



**University of
Sunderland**

Ahmed, Shafiq, Carruthers, R, Gilmour, L, Yildirim, S, Watts, C and Chalmers, A (2015) Selective inhibition of parallel DNA damage response pathways optimizes radiosensitization of glioblastoma stem-like cells. *Cancer Research*, 75 (20). pp. 4416-4428. ISSN 0008-5472

Downloaded from: <http://sure.sunderland.ac.uk/id/eprint/6004/>

Usage guidelines

Please refer to the usage guidelines at <http://sure.sunderland.ac.uk/policies.html> or alternatively contact sure@sunderland.ac.uk.

Selective inhibition of parallel DNA damage response pathways optimises radiosensitisation of glioblastoma stem-like cells

Running title: Radiosensitisation of glioblastoma stem-like cells

Shafiq U Ahmed^{1,4}, Ross Carruthers¹, Lesley Gilmour¹, Salih Yildirim², Colin Watts³ and Anthony J Chalmers^{1,4}

Author affiliations:

¹Translational Radiation Biology, Institute of Cancer Sciences, Wolfson Wohl Cancer Research Centre, University of Glasgow, Glasgow, G61 1QH, UK.

²Present address: Muhendislik Fakültesi, Karabuk Universitesi, Karabuk, Turkey

³Department of Clinical Neurosciences, Division of Neurosurgery, ED Adrian Building, Forvie Site, Robinson Way, Cambridge University, Cambridge, CB2 0PY, UK.

⁴Corresponding authors

Financial support:

Financial support for this study was provided by Medical Research Council (MRC) grant to Anthony J Chalmers

Author contact details

Shafiq U Ahmed: Shafiq.Ahmed@glasgow.ac.uk, (Telephone: 0141 330 3984)

Ross Carruthers: Ross.carruthers@glasgow.ac.uk

Lesley Gilmour: Lesley.Gilmour@glasgow.ac.uk

Salih Yildirim: salihyildirim@karabuk.edu.tr

Colin Watts: cw209@cam.ac.uk

Anthony J Chalmers: Anthony.chalmers@glasgow.ac.uk, (Telephone: 0141 330 6426)

Author Contributions

Conception and Design: Shafiq U Ahmed, Ross Carruthers, Anthony J Chalmers

Development of methodology: Shafiq U Ahmed, Ross Carruthers, Lesley Gilmour, Salih Yildirim

Acquisition of data: Shafiq U Ahmed, Ross Carruthers, Lesley Gilmour

Analysis of data: Shafiq U Ahmed, Ross Carruthers, Lesley Gilmour

Writing/review of manuscript: Shafiq U Ahmed, Colin Watts, Anthony J Chalmers

Study supervision: Anthony J Chalmers

Potential conflicts of interest: None

Key Words: Glioblastoma stem-like cells, DNA damage response (DDR), DDR inhibitors, ionising radiation, radiosensitisation

Word count: 5262 (Introduction/Materials and methods/Results/Discussion)

Abstract

Glioblastoma (GBM) is the most common form of primary brain tumour in adults and is essentially incurable. Despite aggressive treatment regimens centred on radiotherapy, tumour recurrence is inevitable and is thought to be driven by GBM stem-like cells (GSCs) that are highly radioresistant. DNA damage response pathways are key determinants of radiosensitivity but the extent to which these overlapping and parallel signalling components contribute to GSC radioresistance is unclear. Using a panel of primary patient-derived GBM cell lines, we confirmed by clonogenic survival assays that GSCs were significantly more radioresistant than paired tumour bulk populations. DNA damage response targets ATM, ATR, CHK1 and PARP-1 were upregulated in GSCs and CHK1 was preferentially activated following IR. Consequently, GSC exhibit rapid G2/M cell cycle checkpoint activation and enhanced DNA repair. Inhibition of CHK1 or ATR successfully abrogated G2/M checkpoint function, leading to increased mitotic catastrophe and a modest increase in radiation sensitivity. Inhibition of ATM had dual effects on cell cycle checkpoint regulation and DNA repair that were associated with greater radiosensitising effects on GSCs than inhibition of CHK1, ATR or PARP alone. Combined inhibition of PARP and ATR resulted in a profound radiosensitisation of GSCs which was of greater magnitude than in bulk populations and also exceeded the effect of ATM inhibition. These data demonstrate that multiple, parallel DNA damage signalling pathways contribute to GSC radioresistance and that combined inhibition of cell cycle checkpoint and DNA repair targets provides the most effective means of overcome radioresistance of GSC.

Word count: 247

Introduction

Glioblastoma (GBM) is the most common primary brain tumour in adults. Despite optimal treatment consisting of surgical resection followed by radiotherapy with concomitant and adjuvant temozolomide chemotherapy, median survival remains dismal at 12–15 months (1). Responses to treatments are inevitably followed by relapse, typically within the maximally irradiated volume (2,3). In GBM tumourigenic cells display complex clonal dynamics in which genetically distinct sub-clones have variable serial repopulating activity in vivo (4,5). Such a functional readout is likely to represent activity of self-renewing GBM 'stem-like' cells (GSCs) whose competitive self-renewal ability varies on the basis of frequency and/or quantitative features and underpins the evolution of resistant disease (6). Consistent with this GSCs that express stem cell markers such as CD133, SSEA-1 (CD15), Nestin, SOX2 and Olig2 (7-10) are more resistant to radiotherapy and conventional chemotherapy than more differentiated epigenetically stable 'tumour bulk' cells (10-14). Thus there is an urgent need to develop targeted treatment strategies that will overcome the innate resistance of GSCs, improve local tumour control and extend patient survival.

Radiotherapy is a vital therapeutic modality for GBM which at a cellular level causes single and double stranded DNA breaks that evoke a multifaceted DNA damage response (DDR). At the apex of the DDR lie the serine/threonine protein kinases ataxia telangiectasia mutated (ATM) and ataxia telangiectasia and Rad3-related (ATR) which maintain genomic integrity by activating cell cycle checkpoints and DNA repair pathways (15). ATM is mainly activated by DNA double-strand breaks (DSBs) whereas ATR responds to single-stranded regions of DNA generated at stalled replication forks and during processing of DSBs by nucleases (16-19). The MRN (MRE11-RAD50-NBS1) complex has key roles in sensing and processing DSBs as well as activating ATM and ATR (20). ATR activates cell cycle checkpoint kinase proteins including CHK1 whereas ATM functions primarily through activation of CHK2. These downstream checkpoint kinases activate G1 and G2/M cell cycle checkpoints through phosphorylation of phosphatases CDC25A, CDC25C and kinases CDK1 and Wee1 that regulate cell cycle progression (21). Additionally, ATM promotes repair of a subset of DSBs. Poly(ADP-ribose) polymerase (PARP) facilitates repair of radiation induced single strand breaks (SSBs) and the radiosensitising effects of PARP inhibitors are well characterised (22). This brief summary illustrates key components of the complex network of overlapping and parallel DDR pathways that dictates cellular outcomes after radiation treatment.

