Effect of gedunin on glioblastoma proliferation and invasiveness: *in vitro* and *in vivo* approaches

Thadeu Estevam Moreira Maramaldo Costa[a,b,*], Tatiana Almeida Pádua[b], Jonathas Xavier Pereira[c], Vinicius Gonçalves Rodrigues[c], Leonardo Noboru Seito[b], Erika Marques da Cunha[b], Claudio C. Filgueiras[d], Yael Abreu-Villaça[d], Alex C. Manhães[d], Clarissa Menezes Maya-Monteiro[e], Maria das Graças Henriques[b,f], Thomas Eichenberg Krahe[d,g], Carmen Penido[a,b]

[a] Centro de Desenvolvimento Tecnológico em Saúde, Instituto Nacional de Ciência e Tecnologia de Inovação em Doenças Negligenciadas (INCT-IDN), Fundação Oswaldo Cruz, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil.

[b] Laboratório de Farmacologia Aplicada, Instituto de Tecnologia em Fármacos (Farmanguinhos), Fundação Oswaldo Cruz, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil.

[c] Instituto de Patologia Tropical e Saúde Pública (IPTSP), Universidade Federal de Goiás (UFG), Goiás, Goiânia, Brasil.

[d] Laboratório de Neurofisiologia, Departamento de Ciências Fisiológicas, Instituto de Biologia Roberto Alcantara Gomes, Universidade do Estado do Rio de Janeiro (UERJ), Rio de Janeiro, Brazil.

[e] Laboratório de Imunofarmacologia, Instituto Oswaldo Cruz (IOC), Fundação Oswaldo Cruz, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil.

[f] Laboratório de Farmacologia Celular e Molecular, Departamento de Biologia Celular; Instituto de Biologia Roberto Alcântara Gomes, Universidade do Estado do Rio de Janeiro (UERJ), Rio de Janeiro, Brazil.

[g] Departamento de Psicologia, Pontifícia Universidade Católica do Rio de Janeiro (PUC-Rio), Rio de Janeiro, Brazil.

*Address correspondence to: Dr. Thadeu Costa, Laboratório de Farmacologia Aplicada, Departamento de Farmacologia Aplicada, Farmanguinhos, Fundação Oswaldo Cruz, Rua Sizenando Nabuco 100, Manguinhos, Rio de Janeiro, RJ, CEP 21041-250, Brazil, e-mail: thadeu.costa@fiocruz.br.

41   **Graphical Abstract**

43
44
45
Abstract (250 palavras)

Background Glioblastoma is the most invasive and malignant brain tumor, for which no

effective treatment is currently available. Heat shock protein 90 (HSP90) is a potential

target for the treatment of different types of cancer. Herein, we investigated the effect of

gedunin, an HSP90 inhibitor, in murine GL261 glioblastoma *in vitro* and *in vivo* models.

Methods: Gedunin effects were assessed by *in vitro* cell viability assay (MTT), apoptosis

(PI/Annexin staining), proliferation (CFSE), invasion (transmigration, scratch assay and

zymography), protein detection (western blot) and *in vivo* orthotopic glioblastoma model

(brain computed tomography and histology). **Results:** Gedunin treatment decreased

GL261 cell proliferation and triggered apoptosis in a concentration-dependent manner.

Gedunin also reduced GL261 cell migration and metalloproteinase-2 activity, suggesting

that it impairs glioblastoma cell invasion. Despite the reduction of total protein content in

gedunin-treated cells, the phosphorylation of STAT3 and ERK1/2 pathways was

enhanced within 24 h. *In situ* treatment with gedunin did not significantly reduce tumor

volume. Still, it reduced the tumor central area and the presence of vascular structures in

xenograft glioblastoma in C57BL/6 mice, a clinical feature associated with morbidity and

mortality. **Conclusion:** Gedunin inhibits murine glioblastoma cell growth and proliferation by inducing apoptosis.

Keywords: Brain tumor, GL261, limonoids, natural products.

List of abbreviations

17-AAG - 17-(Allylamino)-17-demethoxygeldanamycin/tanespimycin
AKT/PKB - protein kinase B
ARRIVE - Animal Research: Reporting of *In Vivo* Experiment
BCR/ABL - breakpoint cluster region/Abelson murine leukemia virus
CFSE - carboxyfluorescein succinimidyl ester
DMEM - Dulbecco´s modified Eagle´s medium
DMSO - dimethyl sulfoxide
EDTA - ethylenediamine tetraacetic acid
Erk ½ - extracellular signal-regulated kinases ½
FBS - Fetal bovine serum
FITC - fluorescein isothiocyanate
GAPDH - glyceraldehyde-3-phosphate dehydrogenase mouse
HER2/neu, ErbB2 - human epidermal growth factor receptor 2
HPF - high-power fields
HSP90 – Heat Shock Protein 90
IgG – immunoglobulin G
MMP - matrix metalloproteinase
MTT - 3-(4,5-dimethyl-2-thiazolyl)-2,5-diphenyl-2H-tetrazolium bromide
p44/42 MAPK - mitogen-activated protein kinase
PBS - phosphate buffer saline
PI -propidium iodide
SDS-PAGE - sodium dodecyl sulfate-polyacrylamide gel electrophoresis
Src - proto-oncogene c-Src

1. Introduction

Glioblastoma is a highly invasive and malignant tumor defined by the World Health Organization as grade IV, based on histological, immunohistochemical, and molecular features [1]. Patients bearing glioblastoma have a poor prognosis, with estimated median survival rates of eight months and a maximum five-year survival rate of only 5% [2,3].

