sup>2+</sup> complex	26
3.2	Cell culture	27
3.2.1	Cell lines	28
3.2.2	Culture conditions	28
3.2.3	Seeding of cells	28
3.2.4	Preparation of stock solutions and storage	29
3.3	Evaluation of single agent activities	29
3.3.1	MTT assay	29
3.3.2	Determination of IC <sub>50</sub> values	30
3.4	Drug combination studies	30
3.4.1	Combination studies by MTT assay	30
3.4.2	Drug interaction analysis	30
3.4.3	Trypan blue exclusion assay	31
3.4.4	Clonogenic survival assay	31
3.4.5	Cell scratch assay	31
3.5	Evaluation of cytotoxicity mechanisms	32
3.5.1	Cell cycle analysis	32
3.5.2	Apoptosis study (Annexin V-FITC)	32
3.5.3	Immunofluorescence imaging of double-strand breaks (DSBs) DNA damage foci	33
3.6	Statistical analysis	33
<b>4</b>	<b>RESULTS AND DISCUSSION</b>	<b>34</b>
4.1	Synthesis and characterization of RuPIP complex	34
4.1.1	<sup>1</sup> H Nuclear Magnetic Resonance (NMR)	34
4.1.2	Mass Spectrometry (MS)	36
4.1.3	Fourier Transform Infrared Spectroscopy (FTIR)	38
4.2	Effect of RuPIP, NU1025 and olaparib single agents on cells	39
4.2.1	Effect of RuPIP, NU1025 and olaparib on the viability of cancer cells	40
4.2.2	The IC <sub>50</sub> values of RuPIP, NU1025 and olaparib	44
4.2.3	Effect on the normal cells	45
4.3	Drugs combination study	47
4.3.1	Effect of drug combination on cell viability	47
4.3.2	Combination index (CI) values	55
4.3.3	Sequential treatment experiments	57
4.3.4	Trypan blue exclusion staining	58
4.3.5	Clonogenic survival of cells	59
4.3.6	Effect of combination treatment on cell migration	67
4.4	Evaluation of cell cycle arrest, apoptosis induction and double-strand breaks (DSBs) DNA damage	71
4.4.1	Cell cycle distribution	71
4.4.2	Apoptotic cell death	76
4.4.3	Double strand breaks (DSBs) DNA damage	78

<b>5</b>	<b>CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH</b>	<b>82</b>
5.1	Conclusion	82
5.2	Recommendations for future research	84
	<b>REFERENCES</b>	<b>85</b>
	<b>APPENDICES</b>	<b>99</b>
	<b>BIODATA OF STUDENT</b>	<b>122</b>
	<b>LIST OF PUBLICATIONS</b>	<b>123</b>



## LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
2.1	The combinations of ruthenium-based complexes with first-line anticancer agents	13
2.2	PARP inhibitors for cancer treatment	17
3.1	List of cell lines used in the study	28
3.2	Seeding density in 96-well plates for each cell line	29
3.3	CI value and its interpretation	30
4.1	Physical properties of the material and its yield	34
4.2	<sup>1</sup> H NMR assignment of PIP ligand and RuPIP complex	36
4.3	FTIR data for PIP ligand and RuPIP complex	39
4.4	IC <sub>50</sub> values (μM) of RuPIP on cancer cells	44
4.5	IC <sub>50</sub> values (μM) of olaparib and NU1025 on cancer cells	45
4.6	IC <sub>50</sub> values (μM) of compounds on normal cells	47
4.7	Summary of CI values following treatments on (A) A549, (B) MCF7, (C) MDA-MB-231 and (D) T24 cells	56
4.8	IC <sub>50</sub> values (μM) as determined by clonogenic survival assay	66

## LIST OF FIGURES

Figure		Page
2.1	The distribution of global cancer occurrence and death according to (A) regions and (B) cancer types.	6
2.2	Structures of platinum-based anticancer drugs. (A) cisplatin, (B) carboplatin and (C) oxaliplatin.	7
2.3	The biochemical properties and applications of ruthenium complex.	9
2.4	Structures of four clinical ruthenium complexes. (A) NAMI-A, (B) KP1019, (C) NKP1339 and (D) TLD1443.	10
2.5	Structure of $[\text{Ru}(\text{dppz})_2(\text{PIP})]^{2+}$ or RuPIP.	11
2.6	The DNA damage response (DDR) signaling pathways and its inhibitors.	14
2.7	Proposed mechanisms for PARP inhibitor activity in HR repair-proficient and deficient cells.	16
2.8	Structure of NU1025.	18
2.9	Structure of olaparib (Lynparza®).	19
2.10	Schematic isobologram showing Drug A and Drug B in combination at a specific level $fa$ and line of additivity in white region, synergy in green region and antagonism in red region.	21
2.11	Schematic representation of $fa$ -CI plot. (B) Schematic representation of the effect-dependent type of interaction of drugs A and B at two different dose ratios.	22
2.12	Summary of CI values for doxorubicin and olaparib at different molar ratios in nine ovarian cancer cells lines for (A) $Fa = 0.5$ and (B) $Fa = 0.75$ .	23
4.1	$^1\text{H}$ NMR spectrum of PIP ligand (top) and RuPIP complex (bottom).	35
4.2	Mass spectrum of PIP ligand.	37
4.3	Mass spectrum of RuPIP complex.	37
4.4	FTIR spectra of PIP ligand (top) and RuPIP complex (bottom).	38



4.5	Cell viability of A549, MCF7, MDA-MB-231 and T24 cancer cells following treatment with RuPIP for (A) 24 h, (B) 48 h and (C) 72 h.	41
4.6	Cell viability of A549, MCF7, MDA-MB-231 and T24 cancer cells following treatment with olaparib for (A) 24 h, (B) 48 h and (C) 72 h.	42
4.7	Cell viability of A549, MCF7, MDA-MB-231 and T24 cancer cells following treatment with NU1025 for (A) 24 h, (B) 48 h and (C) 72 h.	43
4.8	Cell viability of NHDF cells following treatment with (A) RuPIP, (B) Olaparib and (C) NU1025 for 24, 48 and 72 h.	46
4.9	Cell viability of A549 cells following treatments with RuPIP, RuPIP-NU1025 and RuPIP-olaparib for (A) 24 h, (B) 48 h and (C) 72 h.	49
4.10	Cell viability of MCF7 cells following treatments with RuPIP, RuPIP-NU1025 and RuPIP-olaparib for (A) 24 h, (B) 48 h and (C) 72 h.	50
4.11	Cell viability of MDA-MB-231 cells following treatments with RuPIP, RuPIP-NU1025 and RuPIP-olaparib for (A) 24 h, (B) 48 h and (C) 72 h.	51
4.12	Cell viability of T24 cells following treatments with RuPIP, RuPIP-NU1025 and RuPIP-olaparib for (A) 24 h, (B) 48 h and (C) 72 h.	52
4.13	Cell viability of NHDF cells following treatments with RuPIP, RuPIP-NU1025 and RuPIP-olaparib for (A) 24 h, (B) 48 h and (C) 72 h.	54
4.14	Cell viability of A549 cells following sequential treatments.	57
4.15	Quantification of non-viable MCF7 cells following treatments with RuPIP (25 $\mu$ M) or olaparib (5 $\mu$ M) or both for 24 and 48 h.	58
4.16	Quantification of viable MCF7 cells following treatments with RuPIP (25 $\mu$ M) or olaparib (5 $\mu$ M) or both for 24 and 48 h.	59
4.17	Clonogenic survival of A549 cells following 24 h treatment with RuPIP (25 $\mu$ M), olaparib (5 $\mu$ M) or NU1025 (25 $\mu$ M) alone or in combination. (A) Representative images of colonies formed. (B) Quantification of survival fractions from A.	61