There is growing evidence that DDR signalling is upregulated in GBM and integral to GSC radioresistance. Analysis of GBM clinical samples has revealed high levels of p-ATM, p-CHK1, p-CHK2 and PARP1 compared to normal brain tissue (23,24). Furthermore, basal levels of p-CHK1, p-CHK2 and Rad17 have been shown to be higher in CD133+ GSCs compared to non-tumourigenic CD133- populations, a finding that was associated with radioresistance of the GSC population (10). However, subsequent studies have either failed to show differences in DNA repair capacity based on CD133 status or revealed increased radiosensitivity of CD133+ GSCs compared to established GBM cell lines (25,26). Such discrepancies may reflect methodological differences or comparisons between non-isogenic cell lines. Indeed, we have recently demonstrated that radioresistance of GSC populations is associated with enhanced ATM dependent DSB repair proficiency (27).

Currently there is intense research into the development of small molecule inhibitors of DDR proteins (DDRi), one aim of which is to increase the therapeutic index of standard treatments

(28). This is driven by several factors: (i) DNA is the major target for many anticancer therapies, (ii) constitutive activation of DDR is frequently observed in cancers (29) and (iii) activation of DDR is associated with resistance to cytotoxic therapies. Several preclinical studies have successfully utilised DDRi to increase chemo- and radiosensitivity in GBM models but these results were not substantiated in the treatment resistant GSC population (30-34). More recently we have shown the ATM inhibitor KU55933 to be a potent radiosensitiser of GSC (27) and inhibition of PARP has also been shown to overcome radioresistance of GSCs (35). These findings corroborate and extend the landmark study by Bao and colleagues in which inhibition of CHK1 and CHK2 using debromohymenialdisine was shown to enhance the radiosensitivity of GSCs (10).

The observation that GSCs exhibit upregulated DDR signalling provides both opportunities and challenges. Whilst targeting individual components of this complex network can increase the radiosensitivity of GSC, the relative contributions of these components and the implications of multiple DDR pathways and mechanisms contributing to radioresistance remain unexplored. We addressed this by utilising paired, primary, patient derived GBM cell lines cultured to enrich for or deplete the GSC population ('GSC' and 'bulk' populations respectively). We show that GSCs express higher total and activated levels of DDR targets than bulk populations and that this phenotype is maintained in orthotopic xenograft models and GBM patient specimens. Our mechanistic studies highlight rapid activation of cell cycle checkpoint and enhanced DNA repair as key determinants of GSC radioresistance. We show that, although selective inhibition of either pathway increases radiosensitivity of GSC, effects are limited by reciprocity between these signalling conduits. Accordingly, combined inhibition of ATR and PARP1 significantly enhanced the radiosensitivity of GSCs, and the magnitude of this effect was greater than in bulk populations. We propose that targeting of parallel DDR pathways is required to maximise radiosensitisation of GSCs and optimise outcomes for GBM patients.

Word count: 867

Materials and Methods

Derivation and maintenance of primary and patient derived GBM cell lines

Primary patient derived GBM cell lines E2, G7, R10, R15 and R24 were derived from freshly resected tumour specimens and maintained as described previously (22,36). Patient consent was sought before surgery and tissue collection was approved by the local regional Ethics Committee (LREC ref 04/Q0108/60) and compliant with the UK Human Tissue Act 2004 (HTA Licence ref 12315). Each cell line was cultured in pairs either on Matrigel™ (Life Technology) coated flasks in AdvDMEM F12 medium (Gibco) supplemented with 1% B27 (Invitrogen), 0.5% N2 (Invitrogen), 4µg/ml heparin, 20ng/ml bFGF, 20ng/ml EGF (Sigma), and 1% L-Glutamine to maintain the GSC population or in MEM (Gibco) supplemented with 10% FBS Sigma, 1% L-glutamine and 1% sodium pyruvate to deplete the GSCs and generate a differentiated tumour bulk population. All cell cultures were maintained at 37°C, 5% CO₂. Cell lines were utilised between 6-15 passages and then discarded.

Generation of orthotopic tumours and immunohistochemistry

Tumours were generated by injecting 1×10^5 cells in CD1 nude mice as described previously (37), and in supplementary materials and methods. Immunohistochemistry was performed on paraffin embedded sections. Following antigen retrieval sections were incubated with anti-Ki67, PARP-1 or p-ATM antibodies overnight followed by incubation with secondary antibodies. Staining was visualised by application of DAB.

Drug treatment and radiation

ATM inhibitor KU-55933 (Tocris bioscience), ATR inhibitor VE821, PARP inhibitor olaparib, CHK1 inhibitors SCH900776 and CHIR-124 (Selleckchem), hydroxyurea and aphidicolin (Sigma) were all dissolved in DMSO. For drug-radiation combination studies, cells were exposed to fresh media containing the inhibitor or relative DMSO control for 1 hour prior to irradiation in tissue culture vessels using an XStrahl RS225 cabinet at room temperature with 195kV/15mA X rays producing a dose rate of 1.6 Gray per minute. For UV studies, media containing the drug was removed after one hour and cells were irradiated using a UV Stratalinker (Stratagene).

Clonogenic and neurosphere assays

Paired GSC and bulk population from E2 and G7 cell lines formed countable colonies and were seeded at a density of 250 cells per well in Matrigel coated 6 well dishes for 24 hours. Wells were treated with the inhibitors or relative DMSO control for 1 hour followed by mock or 1-5Gy irradiation. Cells were then incubated for a further 24 hours followed by replacement with fresh media. E2 and G7 colonies were fixed after 2 or 3 weeks respectively in methanol followed by staining with crystal violet. Colonies consisting of minimum 50 cells were counted manually and using an automated colony counter (GelCount™, Oxford Optronix). Clonogenic survival data were fitted using a linear quadratic model and $SER_{0.37}$ and SF_{4Gy} values were calculated from the fitted curve. ANOVA test was used to analyse differences between clonogenic survival curves.

For neurosphere assay 10 GSCs were seeded into each well of a 96 well plate in 100µL medium containing the drug or relative DMSO control for 1 hour followed by mock or 2Gy

irradiation. 48 hours later a further 150 μ L of fresh media was added per well. Neurospheres were manually counted under 5x magnification after 3 or 4 weeks for G7 and E2 GSC respectively.

Immunofluorescence

Paired bulk and/or GSCs were plated on coverslips coated with Matrigel and treated with radiation alone or in combination with the inhibitors for 24 hours. Cells were fixed and incubated with γ -H2AX or p-His H3 S10 antibodies overnight at 4°C followed by incubation with secondary conjugated antibodies. Nuclei were counterstained with Vectashield containing DAPI. Images were acquired using Zeiss LSM 710 confocal microscope and analysed using Velocity software (PerkinElmer). γ -H2AX foci data are presented as box and whisker plots from 3 independent experiments unless otherwise stated and analysed using Mann Whitney U-test as they were not normally distributed.

Flow cytometry and cell death

For analysis of mitotic population, cells were treated and fixed with 70% ethanol and incubated with p- H3 S10 antibody followed by γ -H2AX antibody and analysed using flow cytometry. Combined annexin V and PI analysis was carried out as described previously. Analysis of GSC markers was carried out using CD133 and CD15 (Miltenyi biotech). Data was analysed using FlowJo software (Tristar). Analysis of caspase 3/7 activity was carried out using Caspase-Glo 3/7 kit (Promega).