The current standard protocol for glioblastoma treatment relies on total tumor excision followed by radiotherapy with concurrent and adjuvant chemotherapy with temozolomide [4]. The most common adverse events related to temozolomide treatment are myelosuppression and hepatotoxicity [5–7]. Another limiting factor of glioblastoma treatment is that most orally and intravenously administered alkylating agents induce resistance and have poor blood-brain barrier permeability [8,9]. An alternative strategy is the usage of intracranial wafer implants containing the alkylating agent carmustine after tumor removal surgery, which, in combination with radiochemotherapy, has been shown to significantly improve patient survival [10,11]. However, carmustine wafers induce severe side effects, such as cerebral edema and hematological toxicity [5,12,13]. Glioblastoma is still considered incurable [14]; however, treatments targeting multiple signaling pathways are a promising strategy [15].

Modulation of the chaperone heat shock protein 90 (HSP90) is considered a potential antitumor therapy, including gliomas [16–18]. HSP90 activity is implicated in several hallmarks of cancer, such as proliferation, invasion, metastasis, angiogenesis, and resistance to apoptosis [19]. Increased expression of HSP90 correlates with tumor malignancy and poor prognosis in different types of cancer, including breast, colon, and melanoma [20–23]. Indeed, HSP90 chaperones several proteins involved in oncogenic processes, including the human epidermal growth factor receptor 2 (HER2/neu; ErbB2), tyrosine-protein kinase Src (Src), protein kinase B (AKT/PKB), breakpoint cluster region/Abelson murine leukemia virus (BCR/ABL) and tumor protein 53 (p53) [24–26]. In line with this, encouraging pre-clinical data have been obtained with HSP90 inhibitors in different types of tumor cells and animal models, including lymphoma, melanoma, breast, and lung cancer [27–31]. Currently, in the National Institutes of Health (NIH) Clinical Trials database at ClinicalTrials.gov, there are more than a hundred registered trials (11 currently active) evaluating HSP90 inhibitors (alone or in combination with

other drugs) for the treatment of different types of cancer [32]. Worthy of note, off-target

toxicity, including ocular toxicity and hepatotoxicity, is a limiting factor for the use of

these substances [33,34].

Over the past two decades, our group and others have been studying the antitumoral and

anti-inflammatory effects of gedunin, a limonoid produced by vegetal species from the

Meliaceae family [35] or by semi-synthetic routes [36]. Gedunin negatively modulates

HSP90 activity by binding to the HSP90 co-chaperones p23 and cdc37 and, thus,

impairing the formation of the active HSP90 complex [37,38]. This limonoid has potent

antitumoral effects demonstrated against an array of tumor types *in vivo* and *in vitro*

[37,39–42]. Gedunin anti-tumoral effect on glioblastoma has been shown *in vitro* human

cells lines U87 and U251 [43,44]. However, this effect has been observed in only a few

studies using cell lines. Therefore, further efforts are needed to reproduce previous

findings and to further investigate the anti-glioblastoma effect of gedunin in an *in vivo*

model. In the present study, we used the murine GL261 cell line in *in vitro* assays to

translate the data obtained *in vitro* to a syngeneic *in vivo* model, using the well-established

orthotopic *in vivo* glioblastoma model.

2. Materials and Methods

2.1 Reagents and antibodies

Gedunin (Gaia Chemicals, USA) and the specific HSP90 inhibitor 17-AAG (17-N-allylamino-17-demethoxygeldanamycin, Tanespimycin, Sigma-Aldrich, USA) were dissolved in DMSO (dimethyl sulfoxide, Sigma-Aldrich) and frozen at -86 °C until use. MTT (3-(4,5-dimethylthiazol-2-yl)-2,5-diphenyl tetrazolium bromide), Dulbecco´s modified Eagle´s medium (DMEM), phosphate buffer saline (PBS) tablet, and trypsin-EDTA (ethylenediamine tetraacetic acid) solution were purchased from Sigma Aldrich. Fetal bovine serum (FBS) was purchased from Cultilab (Brazil). Propidium iodide (PI) solution was obtained from Biolegend (USA). Vybrant™ CFDA-SE (carboxyfluorescein diacetate succinimidyl ester) Cell Tracer Kit and gentamicin were obtained from Thermo Fischer Scientific (USA). Annexin V-FITC (fluorescein isothiocyanate) conjugated was purchased from BD Pharmingen (USA). Antibodies against rabbit p44/42 MAPK (mitogen-activated protein kinase, Thr202/Tyr204, D13.14.4E), ERK1/2 (extracellular signal-regulated kinase 1/2, rabbit) and GAPDH (glyceraldehyde-3-phosphate dehydrogenase mouse, D4C6R) were purchased from Cell Signaling (USA). Anti-rabbit-IgG-HRP (horseradish peroxidase) secondary antibody was purchased from Santa Cruz Biotechnologies (USA). DNase I recombinant RNase free was purchased from Roche Life Sciences (Germany).

2.2 GL261 cell culture and treatment

Murine glioblastoma cell line (GL261, Cell Bank from Federal University of Rio de Janeiro - UFRJ, Brazil) was cultured in DMEM (Sigma Aldrich) supplemented with 10 % FBS (Cultilab) and 50 μg/mL gentamicin (Thermo Fisher Scientific) in humidified atmosphere (5 % CO_2 at 37 °C) until confluence. Cells were digested with 0.25 % trypsin at the 5th passage and washed with 1 × PBS. Cell viability was determined by trypan blue (Sigma Aldrich) staining under a light microscope, before further assays. GL261 cells were incubated with 6.25-100 μM of gedunin for 24-72 h at 37 °C, 5 % CO_2.