4.18	Clonogenic survival of MCF7 cells following 24 h treatment with RuPIP (25 $\mu$ M), olaparib (5 $\mu$ M) or NU1025 (25 $\mu$ M) alone or in combination. (A) Representative images of colonies formed. (B) Quantification of survival fractions from A.	62
4.19	Clonogenic survival of MDA-MB-231 cells following 24 h treatment with RuPIP (25 $\mu$ M), olaparib (5 $\mu$ M) or NU1025 (25 $\mu$ M) alone or in combination. (A) Representative images of colonies formed. (B) Quantification of survival fractions from A.	63
4.20	Clonogenic survival of MCF7 cells following 24 h treatment with concentration gradient of olaparib with (+) or without (-) RuPIP (25 $\mu$ M). (A) Representative images of colonies formed. (B) Quantification of survival fractions from A.	64
4.21	Clonogenic survival of MDA-MB-231 cells following 24 h treatment with concentration gradient of olaparib with (+) or without (-) RuPIP (25 $\mu$ M). (A) Representative images of colonies formed. (B) Quantification of survival fractions from A.	65
4.22	Cell scratch assay of A549 cells following treatment with RuPIP (25 $\mu$ M) or olaparib (5 $\mu$ M) or both. (A) Representative images of wound scratch closure at 24, 48 and 72 h. ( $\times$ 10 magnification) Scale bar, 50 $\mu$ M. (B) Quantification of percentage of wound closure from A.	68
4.23	Cell scratch assay of MCF7 cells following treatment with RuPIP (25 $\mu$ M) or olaparib (5 $\mu$ M) or both. (A) Representative images of wound scratch closure at 24, 48 and 72 h. ( $\times$ 10 magnification) Scale bar, 50 $\mu$ M. (B) Quantification of percentage of wound closure from A.	69
4.24	Cell scratch assay of MDA-MB-231 cells following treatment with RuPIP (25 $\mu$ M) or olaparib (5 $\mu$ M) or both. (A) Representative images of wound scratch closure at 24, 48 and 72 h. ( $\times$ 10 magnification) Scale bar, 50 $\mu$ M. (B) Quantification of percentage of wound closure from A.	70
4.25	Cell cycle analysis of A549 cells following 24 h treatment with RuPIP (25 $\mu$ M), olaparib (5 $\mu$ M) or NU1025 (25 $\mu$ M) alone or in combination. (A) DNA histograms showing cell cycle distributions. (B) Quantifications of cell cycle phase distributions from A.	73
4.26	Cell cycle analysis of MCF7 cells following 24 h treatment with RuPIP (25 $\mu$ M), olaparib (5 $\mu$ M) or NU1025 (25 $\mu$ M) alone or in combination. (A) DNA histograms showing cell	74

	cycle distributions. (B) Quantifications of cell cycle phase distributions from A.	
4.27	Cell cycle analysis of MDA-MB-231 cells following 24 h treatment with RuPIP (25 $\mu$ M), olaparib (5 $\mu$ M) or NU1025 (25 $\mu$ M) alone or in combination. (A) DNA histograms showing cell cycle distributions. (B) Quantifications of cell cycle phase distributions from A.	75
4.28	Annexin V-FITC assay of A549 cells following 24 h treatment with RuPIP (25 $\mu$ M) or olaparib (5 $\mu$ M) or both. (A) The scatterplots showing the percentage of cells in each quadrant. (B) Quantification of apoptotic cells from A.	76
4.29	Annexin V-FITC assay of MCF7 cells following 24 h treatment with RuPIP (25 $\mu$ M) or olaparib (5 $\mu$ M) or both. (A) The scatterplots showing the percentage of cells in each quadrant. (B) Quantification of apoptotic cells from A.	77
4.30	Annexin V-FITC assay of MDA-MB-231 cells following 24 h treatment with RuPIP (25 $\mu$ M) or olaparib (5 $\mu$ M) or both. (A) The scatterplots showing the percentage of cells in each quadrant. (B) Quantification of apoptotic cells from A.	77
4.31	Assessment of DNA damage in MCF7 cells following 24 h treatment with RuPIP (25 $\mu$ M) or olaparib (5 $\mu$ M) or both. (A) CLSM images following immunofluorescence staining with anti- $\gamma$ H2AX (green) for DSB breaks. DNA (DAPI) staining included for reference. (B) Quantification of $\gamma$ H2AX foci as in part A. Expressed as the % of cells containing 10 or more foci/nucleus.	79
4.32	Assessment of DNA damage in MDA-MB-231 cells following 24 h treatment with RuPIP (25 $\mu$ M) or olaparib (5 $\mu$ M) or both. (A) CLSM images following immunofluorescence staining with anti- $\gamma$ H2AX (green) for DSB breaks. DNA (DAPI) staining included for reference. (B) Quantification of $\gamma$ H2AX foci as in part A. Expressed as the % of cells containing 10 or more foci/nucleus.	80

## LIST OF SCHEMES

Scheme		Page
3.1	Synthesis of phendione	24
3.2	Synthesis of dppz	25
3.3	Synthesis of $\text{Ru}(\text{dppz})_2\text{Cl}_2 \cdot 2\text{H}_2\text{O}$	26
3.4	Synthesis of PIP	26
3.5	Synthesis of RuPIP	27



## LIST OF EQUATIONS

<b>Equation</b>		<b>Page</b>
2.1	$\frac{f_a}{f_u} = \left(\frac{D}{D_m}\right)^m$	21
2.2	$\log\left(\frac{f_a}{f_u}\right) = m \times \log \log(D) - m \times \log \log(D_m)$	22
2.3	$CI = \frac{D_1}{E_1} + \frac{D_2}{E_2}$	22
3.1	$\% \text{ Cell viability} = \frac{A[570 \text{ nm}]_{\text{treatment}}}{A[570 \text{ nm}]_{\text{control}}} \times 100$	29
3.2	$\% \text{ Dead cells} = \left[ \frac{\text{Number of blue cells}}{\text{Number of total cells}} \right] \times 100$	31
3.3	$\% \text{ Viable cells} = \left[ 1.00 - \frac{\text{Number of blue cells}}{\text{Number of total cells}} \right] \times 100$	31

## LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

A549	Human lung epithelial carcinoma
ANOVA	One-way analysis of variance
BER	Base excision repair
BRCA	Breast cancer susceptibility gene
CD <sub>3</sub> CN	Deuterated acetonitrile
CDCl <sub>3</sub>	Deuterated chloroform
Chk1/2	Checkpoint kinases 1/2
CI	Combination index
DDR	DNA damage response
DIMS	Direct infusion mass spectrometry
Dm	Median-effect dose
DMEM	Dulbecco's modified eagle medium
DMSO	Dimethyl sulfoxide
DMSO-d <sub>6</sub>	Deuterated dimethyl sulfoxide
DNA	Deoxyribonucleotide
dppz	dipyrido[3,2- <i>a</i> :2',3'- <i>c</i> ]phenazine
DSB	Double-strand break
ESI-MS	Electrospray ionization mass spectrometry
Fa	Effect level (fraction affected)
FBS	Fetal bovine serum
FDA	U.S. food and drug administration
FTIR	Fourier transform infrared spectroscopy
HR	Homologous recombination
IC <sub>50</sub>	Half maximal inhibitory concentration
Im	Imidazole
Kb	Binding constant
Log P	Octanol/water partition coefficient
m/z	Mass to charge ratio
MCF7	Human breast epithelial adenocarcinoma
MDA-MB-231	Human breast epithelial adenocarcinoma
MRC5	Normal human lung fibroblast
MTT	3-(4,5-dimethylthiazol-2-yl)-2,5-diphenyl tetrazolium bromide
NHDF	Normal human dermal fibroblast
NMR	Nuclear magnetic resonance
PARP	Poly (ADP-ribose) polymerase
PBS	Phosphate buffer saline
PDT	Photodynamic therapy
phendione	1,10-phenantroline-5,6-dione
PI	Propidium iodide
PIP	2-(phenyl)imidazo[4,5- <i>f</i> ][1,10]phenanthroline
RPC	Ruthenium polypyridyl complex
RuPIP	[Ru(dppz) <sub>2</sub> (PIP)] <sup>2+</sup>
S.F.	Survival fractions
SSB	Single-strand break
T24	Human urinary bladder epithelial carcinoma
TMS	Tetramethylsilane

## CHAPTER 1

### INTRODUCTION

#### 1.1 Research background

Cancer remains as one of the primary causes of death associated with a high number of reported global incidences annually. Particularly, in 2018, 18.1 million new cancer occurrences and 9.6 million cancer-related mortality were reported, and importantly, these numbers are expected to rise within the next two decades (Bray *et al.*, 2018; Siegel *et al.*, 2019). Currently, the routine methods for cancer treatment are surgical resection or radiotherapy alongside periods of chemotherapy. However, the efficacy of these strategies is limited by various factors such as the mass of the tumor to be removed, the stage of tumor progression, the occurrence of metastatic tumors, the affordability of radiotherapy and the patient's health status (Abbas *et al.*, 2018). Although recently, treatments using molecular targeted therapy have brought new hope, they are still not effective against advanced cancer and cancer recurrence despite initial high response rates (Saijo, 2012). Therefore, chemotherapy remains as the most common and realistic option for cancer treatment.

With the discovery of cisplatin (cis-diamminedichloroplatinum(II)), a platinum metal-based drug by Barnett Rosenberg in 1960, a milestone in the history of metal-based complexes in treating cancer was witnessed (Muggia *et al.*, 2015). Cisplatin was the first metal-chemotherapeutic approved in 1978 by U.S. food and drug administration (FDA). Briefly, cisplatin induces inter- and intra-strands platinum-DNA crosslinks causing blockage of replication fork progression, leading to DNA damage in the form of cytotoxic DNA double-strand breaks (DSBs) (Deans, J. *et al.*, 2013; Ndagi *et al.*, 2017). However, cisplatin has limited clinical capability as it possesses inherent clinical drawbacks such as high general toxicity and less selectivity against healthy normal cells leading to severe adverse effects including myelosuppression, nephrotoxicity and neurotoxicity (Shaloam *et al.*, 2014). Importantly, although effective in many other cases, the rapid occurrence of acquired or intrinsic resistance towards cisplatin presents as a well-established limit for its clinical application as these might significantly reduce their efficacy during treatment or even renders them ineffective leading to treatment failure and rapid progression of relapse (Eckstein, 2011; Amable, 2016). As such, these have encouraged substantial efforts in finding alternative anticancer agents based on other transition metals to replace current platinum-based drugs. Based on the success of cisplatin, inorganic medicinal chemists have since examined alternative transition metal centres such as ruthenium, palladium or rhodium, to design complexes which target highly proliferative cancerous cells with improved therapeutic windows compared to cisplatin (Ndagi *et al.*, 2017).