Western blotting

For immunoblotting whole cell lysates were prepared and processed in SDS buffer, blotted onto membranes and probed with primary antibodies (supplementary material and methods) overnight followed by appropriate secondary antibodies for 1-3 hours. Bound antibodies were visualised using chemiluminescence kit (Thermo Scientific).

Statistical Analyses

All experiments were repeated 3 times unless otherwise stated and data points reported as mean \pm SEM. Statistical analysis and graphs were produced using Minitab 16 and Graphpad Prism 6. Unpaired t-test or one sample t-test were used to generate *p* values.

Word count: 792

Results

GSC populations are radioresistant

We have previously characterised two primary GBM cell lines (E2 and G7) (27,37). Using the same techniques three additional primary GBM cell lines (R10, R15 and R24) were expanded by culturing under selective media to enrich for or deplete the GSC population. We demonstrated that GSC enriched populations of E2, G7 (27,37), R10 and R24 generate orthotopic tumours in immunodeficient mice that recapitulate the human disease, whereas GSC depleted, tumour bulk populations do not (supplementary Figure S1). While the neural stem cell markers nestin, SOX2, CD133, Olig2 and CD15 were heterogeneously expressed between different GSC cultures, expression of these markers was consistently increased in GSCs compared to bulk populations (Figure 1A and 1B). Clonogenic survival assays in E2 and G7 cell lines confirmed GSC cultures to be more radioresistant than paired bulk populations. Dose modifying factors calculated at 37% survival ($DMF_{0.37}$) showed that E2 and G7 GSCs were more radioresistant than corresponding bulk populations by factors of 1.36 ($p=0.001$) and 1.44 ($p<0.001$) respectively (Figure 1C-E). Radioresistance of GSC populations was confirmed by comparing surviving fraction at 4Gy (SF_{4Gy} , supplementary Table 1). These findings were consistent with the observation that E2 and G7 GSCs were refractory to cell death as measured by Annexin-V and propidium iodide staining following treatment with high radiation doses (15 and 30 Gy, Figure 1F, supplementary Figure S2). Caspase 3/7 activity assays supported the assertion that GSC populations are extremely resistant to radiation induced apoptotic cell death (Figure 1G).

GSCs express high levels of DDR targets under basal conditions and activate CHK1 rapidly following IR

DDR targets have previously been shown to be upregulated and associated with GSC radioresistance (10,27,35). We explored this further in our GSC and bulk culture models and observed an overall pattern of higher levels of total and phosphorylated CHK1 (S345) and ATR (S428) in GSCs compared to bulk populations in primary GBM cell lines (Figure 2A). Similarly, higher levels of PARP-1 and phosphorylated ATM (p-ATM, S1981) were also observed in the majority of the GSC populations (Figure 2A). To confirm these findings *in vivo* we generated xenograft tumours from E2 and G7 GSC using an orthotopic mouse model. Analysis of tumour sections revealed a heterogeneous pattern of p-ATM (S1981) and PARP-1 staining highlighting differential protein expression between different cell populations (Figure 2B). PARP-1 staining in G7 tumours was abundant and homogeneous, consistent with previous reports proposing PARP-1 as a GBM marker (24). These findings were reproduced in a clinical GBM specimen, which exhibited marked p-ATM and PARP-1 expression in the majority of tumour cells (Figure 2B). These data illustrate collective induction of DDR targets in GSC populations under basal conditions *in vitro* and in a subpopulation of GBM cells *in vivo*.

We next sought to investigate how differences in basal CHK1 levels between GSC and bulk populations affect the DDR. Irradiation of E2 and G7 GSCs evoked pronounced activation of CHK1 (S345 phosphorylation) within 15 minutes that was maintained for at least 3 hours (Figure 2C, supplementary Figure S3). In contrast, bulk cells failed to activate CHK1 despite similar levels of DNA damage (γ -H2AX). CHK2 activation (T68 phosphorylation) was similar in E2 GSC and bulk populations although differences were observed between G7 bulk and

GSC populations (supplementary Figure S3). We explored the possibility that enhanced activation of CHK1 in GSC could be caused by 'priming' of the MRN (MRE11, RAD50, NBS1) DNA damage sensor complex under basal conditions. No differences in total or phosphorylated MRE11 and NBS1 between GSC and bulk populations were observed under basal conditions or following irradiation, but modest upregulation of RAD50 was observed in E2 and G7 GSCs following irradiation (Figure 2C, supplementary Figure S3). The possibility that CHK1 activation was delayed in bulk cells was excluded by demonstrating that S296 phosphorylation of CHK1 was attenuated in E2 and absent in G7 bulk cells but maintained in both GSC cultures at 6, 12 and 24 hours after irradiation (Figure 2D). Enhanced CHK1 activation in GSC was not only a radiation specific phenomenon: E2 and G7 bulk cells also failed to activate CHK1 (S345 and S296 phosphorylation) in response to UV, hydroxyurea or aphidicolin treatments despite levels of γ -H2AX induction that were comparable to GSC populations (Figure 2E, supplementary Figure S3).

Rapid induction of CHK1 in GSCs is associated with enhanced G2/M cell cycle checkpoint activation

We next investigated the impact of rapid CHK1 activation on cell cycle checkpoint responses of GSCs. Both E2 and G7 cell lines were refractory to radiation induced G1/S checkpoint activation, consistent with frequent deregulation of p53 signalling pathways in GBM (38) (supplementary Figure S4). However, analysis of the G2/M checkpoint by flow cytometric quantification of mitotic cells with S10 phosphorylation on histone H3 (p-His H3) revealed that GSC activated G2 arrest significantly more efficiently than paired bulk populations, requiring less time to reduce the mitotic cell population by 50% following IR treatment (Figure 3A, supplementary Figure S5). Intriguingly, E2 bulk cells failed to fully activate the G2/M checkpoint even at three hours. Moreover, a dose response study revealed that depletion of mitotic cell fraction by 75% occurred after significantly lower radiation doses in E2 and G7 GSC compared to bulk populations (Figure 3B, supplementary Figure S5). E2 and G7 bulk cells were also released from the G2/M checkpoint earlier than GSC. Based on these observations we hypothesised that the increased radiosensitivity of tumour bulk cells (Figure 1) might be at least partly explained by these cells entering mitosis carrying unrepaired DNA damage (see also Figure 5 and Figure 6).

Radiosensitising effects of CHK1 inhibition are more pronounced in GBM bulk cells than GSCs

Reasoning that radioresistance of GSCs might be driven by enhanced CHK1 mediated activation of the G2/M checkpoint, we hypothesised that inhibition of CHK1 would abrogate the G2/M checkpoint and increase radiosensitivity. To investigate this we utilised SCH 900776 (SCH) a well characterised CHK1 specific inhibitor which had no significant effect on CHK2 activity as highlighted by unaltered phosphorylation of T68 (Figure 4A-C) (39,40). As expected, SCH treatment alone inhibited CHK1 S296 autophosphorylation in a dose dependent manner and induced CHK1 S345 phosphorylation through CHK1 dependent inhibition of the PP2A phosphatase feedback loop (41) (Figure 4A and 4C, supplementary Figure S6). Treatment of E2 GSCs with SCH resulted in enhanced induction of CHK1 S345 phosphorylation by UV or IR along with increased γ -H2AX levels reflecting increased DNA damaging signalling in response to CHK1 inhibition (Figure 4A-C and supplementary Figure S6). Interestingly, induction of CHK2 T68 phosphorylation was also observed following combined treatment with SCH plus IR suggesting compensatory activation of CHK2

following CHK1 inhibition (Figure 4C) (42). In addition SCH treatment alone generated a γ -H2AX signal highlighting a basal function of CHK1 in maintaining genomic stability (43). Additional biomarkers of CHK1 inhibition included downregulation of phosphorylated Wee1 (S642) and CDC25C (T48) whilst upregulation of CDC25A was observed following SCH treatment alone and augmented in combination with radiation, consistent with enhanced cell cycle progression despite the presence of damaged DNA (Figure 4B and 4C, supplementary Figure S6).