2.3 Animals

Adult male C57BL/6 mice (20-25 g) provided by Oswaldo Cruz Foundation (Fiocruz) breeding unit (Institute for Biomodels Science and Technology, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil)

were kept in standard autoclavable polypropylene boxes, with free access to food and
fresh water in environmentally controlled room temperature (ranging from 22 to 24 °C)
on a light/dark cycle at Farmanguinhos (Fiocruz, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil) and at the
Laboratory of Neurophysiology (State University of Rio de Janeiro, Rio de Janeiro,
Brazil) experimental animal facilities. Animal procedures were performed in accordance
with the ethical guidelines of the Brazilian National Council for the Control of Animal
Experimentation (CONCEA) and reported following the ARRIVE guidelines [45].
Experimental procedures were approved by the Ethics Commission on Animal Use of
Oswaldo Cruz Foundation (license #LW-35/16) and the Ethics Commission on Animal
Use of the State University of Rio de Janeiro (license #025/2017).
184

2.4 Primary mixed glial cell culture
Under sterile conditions, mouse brain cortex tissue was rapidly dissected from euthanized
(150 mg/kg sodium thiopental, i.p.) young adult (4-week-old) C57BL/6 male mice and
transferred to ice-cold DMEM/F12 media (Sigma Aldrich) in 6 well plates. After removal
of the meninges, brain tissue was cut into small pieces, and washed three times with 1x
sterile PBS (Sigma Aldrich). Trypsin-DNAse solution (0.25 % - 250 µg/mL) was added
to the wells and the plate was incubated for 1 h in an orbital shaker (Excella E24, New
Brunswick Scientific, USA) at 37 °C and 150 rpm. Tissue samples were vigorously
triturated and dissociated with a 1 mL pipette tip. Cells were washed with FBS-DNAse
solution (10 % - 250 µg/mL), added to a 20 % percoll gradient media, and centrifuged at
$800 \times g$ for 30 min at 25 °C. Recovered cells were washed ($400 \times g$, 10 min at 4 °C),
distributed in T-25 bottle flasks, and incubated at 37 °C, 5 % CO_2. DMEM/F12 media
was changed every 3-4 days until use. Data were collected from two independent
experiments (n=5 mice per group; license #LW-35/16).
199

2.5 Proliferation assay
GL261 cells (4×10^7/mL) were incubated with 5 µM CFSE solution (Invitrogen
Molecular Probes, USA) diluted in PBS for 15 min at 37 °C, 5 % CO_2. Cells were washed
with 10 % PBS/FBS solution, seeded in 24 well plates (2×10^5 cells per well), incubated
overnight, and treated with gedunin (6.25-100 µM) for 72 h. Cell proliferation was
evaluated by analyzing CFSE fluorescence intensity (FL1) upon cell divisions, by flow

cytometry (FACScalibur, Becton Dickinson, USA). Results were analyzed using FlowJo

X Software (Tree Star, Becton Dickinson).

2.6 MTT assay

GL261 or primary mixed glial cells were seeded in a 96 flat bottom well plate (2×10^4

cells/well) and cultured in DMEM for 24 h (CO_2 5 % at 37 °C) for adhesion. Adherent

cells were cultured with different concentrations of gedunin (6.25-100 μM), 17-AAG (1

μM), or temozolomide (100 μM) for 20 or 68 h, when MTT solution (5 mg/mL; 22.5

μL/well) was added to the culture and incubated for 4 h. The analyzes were performed at

24 and 72 h time points. Plates were centrifuged for 3 min ($720 \times g$ at 4 °C), the

supernatant was discharged and DMSO (150 μL/well) was added for formazan crystals

solubilization. The absorbance was read in a microplate reader (SpectraMax M5,

Molecular Devices, USA) at 540 nm.

2.7 Determination of apoptosis

Apoptosis was evaluated using annexin V-FITC and propidium iodide (PI) staining.

GL261 cells were seeded in 24 well cell culture plates (2×10^5 cells/well) and left to

adhere overnight. GL261 cells were then incubated with gedunin (6.25 - 100 μM) for 24

or 72 h, followed by trypsinization, resuspension in annexin V Binding Buffer (HEPES

10 mM pH 7.4, NaCl 140 mM, $CaCl_2$ 2.5 mM) and labeling with annexin V-FITC and PI

for 15 min at room temperature. Cells incubated with medium were used as the negative

control, whereas 17-AAG-incubated cells were used as the positive control. Staining was

analyzed by cytometry using FACScalibur (Becton Dickinson) and FlowJo Software

(Tree Star, Becton Dickinson). At least 10^4 cells were acquired per sample. Data are

presented in dot plots in a log scale of increasing FL-1 (annexin V-FITC) and FL-3 (PI)

intensity.

2.8 Scratch assay

GL261 cell monolayers, seeded into 6 well plates, were scratched at the center of the well,

and then the migration path was assessed at the leading edge of the scratch by phase-

contrast optical microscopy (100 ×, Olympus IX70, Japan) at indicated time points.

Analyses were performed using Image J software (National Institute of Health, USA)

[46]. The rate of migration was determined by quantifying the total distance that cells moved from the edge of the scratch toward the center of the scratch, as previously described **[47]**.

2.9 Chemotaxis assay

GL261 cell migration was assayed in a 48-well micro-chemotaxis Boyden chamber (Neuro Probe Inc., USA). The bottom wells of the chamber were filled with DMEM 10 % FBS (29 μL) or serum-free DMEM media as the negative control. Polycarbonate membrane filters with 8 μm pore size (Neuro Probe) were placed between the lower and upper chambers. GL261 cells were pre-treated with different concentrations of gedunin (6.25-25 μM) for 1 h in serum-free DMEM and then loaded into the upper wells of Boyden chamber (2×10^4 cells/50 μL/well). The chamber was incubated in a humidified atmosphere with 5 % CO_2 at 37 °C for 24 h. The membranes were removed and stained using a Diff-quick (Laborclin, Brazil). The bottom side of the membranes was visualized by light microscopy for counting GL261 migrating cells ($1000 \times$, Olympus IX70). GL261 chemotaxis was calculated and expressed as the mean number of migrated cells in ten random high-power fields (HPFs) per well (in quadruplicate).

