

INVITRO EVALUATION OF GEMCITABINE AND ITS DERIVATIVE (GEMCITABINE TRIPHOSPHATE) FOR THE TREATMENT OF PANCREATIC CANCER

Shaik Nazma Sultana*, Dr. Syed Ahmed Hussain, Sara Umm E. Hani, Farahanaaz Begum and Juveria Gaffar

Department of Pharmacology, Shadan Women's College of Pharmacy, Hyderabad.



*Corresponding Author: Shaik Nazma Sultana

Department of Pharmacology, Shadan Women's College of Pharmacy, Hyderabad.

Article Received on 18/10/2023

Article Revised on 08/11/2023

Article Accepted on 28/11/2023

ABSTRACT

This research paper explores the cellular effects of Gemcitabine Triphosphate on cellular viability, tubulogenesis, and protein expression levels. The study employed various assays, including the MTT assay, Tubulogenesis assay, Indirect Immunofluorescence assay, and Western Blot analysis. The research involved four treatment groups: Group 1 (normal), Group 2 (Control cell line), Group 3 (Standard GEMCITABINE), and Group 4 (Gemcitabine Triphosphate). The results indicate that Gemcitabine Triphosphate significantly affects cellular viability, tubulogenesis, and protein expression levels compared to standard GEMCITABINE treatment, underscoring the importance of further research into its effects.

1. INTRODUCTION

Cell viability refers to the ability of a cell to stay alive and function properly. It is a critical aspect of cellular health and is often used as an indicator of the overall well-being of cells in various biological and biomedical contexts. Understanding and assessing cell viability is fundamental in fields such as cell biology, microbiology, tissue engineering, drug development, and toxicology, among others.

Several factors can influence cell viability, including:

- Nutrient Availability:** Cells require nutrients like glucose, amino acids, vitamins, and minerals to sustain their metabolic activities. A lack of essential nutrients can lead to decreased cell viability.
- Oxygen Supply:** Aerobic organisms, including most human cells, require oxygen for cellular respiration. Hypoxia, or a lack of oxygen, can significantly impact cell viability.
- pH Levels:** Cells maintain a specific intracellular pH, and any significant deviation from this range can harm cell viability. Both acidic and alkaline conditions can be detrimental.
- Temperature:** Cells have an optimal temperature range in which they function best. Extreme temperatures can disrupt cell membranes, proteins, and other cellular structures, leading to cell death.
- Toxic Substances:** Exposure to toxic chemicals, drugs, or environmental pollutants can negatively affect cell viability. Toxic substances can disrupt cellular processes and induce cell death.

- Radiation:** Ionizing radiation, such as X-rays and gamma rays, can damage cellular DNA and other structures, leading to decreased cell viability.

Cell viability is often assessed through various methods, including:

- Trypan Blue Exclusion:** This dye is used to distinguish between live and dead cells. Live cells exclude the dye, while dead cells take up the dye and become stained.
- MTT Assay:** This colorimetric assay measures the activity of mitochondrial enzymes in live cells. Live cells convert a yellow MTT reagent into a purple formazan product.
- Cell Counting:** The total number of live and dead cells in a sample can be determined using a hemocytometer or automated cell counter.
- Flow Cytometry:** This technique allows for the analysis of individual cells within a population based on various parameters, including cell viability markers.
- Fluorescent Staining:** Fluorescent dyes such as propidium iodide and calcein-AM can be used to assess cell viability by distinguishing between live and dead cells under a microscope or using flow cytometry.
- ATP Assays:** Adenosine triphosphate (ATP) is a molecule produced in live cells, so ATP assays can be used to measure cell viability indirectly.

The assessment of cell viability is crucial in various scientific and clinical applications. In medical research, it is used to evaluate the effects of drugs, toxins, and

disease on cell health. In tissue engineering, it helps monitor the success of growing and maintaining cell cultures. In the pharmaceutical industry, it is essential for drug development and testing. Overall, understanding and maintaining cell viability is critical for advancing our knowledge of biology and for improving health and biotechnological processes.

Cell viability and cell toxicity are related concepts that are often used to assess the health and condition of cells, but they represent different aspects of cellular well-being:

1. Cell Viability

- **Definition:** Cell viability refers to the ability of cells to remain alive and maintain their normal physiological functions.
- **Indication:** It is a measure of whether a cell is alive or dead. A viable cell is one that is functioning properly and capable of carrying out its usual cellular processes.
- **Methods of Assessment:** Cell viability is typically assessed using various methods like dye exclusion assays (e.g., trypan blue exclusion), metabolic activity assays (e.g., MTT assay), and monitoring cellular ATP levels. These methods determine the proportion of living cells within a population.
- **Applications:** Cell viability is important in various fields such as cell biology, tissue engineering, drug development, and microbiology. Researchers use it to evaluate the overall health and functionality of cells.

Gemcitabine is a well-known chemotherapeutic drug used in the treatment of various cancers. This study

focuses on Gemcitabine Triphosphate, a derivative of Gemcitabine, to assess its effects on cellular viability, tubulogenesis, and protein expression levels. A comprehensive understanding of the potential adverse effects of Gemcitabine Triphosphate is essential for its clinical application.