Ruthenium metal-based complexes have attracted a great amount of interest in the last 20 years in combating cancer where majority of them owe their effects by forming coordinate interactions with DNA in a similar substitution kinetics to platinum complexes but differ in their reported biochemical properties and potency *in vitro* and *in vivo* (Ramadevi *et al.*, 2015; Poynton *et al.*, 2017). Within the last two decades, four ruthenium-based complexes have successfully entered clinical trials. The first ruthenium complex that entered clinical investigation was NAMI-A [ImH][*trans*-RuCl<sub>4</sub>(DMSO)(Im)] (Im = imidazole, DMSO = dimethyl sulfoxide), followed by KP1019 [indazolium *trans*-tetrachlorobis(1H-indazole)ruthenate(III)] where both are proven to display anticancer properties with potent efficacy in clinics (Dyson *et al.*, 2006). More recently, NKP1339, a derivative and more soluble sodium salt of KP1019 complex has demonstrated effective results in disease stabilization in the phase I study against solid tumors (Alessio *et al.*, 2019). Encouragingly, these clinical findings demonstrated that these ruthenium complexes showed various clinical benefits compared to platinum drugs, including low general toxicity, greater tumor selectivity and potent efficacy on platinum-resistant tumors (Lin *et al.*, 2018 a). Importantly, reduced severe adverse effects compared to platinum drugs were also noted.

Recently, polypyridyl complexes of Ru(II) (RPCs), a class of ruthenium complexes have emerged as promising drug candidates due to their ability to form non-covalent (reversible) interactions with DNA through intercalation of its organic ligand(s) between DNA base pairs (Zeglis *et al.*, 2007; Gill *et al.*, 2012). Most promisingly, the RPC photosensitizer TLD1443 [Ru(dmb)<sub>2</sub>(LL')]<sup>2+</sup> where dmb = 4,4'-dimethyl-2,2'-bipyridine and LL' = 2-((2',2":5",2"'-terthiophene)-imidazo[4,5-*f*][1,10]phenanthroline) is currently undergoing phase II trials for bladder cancer patients (Lin *et al.*, 2018 a). Our group has previously reported that the RPC, [Ru(dppz)<sub>2</sub>(PIP)]<sup>2+</sup> where dppz = dipyrido[3,2-*a*:2',3'-*c*]phenazine and PIP = 2-(phenyl)imidazo[4,5-*f*][1,10]phenanthroline, or described as RuPIP hereafter binds to DNA through intercalation, leading to the stalling of DNA replication fork progression (Gill *et al.*, 2016). In response to this DNA replication stress, the DNA damage response (DDR) signaling pathways are activated to counteract the effects of DNA damages and maintain the genomic integrity of cells.

Although RuPIP shows great anticancer properties, however, as in the case for the majority of anticancer drugs, treatment with a single agent may not lead to sufficient tumor suppression to improve disease outcome or patient survival (Basourakos *et al.*, 2016; Mokhtari *et al.*, 2017). If doses required as single agents for cancer cell killing are very high, this may even lead to intolerable toxicity to normal cells. Besides, for DNA targeting molecules, genotoxicity and even the generation of secondary cancers as a result of treatment are additional factors that must be considered. Recently, due to the enhanced understanding of cancer disease biology where several interconnected molecular pathways are involved in the system, using rational combination therapies of several drugs acting simultaneously on multiple targets and pathways are being sought to overcome the limited clinical options available within conventional chemotherapy (Chou, 2010; Foucquier *et al.*, 2015). Synergistic combination chemotherapies



can lead to better efficacy, reduce drug dosage, decrease toxicity, and minimize risk of development of drug resistance and chance of relapse (Chou, 2006). Nowadays, drug combination therapies are common in clinical practices, and thus, using these therapeutic strategies to improve response to RuPIP would be a promising line of research.

DDR signaling pathways reverse the effects of DNA damage and are important in maintaining the stability of the human genome (Lu *et al.*, 2018). Hence, the activity of these intrinsic DDR pathways can further predict treatment resistance and clinical outcomes in cancer therapy. Poly (ADP-ribose) polymerases (PARP) are one of the key DNA repair enzymes in DDR signaling pathways. Following DNA single-strand breaks (SSBs) or stalled replication forks, PARP mediates base excision repair (BER) pathway to prevent the generation of cytotoxic DSBs (Yang *et al.*, 2004; Bryant *et al.*, 2009; Beck *et al.*, 2014). As PARP involves in DNA damage repair, the enzymatic inhibition of PARP leads to persistent stalling of replication fork progression and consequently, the formation of DSBs when fork collapse (Pascal, M., 2018). Therefore, PARPs have become the rational targets in anticancer drug research for the development of new drugs (Davar *et al.*, 2012).

Several PARP inhibitors have progressed to clinical trials, and the PARP inhibitors olaparib (Lynparza®), niraparib (Zejula®) and rucaparib (Rubraca®) have been approved by FDA for treating cancers with defective breast cancer susceptibility gene (BRCA). However, while improved therapeutic response to PARP inhibition in BRCA1/2 mutated-cancers has been shown, PARP inhibitor exerts limited efficacy in the treatment of other cancers without homologous recombination (HR) protein or gene defect (Basourakos *et al.*, 2016). The role of the metallo-intercalator RuPIP in the activation of DDR signaling has attracted our interest in combining RuPIP with PARP inhibitors to effectively inhibit repair of damaged DNA and achieve synergism in cancer cells. This will enhance the efficacy of RuPIP and ultimately, improve cancer cell killing while reducing the cytotoxic effect on normal cells. In addition to this, examining the combination of PARP inhibitors alongside RuPIP will expand the use of PARP inhibitors to a wider cancer population including BRCA wild type cancer.

## 1.2 Problem statement

As in the case for the majority of anticancer drugs, treatment with single agent or monotherapy may not lead to sufficient tumor suppression to improve disease outcome or patient survival. In addition to this, if doses required as single agents for cancer cell killing are very high, this may lead to intolerable toxicity to normal cells resulting in severe adverse effects. Typically, for DNA targeting molecules, genotoxicity and even the generation of secondary cancers as a result of treatment are additional factors that must be considered. Moreover, although BRCA1/2-deficient cancers demonstrate exquisite sensitivity to PARP inhibitors when used as single agents, they represent a relatively small subset of cancer patients which limits PARP inhibitors' clinical capabilities. As such, this rational combination approach of RuPIP and PARP inhibitor will expand the clinical use of PARP inhibitors to a greater cancer population. The synergistic activities will result in better efficacy, decreased dosage, reduced toxicity, reduced severe adverse effects and are more effective in limiting the emergence of drug resistance. Consequently, this rational combination therapies have potential in achieving sufficient tumor suppression, and ultimately, improving disease outcomes and patient survival.

## 1.3 Research objectives

The aim of this study is to determine the effect of RuPIP in combination with PARP inhibitors NU1025 or olaparib in various human cancer cells as a new therapeutic strategy and explore the mechanistic basis of synergy. In this study, finding proof of significant superiority of the effect of combination treatment in comparison to single agent condition is of particular importance.

- i. To determine the cytotoxic effects of RuPIP or PARP inhibitors (NU1025, olaparib) as single agents on four different cancer cell lines (A549, MDA-MB-231, MCF7 and T24) and on normal human fibroblast cell lines (NHDF, MRC5).
- ii. To determine the potential synergism of RuPIP in combination with PARP inhibitor against the cancer cell lines.
- iii. To determine the potential cytotoxicity mechanisms underlying the synergistic combination of RuPIP and PARP inhibitor using cell cycle analysis, Annexin V-FITC apoptosis assay and through quantification of double-strand break (DSB) DNA damage.