Since our earlier results showed that GSCs activate the G2/M cell cycle checkpoint rapidly in response to IR (Figure 3), we hypothesised that CHK1 inhibition would abolish this and thus overcome the radioresistant phenotype of the GSC populations. Indeed, SCH treatment abrogated radiation induced G2 arrest in E2 and significantly attenuated it in G7 GSCs, while SCH treatment in the absence of radiation was sufficient to drive E2 and G7 GSCs into mitosis (Figure 4D). Importantly, clonogenic survival assays confirmed significant radiosensitisation of E2 and G7 GSC by CHK1 inhibition as illustrated by sensitisation enhancement ratios at 37% survival ($SER_{0.37}$) of 1.9 and significant reductions in surviving fractions at 4Gy (SF_{4Gy}) in both cell lines (Figure 4E and 4F). Despite the limited ability of bulk populations to phosphorylate CHK1 and induce G2/M checkpoint activation in response to radiation, a similar or greater magnitude of radiosensitisation ($SER_{0.37}=2.3-2.4$) was observed in bulk populations treated with SCH. This unexpected observation was confirmed using an alternative CHK1 inhibitor CHIR-124 (44) (supplementary Figure S7). While these data support the assertion that CHK1 inhibition has therapeutic potential in GBM, the observation that overexpression and constitutive activation of CHK1 in GSCs was not associated with increased radiosensitisation by CHK1 inhibitors indicates that additional mechanisms could be responsible for limiting the radiosensitisation effects of CHK1 inhibition in the GSC population.

Inhibition of CHK1 radiosensitises GSC through a mechanism involving mitotic catastrophe

Our subsequent studies were aimed at investigating the mechanisms responsible for (i) GSC radiosensitisation by CHK1 inhibition and (ii) enhanced radiosensitisation of bulk cells. Initial analysis of DNA damage in E2 GSCs using flow cytometry highlighted a significant increase in the γ -H2AX positive cell population following combined SCH and IR treatment compared to individual treatments alone (Figure 5A and 5B). Interestingly, SCH treatment alone induced a γ -H2AX response, confirming our earlier results (Figure 4A-C). Since this signal was observed predominantly in S-phase cells, we inferred that CHK1 inhibition exacerbates replication stress in GSCs. While induction of γ -H2AX was also observed in the paired E2 bulk population following treatment with SCH and IR (Figure 5C), the magnitude of this effect was significantly lower than in GSCs. The observation that enhanced generation of DNA damage did not translate to enhanced radiosensitisation of GSCs (Figure 4E and 4F) led us to investigate the manner in which the different populations responded to this S-phase dependent DNA damage. Since SCH treatment also inhibited the G2/M checkpoint (Figure 4D) we first investigated whether treated GSCs would enter mitosis with damaged DNA. Analysis of γ -H2AX in mitotic (p-His H3) cells revealed induction by SCH of a distinct population of mitotic cells with high γ -H2AX signal. This population was significantly increased after combined treatment with IR (Figure 5D and 5E). Immunofluorescence analysis confirmed these results, demonstrating a distinct mitotic cell population with intense,

pan-nuclear γ -H2AX staining (middle panel, Figure 5F). This is likely to represent cells in the initial stages of mitotic catastrophe, which was clearly visible in a separate population of mitotic cells characterised by loss of membrane integrity and fragmented morphology (bottom panel). Both populations were augmented in GSCs following combined treatment with SCH and IR relative to either treatment alone. In addition, we evaluated the consequence of mitotic division in cells with damaged DNA and found a significant increase in the percentage of GSCs harbouring one or more micronucleus following the combined treatment (Figure 5G). Taken together, our data demonstrate that CHK1 inhibition sensitises GSC to IR by preventing G2/M checkpoint activation, allowing mitotic entry of cells bearing damaged DNA resulting in mitotic catastrophe and genomic instability.

Limited radiosensitisation of GSCs by CHK1 inhibition is explained by enhanced DNA repair

We next sought to identify the mechanism that could be responsible for limiting the radiosensitising effects of CHK1 inhibition in GSCs by comparing effects in paired bulk cell populations in which SCH had shown more pronounced radiosensitising effects (Figure 4E and 4F). Despite our previous data showing that combined treatment of E2 cells with SCH and IR generated less DNA damage in bulk cells than in GSCs (Figure 5A-C), this treatment resulted in a significant increase in overall and mitotic specific γ -H2AX positive cells compared to radiation or SCH treatment alone in G7 bulk cells (Figure 6A and 6B), the magnitude of which was significantly greater than that observed in the paired GSC population. The percentage of bulk cells exhibiting mitotic catastrophe and micronuclei after treatment with SCH +/- IR was also significantly greater than in the corresponding GSC population (Figure 6C and 6D). Since micronuclei are a direct consequence of mitotic division in cells with unrepaired DNA DSBs, these observations are strongly supportive of the theory that GSC exhibit significantly enhanced DNA repair capacity when compared with bulk cells. This theory is corroborated by the observation that a significantly higher percentage of bulk cells than GSCs harbour micronuclei under basal conditions (Figure 6D). To substantiate this hypothesis, detailed analysis of DNA DSB repair was conducted by quantification of γ -H2AX foci in CENPF positive (G2/M) and negative (G1) cells 24 hours after high dose radiation (10 Gy). This clearly showed increased repair proficiency of GSC compared to bulk cells (Figure 6E and 6F), supporting our earlier hypothesis that enhanced DNA repair is responsible for the attenuated radiosensitising effects of CHK1 inhibition that were observed in E2 GSCs. Enhanced DNA repair by GSC thus appears to compensate for the significant increase in DNA damage observed in GSCs treated with radiation and CHK1 inhibition (Figure 5C).

Optimum radiosensitisation of GSCs through parallel inhibition of DNA damage response pathways

In order to identify the optimum targets for GSC radiosensitisation we evaluated small molecule inhibitors of additional DDR proteins that were up-regulated in GSCs (Figure 2A). DNA repair was targeted using the PARP inhibitor olaparib, cell cycle checkpoints were inhibited using the ATR inhibitor VE821 and combined targeting of cell cycle checkpoints and DNA repair was evaluated using the ATM inhibitor KU55933. Results in E2 cells showed that ATR inhibition sensitised GSC and bulk populations equally although there was a trend towards increased radiosensitisation of bulk cells (Figure 7A and 7B). $SER_{0.37}$ values for ATR and CHK1 inhibition were comparable. In contrast, inhibition of PARP or ATM

revealed a trend towards increased radiosensitisation of GSC. The ATM inhibitor KU55933 proved to be the most potent radiosensitiser of GSC ($SER_{0.37}=2.60$, Figure 7B).