2.10 Zymography

GL261 cells were plated (1×10^6/well) in a 6-well plate in DMEM. After 24 h, supernatant was removed, and cells were washed 3 times with pure DMEM to eliminate any FBS trace. Then, cells received gedunin (6.25-50 μM) or 17-AAG (1 μM) treatment in serum-free DMEM. After 48 h, the supernatant was collected and stored at -70 °C until lyophilization. Samples were dehydrated in a Gamma 2-16 LSCplus (Christ, Germany) ice condenser and, resuspended with 200 μL of zymography extraction buffer (Tris-HCl 50 mM pH 7.5, NaCl 0.2 M, Triton X-100 0.1 %, $CaCl_2$ 10 mM, protease inhibitor cocktail). Lowry method was used for protein quantitation. Enzymatic activity of matrix metalloproteinase (MMP)-2 was determined on a 10 % SDS-PAGE containing 0.1 % gelatin from porcine skin (Sigma Aldrich) [48].

2.11 Western blot

GL261 cells (1×10^5 cells) treated with gedunin (6.25-100 μM) or 17-AAG (1 μM) for

24 h were lysed in a buffer containing protease inhibitors. Protein extract (20 μg) was

resolved by SDS-PAGE, proteins were transferred to polyvinylidene difluoride (PVDF)

membranes (GE Healthcare, USA), and then probed with primary antibodies. Antibodies

were diluted in Tris-buffered saline containing 0.5 % Tween 20 and 5 % non-fat milk or

bovine serum albumin (BSA, Sigma -Aldrich, USA), and incubated overnight at 4 °C.

The membranes were incubated with horseradish peroxidase (HRP)-conjugated

secondary IgG (Santa Cruz Biotechnology) for 1 h at room temperature. The blots were

developed in a Hyperfilm with the use of a chemiluminescent substrate (ECL; Amersham

Biosciences, USA). The band intensity was quantified using ImageJ (NIH, USA), and

expressed in arbitrary units (a.u.). The raw intensity values of total proteins were

normalized using the values of the constitutive protein (GAPDH, used as loading control)

and of the control group (untreated cells) to allow comparison between different

experiments. The phospho-protein values were normalized by the specific total protein

content. Western blot membranes were stripped using harsh stripping buffer (SDS 10%

Tris HCl, pH 6.8, 0.5 M; 0.8 % ß-mercaptoethanol), at 50 °C for up to 45 min under

agitation in an orbital shaker (Excella E24, New Brunswick Scientific, USA). Stripping

was performed between the phospho and total proteins antibody incubations. Analyses

were performed using Image J software (NIH, USA)[46].

2.12 Orthotopic glioblastoma model and osmotic mini-pump implantation

Glioblastoma was induced in adult male C57BL/6 by stereotaxic injections of GL261

cells at the Laboratory of Neurophysiology experimental animal facility (UERJ, Rio de

Janeiro, Brazil). Mice were intraperitoneally anesthetized with 100 mg/kg ketamine

(Syntec, Brazil) and 10 mg/kg xylazine (Sedalex™ Venco, Brazil). Under sterile

conditions, a midline incision was made in the scalp, the skull was exposed to identify

bregma and lambda, and a small burr hole was drilled over the right hemisphere. GL261

cells (5×10^4/μL; final volume of 2 μL) were stereotaxically injected into the caudate

putamen with a 10 μL Hamilton syringe at the rate of 0.5 μL/min. The needle was slowly

removed 4 min after the injection was finished. The following coordinates (in mm) were

used for stereotaxic injections (anterior-posterior; medial-lateral; dorsal-ventral): 0.1

AP; 2.32 ML; 2.35 DV. Coordinates were based on the Cha et al., 2003 [49] descriptions

and confirmed on Paxinos and Franklin mouse brain atlas [50]. Fourteen days after

GL261 injections, animals were implanted with Alzet osmotic minipumps (model 2004,

0.25 µL/h; Durect Corporation, USA) filled with gedunin (250 µM, n=8) or DMSO (2.5

%, n=8). Cannulas (1-2 mm long) were placed into the site of the tumor following similar

surgical procedures described above. Treatment lasted between 14 and 17 days. Mice

were monitored every day for clinical signs of pain and distress, such as ruffled fur,

hunched back, trembling, convulsions, paralysis, and permanent recumbency [51]. If

signs of pain and distress were observed, the animal was excluded from the study and

euthanized. Data were collected from two independent experiments (n=8 randomized

mice per group). Mice were euthanized 28 days after GL261 injection with sodium

thiopental (150 mg/kg, i.p.).

2.13 Mouse Brain Computed Tomography Images

After 14-day treatment, anesthetized mice (100 mg/kg ketamine/10 mg/kg xylazine, i.p.)

were intravenously (i.v.) injected with 300 mg/mL of Omnipaque iohexol contrast (GE

Healthcare). Brains were scanned 3-6 min after contrast administration in a GE Highspeed

CT/E image system (Pedro Ernesto University Hospital, UERJ, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil),

according to the following protocol: 120 kV tube voltage, 55 mA, 1 mm slice thickness.

Images were reconstructed in a 256 x 256-pixel matrix using InVesalius 3.1.1 software

(developed by Centro de Tecnologia da Informação Renato Archer, CNPq, and Ministry

of Health, Brazil). Tumor volumetry was determined by selecting contrast-enhanced

regions of interest in coronal sections.

2.14 Histology of Brain Tissue

Euthanized mice (150 mg/kg sodium thiopental, i.p.) were perfused with 4 %

formaldehyde. Mouse brains were collected and transferred into a 4 % formaldehyde

solution for 2 days for tissue fixation. Brains were then sectioned and embedded in

paraffin. Coronal sections of brain tissue (5 µm) were made using a Shandon Finesse 325

microtome (Thermo Fisher Scientific). Brain slices were stained with hematoxylin

(Merck, USA) and eosin (Sigma Aldrich, USA). Tumor central area was measured using

Axioplan® software [52]. Lesion size, liquefactive necrosis area, vascular structures,

intratumoral hemorrhage, and mitosis were blindly analyzed in the central slice tumor

area. Lesion size area was defined by the percentage of tumor area relative to the size of

the total brain area in the slice. The liquefactive necrosis area was determined by the

percentage of necrosis area relative to lesion size. Vascular structures with their full

composition were counted in both intratumor and peritumoral regions. Intratumor

hemorrhage was described in a semi-quantitative form regarding the intensity at the slice,

with the following definitions: discrete (+), moderate (++), and intense (+++). Mitosis

was characterized by estimating the average amount of cells per analyzed field, and thus:

>50% (+), 50-75% (++), and >75% (+++). Multipoint brain slice images were composed

in NIS-Elements AR (Nikon Corporation). Each brain slice was analyzed by an observer

blind to the experimental groups.