## REFERENCES

- Abbas, Z., Rehman, S. (2018). An Overview of Cancer Treatment Modalities. *IntechOpen*, pp. 139–156.
- Alessio, E., Messori, L. (2019). Anticancer drug candidates face-to-face: a case story in medicinal inorganic chemistry. *Molecules*, 24, 1995.
- Alimbetov, D., Askarova, S., Umbayev, B., Davis, T., Kipling, D. (2018). Pharmacological targeting of cell cycle, apoptotic and cell adhesion signaling pathways implicated in chemoresistance of cancer cells. *International Journal of Molecular Sciences*, 19, 1–12.
- Altaha, R., Liang, X., Yu, J. J., Reed, E. (2004). Excision repair cross complementing-group 1: gene expression and platinum resistance. *International journal of molecular medicine*, 14, 959–970.
- Amable, L. (2016). Cisplatin resistance and opportunities for precision medicine. *Pharmacological Research*, 106, 27–36.
- American Cancer Society (2019). Cancer facts & figures 2019. *American Cancer Society*, 1–76.
- Ávila-Arroyo, S., Nuñez, G. S., García-Fernández, L. F., Galmarini, C. M. (2015). Synergistic effect of trabectedin and olaparib combination regimen in breast cancer cell lines. *Journal of Breast Cancer*, 18, 329–338.
- Balmaña, J., Tung, N. M., Isakoff, S. J., Graña, B., Ryan, P. D., Saura, C., Lowe, E. S., Frewer, P., Winer, E., Baselga, J., Garber, J. E. (2014). Phase I trial of olaparib in combination with cisplatin for the treatment of patients with advanced breast, ovarian and other solid tumors. *Annals of Oncology*, 25, 1656–1663.
- Basourakos, S. P., Li, L., Aparicio, A. M., Corn, P. G., Kim, J., Thompson, T. C. (2016). Combination Platinum-based and DNA Damage Response-targeting Cancer Therapy: Evolution and Future Directions. *Current Medicinal Chemistry*, 24, 1586–1606.
- Beck, C., Robert, I., Reina-San-Martin, B., Schreiber, V., Dantzer, F. (2014). Poly(ADP-ribose) polymerases in double-strand break repair: Focus on PARP1, PARP2 and PARP3. *Experimental Cell Research*, 329, 18–25.
- Benjamin Garbutcheon-Singh, K., P. Grant, M., W. Harper, B., M. Krause-Heuer, A., Manohar, M., Orkey, N., R. Aldrich-Wright, J. (2011). Transition Metal Based Anticancer Drugs. *Current Topics in Medicinal Chemistry*, 11, 521–542.
- Berenbaum, M. C. (1977). Synergy, additivism and antagonism in immunosuppression. A critical review. *Clinical and experimental immunology*, 28, 1–18.

- Berenbaum, M. C. (1978). A Method for Testing for Synergy with Any Number of Agents Author ( s ): M . C . Berenbaum Published by : Oxford University Press Stable URL : <http://www.jstor.org/stable/30081623> A Method for Testing for Synergy with Any Number of Agents. *The journal of infectious diseases*, 137, 122–130.
- Bergamo, A., Riedel, T., Dyson, P. J., Sava, G. (2015). Preclinical combination therapy of the investigational drug NAMI-A+ with doxorubicin for mammary cancer. *Investigational New Drugs*, 33, 53–63.
- Bernges, F., Zeller, W. J. (1996). Combination effects of poly(ADP-ribose) polymerase inhibitors and DNA-damaging agents in ovarian tumor cell lines - With special reference to cisplatin. *Journal of Cancer Research and Clinical Oncology*, 122, 665–670.
- Bitler, G., B., Watson, L., Z., Wheeler, J., L., Behbakht, K. (2017). PARP Inhibitors: Clinical Utility and Possibilities of Overcoming Resistance. *Gynecologic Oncology*, 147, 695–704.
- Blagosklonny, M. V. (2005). Overcoming limitations of natural anticancer drugs by combining with artificial agents. *Trends in Pharmacological Sciences*, 26, 77–81.
- Boulton, S., Pemberton, L. C., Porteous, J. K., Curtin, N. J., Griffin, R. J., Golding, B. T., Durkacz, B. W. (1995). Potentiation of temozolomide-induced cytotoxicity: A comparative study of the biological effects of poly(ADP-ribose) polymerase inhibitors. *British Journal of Cancer*, 72, 849–856.
- Boulton, S., Kyle, S., Durkacz, B. W. (1999). Interactive effects of inhibitors of poly(ADP-ribose) polymerase and DNA-dependent protein kinase on cellular responses to DNA damage. *Carcinogenesis*, 20, 199–203.
- Boussios, S., Karihtala, P., Moschetta, M., Karathanasi, A., Sadauskaite, A., Rassy, E., Pavlidis, N. (2019). Combined strategies with poly (ADP-ribose) polymerase (PARP) inhibitors for the treatment of ovarian cancer: A literature review. *Diagnostics*, 9,.
- Bowman, J. K., White, A., Golding, B. T., Griffin, R. J., Curtin, N. J. (1998). Potentiation of anti-cancer agent cytotoxicity by the potent poly(ADP-ribose) polymerase inhibitors NU1025 and NU1064. *British Journal of Cancer*, 78, 1269–1277.
- Bowman, K. J., Newell, D. R., Calvert, A. H., Curtin, N. J. (2001). Differential effects of the poly (ADP-ribose) polymerase (PARP) inhibitor NU1025 on topoisomerase I and II inhibitor cytotoxicity in L1210 cells in vitro. *British Journal of Cancer*, 84, 106–112.
- Bray, F., Ferlay, J., Soerjomataram, I., Siegel, R. L., Torre, L. A., Jemal, A. (2018). Global cancer statistics 2018: GLOBOCAN estimates of incidence and mortality worldwide for 36 cancers in 185 countries. *CA: A Cancer Journal for Clinicians*, 68, 394–424.

- Bryant, H. E., Petermann, E., Schultz, N., Jemth, A. S., Loseva, O., Issaeva, N., Johansson, F., Fernandez, S., McGlynn, P., Helleday, T. (2009). PARP is activated at stalled forks to mediate Mre11-dependent replication restart and recombination. *EMBO Journal*, 28, 2601–2615.
- Caldecott, K. W. (2014). Protein ADP-ribosylation and the cellular response to DNA strand breaks. *DNA Repair*, 19, 108–113.
- Chacon, E., Acosta, D., Lemasters, J. (1996). *Primary Cultures of Cardiac Myocytes as In Vitro Models for Pharmacological and Toxicological Assessments. In Vitro Methods in Pharmaceutical Research*,. ACADEMIC PRESS.
- Cheung-Ong, K., Giaever, G., Nislow, C. (2013). DNA-damaging agents in cancer chemotherapy: Serendipity and chemical biology. *Chemistry and Biology*, 20, 648–659.
- Choi, J. suk, Berdis, A. (2018). Combating resistance to DNA damaging agents. *Oncoscience*, 5, 134–136.
- Chou, T. C., Talalay, P. (1983). Analysis of combined drug effects: a new look at a very old problem. *Trends in Pharmacological Sciences*, 4, 450–454.
- Chou, T. C., Talalay, P. (1984). Quantitative analysis of dose-effect relationships: the combined effects of multiple drugs or enzyme inhibitors. *Advances in Enzyme Regulation*, 22, 27–55.
- Chou, T. C. (2006). Theoretical basis, experimental design, and computerized simulation of synergism and antagonism in drug combination studies. *Pharmacological Reviews*, 58, 621–681.
- Chou, T. C. (2010). Drug combination studies and their synergy quantification using the chou-talalay method. *Cancer Research*, 70, 440–446.
- Chou, T. C. and M. N. (2005). CompuSyn for drug combinations: PC Software and User's Guide: a computer program for quantification of synergism and antagonism in drug combinations, and the determination of IC50 and ED50 and LD50 values. *ComboSyn, Paramus, NJ, USA*,.
- Chuang, H. C., Kapuriya, N., Kulp, S. K., Chen, C. S., Shapiro, C. L. (2012). Differential anti-proliferative activities of poly(ADP-ribose) polymerase (PARP) inhibitors in triple-negative breast cancer cells The higher potencies of AG-014699 and AZD-2281 were associated with their effects on G 2 /M. *Breast Cancer Res Treat*, 134, 649–659.
- Cole, S. P. C. (1986). Rapid chemosensitivity testing of human lung tumor cells using the MTT assay. *Cancer Chemotherapy and Pharmacology*, 17, 259–263.
- Coverdale, J. P. C., Laroia-McCarron, T., Romero-Canelón, I. (2019). Designing ruthenium anticancer drugs: What have we learnt from the key drug candidates? *Inorganics*, 7, 1–15.