To understand the reasons for the different magnitudes of GSC radiosensitisation by the DDR inhibitors we investigated their effects on cell cycle checkpoints and DNA repair. Whereas inhibition of either ATR or CHK1 completely ablated radiation induced G2/M checkpoint activation (Figure 7C), inhibition of ATM had only a partial effect. In contrast, ATM inhibition significantly impaired repair of radiation induced DSBs as demonstrated by a significant increase in the number of unresolved γ -H2AX foci 24 hours post-irradiation (Figure 7D). A similar effect on DNA repair was observed following PARP inhibition. Considering that ATM inhibition was associated with the greatest radiosensitisation of GSCs we hypothesised that dual inhibition of cell cycle checkpoint activation and DNA repair might provide optimum radiopotential. This was investigated by concomitant inhibition of DNA repair and cell cycle checkpoint function by combined treatment with inhibitors of PARP and ATR. As predicted, the radiosensitising effect of this combination in GSCs exceeded that of any of the inhibitors individually ($SER_{0.37}=3.20$, Figure 7E) and was significantly greater than that observed in the paired bulk cells. This is likely to be due to increased unrepaired DSBs since combined inhibition of ATR and PARP was shown to be associated with a significant increase in γ -H2AX foci in GSCs compared to the bulk population (supplementary Figure S8). To support the clinical relevance of this result we performed neurosphere formation assays using E2 GSCs and confirmed that dual inhibition of ATR and PARP achieved maximum potentiation of the inhibitory effects of radiation on neurosphere formation (Figure 7F). Taken together our results show that optimal radiosensitisation of GSCs is achieved through parallel inhibition of DDR pathways.

Word count: 2494

Discussion

GBM are heterogeneous tumours that are thought to be dependent on a cellular hierarchy that includes a privileged GSC subpopulation resistant to conventional therapy and capable of tumour propagation and growth. Uncertainty over the ideal model(s) in which to study radiation responses of the GSC population may account for the disparities in the findings of the various published studies (10,25,26). In keeping with our previous studies we generated paired cultures of primary, patient derived GBM cell lines (10,35) in which the GSC population was either enriched or depleted (27). The use of sorted cell populations based on a specific stem cell marker such as CD133 has been questioned because both CD133+ and CD133- cells were capable of generating tumours *in vivo* (45). In addition, our study shows that stem cell markers are heterogeneously expressed. Thus the GSC “signature” is likely to be more complex, modulated by the cellular microenvironment and governed by multiple parameters including epigenetic and genetic aberrations which impact upon the expression of key regulatory proteins. In keeping with this interpretation, a recent publication highlights four core neurodevelopment transcription factors that are crucial to GSC maintenance and tumourigenicity (46).

Our study shows that GSCs are more radioresistant than paired bulk populations and exhibit higher expression of total and activated DDR targets under basal conditions. The reason for this is unclear; we speculate that it may reflect an endogenous response of neural stem cells to DNA damage which is subsequently maintained as part of mutagenic selection and the malignant phenotype. In addition, genetic differences between GSCs and bulk cells may affect cellular biochemistry, possibly accounting for lower proteasomal activity in GSCs contributing to higher levels of DDR targets (47). More recently increased levels of reactive oxygen species have been proposed as a mechanism responsible for upregulated PARP-1 in GSCs (35).

One surprising observation was the apparent lack of CHK1 activation in bulk cells exposed to IR. This observation and the slower DNA repair kinetics of these cells might explain why they are significantly more radiosensitive than the GSC population. Whilst our results support this, it should be emphasised that the bulk cells remain relatively radioresistant, suggesting that alternative pathways might compensate for the lack of CHK1 activation and attenuated DDR. Indeed, non-canonical DDR pathways including NOTCH, TGF β and receptor tyrosine kinase signalling have all been associated with GBM radioresistance and may be activated in these cells (reviewed in (48)). Alternatively, bulk cells may rely on DNA damage tolerance (DDT) mechanisms which utilise translesion synthesis polymerases to bypass lesions for repair at later time points (49). This provides a mechanism to tolerate DNA damage allowing cells to continue replicating and might explain the survival of bulk cells following IR despite the lack of checkpoint activation and early checkpoint release.

The MRN complex is a crucial DNA damage sensor that is recruited to and participates in DNA DSB repair. Although our results show no significant differences in the levels of total and phosphorylated components of the MRN complex between GSC and bulk populations, the rate at which the complex is recruited to damaged site and catalytic activity of specific components may be greater in the GSCs contributing to the enhanced radioresistance of these cells.

Our study shows that multiple DDR targets including ATR, ATM, CHK1 and PARP-1 are upregulated in GSCs compared to the bulk population, and that some are also preferentially activated. Although some of these targets have overlapping functions, individually they have distinct roles which suggest that multiple DDR pathways contribute to GSC radioresistance. Our studies showed that both GSC and bulk populations were radiosensitised by CHK1 or ATR inhibition despite higher expression and activity of these proteins in GSCs. This led us to propose that alternative DDR pathways might mitigate the radiosensitising effects of CHK1 or ATR inhibition in the GSC populations. In support of this explanation, inhibition of ATM, with its dual functions in DNA repair and cell cycle checkpoint activation, yielded the most potent single agent radiosensitisation of GSCs. Importantly we confirmed this hypothesis by demonstrating that combined inhibition of ATR and PARP generated maximum radiosensitisation, and that this effect was of significantly greater magnitude in GSCs than in bulk populations. Inhibition of PARP resulted in a significant increase in DNA DSBs, which were likely to have been generated during S-phase from unrepaired DNA SSBs. In the context of ATR inhibition these cells were unable to activate the G2/M cell cycle checkpoint to entered mitosis carrying high levels of unresolved DSBs. Thus we propose that GSC radioresistance is driven by both enhanced cell cycle checkpoint activation and DNA repair, and therefore optimal radiosensitisation is only achieved by dual inhibition of both pathways.

Our data strongly support further pre-clinical evaluation of ATR and PARP inhibitors in combination with IR as a potential treatment for GBM. This is an entirely novel approach that to our knowledge has not been investigated in any cancer models. Clearly there will be concerns over the potential *in vivo* toxicity of this combination treatment modality: ATR is essential for tissue homeostasis, highlighted by embryonic lethality of *ATR* knockout mice, whereas *PARP1* knockout in mice is less deleterious. However, clinical experience with PARP inhibitors has been extremely promising; it is tolerated well as a single agent and clinical studies in combination with radiation are progressing. To our knowledge only one clinical study is currently recruiting patients to explore ATR inhibition as a radiosensitising strategy in advanced solid tumours (www.clinicaltrials.gov). However, a pre-clinical study using the ATR inhibitor VE822 has demonstrated radiosensitisation of pancreatic tumours in mice with no apparent *in vivo* toxicity (50). The high proliferation indices of most GBM is predicted to render them more sensitive to the combination of radiotherapy, PARP inhibition (33) and ATR inhibition, and the GSC specific radiosensitisation mechanisms outlined in this paper are associated exclusively with S, G2 and M phases of the cell cycle. Since normal brain tissues are comprised almost entirely of non-replicating, post-mitotic cells with intact G1/S checkpoint and DNA repair pathways, we predict that the radiosensitising effects of the proposed combination will be exerted exclusively upon GBM tumour cells, and will have particular impact on the radioresistant GSC population.