2.15 Statistical Analysis

All analyses were performed using GraphPad Prism 8 (GraphPad Software, USA).

Western blot analyses were performed using the non-parametric Kruskal-Wallis test

followed by Dunnett's multiple comparisons. Histologic analyses were performed by

one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) and Tukey's post-test for multiple comparisons.

All other comparisons were carried out using one-way ANOVA followed by the Student-

Newman-Keuls test. Data are shown as the mean $\pm$ SEM (unless otherwise mentioned).

Significance was assumed either at the level of $p \leq 0.05$, $p \leq 0.01$, or $p \leq 0.001$, as

specified.

3. Results

3.1 Gedunin impairs GL261 cell growth and viability in vitro

To verify the effect of gedunin on GL261 cell growth, a 72 h CFSE proliferation assay was performed, in which staining decreases as cells proliferate. Incubation of CFDA-SE-stained GL261 cells with gedunin decreased cell proliferation in a concentration-dependent manner (**Fig. 1A**). Gedunin (25-100 μM) significantly inhibited GL261 cell growth, similar to what was observed with the selective HSP90 inhibitor 17-AAG (reference control). **Figure 1B** shows representative histograms of CFSE fluorescence intensity (FL-1) of GL261 cells depicted in **Figure 1A**.

The effect of gedunin on cell viability was evaluated by the MTT assay. The incubation of GL261 cells with gedunin decreased mitochondrial function in a concentration-dependent manner within 24 and 72 h (**Fig. 1C**). MTT assay was also performed on primary mixed glial cells to evaluate gedunin toxicity to non-tumoral cells. Gedunin effect on primary mixed glial cells was less toxic, and higher concentrations were required to induce cell death when compared to GL261 cells (**Fig. 1C**). The half-maximal inhibitory concentration [IC50] of gedunin on GL261 cells was 2.3 times lower than the IC_{50} observed on primary glial cells (**Fig. 1D**). Temozolomide, the first-line treatment for glioblastoma, also reduced GL261 viability within 72 h in a concentration-dependent manner (**Suppl. Fig. 1**). Considering the antiproliferative and cytotoxic effects of gedunin on GL261 cells, we further examined whether this limonoid induced apoptosis.

Figure 1. *Gedunin impairs GL261 cell proliferation.* (A) Effect of gedunin (6.25-100 μM) and 17-AAG (1 μM) on GL261 cell proliferation evaluated by CFSE staining and analyzed by FACScalibur (BD Biosciences) 72 h after incubation. Results are expressed as the mean ± SEM of median fluorescence intensity (MFI) from triplicate wells from three independent experiments. (B) Representative histogram shows CFSE fluorescence intensity (FL-1) from one experiment. (C) Effect of gedunin (6.25-100 μM) and 17-AAG (1 μM) on GL261 cell viability evaluated by MTT reduction assay (SpectraMax M5, Molecular Devices) 24 and 72 h after incubation. (D) IC50 values of gedunin treatment on GL261 and glial mixed cells 72 h after incubation. SI: selectivity index.

3.2 Gedunin induces GL261 cell apoptosis in vitro

Apoptosis is regulated by a series of signaling events that include disruption of the mitochondrial membrane and phosphatidylserine externalization [53,54]. Membrane

phosphatidylserine staining by annexin V-FITC revealed that gedunin induced apoptosis

of GL261 cells in a concentration- and time-dependent manner (**Fig. 2A**). Apoptosis was

detected 24 h after treatment, and surpassed 90 % within 72 h, at the highest

concentrations. Representative dot plots of PI$^+$ and annexin V$^+$ cells are shown in **Figure**

2B. Apoptotic cells are characterized by reduced forward scatter and increased side scatter

[55–57]. Indeed, GL261 cells incubated with gedunin diminished FSC-H and increased

SSC-H intensities, when compared to non-treated cells (**Fig. 2C**), supporting results

shown in Figures 2 A and B. Representative dot-plots of the effect of 17-AAG (1 µM) on

GL261 apoptosis (24 h and 72 h) is available on **Supplemental Figure 2**.

Figure 2. *Gedunin induces time- and concentration-dependent GL261 apoptosis.* (A)
Effect of gedunin (6.25-100 μM) on GL261 cell (2 × 10^4/well) apoptosis evaluated by
propidium iodide and annexin V-FITC staining MTT (FacsCalibur – BD Biosciences) 24
h and 72 h after incubation. Results are expressed as the mean ± SEM of viability
percentage from triplicates wells from three independent experiments (24 well plates). *
indicates statistically significant differences (p ≤ 0.05) between treated and untreated
cells. (B) Representative dot plots of flow cytometry analysis of gedunin-treated GL261
cells labeled with annexin V-FITC and PI after 24 and 72 h incubation. (C) Representative

contour plots of SSC-H and FSC-H of gedunin-treated (6.25 - 100 µM) GL261 cells after

72 h.

3.3 Gedunin impairs GL261 cell migration and invasiveness in vitro

Tumor cell migration is an earlier step in cancer dissemination and invasion [58,59].

Scratch assay shows that gedunin (12.5 and 25 µM) reduced GL261 cell migration when

compared to the untreated group within 24 h, 48 h, and 72 h (**Fig. 3A, B**). Confirming

results obtained in the scratch assay, reduction of chemotaxis was also observed in the

Boyden chamber migration assay, in which gedunin treatment (25 µM) impaired cell

migration within 48 h (**Fig. 3C**).