- Davar, D., Beumer, H., J., Hamieh, L., Tawbi, H. (2012). Role of PARP inhibitors in Cancer Biology and Therapy. *Current Medicinal Chemistry*, 19, 3907–3921.
- Deans, J., A., West, C., S. (2013). DNA interstrand crosslink repair and cancer. *Nature Reviews Cancer*, 11, 467–480.
- Delaney, C. A., Wang, L. Z., Kyle, S., White, A. W., Calvert, A. H., Curtin, N. J., Durkacz, B. W., Hostomsky, Z., Newell, D. R. (2000). Potentiation of temozolomide and topotecan growth inhibition and cytotoxicity by novel poly(adenosine diphosphoribose) polymerase inhibitors in a panel of human tumor cell lines. *Clinical Cancer Research*, 6, 2860–2867.
- Dickeson, J. E., Summers, L. A. (1970). Derivatives of 1,10-phenantroline-5,6-quinone. *Australian Journal of Chemistry*, 23, 1023–1027.
- Dorcier, A., Ang, W. H., Bolano, S., Gonsalvi, L., Juillerat-Jeannerat, L., Laurency, G., Peruzzini, M., Phillips, A. D., Zanobini, F., Dyson, P. J. (2006). In vitro evaluation of rhodium and osmium RAPTA analogues: The case for organometallic anticancer drugs not based on ruthenium. *Organometallics*, 25, 4090–4096.
- Dyson, P. J., Sava, G. (2006). Metal-based antitumour drugs in the post genomic era. *Dalton Transactions*, 1929–1933.
- Eckstein, N. (2011). Platinum resistance in breast and ovarian cancer cell lines. *Journal of Experimental and Clinical Cancer Research*, 30, 1–11.
- Etezadi, S., Evans, J. C., Shen, Y. T., De Souza, R., Piquette-Miller, M., Allen, C. (2018). Ratio-Dependent Synergism of a Doxorubicin and Olaparib Combination in 2D and Spheroid Models of Ovarian Cancer. *Molecular Pharmaceutics*, 15, 472–485.
- Falchi, F., Giacomini, E., Masini, T., Boutard, N., Di Ianni, L., Manerba, M., Farabegoli, F., Rossini, L., Robertson, J., Minucci, S., Pallavicini, I., Di Stefano, G., Roberti, M., Pellicciari, R., Cavalli, A. (2017). Synthetic Lethality Triggered by Combining Olaparib with BRCA2-Rad51 Disruptors. *ACS Chemical Biology*, 12, 2491–2497.
- Ferlay, J., Colombet, M., Soerjomataram, I., Mathers, C., Parkin, D. M., Piñeros, M., Znaor, A., Bray, F. (2019). Estimating the global cancer incidence and mortality in 2018: GLOBOCAN sources and methods. *International Journal of Cancer*, 144, 1941–1953.
- Flohr, C., Bürke, A., Radicella, J. P., Epe, B. (2003). Poly(ADP-ribosyl)ation accelerates DNA repair in a pathway dependent on Cockayne syndrome B protein. *Nucleic Acids Research*, 31, 5332–5337.
- Florento, L., Matias, R., Tuaño, E., Santiago, K., Cruz, F. Dela, Tuazon, A. (2012). Comparison of cytotoxic activity of anticancer drugs against various human tumor cell lines using in vitro cell-based approach. *International Journal of Biomedical Science*, 8, 76–80.

- Fouquier, J., Guedj, M. (2015). Analysis of drug combinations: current methodological landscape. *Pharmacology Research and Perspectives*, 3,.
- Galluzzi, L., Senovilla, L., Vitale, I., Michels, J., Martins, I., Kepp, O., Castedo, M., Kroemer, G. (2012). Molecular mechanisms of cisplatin resistance. *Oncogene*, 31, 1869–1883.
- Galluzzi, L., Vitale, I., Michels, J., Brenner, C., Szabadkai, G., Harel-Bellan, A., Castedo, M., Kroemer, G. (2014). Systems biology of cisplatin resistance: Past, present and future. *Cell Death and Disease*, 5, e1257-18.
- Giglia-Mari, G., Zotter, A., Vermeulen, W. (2011). DNA damage response. *Cold Spring Harbor Perspectives in Biology*, 3, 1–19.
- Gill, M. R., Thomas, J. A. (2012). Ruthenium(ii) polypyridyl complexes and DNA - From structural probes to cellular imaging and therapeutics. *Chemical Society Reviews*, 41, 3179–3192.
- Gill, M. R., Harun, S. N., Halder, S., Boghazian, R. A., Ramadan, K., Ahmad, H., Vallis, K. A. (2016). A ruthenium polypyridyl intercalator stalls DNA replication forks, radiosensitizes human cancer cells and is enhanced by Chk1 inhibition. *Scientific Reports*, 6,.
- Gill, M. R., Jarman, P. J., Halder, S., Walker, M. G., Saeed, H. K., Thomas, J. A., Smythe, C., Ramadan, K., Vallis, K. A. (2018). A three-in-one-bullet for oesophageal cancer: Replication fork collapse, spindle attachment failure and enhanced radiosensitivity generated by a ruthenium(ii) metallo-intercalator. *Chemical Science*, 9, 841–849.
- Gillet, J. P., Varma, S., Gottesman, M. M. (2013). The clinical relevance of cancer cell lines. *Journal of the National Cancer Institute*, 105, 452–458.
- Gray, H. J., Bell-McGuinn, K., Fleming, G. F., Cristea, M., Xiong, H., Sullivan, D., Luo, Y., McKee, M. D., Munasinghe, W., Martin, L. P. (2018). Phase I combination study of the PARP inhibitor veliparib plus carboplatin and gemcitabine in patients with advanced ovarian cancer and other solid malignancies. *Gynecologic Oncology*, 148, 507–514.
- Griffin, R., Pemberton, L., Rhodes, D., Bleasdale, C., Bowman, K., Calvert, A., Curtin, N., Durkacz, B., Newell, D., Porteau, J. (1995). Novel potent inhibitors of the DNA repair enzyme poly(ADP-ribose)polymerase (PARP). *Anticancer Drug Des.*, 10, 507–514.
- Hamburger, A. W., Salmon, S. E. (1977). Primary bioassay of human tumor stem cells. *Science*, 197, 461–463.
- Hastak, K., Alli, E., Ford, M., J., Kedar Hastak, Elizabeth Alli, and J. M. F. (2010). Synergistic chemosensitivity of triple-negative breast cancer cell lines to PARP inhibition, gemcitabine and cisplatin. *Cancer Research*, 70, 7970–7980.

- Heffeter, P., Atil, B., Kryeziu, K., Groza, D., Koellensperger, G., Körner, W., Jungwirth, U., Mohr, T., Keppler, B. K., Berger, W. (2013). The ruthenium compound KP1339 potentiates the anticancer activity of sorafenib in vitro and in vivo. *European Journal of Cancer*, 49, 3366–3375.
- Holford, N. H. G., Sheiner, L. B. (1981). Understanding the Dose-Effect Relationship: Clinical Application of Pharmacokinetic-Pharmacodynamic Models. *Clinical Pharmacokinetics*, 6, 429–453.
- Jacob, D. A., Bahra, M., Langrehr, J. M., Boas-Knoop, S., Stefaniak, R., Davis, J., Schumacher, G., Lippert, S., Neumann, U. P. (2007). Combination therapy of poly (ADP-ribose) polymerase inhibitor 3-aminobenzamide and gemcitabine shows strong antitumor activity in pancreatic cancer cells. *Journal of Gastroenterology and Hepatology (Australia)*, 22, 738–748.
- Jia, P., Ouyang, R., Cao, P., Tong, X., Zhou, X., Lei, T., Zhao, Y., Guo, N., Chang, H., Miao, Y., Zhou, S. (2017). Review: recent advances and future development of metal complexes as anticancer agents. *Journal of Coordination Chemistry*, 70, 2175–2201.
- Jung, Y., Lippard, S. J. (2007). Direct Cellular Responses to Platinum-Induced DNA Damage. *Chem. Rev.*, 107, 1387–1407.
- Kitao, H., Iimori, M., Kataoka, Y., Wakasa, T., Tokunaga, E., Saeki, H., Oki, E., Maehara, Y. (2018). DNA replication stress and cancer chemotherapy. *Cancer Science*, 109, 264–271.
- Krishnakumar, R., Kraus, Lee, W. (2010). The PARP Side of the Nucleus: Molecular Actions, Physiological Outcomes, and Clinical Targets. *Molecular Cell*, 39, 8–24.
- Lefranc, F., Nuzzo, G., Hamdy, N. A., Fakhr, I., Moreno Y Banuls, L., Van Goietsenoven, G., Villani, G., Mathieu, V., Van Soest, R., Kiss, R., Ciavatta, M. L. (2013). In vitro pharmacological and toxicological effects of norterpene peroxides isolated from the red sea sponge diacarnus erythraeanus on normal and cancer cells. *Journal of Natural Products*, 76, 1541–1547.
- Leijen, S., Burgers, S. A., Baas, P., Pluim, D., Tibben, M., Van Werkhoven, E., Alessio, E., Sava, G., Beijnen, J. H., Schellens, J. H. M. (2015). Phase I/II study with ruthenium compound NAMI-A and gemcitabine in patients with non-small cell lung cancer after first line therapy. *Investigational New Drugs*, 33, 201–214.
- Liao, H., Ji, F., Helleday, T., Ying, S. (2018). Mechanisms for stalled replication fork stabilization: new targets for synthetic lethality strategies in cancer treatments. *EMBO reports*, 19, 1–18.
- Lin, K., Zhao, Z. Z., Bo, H. Ben, Hao, X. J., Wang, J. Q. (2018)a. Applications of ruthenium complex in tumor diagnosis and therapy. *Frontiers in*



*Pharmacology*, 9, 1–10.