2. Research Methodology

2.1. MTT Assay Cellular viability was evaluated using the MTT assay, with four treatment groups: Group 1 (normal), Group 2 (Control cell line), Group 3 (Standard GEMCITABINE), and Group 4 (Gemcitabine Triphosphate). Cellular viability was quantified by measuring absorbance, with lower absorbance values indicating reduced cellular viability.

2.2. Tubulogenesis Assay The Tubulogenesis assay was employed to assess the effect of Gemcitabine Triphosphate on cellular tubulogenesis. The same four treatment groups were utilized. This assay examined the ability of cells to form tubular structures.


2.3. Indirect Immunofluorescence Assay The Indirect Immunofluorescence assay was used to investigate changes in protein localization patterns due to Gemcitabine Triphosphate treatment. All four treatment groups (Group 1, Group 2, Group 3, and Group 4) were analyzed to determine alterations in protein distribution within cells.

2.4. Western Blot Analysis Protein expression levels were assessed using Western Blot analysis. The four groups, Group 1 (normal), Group 2 (Control cell line), Group 3 (Standard GEMCITABINE), and Group 4 (Gemcitabine Triphosphate), were examined for differences in protein expression levels.

RESULTS of Gemcitabine triphosphate


MTT Assay

Treatments	MTT Assay
Group 1 (normal)	89.26
Group 2 (Control cell line)	93.18
Group 3 (Standard) GEMCITABINE	66.42
Group 4 (Gemcitabine triphosphate)	54.28




Tubulogenesis Assay


Treatments	Tubulogenesis Assay
Group 1 (normal)	77.18
Group 2 (Control cell line)	89.43
Group 3 (Standard) GEMCITABINE	47.24
Group 4 (Gemcitabine triphosphate)	44.19

**Indirect Immunofluorescence Assay**

Treatments	Indirect Immunofluorescence Assay
Group 1 (normal)	87.43
Group 2 (Control cell line)	98.18
Group 3 (Standard) GEMCITABINE	65.13
Group 4 (Gemcitabine triphosphate)	46.23

**Western Blot Analysis**

Treatments	Western Blot Analysis
Group 1 (normal)	1.54
Group 2 (Control cell line)	1.96
Group 3 (Standard) GEMCITABINE	0.47
Group 4 (Gemcitabine triphosphate)	0.38



3. DISCUSSION

3.1. MTT Assay The MTT assay results reveal a significant reduction in cellular viability in Group 4 (Gemcitabine Triphosphate) compared to Group 3 (Standard GEMCITABINE). This suggests that Gemcitabine Triphosphate has a pronounced detrimental effect on cellular viability. These findings warrant further investigation into potential side effects.

3.2. Tubulogenesis Assay In the Tubulogenesis assay, Group 4 (Gemcitabine Triphosphate) demonstrated a substantial decrease in the formation of tubular structures compared to the control groups (Group 1 and Group 2). This indicates that Gemcitabine Triphosphate inhibits tubulogenesis, which may have implications for various physiological processes. Further studies should explore these consequences in more detail.

3.3. Indirect Immunofluorescence Assay The Indirect Immunofluorescence assay revealed changes in protein localization patterns in Group 4 (Gemcitabine Triphosphate), indicating potential disruptions in cellular processes. The mechanisms underlying these changes should be investigated to understand the impact of Gemcitabine Triphosphate.

3.4. Western Blot Analysis Group 4 (Gemcitabine Triphosphate) exhibited alterations in protein expression levels, which were lower than Group 3 (Standard GEMCITABINE). These variations may affect cell function and warrant further investigation to determine the mechanisms responsible for these changes.

4. CONCLUSION

The results of this study suggest that Gemcitabine Triphosphate significantly affects cellular viability, tubulogenesis, and protein expression levels when compared to standard GEMCITABINE treatment. This

highlights the potential adverse effects of Gemcitabine Triphosphate on cellular processes and emphasizes the need for further research to elucidate the underlying mechanisms and assess the safety of Gemcitabine Triphosphate in clinical applications. Thorough investigation into the side effects of derivatives of pharmaceutical drugs is essential, especially within the context of cancer treatment.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Jemal A, Siegel R, Ward E, Hao Y, Xu J, Murray T, et al. Cancer statistics, *CA Cancer J Clin*, 2008 Mar–Apr; 58(2): 71–96.
2. ACS. *Cancer Facts & Figures 2008*. Atlanta: American Cancer Society, 2008.
3. Carpelan-Holmstrom M, Nordling S, Pukkala E, Sankila R, Luttges J, Kloppel G, et al. Does anyone survive pancreatic ductal adenocarcinoma? A nationwide study re-evaluating the data of the Finnish Cancer Registry. *Gut*, 2005 Mar; 54(3): 385–7.
4. Jamieson JD. Perspectives for cell and organ culture systems in the study of pancreatic carcinoma. *J Surg Oncol*, 1975; 7(2): 139–41.
5. Longnecker DS, Wiebkin P, Schaeffer BK, Roebuck BD. Experimental carcinogenesis in the pancreas. *Int Rev Exp Pathol*, 1984; 26: 177–229.
6. Hall PA, Lemoine NR. Rapid acinar to ductal transdifferentiation in cultured human exocrine pancreas. *J Pathol*, 1992 Feb; 166(2): 97–103.
7. Habbe N, Shi G, Meguid RA, Fendrich V, Esni F, Chen H, et al. Spontaneous induction of murine pancreatic intraepithelial neoplasia (mPanIN) by acinar cell targeting of oncogenic Kras in adult mice. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A.*, 2008 Dec 2; 105(48): 18913–8.
8. Park SW, Davison JM, Rhee J, Hruban RH, Maitra A, Leach SD. Oncogenic KRAS induces progenitor cell expansion and malignant transformation in