In summary, our study provides the first detailed examination of DDR responses in GSCs and has important implications for the management of GBM. Our results support the notion that GSCs are profoundly radioresistant and identify a novel drug combination strategy targeting both cell cycle checkpoint and DNA repair functions that has potential to overcome this. Future studies will focus on *in vivo* characterisation of this strategy and will identify optimal radiation/drug combination scheduling to take forward to phase I clinical trials in GBM patients.

Word count: 1109

References

1. Stupp R, Hegi ME, Mason WP, van den Bent MJ, Taphoorn MJ, Janzer RC, et al. Effects of radiotherapy with concomitant and adjuvant temozolomide versus radiotherapy alone on survival in glioblastoma in a randomised phase III study: 5-year analysis of the EORTC-NCIC trial. *Lancet Oncol* 2009;10(5):459-66.
2. Hochberg FH, Pruitt A. Assumptions in the radiotherapy of glioblastoma. *Neurology* 1980;30(9):907-11.
3. Lee SW, Fraass BA, Marsh LH, Herbort K, Gebarski SS, Martel MK, et al. Patterns of failure following high-dose 3-D conformal radiotherapy for high-grade astrocytomas: a quantitative dosimetric study. *Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys* 1999;43(1):79-88.
4. Piccirillo SGM, Colman S, Potter NE, van Delft FW, Lillis S, Carnicer MJ, et al. Genetic and Functional Diversity of Propagating Cells in Glioblastoma. *Stem cell report* 2014;DOI:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.stemcr.2014.11.003>.
5. Sottoriva A, Spiteri I, Shibata D, Curtis C, Tavare S. Single-molecule genomic data delineate patient-specific tumor profiles and cancer stem cell organization. *Cancer Res* 2013;73(1):41-9.
6. Greaves M, Maley CC. Clonal evolution in cancer. *Nature* 2012;481(7381):306-13.
7. Galli R, Binda E, Orfanelli U, Cipelletti B, Gritti A, De Vitis S, et al. Isolation and characterization of tumorigenic, stem-like neural precursors from human glioblastoma. *Cancer Res* 2004;64(19):7011-21.
8. Singh SK, Hawkins C, Clarke ID, Squire JA, Bayani J, Hide T, et al. Identification of human brain tumour initiating cells. *Nature* 2004;432(7015):396-401.
9. Son MJ, Woolard K, Nam DH, Lee J, Fine HA. SSEA-1 is an enrichment marker for tumor-initiating cells in human glioblastoma. *Cell Stem Cell* 2009;4(5):440-52.
10. Bao S, Wu Q, McLendon RE, Hao Y, Shi Q, Hjelmeland AB, et al. Glioma stem cells promote radioresistance by preferential activation of the DNA damage response. *Nature* 2006;444(7120):756-60.
11. Cheng L, Huang Z, Zhou W, Wu Q, Donnola S, Liu JK, et al. Glioblastoma stem cells generate vascular pericytes to support vessel function and tumor growth. *Cell* 2013;153(1):139-52.
12. Velpula KK, Rehman AA, Chelluboina B, Dasari VR, Gondi CS, Rao JS, et al. Glioma stem cell invasion through regulation of the interconnected ERK, integrin alpha6 and N-cadherin signaling pathway. *Cell Signal* 2012;24(11):2076-84.
13. Liu G, Yuan X, Zeng Z, Tunici P, Ng H, Abdulkadir IR, et al. Analysis of gene expression and chemoresistance of CD133+ cancer stem cells in glioblastoma. *Mol Cancer* 2006;5:67.
14. Chen J, Li Y, Yu TS, McKay RM, Burns DK, Kernie SG, et al. A restricted cell population propagates glioblastoma growth after chemotherapy. *Nature* 2012;488(7412):522-6.
15. Smith J, Tho LM, Xu N, Gillespie DA. The ATM-Chk2 and ATR-Chk1 pathways in DNA damage signaling and cancer. *Adv Cancer Res* 2010;108:73-112.
16. Jazayeri A, Falck J, Lukas C, Bartek J, Smith GC, Lukas J, et al. ATM- and cell cycle-dependent regulation of ATR in response to DNA double-strand breaks. *Nat Cell Biol* 2006;8(1):37-45.
17. Myers JS, Cortez D. Rapid activation of ATR by ionizing radiation requires ATM and Mre11. *J Biol Chem* 2006;281(14):9346-50.
18. Byun TS, Pacek M, Yee MC, Walter JC, Cimprich KA. Functional uncoupling of MCM helicase and DNA polymerase activities activates the ATR-dependent checkpoint. *Genes Dev* 2005;19(9):1040-52.
19. MacDougall CA, Byun TS, Van C, Yee MC, Cimprich KA. The structural determinants of checkpoint activation. *Genes Dev* 2007;21(8):898-903.
20. Duursma AM, Driscoll R, Elias JE, Cimprich KA. A role for the MRN complex in ATR activation via TOPBP1 recruitment. *Mol Cell* 2013;50(1):116-22.
21. Boutros R, Lobjois V, Ducommun B. CDC25 phosphatases in cancer cells: key players? Good targets? *Nat Rev Cancer* 2007;7(7):495-507.