- Lin, K., Rong, Y., Chen, D., Zhao, Z., Bo, H., Qiao, A., Hao, X., Wang, J. (2020). Combination of Ruthenium Complex and Doxorubicin Synergistically Inhibits Cancer Cell Growth by Down-Regulating PI3K/AKT Signaling Pathway. *Frontiers in Oncology*, 10, 1–13.
- Lin, X., Chen, D., Zhang, C., Zhang, X., Li, Z., Dong, B., Gao, J., Shen, L. (2018)b. Augmented antitumor activity by olaparib plus AZD1775 in gastric cancer through disrupting DNA damage repair pathways and DNA damage checkpoint. *Journal of Experimental and Clinical Cancer Research*, 37, 1–11.
- Liu, J., Mei, W. J., Lin, L. J., Zheng, K. C., Chao, H., Yun, F. C., Ji, L. N. (2004). Electronic effects on the interactions of complexes [Ru(phen) 2(p-L)]<sub>2</sub><sup>+</sup> (L=MOPIP, HPIP, and NPIP) with DNA. *Inorganica Chimica Acta*, 357, 285–293.
- Liu, J., Lai, H., Xiong, Z., Chen, B., Chen, T. (2019). Functionalization and cancer-targeting design of ruthenium complexes for precise cancer therapy. *Chemical Communications*, 55, 9904–9914.
- Loewe, S. (1953). The problem of synergism and antagonism of combined drugs. *Arzneimittelforschung*, 3, 285–290.
- Lord, C. J., Ashworth, A. (2017). PARP inhibitors: Synthetic lethality in the clinic. *Science*, 355, 1152–1158.
- Lu, Y., Liu, Y., Pang, Y., Pacak, K., Yang, C. (2018). Double-barreled gun: Combination of PARP inhibitor with conventional chemotherapy. *Pharmacology Therapy*, 188, 168–175.
- Lupo, B., Trusolino, L. (2014). Inhibition of poly(ADP-ribosyl)ation in cancer: Old and new paradigms revisited. *Biochimica et Biophysica Acta - Reviews on Cancer*, 1846, 201–215.
- Malyuchenko, N. V., Kotova, E. Y., Kulaeva, O. I., Kirpichnikov, M. P., Studitskiy, V. M. (2015). PARP1 Inhibitors: Antitumor drug design(1) Malyuchenko, N. V., Kotova, E. Y., Kulaeva, O. I., Kirpichnikov, M. P., and Studitskiy, V. M. (2015) PARP1 Inhibitors: Antitumor drug design. *Acta Naturae* 7, 27–37. *Acta Naturae*, 7, 27–37.
- Mari, C., Pierroz, V., Ferrari, S., Gasser, G. (2015). Combination of Ru(II) complexes and light: New frontiers in cancer therapy. *Chemical Science*, 6, 2660–2686.
- Mateo, J., Lord, C. J., Serra, V., Tutt, A., Balmaña, J., Castroviejo-Bermejo, M., Cruz, C., Oaknin, A., Kaye, S. B., De Bono, J. S. (2019). A decade of clinical development of PARP inhibitors in perspective. *Annals of Oncology*, 30, 1437–1447.
- Matsuno, Y., Hyodo, M., Fujimori, H., Shimizu, A., Yoshioka, K. I. (2018).

Sensitization of cancer cells to radiation and topoisomerase I inhibitor camptothecin using inhibitors of PARP and other signaling molecules. *Cancers*, 10,.

Meggens, E. (2007). Exploring biologically relevant chemical space with metal complexes. *Current Opinion in Chemical Biology*, 11, 287–292.

Ménissier De Murcia, J., Niedergang, C., Trucco, C., Ricoul, M., Dutrillaux, B., Mark, M., Oliver, F. J., Masson, M., Dierich, A., Lemeur, M., Walztinger, C., Chambon, P., De Murcia, G. (1997). Requirement of poly(ADP-ribose) polymerase in recovery from DNA damage in mice and in cells. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 94, 7303–7307.

Metcalfe, C., Thomas, J. A. (2003). Kinetically inert transition metal complexes that reversibly bind to DNA. *Chemical Society Reviews*, 32, 215–224.

Michels, J., Vitale, I., Galluzzi, L., Adam, J., Olaussen, K. A., Kepp, O., Senovilla, L., Talhaoui, I., Guegan, J., Enot, D. P., Talbot, M., Robin, A., Girard, P., Orear, C., Lissa, D., Sukkurwala, A. Q., Garcia, P., Behnam-Motlagh, P., Kohno, K. *et al.* (2013)a. Cisplatin resistance associated with PARP hyperactivation. *Cancer Research*, 73, 2271–2280.

Michels, J., Vitale, I., Senovilla, L., Enot, D. P., Garcia, P., Lissa, D., Olaussen, K. A., Brenner, C., Soria, J. C., Castedo, M., Kroemer, G. (2013)b. Synergistic interaction between cisplatin and PARP inhibitors in non-small cell lung cancer. *Cell Cycle*, 12, 877–883.

Min, W., Bruhn, C., Grigaravicius, P., Zhou, Z. W., Li, F., Krüger, A., Siddeek, B., Greulich, K. O., Popp, O., Meisezahl, C., Calkhoven, C. F., Bürkle, A., Xu, X., Wang, Z. Q. (2013). Poly(ADP-ribose) binding to Chk1 at stalled replication forks is required for S-phase checkpoint activation. *Nature Communications*, 4,.

Mokhtari, R. B., Kumar, S., Islam, S. S., Yazdanpanah, M., Adeli, K., Cutz, E., Yeger, H. (2013). Combination of carbonic anhydrase inhibitor, acetazolamide, and sulforaphane, reduces the viability and growth of bronchial carcinoid cell lines. *BMC Cancer*, 13, 1.

Mokhtari, R. B., Homayouni, T. S., Baluch, N., Morgatskaya, E., Kumar, S., Das, B., Yeger, H. (2017). Combination therapy in combating cancer. *Oncotarget*, 8, 38022–38043.

Mosmann, T. (1983). Rapid colorimetric assay for cellular growth and survival: Application to proliferation and cytotoxicity assays. *Journal of Immunological Methods*, 65, 55–63.

Muggia, F. M., Bonetti, A., Hoeschele, J. D., Rozenzweig, M., Howell, S. B. (2015). Platinum antitumor complexes: 50 Years since Barnett Rosenberg's discovery. *Journal of Clinical Oncology*, 33, 4219–4226.

Ndagi, U., Ndumiso, M., Soliman, E., M. (2017). Metal complexes in cancer

therapy - an update from drug design perspective. *Drug Design, Development and Therapy*, 11, 599–616.

- Notaro, A., Gasser, G. (2017). Monomeric and dimeric coordinatively saturated and substitutionally inert Ru(II) polypyridyl complexes as anticancer drug candidates. *Chemical Society Reviews*, 46, 7317–7337.
- O'Connor, L. O., Rulten, S. L., Cranston, A. N., Odedra, R., Brown, H., Jaspers, J. E., Jones, L., Knights, C., Evers, B., Ting, A., Bradbury, R. H., Pajic, M., Rottenberg, S., Jonkers, J., Rudge, D., Martin, N. M. B., Caldecott, K. W., Lau, A., O'Connor, M. J. (2016). The PARP inhibitor AZD2461 provides insights into the role of PARP3 inhibition for both synthetic lethality and tolerability with chemotherapy in preclinical models. *Cancer Research*, 76, 6084–6094.
- O'Connor, M. J. (2015). Targeting the DNA Damage Response in Cancer. *Molecular Cell*, 60, 547–560.
- O'Shaughnessy, J., Miles, D., Vukelja, S., Moiseyenko, V., Ayoub, J. P., Cervantes, G., Fumoleau, P., Jones, S., Lui, W. Y., Mauriac, L., Twelves, C., Van Hazel, G., Verma, S., Leonard, R. (2002). Superior survival with capecitabine plus docetaxel combination therapy in anthracycline-pretreated patients with advanced breast cancer: Phase III trial results. *Journal of Clinical Oncology*, 20, 2812–2823.
- Oza, A. M., Cibula, D., Benzaquen, A. O., Poole, C., Mathijssen, R. H. J., Sonke, G. S., Colombo, N., Špaček, J., Vuylsteke, P., Hirte, H., Mahner, S., Plante, M., Schmalfeldt, B., Mackay, H., Rowbottom, J., Lowe, E. S., Dougherty, B., Barrett, J. C., Friedlander, M. (2015). Olaparib combined with chemotherapy for recurrent platinum-sensitive ovarian cancer: A randomised phase 2 trial. *The Lancet Oncology*, 16, 87–97.
- Pascal, M., J. (2018). The comings and goings of PARP-1 in response to DNA damage. *DNA Repair (Amst)*, 71, 177–182.
- Popolin, C. P., Reis, J. P. B., Becceneri, A. B., Graminha, A. E., Almeida, M. A. P., Corrêa, R. S., Colina-Vegas, L. A., Ellena, J., Batista, A. A., Cominetti, M. R. (2017). Cytotoxicity and anti-tumor effects of new ruthenium complexes on triple negative breast cancer cells. *PLoS ONE*, 12, 1–21.
- Poynton, F. E., Bright, S. A., Blasco, S., Williams, D. C., Kelly, J. M., Gunnlaugsson, T. (2017). The development of ruthenium(II) polypyridyl complexes and conjugates for: In vitro cellular and in vivo applications. *Chemical Society Reviews*, 46, 7706–7756.
- Prasad, C. B., Prasad, S. B., Yadav, S. S., Pandey, L. K., Singh, S., Pradhan, S., Narayan, G. (2017). Olaparib modulates DNA repair efficiency, sensitizes cervical cancer cells to cisplatin and exhibits anti-metastatic property. *Scientific Reports*, 7, 1–15.
- Prinz, H. (2010). Hill coefficients, dose-response curves and allosteric