- zebrafish exocrine pancreas. *Gastroenterology*, 2008 Jun; 134(7): 2080–90.
9. Murtaugh LC, Leach SD. A case of mistaken identity? Nonductal origins of pancreatic “ductal” cancers. *Cancer Cell*. 2007 Mar; 11(3): 211–3.
 10. Githens S. Pancreatic duct cell cultures. *Annu Rev Physiol*, 1994; 56: 419–43.
 11. Githens S. The pancreatic duct cell: proliferative capabilities, specific characteristics, metaplasia, isolation, and culture. *J Pediatr Gastroenterol Nutr*, 1988 Jul–Aug; 7(4): 486–506.
 12. Bonner-Weir S, Toschi E, Inada A, Reitz P, Fonseca SY, Aye T, et al. The pancreatic ductal epithelium serves as a potential pool of progenitor cells. *Pediatric diabetes*, 2004; 5 Suppl 2: 16–22.
 13. Jones RT, Barrett LA, van Haaften C, Harris CC, Trump BF. Carcinogenesis in the pancreas. I. Long-term explant culture of human and bovine pancreatic ducts. *J Natl Cancer Inst.*, 1977 Mar; 58(3): 557–65.
 14. Oda D, Savard CE, Nguyen TD, Swenson ER, Lee SP. Culture of human main pancreatic duct epithelial cells. *In Vitro Cell Dev Biol Anim*, 1998 Mar; 34(3): 211–6.
 15. Trautmann B, Schlitt HJ, Hahn EG, Lohr M. Isolation, culture, and characterization of human pancreatic duct cells. *Pancreas*, 1993 Mar; 8(2): 248–54.
 16. Furukawa T, Duguid WP, Rosenberg L, Viallet J, Galloway DA, Tsao MS. Long-term culture and immortalization of epithelial cells from normal adult human pancreatic ducts transfected by the E6E7 gene of human papilloma virus 16. *Am J Pathol*, 1996 Jun; 148(6): 1763–70.
 17. Ouyang H, Mou L, Luk C, Liu N, Karaskova J, Squire J, et al. Immortal human pancreatic duct epithelial cell lines with near normal genotype and phenotype. *Am J Pathol*, 2000 Nov; 157(5): 1623–31.
 18. Lee KM, Yasuda H, Hollingsworth MA, Ouellette MM. Notch 2-positive progenitors with the intrinsic ability to give rise to pancreatic ductal cells. *Lab Invest*, 2005 Aug; 85(8): 1003–12.
 19. Qian J, Niu J, Li M, Chiao PJ, Tsao MS. In vitro modeling of human pancreatic duct epithelial cell transformation defines gene expression changes induced by K-ras oncogenic activation in pancreatic carcinogenesis. *Cancer Res.*, 2005 Jun 15; 65(12): 5045–53.
 20. Campbell PM, Lee KM, Ouellette MM, Kim HJ, Groehler AL, Khazak V, et al. Ras-driven transformation of human nestin-positive pancreatic epithelial cells. *Methods Enzymol*, 2008; 439: 451–65.
 21. Bendayan M, Duhr MA, Gingras D. Studies on pancreatic acinar cells in tissue culture: basal lamina (basement membrane matrix promotes three-dimensional reorganization. *Eur J Cell Biol.*, 1986 Oct; 42(1): 60–7.
 22. Longnecker DS, Lilja HS, French J, Kuhlmann E, Noll W. Transplantation of azaserine-induced carcinomas of pancreas in rats. *Cancer Lett.*, 1979 Aug; 7(4): 197–202.
 23. Ulrich AB, Schmied BM, Standop J, Schneider MB, Pour PM. Pancreatic cell lines: a review. *Pancreas*, 2002 Mar; 24(2): 111–20.
 24. Esni F, Miyamoto Y, Leach SD, Ghosh B. Primary explant cultures of adult and embryonic pancreas. *Methods Mol Med*, 2005; 103: 259–71.
 25. Hober C, Benhamou PY, Watt PC, Watanabe Y, Nomura Y, Stein E, et al. A new culture method for human pancreatic islets using a biopore membrane insert. *Pancreas*, 1997 Mar; 14(2): 199–204.