Extracellular matrix remodeling by the proteolytic activity of tumor cell matrix

metalloproteinases (MMPs) is a crucial step for tumor cell invasion in the surrounding

tissue [60]. Gedunin also reduced the activity of MMP-2 (**Fig. 3D**), suggesting that this

limonoid impairs different mechanisms associated with tumor cell invasion.

(A)

(B)

(C)

FBS	−	+	+	+	+
Ged (μM)	−	−	+	+	+
			6.25	12.5	25

(D)

Figure 3. *Gedunin impairs in vitro GL261 cell migration and invasiveness.* (A) Microscopic views of *the in vitro* scratch assay. GL261 migration into the scratched area 24-72 h after gedunin treatment (6.25-25 μM). (B) Percentages of GL261 cell migration calculated as the ratio of uncovered area (24-72 h) by the initial scratched area (0 h). Results are expressed as the mean ± SEM from two independent experiments (6 well plates). (C) Boyden chamber chemotaxis assay demonstrating the number of gedunin-treated or untreated cells per 15 high power fields (HPF) after 24 h migration. Results are expressed as the mean ± SEM from quadruplicate wells. (D) MMP-2 activity of GL261 cell supernatant assessed by zymography assay 48 h after gedunin treatment (6.25-50 μM). Results are expressed as the mean ± SEM from two independent experiments. * Indicates statistically significant differences ($p \leq 0.05$) between treated and untreated cells, whereas # indicates statistically significant differences ($p \leq 0.05$) between stimulated and unstimulated cells. FBS: fetal bovine serum.

3.4 Gedunin modulates signaling proteins in GL261 cells

Ras/ERK is one of the main pro-survival pathways in glioblastoma cells [61,62]. Phosphorylation of ERK 1/2 (pERK) was induced by gedunin (**Fig. 4A-C**) whereas the immunostaining of total ERK1/2 was reduced (**Fig. 4D**). It is noteworthy that the staining of GAPDH, used as loading control, was also reduced (**Fig. 4A**; replicates in **Suppl. Fig. 3**) which may be explained by the induction of apoptosis and cell death. GL261 treatment with 17-AAG also reduced total protein content but did not induce ERK phosphorylation within the 24 h incubation.

Figure 4. *Gedunin activates ERK 1/2 pathway.* Western blot analysis of the effect of gedunin (6.25 – 100 μM) on intracellular signaling proteins, 24 h after treatment. (A) Representative immunoblots of one experiment out of 8 independent experiments with a similar trend. Box plots of (B) pERK/ERK, (C) pERK/GAPDH and (D) ERK/GAPDH on GL261 cells. 17-AAG was used as the reference control of HSP90 activity inhibition. GAPDH was used as the loading control. Results are expressed as the mean ± SEM of protein expression from six independent experiments. * indicates statistically significant differences (p ≤ 0.05) between treated and untreated cells. Please find the uncropped blots in supplemental figure 3.

3.5 Gedunin effect on glioblastoma in vivo

The orthotopic C57BL/6 mouse glioblastoma model used in the present study has been established as a standard procedure to reproduce human molecular and histological features of glioblastoma [63,64]. Biodistribution data obtained by our group show that ^{99m}Tc-labeled-gedunin did not reach substantial levels in the brain tissue when intravenously injected in mice (Costa et al., *manuscript in preparation*). We, therefore, assessed whether gedunin *in vivo* treatment was effective by using osmotic pumps placed *in situ.*

Computed tomography (CT) scans revealed solid tumor growth that occupied an extensive area of the brain tissue of mice from all groups (white mass, top panels in black background of **Fig. 5A,** indicated by an asterisk in the upper left image scan). Three-dimensional reconstructions of CT images are shown in **Figure 5** bottom panels, in which tumor mass is represented by white over gray (brain) areas. Even though tumor volume median values (mm^3) of gedunin-treated mice were smaller than those for untreated or DMSO-injected mice, variability within groups was high (lowest and highest tumor volume values for each group were: untreated, 21.7 - 75.6; DMSO, 16.8 - 83.6; GED, 11.7 - 67.4). No significant differences were observed between groups (ANOVA, p = 0.106; **Fig. 5B, C**). **Supplemental Figure 4** shows CT of mouse brains with and without tumors, for a better illustration of the tumor mass. Body mass (g) was measured before GL261 injection and 28 days later, and no alterations were observed (data not shown).

Figure 5. *Tumor size analysis of gedunin-treated mice.* (A) Representative sequential coronal CT-images and respective 3D brain reconstructions (dorsal view) from untreated, DMSO-injected and gedunin (250 μM)-treated mice. Lighter regions in 3D reconstructions represent brain tumors. Images were acquired after 14 days of *in situ* treatment (Alzet® osmotic minipumps) in GL261 cell-injected mice (1×10^5 cells/brain/2 μL). Boxplot graphs show tumor volume values (B) and the ratio between tumor and mouse brain volume values (C) from 6-8 mice per group out of 2 independent experiments. Tumor volumetry was determined by selecting contrast-enhanced regions of interest in coronal sections using InVesalius 3.1.1 software. CT: Computed Tomography. The white area corresponds to the glioblastoma observed in all CT scans. Dashed line: coronal slice cut point. Results are expressed as the mean ± SEM of tumor volume measurements from two independent experiments.

Because clinical CT scanners are designed for imaging human brains, which have volumes roughly 3,000 times larger than those of mice [65–67], the limited spatial resolution may not be precise enough to reliably assess treatment responses in small murine brains [68,69]. To address this limitation, we investigated whether differences between groups could be detected by analyzing tumor area from histological sections. Indeed, **Figure 6** illustrates that gedunin-treated mice had reduced tumor central area (see

Methods section). In addition, gedunin-treated brain tumors displayed fewer vascular

structures **(Table 1 and Supplemental Figure 5).**

Figure 6. *Tumor size analysis of gedunin-treated mice.* Representative images of coronal

mouse brain slices stained with hematoxylin and eosin showing the tumor central area

(100 × magnification) of (A) untreated, (B) DMSO-, and (C) gedunin-treated mice (n=8

per group) 28 days after GL261 cell implantation. (D) Boxplot graph displaying tumor

central area values measured in histological brain sections. Results are expressed as the

mean ± SEM of tumor central area measurements from two independent experiments.