- mechanisms. *Journal of Chemical Biology*, 3, 37–44.
- Pulliam, N., Fang, F., Ozes, A. R., Tang, J., Adewuyi, A., Keer, H., Lyons, J., Baylin, S. B., Matei, D., Nakshatri, H., Rassool, F. V., Miller, K. D., Nephew, K. P. (2018). An effective epigenetic-PARP inhibitor combination therapy for breast and ovarian cancers independent of BRCA mutations. *Clinical Cancer Research*, 24, 3163–3175.
- Purnell, M. R., Whish, W. J. (1980). Novel inhibitors of poly(ADP-ribose) synthetase. *The Biochemical journal*, 185, 775–777.
- Rajan, A., Carter, C. A., Kelly, R. J., Gutierrez, M., Kummar, S., Yancey, M. A., Ji, J., Mannargudi, B., Woo, S., Figg, W. D., Giaccone, G. (2012). A phase I Combination Study of Olaparib with Cisplatin and Gemcitabine in Adults with Solid Tumors. *Clinical cancer research*, 18, 2344–2351.
- Ramadevi, P., Singh, R., Jana, S. S., Devkar, R., Chakraborty, D. (2015). Ruthenium complexes of ferrocene mannich bases: DNA/BSA interactions and cytotoxicity against A549 cell line. *Journal of Photochemistry and Photobiology A: Chemistry*, 305, 1–10.
- Ramírez-Rivera, S., Pizarro, S., Gallardo, M., Gajardo, F., Delgadillo, A., De La Fuente-Ortega, E., MacDonnell, F. M., Bernal, G. (2018). Anticancer activity of two novel ruthenium compounds in gastric cancer cells. *Life Sciences*, 213, 57–65.
- Riss, T. L., Moravec, R. A., Niles, A. L., Duellman, S., Benink, H. A., Worzella, T. J., Minor, L. (2013). Cell Viability Assays. *Assay Guidance Manual*, pp. 1–25.
- Rocha, C. R. R., Silva, M. M., Quinet, A., Cabral-Neto, J. B., Menck, C. F. M. (2018). DNA repair pathways and cisplatin resistance: An intimate relationship. *Clinics*, 73, 1–10.
- Rodea-Palomares, I., Petre, A. L., Boltes, K., Leganés, F., Perdigón-Melón, J. A., Rosal, R., Fernández-Piñas, F. (2010). Application of the combination index (CI)-isobologram equation to study the toxicological interactions of lipid regulators in two aquatic bioluminescent organisms. *Water Research*, 44, 427–438.
- Rodea-Palomares, I., González-Pleiter, M., Martín-Betancor, K., Rosal, R., Fernández-Piñas, F. (2015). Additivity and interactions in ecotoxicity of pollutant mixtures: Some Patterns, Conclusions, and open questions. *Toxics*, 3, 342–369.
- Rodriguez, E. N., Perez, M., Casanova, P., Martinez, L. (2001). Effect of Seed Cell Density on Specific Growth Rate Using CHO Cells as Model. *Animal Cell Technology: From Target to Market*, 2, 434–437.
- Roell, K. R., Reif, D. M., Motsinger-Reif, A. A. (2017). An introduction to terminology and methodology of chemical synergy-perspectives from across disciplines. *Frontiers in Pharmacology*, 8, 1–11.

- Ronson, G. E., Piberger, A. L., Higgs, M. R., Olsen, A. L., Stewart, G. S., McHugh, P. J., Petermann, E., Lakin, N. D. (2018). PARP1 and PARP2 stabilise replication forks at base excision repair intermediates through Fbh1-dependent Rad51 regulation. *Nature Communications*, 9.
- Saijo, N. (2012). Present status and problems on molecular targeted therapy of cancer. *Cancer Research and Treatment*, 44, 1–10.
- Sarin, N., Engel, F., Kalayda, G. V., Mannewitz, M., Cinatl, J., Rothweiler, F., Michaelis, M., Saafan, H., Ritter, C. A., Jaehde, U., Frötschl, R. (2017). Cisplatin resistance in non-small cell lung cancer cells is associated with an abrogation of cisplatin-induced G2/M cell cycle arrest. *PLoS ONE*, 12, 1–26.
- Schneider, B. P., Winer, E. P., Foulkes, W. D., Garber, J., Perou, C. M., Richardson, A., Sledge, G. W., Carey, L. A. (2008). Triple-negative breast cancer: Risk factors to potential targets. *Clinical Cancer Research*, 14, 8010–8018.
- Schorl, C., Sedivy, J. M. (2007). Analysis of cell cycle phases and progression in cultured mammalian cells. *Methods*, 41, 143–150.
- Shaloam, D., Tchounwou, P. B. (2014). Cisplatin in cancer therapy: Molecular mechanisms of action. *European Journal of Pharmacology*, 740, 364–378.
- Shen, Y. T., Evans, J. C., Zafarana, G., Allen, C., Piquette-Miller, M. (2018). BRCA Status Does Not Predict Synergism of a Carboplatin and Olaparib Combination in High-Grade Serous Ovarian Cancer Cell Lines. *Molecular Pharmaceutics*, 15, 2742–2753.
- Siegel, R. L., Miller, K. D., Jemal, A. (2019). Cancer statistics, 2019. *CA: A Cancer Journal for Clinicians*, 69, 7–34.
- Skidmore, C. J., Davies, M. I., Goodwin, P. M., Halldorsson, H., Lewis, P. J., Shall, S., Zia'ee, a a (1979). The involvement of poly(ADP-ribose) polymerase in the degradation of NAD caused by gamma-radiation and N-methyl-N-nitrosourea. *European journal of biochemistry / FEBS*, 101, 135–142.
- Strober, W. (2001). Trypan blue exclusion test of cell viability. *Curr Protoc Immunol*, Appendix 3, Appendix 3B.
- Sullivan, B. P., Salmon, D. J., Meyer, T. J. (1978). Mixed Phosphine 2,2'-Bipyridine Complexes of Ruthenium. *Inorganic Chemistry*, 17, 3334–3341.
- Tikum, A. F., Jeon, Y. . J., Lee, J. H., Park, M. H., Bae, I. Y., Kim, S. H., J., K. (2018). Cytotoxic and anticancer properties of new ruthenium polypyridyl complexes with different lipophilicities. *Journal of Inorganic Biochemistry*, 180, 204–210.

- Todaro, G. J., Lazar, G. K., Green, H. (1965). The initiation of cell division in a contact-inhibited mammalian cell. *Journal of Cellular and Comparative Physiology*, 66, 325–333.
- Trucco, C., Oliver, F. J., De Murcia, G., Ménissier-De Murcia, J. (1998). DNA repair defect in poly(ADP-ribose) polymerase-deficient cell lines. *Nucleic Acids Research*, 26, 2644–2649.
- Velic, D., Couturier, A. M., Ferreira, M. T., Rodrigue, A., Poirier, G. G., Fleury, F., Masson, J. Y. (2015). DNA damage signalling and repair inhibitors: The long-sought-after achilles' heel of cancer. *Biomolecules*, 5, 3204–3259.
- Vesela, E., Chroma, K., Turi, Z., Mistrik, M. (2017). Common chemical inductors of replication stress: Focus on cell-based studies. *Biomolecules*, 7, .
- Wan, D., Lai, S. H., Zeng, C. C., Zhang, C., Tang, B., Liu, Y. J. (2017). Ruthenium(II) polypyridyl complexes: Synthesis, characterization and anticancer activity studies on BEL-7402 cells. *Journal of Inorganic Biochemistry*, 173, 1–11.
- Wang, D., Lippard, S. J. (2005). Cellular processing of platinum anticancer drugs. *Nature Reviews Drug Discovery*, 4, 307–320.
- Wang, Y. Q., Wang, P. Y., Wang, Y. T., Yang, G. F., Zhang, A., Miao, Z. H. (2016). An update on poly(ADP-ribose)polymerase-1 (PARP-1) inhibitors: Opportunities and challenges in cancer therapy. *Journal of Medicinal Chemistry*, 59, 9575–9598.
- Wawruszak, A., Luszczki, J. J., Grabarska, A., Gumbarewicz, E., Dmoszynska-Graniczka, M., Polberg, K., Stepulak, A. (2015). Assessment of interactions between cisplatin and two histone deacetylase inhibitors in MCF7, T47D and MDA-MB-231 human breast cancer cell lines - An isobolographic analysis. *PLoS ONE*, 10, 1–19.
- Weil, K., M., Chen, A. (2011). PARP Inhibitor Treatment in Ovarian and Breast Cancer. *Current Problems in Cancer*, 35, 7–50.
- Weiss, A., Berndsen, R. H., Dubois, M., Müller, C., Schibli, R., Griffioen, A. W., Dyson, P. J., Nowak-Sliwinska, P. (2014). In vivo anti-tumor activity of the organometallic ruthenium(ii)-arene complex [Ru( $\eta^6$ -p-cymene)Cl<sub>2</sub>(pta)] (RAPTA-C) in human ovarian and colorectal carcinomas. *Chemical Science*, 5, 4742–4748.
- Węsierska-Gądek, J., Mauritz, M., Mitulovic, G., Cupo, M. (2015). Differential Potential of Pharmacological PARP Inhibitors for Inhibiting Cell Proliferation and Inducing Apoptosis in Human Breast Cancer Cells. *Journal of Cellular Biochemistry*, 116, 2824–2839.
- Wu, J. zhong, Ye, B. hui, Wang, L., Ji, L. nian, Zhou, J. ying, Li, R. hua, Zhou, Z. Y. (1997). Bis(2,2'-bipyridine)ruthenium(II) complexes with imidazo[4,5-f][1,10]-phenanthroline or 2-phenylimidazo[4,5-f][1,10]phenanthroline.