22. Carruthers R, Chalmers AJ. The potential of PARP inhibitors in neuro-oncology. *CNS Oncol* 2012;1(1):85-97.
23. Bartkova J, Hamerlik P, Stockhausen MT, Ehrmann J, Hlobilkova A, Laursen H, et al. Replication stress and oxidative damage contribute to aberrant constitutive activation of DNA damage signalling in human gliomas. *Oncogene* 2010;29(36):5095-102.
24. Galia A, Calogero AE, Condorelli R, Frassetta F, La Corte A, Ridolfo F, et al. PARP-1 protein expression in glioblastoma multiforme. *Eur J Histochem* 2012;56(1):e9.
25. McCord AM, Jamal M, Williams ES, Camphausen K, Tofilon PJ. CD133+ glioblastoma stem-like cells are radiosensitive with a defective DNA damage response compared with established cell lines. *Clin Cancer Res* 2009;15(16):5145-53.
26. Ropolo M, Daga A, Griffiero F, Foresta M, Casartelli G, Zunino A, et al. Comparative analysis of DNA repair in stem and nonstem glioma cell cultures. *Mol Cancer Res* 2009;7(3):383-92.
27. Carruthers R, Ahmed SU, Strathdee K, Gomez-Roman N, Amoah-Buahin E, Watts C, et al. Abrogation of radioresistance in glioblastoma stem-like cells by inhibition of ATM kinase. *Mol Oncol* 2014.
28. Curtin NJ. DNA repair dysregulation from cancer driver to therapeutic target. *Nat Rev Cancer* 2012;12(12):801-17.
29. Bartkova J, Horejsi Z, Koed K, Kramer A, Tort F, Zieger K, et al. DNA damage response as a candidate anti-cancer barrier in early human tumorigenesis. *Nature* 2005;434(7035):864-70.
30. Golding SE, Rosenberg E, Valerie N, Hussaini I, Frigerio M, Cockcroft XF, et al. Improved ATM kinase inhibitor KU-60019 radiosensitizes glioma cells, compromises insulin, AKT and ERK prosurvival signaling, and inhibits migration and invasion. *Mol Cancer Ther* 2009;8(10):2894-902.
31. Biddlestone-Thorpe L, Sajjad M, Rosenberg E, Beckta JM, Valerie NC, Tokarz M, et al. ATM kinase inhibition preferentially sensitizes p53-mutant glioma to ionizing radiation. *Clin Cancer Res* 2013;19(12):3189-200.
32. Eich M, Roos WP, Nikolova T, Kaina B. Contribution of ATM and ATR to the resistance of glioblastoma and malignant melanoma cells to the methylating anticancer drug temozolomide. *Mol Cancer Ther* 2013;12(11):2529-40.
33. Dungey FA, Loser DA, Chalmers AJ. Replication-dependent radiosensitization of human glioma cells by inhibition of poly(ADP-Ribose) polymerase: mechanisms and therapeutic potential. *Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys* 2008;72(4):1188-97.
34. Hirose Y, Berger MS, Pieper RO. Abrogation of the Chk1-mediated G(2) checkpoint pathway potentiates temozolomide-induced toxicity in a p53-independent manner in human glioblastoma cells. *Cancer Res* 2001;61(15):5843-9.
35. Venere M, Hamerlik P, Wu Q, Rasmussen RD, Song LA, Vasanji A, et al. Therapeutic targeting of constitutive PARP activation compromises stem cell phenotype and survival of glioblastoma-initiating cells. *Cell Death Differ* 2014;21(2):258-69.
36. Fael Al-Mayhany TM, Ball SL, Zhao JW, Fawcett J, Ichimura K, Collins PV, et al. An efficient method for derivation and propagation of glioblastoma cell lines that conserves the molecular profile of their original tumours. *J Neurosci Methods* 2009;176(2):192-9.
37. Mannino M, Gomez-Roman N, Hochegger H, Chalmers AJ. Differential sensitivity of Glioma stem cells to Aurora kinase A inhibitors: implications for stem cell mitosis and centrosome dynamics. *Stem Cell Res* 2014;13(1):135-43.
38. Comprehensive genomic characterization defines human glioblastoma genes and core pathways. *Nature* 2008;455(7216):1061-8.
39. Guzi TJ, Paruch K, Dwyer MP, Labroli M, Shanahan F, Davis N, et al. Targeting the replication checkpoint using SCH 900776, a potent and functionally selective CHK1 inhibitor identified via high content screening. *Mol Cancer Ther* 2011;10(4):591-602.

40. Montano R, Chung I, Garner KM, Parry D, Eastman A. Preclinical development of the novel Chk1 inhibitor SCH900776 in combination with DNA-damaging agents and antimetabolites. *Mol Cancer Ther* 2012;11(2):427-38.
41. Leung-Pineda V, Ryan CE, Piwnica-Worms H. Phosphorylation of Chk1 by ATR is antagonized by a Chk1-regulated protein phosphatase 2A circuit. *Mol Cell Biol* 2006;26(20):7529-38.
42. Bartek J, Lukas J. Chk1 and Chk2 kinases in checkpoint control and cancer. *Cancer Cell* 2003;3(5):421-9.
43. Liu Q, Guntuku S, Cui XS, Matsuoka S, Cortez D, Tamai K, et al. Chk1 is an essential kinase that is regulated by Atr and required for the G(2)/M DNA damage checkpoint. *Genes Dev* 2000;14(12):1448-59.
44. Tse AN, Rendahl KG, Sheikh T, Cheema H, Aardalen K, Embry M, et al. CHIR-124, a novel potent inhibitor of Chk1, potentiates the cytotoxicity of topoisomerase I poisons in vitro and in vivo. *Clin Cancer Res* 2007;13(2 Pt 1):591-602.
45. Wang J, Sakariassen PO, Tsinkalovsky O, Immervoll H, Boe SO, Svendsen A, et al. CD133 negative glioma cells form tumors in nude rats and give rise to CD133 positive cells. *Int J Cancer* 2008;122(4):761-8.
46. Suva ML, Rheinbay E, Gillespie SM, Patel AP, Wakimoto H, Rabkin SD, et al. Reconstructing and reprogramming the tumor-propagating potential of glioblastoma stem-like cells. *Cell* 2014;157(3):580-94.
47. Vlashi E, Kim K, Lagadec C, Donna LD, McDonald JT, Eghbali M, et al. In vivo imaging, tracking, and targeting of cancer stem cells. *J Natl Cancer Inst* 2009;101(5):350-9.
48. Cruceru ML, Neagu M, Demoulin JB, Constantinescu SN. Therapy targets in glioblastoma and cancer stem cells: lessons from haematopoietic neoplasms. *J Cell Mol Med* 2013;17(10):1218-35.
49. Ghosal G, Chen J. DNA damage tolerance: a double-edged sword guarding the genome. *Transl Cancer Res* 2013;2(3):107-29.
50. Fokas E, Prevo R, Pollard JR, Reaper PM, Charlton PA, Cornelissen B, et al. Targeting ATR in vivo using the novel inhibitor VE-822 results in selective sensitization of pancreatic tumors to radiation. *Cell Death Dis* 2012;3:e441.

Figure legends

Figure 1. GSCs are radioresistant with defective DDR

(A) Enrichment of stem cell markers SOX2, Nestin, CD133 and Olig2 under GSC culture condition compared to paired bulk populations in primary patient derived GBM cell lines. **(B)** Flow cytometry plots and summary showing relative expression of CD133 and CD15 in E2 and G7 GSC and bulk populations. **(C-D)** Clonogenic survival assays showing E2 and G7 GSCs are more radioresistant compared to the paired bulk populations. **(E)** Calculation of dose modifying factor (DMF) at 37% survival comparing E2 and G7 GSC vs bulk populations and *p* value associated with comparisons of DMF. **(F)** Plots summarising combined annexin V and PI staining or **(G)** fold induction in caspase 3/7 activity at 48 hours in E2 and G7 GSC and bulk populations following treatment with 15 or 30 Gy ionising radiation. Error bars show mean \pm SEM from *n*=3 independent experiments, * *p*<0.05, NS=non-significant.

Figure 2. GSCs have upregulated DDR proteins under basal condition and active CHK1 rapidly following IR

(A) Analysis of multiple DDR proteins under basal conditions in GSC or bulk populations in a panel of primary patient derived GBM cell lines. Loading control as shown in Figure 1A. **(B)** Immunohistochemistry analysis of orthotopic tumour section generated from E2 and G7 GSC and GBM patient specimen showing PARP1 and p-ATM staining. **(C)** Western blots showing rapid activation of DNA damage response markers at early time points in E2 GSC compared to bulk populations following 5Gy IR. **(D)** 24 hour time course highlighting CHK1 and phosphorylated CHK1 levels in E2 and G7 paired GSC and bulk populations following 5Gy IR. **(E)** Response of E2 bulk and GSC populations to various activators of CHK1: IR=5Gy, 1hr; UV=10Jm⁻², 1hr; HU=10mM, 3hr; Aphidicolin=1mM, 3hr, (* longer exposure).