** Indicates statistically significant differences ($p \leq 0.05$) between gedunin-treated and

DMSO-treated cells.

Table 1. **Glioblastoma histology features after gedunin *in vivo* treatment**

	Untreated	**DMSO**	**Gedunin**	**p**
Vascular Structures	13	32	8	P< 0.05 *
Liquefactive Necrosis	9.6%	10.6%	8.8%	NS
Intratumoral Hemorrhage	+	++	++	NS

Mitosis	+	++	+	NS

Table 1. *Glioblastoma histology features after gedunin in vivo treatment.* Table shows absolute and semi-quantitative description of the histological analyses of brain slices and p-values of gedunin-treated vs DMSO-treated mice, analyzed by Tukey's post-test. NS= non-significant; += discrete; ++= moderate.

4. Discussion

Uncontrolled proliferation and apoptosis resistance are central features of tumor development, being major targets for cancer treatment [19]. HSP90 is a key factor for tumor growth, since it chaperones several essential proteins involved in oncogenic processes. In the present study, we demonstrate that gedunin, a natural occurring HSP90 inhibitor, impairs murine glioblastoma cell growth *in vitro*, by arresting proliferation and inducing cell death in non-toxic concentrations to primary mouse brain cells. As previously shown in human cell lines [43,44], gedunin reduced murine glioblastoma cell migration, tumor-related signaling pathways, and extracellular metalloproteinase MMP-2 activity, features involved in glioblastoma growth. GL261-orthotopically injected C57BL/6 mice treated with gedunin had reduced presence of vascular structures, an important hallmark of tumor maintenance and growth.

Gedunin and other HSP90-binding agents induce the expression of HSP70 in cancer cells due to HSP90 inhibition (**Suppl. Figure 6**) [70–72] and show antiproliferative and cytotoxic effects against different tumor cells [37,39–42]. HSP90 inhibitors have increased affinity to the HSP90 machinery expressed by tumor cells [16]. This supports our data showing that gedunin toxicity against GL261 cells was achieved at a concentration lower than half of the required against primary glial cells [73]. Gedunin-triggered apoptosis, detected by phosphatidylserine exposure on the cell surface, was confirmed by flow cytometric analysis of cell physical criteria that showed the reduced size and increased granularity of apoptotic cells, due to the formation of apoptotic bodies and plasma membrane blebbing [55]. Our results clearly show that, as apoptosis progresses, GL261 cell FSC becomes progressively lower (likely due to cell dehydration and shrinkage), whereas SSC increases, due to cytoplasm and nuclear condensation [55,57].

Glioblastoma is a highly invasive and diffuse tumor that requires cell migration and extracellular matrix degradation to spread to adjacent tissue [74,75]. Scratch and

chemotaxis assays showed that gedunin diminished GL261 migration, in concentrations and time points lower than the ones that induced cytotoxicity. Another way by which gedunin controls tumor invasiveness is by inhibiting MMP-2 activity, with a higher effect than 17-AAG. Indeed, HSP90 stabilizes and promotes the activation of extracellular MMP-2, being crucial for GL261 and HT-1080 tumor cell invasion [76,77].

Although total ERK ½ was reduced, gedunin promoted a strong sustained (24 h) ERK1/2 activation/phosphorylation, corroborating previous work which demonstrate that HSP90 inhibition can also prompt the phosphorylation/activation of ERK [78,79]. The activation of ERK ½ pathway is associated with mechanisms involved in GBM development such as proliferation, invasion, metabolism, and death [80,81]. However, depending on the cell type and stimulus, ERK ½ sustained activation can promote cell cycle arrest, autophagic vacuolization, or caspase activation leading to cell senescence, autophagy, or apoptosis, respectively [82–84], mechanisms that might be involved in the reduced levels of GL261 cell proliferation, migration, and induced programmed cell death observed in this work.

As previously mentioned in the results section, even though our findings indicate that gedunin fits the predicted ADMET criteria for druggability and BBB permeation, systemic (i.v.) administration of ^{99m}TC-labeled gedunin failed to reach the brain tissue at substantial levels (Costa *et al.*, manuscript in preparation). Hence, we used gedunin-filled Alzet® minipumps to perform *in situ* treatment (resembling the FDA-approved Gliadel® [carmustine] implants) to ensure that gedunin would be available at the tumor site. It is important to note that the residual volume of gedunin inside the minipumps was measured at the end of treatment to ensure that gedunin was released *in situ* (values shown in **Suppl. Table 1**). It is important to emphasize the limitations of the CT mouse brain image acquisition using a clinical CT scanner, since the limited spatial resolution of clinical CT scanners might not be precise enough to analyze such a small brain [68,69]. While our findings reinforce the feasibility of using clinical CT scanners for *in vivo* brain tumor imaging in mice, their use for detecting treatment responses in tumor volume requires further investigation. Another limitation of our study is that mouse tumor sizes were not evaluated over time, since CT scan was only feasible in mice with no minipump implants, due to the stainless steel of brain infusion cannulas.