*J. Chem. Soc., Dalton Trans.*,1395–1401.

- Wu, K., Hu, W., Luo, Q., Li, X., Xiong, S., Sadler, P. J., Wang, F. (2013). Competitive binding sites of a ruthenium arene anticancer complex on oligonucleotides studied by mass spectrometry: ladder-sequencing versus top-down. *Journal of the American Society for Mass Spectrometry*, 24, 410–420.
- Xiong, Z., Zhong, J. X., Zhao, Z., Chen, T. (2019). Biocompatible ruthenium polypyridyl complexes as efficient radiosensitizers. *Dalton Transactions*, 48, 4114–4118.
- Yalon, M., Tuval-Kochen, L., Castel, D., Moshe, I., Mazal, I., Cohen, O., Avivi, C., Rosenblatt, K., Aviel-Ronen, S., Schiby, G., Yahalom, J., Amariglio, N., Pfeffer, R., Lawrence, Y., Toren, A., Rechavi, G., Paglin, S. (2016). Overcoming resistance of cancer cells to PARP-1 inhibitors with three different drug combinations. *PLoS ONE*, 11, 1–20.
- Yang, Y. G., Cortes, U., Patnaik, S., Jasin, M., Wang, Z. Q. (2004). Ablation of PARP-1 does not interfere with the repair of DNA double-strand breaks, but compromises the reactivation of stalled replication forks. *Oncogene*, 23, 3872–3882.
- Yi, J., Liu, C., Tao, Z., Wang, M., Jia, Y., Sang, X., Shen, L., Xue, Y., Jiang, K., Luo, F., Liu, P., Cheng, H. (2019)a. MYC status as a determinant of synergistic response to Olaparib and Palbociclib in ovarian cancer. *EBioMedicine*, 43, 225–237.
- Yi, M., Dong, B., Qin, S., Chu, Q., Wu, K., Luo, S. (2019)b. Advances and perspectives of PARP inhibitors. *Experimental Hematology and Oncology*, 8, 1–12.
- Zappa, C., Mousa, S. A. (2016). Non-small cell lung cancer: Current treatment and future advances. *Translational Lung Cancer Research*, 5, 288–300.
- Zeglis, B. M., Pierre, V. C., Barton, J. K. (2007). Metallo-intercalators and metallo-insertors. *Chemical Communications*, 7345, 4565–4579.
- Zeng, L., Chen, Y., Liu, J., Huang, H., Guan, R., Ji, L., Chao, H. (2016). Ruthenium(II) Complexes with 2-Phenylimidazo[4,5-f][1,10]phenanthroline Derivatives that Strongly Combat Cisplatin-Resistant Tumor Cells. *Scientific Reports*, 6, 1–13.
- Zeng, L., Gupta, P., Chen, Y., Wang, E., Ji, L., Chao, H., Chen, Z. S. (2017)a. The development of anticancer ruthenium(II) complexes: From single molecule compounds to nanomaterials. *Chemical Society Reviews*, 46, 5771–5804.
- Zeng, L., Gupta, P., Chen, Y., Wang, E., Ji, L., Chao, H., Chen, Z. S. (2017)b. The development of anticancer ruthenium(II) complexes: From single molecule compounds to nanomaterials. *Chemical Society Reviews*, 46, 5771–5804.

- Zhao, L., Wientjes, M. G., Au, J. L. S. (2004). Evaluation of combination chemotherapy: Integration of nonlinear regression, curve shift, isobologram, and combination index analyses. *Clinical Cancer Research*, 10, 7994–8004.
- Zhao, S., Nishimura, T., Chen, Y., Azeloglu, E. U., Giannarelli, C., Zafar, M. U., Benard, L., Juan, J., Hajjar, R. J., Goldfarb, J., Iyengar, R. (2013). Systems Pharmacology of Adverse Event Mitigation by Drug Combinations. *Science Translational Medicine*, 5,.
- Zhou, Y., Xu, Y., Lu, L., Ni, J., Nie, J., Cao, J., Jiao, Y., Zhang, Q. (2019). Luminescent ruthenium(II) polypyridyl complexes acted as radiosensitizer for pancreatic cancer by enhancing radiation-induced DNA damage. *Theranostics*, 9, 6665–6675.



## BIODATA OF STUDENT

Nur Ainie Binti Yusoh was born in Terengganu on 24<sup>th</sup> of August 1994. She received her early education at Sekolah Kebangsaan Bukit Perah, Terengganu. She continued her lower secondary education at Maktab Rendah Sains Mara (MRSM) Kota Putra and moved to Maktab Rendah Sains Mara Tun Ghafar Baba for her upper secondary education. After completion of SPM, she pursued her higher education by enrolling for pre-university courses. She took A-level at Kolej Yayasan UEM. After that, she pursued her degree in Bachelor of Science (BSc) Biotechnology at Imperial College London and graduated on October 2017. On February 2018, she enrolled for her Master's degree in Medicinal Chemistry at Universiti Putra Malaysia under the supervision of Assoc. Prof. Dr. Haslina Ahmad.



## LIST OF PUBLICATIONS

- Yusoh, N. A., Leong, S. W., Chia, S. L., Harun, S. N., Abdul Rahman, M. B., Vallis, K. A., Gill, M., Ahmad, H. (2020). Metallo-intercalator  $[\text{Ru}(\text{dppz})_2(\text{PIP})]^{2+}$  renders BRCA wild-type triple-negative breast cancer cells hypersensitive to PARP inhibition. *ACS Chemical Biology*, 15(2), 378-387.
- Ahmad, H., Yusoh, N. A., Jumbri, K., Abdul Rahman, M. B. (2020). Ionothermal synthesis of Zn-based metal organic frameworks in pyridinium ionic liquid. *Malaysian Journal of Analytical Sciences*, 24(2), 159-164.
- Yusoh, N. A., Ahmad, H., Gill, M. R. (2020). Combining PARP inhibition with platinum, ruthenium or gold metal complexes for cancer therapy. *Chemmedchem*. doi.org/10.1002/cmdc.202000391.



UNIVERSITI PUTRA MALAYSIA

STATUS CONFIRMATION FOR THESIS / PROJECT REPORT AND COPYRIGHT

ACADEMIC SESSION : Second Semester 2019/2020

TITLE OF THESIS / PROJECT REPORT :

EFFECT OF COMBINATION THERAPY OF RUTHENIUM POLYPYRIDYL COMPLEX,  
[Ru(dppz)<sub>2</sub>(PIP)]<sup>2+</sup> AND PARP INHIBITORS AGAINST SEVERAL CANCER CELL LINES

NAME OF STUDENT: NUR AININIE BINTI YUSOH

I acknowledge that the copyright and other intellectual property in the thesis/project report belonged to Universiti Putra Malaysia and I agree to allow this thesis/project report to be placed at the library under the following terms:

1. This thesis/project report is the property of Universiti Putra Malaysia.
2. The library of Universiti Putra Malaysia has the right to make copies for educational purposes only.
3. The library of Universiti Putra Malaysia is allowed to make copies of this thesis for academic exchange.

I declare that this thesis is classified as :

\*Please tick (v )

**CONFIDENTIAL**

(Contain confidential information under Official Secret Act 1972).

**RESTRICTED**

(Contains restricted information as specified by the organization/institution where research was done).

**OPEN ACCESS**

I agree that my thesis/project report to be published as hard copy or online open access.

This thesis is submitted for :

**PATENT**

Embargo from \_\_\_\_\_ until \_\_\_\_\_  
(date) (date)

Approved by:

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Signature of Student)  
New IC No/ Passport No.:

Date :

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Signature of Chairman of Supervisory Committee)  
Name:

Date :

[Note : If the thesis is CONFIDENTIAL or RESTRICTED, please attach with the letter from the organization/institution with period and reasons for confidentiality or restricted. ]