Figure 3. Rapid activation of G2/M cell cycle checkpoint in GSCs following IR

Summary of flow cytometry data analysing mitotic p-His H3 S10 cell population to measure G2/M cell cycle checkpoint in paired E2 and G7 GSC and bulk populations. **(A)** 3 hour time course following 5Gy IR treatment showing a rapid activation of G2/M checkpoint in GSCs as measured by the time required to reduce mitotic population by 50%. **(B)** IR dose response showing E2 and G7 GSC populations require significantly lower dose of radiation compared to the bulk cells to activate G2/M checkpoint by 75% relative to unirradiated cells. **(C)** 12 hour IR time course showing E2 and G7 bulk cells exit the G2/M checkpoint significantly quicker than the paired GSC population as measured by the time required for mitotic cell population to return to baseline levels. Plots show mean \pm SEM, *n* \geq 3 independent experiments.

Figure 4. GSCs are radiosensitised by the CHK1 inhibitor SCH900776 (SCH)

(A) Inhibition of CHK1 in E2 GSCs following 1 hr pre-treatment with various concentrations of SCH followed by 120Jcm⁻² UV for 1hr. **(B)** Time course showing abrogation of IR induced CHK1 activation by pre-treatment of E2 GSCs with 3 μ M of SCH for 1hr (* denotes longer exposure). **(C)** Analysis of multiple biomarkers of CHK1 inhibition at 24 hours in E2 GSCs treated with various concentrations of SCH for 1hr followed by 5Gy IR. **(D)** Plots summarising flow cytometry data showing inhibition of IR induced G2/M checkpoint activation in E2 and G7 GSCs treated with 3 μ M SCH for 1hr followed by 5Gy IR, (mean \pm

SEM from $n \geq 3$ independent experiments, * $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$ relative to IR alone. **(E)** Clonogenic survival curves showing radiosensitisation of E2 and G7 GSC and bulk populations following 3 μ M of SCH treatment. **(F)** Summary of clonogenic data showing SER of GSC and bulk populations at 37% survival and SF at 4Gy in the presence or absence of SCH. * denotes $p < 0.05$ based on the 95% confidence intervals between SER of GSCs and bulk population or SF of GSC or bulk populations plus or minus SCH treatment. NS=Non significant.

Figure 5. Inhibition of CHK1 increases DNA damage, induces mitotic catastrophe and leads to genomic instability in irradiated GSC

(A) Representative flow cytometry plots showing the percentage of γ -H2AX positive cells in E2 GSC following 3 μ M SCH treatment for 1 hr followed by 5Gy IR treatment for 24 hours. **(B)** Bar chart summarising the percentage of γ -H2AX positive cells at 24 hours following treatment of E2 GSCs with various concentrations of SCH, error bars show mean + SEM, $n \geq 3$ independent experiments, * $p < 0.05$. **(C)** Representative flow cytometry plots from E2 bulk cells with summary comparing the percentage of γ -H2AX population to GSCs at 24 hours following 3 μ M SCH and 5Gy IR treatment. **(D)** Representative histogram plots from flow cytometry data showing the percentage of mitotic cells with high γ -H2AX at 24 hours following treatment with 3 μ M SCH and 5Gy IR. **(E)** Summary of flow cytometry data showing percentage of mitotic cells with high γ -H2AX at 24 hours following treatment of E2 GSC with various concentrations of SCH, error bars show mean + SEM, $n \geq 3$ independent experiments, * $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$. **(F)** Representative immunofluorescence images showing p-His H3 positive mitotic cells (green) with no/low γ -H2AX (red, top panel) or high γ -H2AX (middle panel). Image of cell undergoing mitotic catastrophe as marked by nuclear blebbing and high γ -H2AX (bottom panel). DAPI nuclear stain in blue. Bar charts summarising immunofluorescence data from analysis of ~ 75 mitotic cells. **(G)** Representative image and summary of the percentage of E2 GSCs with micronuclei (arrows) following treatment with 3 μ M SCH and IR for 24 hours, error bars show mean + SEM from scoring ~ 500 nuclei, * $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$).

Figure 6. GSC show enhanced DNA repair capacity following irradiation and/or CHK1 inhibition





Summary of flow cytometry data showing the percentage of **(A)** γ -H2AX positive cells, **(B)** mitotic cells with high γ -H2AX and **(C)** mitotic catastrophe (arrows) in paired G7 bulk and GSC populations at 24 hours following treatment with 3 μ M SCH and/or 5Gy IR, error bars show mean + SEM, $n \geq 3$ independent experiments, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$. **(D)** Bar chart summary of the percentage of G7 bulk and GSC with micronuclei following indicated treatment combination for 24 hours, error bars show mean + SEM from scoring ~ 600 nuclei, *** $p < 0.001$. **(E)** Representative immunofluorescence images of E2 GSC and bulk populations at 24 hours following 10Gy IR, γ -H2AX foci (green), CENPF (red) and DAPI (blue). **(F)** Plots showing median γ -H2AX foci per nucleus in E2 bulk and GSC CENPF positive or negative cells populations from scoring a minimum 65 (CENPF positive) or 300 (CENPF negative) nuclei, * $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$.

Figure 7. Enhanced radiosensitisation of GSCs by parallel inhibition of DNA repair and cell cycle checkpoint pathways

(A-B) Clonogenic survival curves in E2 GSC and bulk populations following treatment with multiple DDRi in combination with radiation. **(B)** Summary of SER at 37% survival in paired populations with 95% confidence interval, * $p < 0.05$ and NS=non-significant between GSC and bulk population. CHK1i data as shown previously in Figure 4E & 4F. **(C)** Inhibition of IR induced G2/M checkpoint activation in E2 GSCs following 5Gy IR treatment in the presence of various DDRi, significance relative to DMSO treatment (IR alone) are indicated; * $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$. **(D)** Plots showing median number of γ -H2AX foci in CENPF positive cells at 24 hours following treatment with IR in combination with DDRi, minimum of 65 nuclei scored; *** $p < 0.001$. **(E)** Neurosphere formation assay showing significant reduction in the number of neurospheres at 4 weeks following ATR+PARP1 inhibition in combination with radiation; ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$. **(F)** Clonogenic survival curves in E2 cells showing significant radiosensitisation of GSC over the bulk population as shown by the SER following combined treatment with ATR+PARP inhibitors in combination with radiation. ATMi data as shown in part A and B.

Figure 1

A Primary patient derived GBM cell lines



E

	DMF 0.37 (95% CI)	P value
E2	1.36 (1.15, 1.57)	
GSC vs Bulk		p = 0.001
G7	1.44 (1.22, 1.66)	
GSC vs Bulk		p < 0.001





Figure 2








Figure 3





G2/M₅₀ Index (t=min)
50% reduction in mitotic cells

	Bulk	GSC	<i>p</i>
E2	>180	39±11	NA
G7	87±13	58±6	0.0269



G2/M₇₅ Index (Gy)
75% reduction in mitotic cells

	Bulk	GSC	<i>p</i>
E2	5.3±1.8	2.6±0.1	0.0417
G7	3.4±0.3	1.5±0.6	0.0191



G2/M release (t=min)
Return to baseline mitotic levels

	Bulk	GSC	<i>p</i>
E2	513±48	859±28	0.0301
G7	557±75	802±25	0.0400

Figure 4




Figure 5




Figure 6




Figure 7