As expected, GL261-injections triggered the development of mouse glioblastoma in orthotopically-injected C57BL/6 mice with liquefactive necrosis, hemorrhage, mitosis,

and increased vascular structures [63]. *In situ* treatment with gedunin significantly
reduced tumor central area and the presence of vascular structures, which might decrease
tumor nutritional supply.
The severity and the poor prognosis of patients bearing glioblastoma call for new
therapeutic targets and drugs. Data presented in this paper sheds light on alternative
treatments for this type of tumor by revealing GL261 dependency of HSP90 and gedunin
as a potential lead compound.
597

Funding
This work was supported by the Carlos Chagas Filho Research Support Foundation
(FAPERJ), the Coordination for the Improvement of Higher Education Personnel
(CAPES), the Brazilian agency National Council for Scientific and Technological
Development (CNPq), and the Oswaldo Cruz Foundation (Fiocruz). CP, MGMO, and
ACM hold fellowships from CNPq. TEMMC was a PhD student from the Graduate
Program in Cell and Molecular Biology (IOC/Fiocruz).
605

606 ***Conflict of interest***
607 The authors declare no conflict of interest.
608

Author contributions
CP, TEMMC, and TEK conceived and designed the work. TEMMC, CP, TEK, ACM,
and MGH designed experiments. TEMMC, CP, TAP, LNS, EMC, CCF, CMMM, JXP,
VGR, YAV, and TEK performed the experiments, acquired, and/or analyzed data. CP,
TEK, ACM, JXC, and MGH contributed with funding and resources. CP supervised the
work. CP and TEMMC wrote the original draft. CMMM and TEK wrote and revised the
manuscript. All authors revised and edited the final manuscript.
616

617 ***Acknowledgments***
618 The authors gratefully acknowledge Dr. André Luis Peixoto Candéa, D.Sc. Erika Tatiana
619 Muñoz, Dr. Samara Cristina Ferreira Machado, Edson Santos Silva, Filipe Leal Portilho,
620 Ubirajara Ribeiro, and Maria Heloisa Oliveira for technical support. We also thank the

References

[1]   Louis DN, Perry A, Reifenberger G, Deimling AV, Figarella D, Webster B, et
al. The 2016 World Health Organization Classification of Tumors of the Central
Nervous System : a summary. Acta Neuropathol (Berl) 2016.
https://doi.org/10.1007/s00401-016-1545-1.
[2]   Ostrom QT, Price M, Neff C, Cioffi G, Waite KA, Kruchko C, et al. CBTRUS
Statistical Report: Primary Brain and Other Central Nervous System Tumors Diagnosed
in the United States in 2016—2020. Neuro-Oncol 2023;25:iv1–99.
https://doi.org/10.1093/neuonc/noad149.
[3]   Delgado-López PD, Corrales-García EM. Survival in glioblastoma: a review on
the impact of treatment modalities. Clin Transl Oncol 2016;18:1062–71.
https://doi.org/10.1007/s12094-016-1497-x.
[4]   Stupp R, Mason WP, van den Bent MJ, Weller M, Fisher B, Taphoorn MJ, et al.
Radiotherapy plus concomitant and adjuvant temozolomide for glioblastoma. N Engl J
Med 2005;352:987–96. https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMoa043330.
[5]   Niewald M, Berdel C, Fleckenstein J, Licht N, Ketter R, Rübe C. Toxicity after
radiochemotherapy for glioblastoma using temozolomide - a retrospective evaluation.
Radiat Oncol 2011;6:141. https://doi.org/10.1186/1748-717X-6-141.
[6]   Dinnes J, Cave C, Huang S, Milne R. A rapid and systematic review of the
effectiveness of temozolomide for the treatment of recurrent malignant glioma. Br J
Cancer 2002;86:501–5. https://doi.org/10.1038/sj.bjc.6600135.
[7]   Attarian F, Taghizadeh-Hesary F, Fanipakdel A, Javadinia SA, Porouhan P,
PeyroShabany B, et al. A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis on the Number of
Adjuvant Temozolomide Cycles in Newly Diagnosed Glioblastoma. Front Oncol
2021;11:1–6. https://doi.org/10.3389/fonc.2021.779491.
[8]   Lechapt-Zalcman E, Levallet G, Dugué AE, Vital A, Diebold M-D, Menei P, et
al. O6-methylguanine-DNA methyltransferase (MGMT) promoter methylation and low
MGMT-encoded protein expression as prognostic markers in glioblastoma patients
treated with biodegradable carmustine wafer implants after initial surgery followed by
radiotherapy w. Cancer 2012;118:4545–54. https://doi.org/10.1002/cncr.27441.
[9]   Jena Lynnand McErlean E and MH, Jena L, McErlean E, McCarthy H. Delivery
across the blood-brain barrier: nanomedicine for glioblastoma multiforme. Drug Deliv
Transl Res 2020;10:304–18. https://doi.org/10.1007/s13346-019-00679-2.
[10]   McGirt MJ, Than KD, Weingart JD, Chaichana KL, Attenello FJ, Olivi A, et al.
Gliadel (BCNU) wafer plus concomitant temozolomide therapy after primary resection
of glioblastoma multiforme. J Neurosurg JNS 2009;110:583–8.
https://doi.org/10.3171/2008.5.17557.
[11]   Qi Z, Xing W, Shao C, Yang C, Wang Z. The role of Gliadel wafers in the
treatment of newly diagnosed GBM: a meta-analysis. Drug Des Devel Ther
2015;9:3341. https://doi.org/10.2147/DDDT.S85943.

[12] Reithmeier T, Graf E, Piroth T, Trippel M, Pinsker MO, Nikkhah G. BCNU for
recurrent glioblastoma multiforme: efficacy, toxicity and prognostic factors. BMC
Cancer 2010;10:30. https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2407-10-30.
[13] Bregy A, Shah AH, Diaz MV, Pierce HE, Ames PL, Diaz D, et al. The role of
Gliadel wafers in the treatment of high-grade gliomas. Expert Rev Anticancer Ther
2013;13:1453–61. https://doi.org/10.1586/14737140.2013.840090.
[14] Alexandru O, Purcaru S, Tataranu L, Lucan L, Castro J, Folcuţi C, et al. The
Influence of EGFR Inactivation on the Radiation Response in High Grade Glioma. Int J
Mol Sci 2018;19:229. https://doi.org/10.3390/ijms19010229.
[15] Tanaka S, Louis DN, Curry WT, Batchelor TT, Dietrich J. Diagnostic and
therapeutic avenues for glioblastoma : no longer a dead end ? Nat Rev Clin Oncol
2012;10:14–26. https://doi.org/10.1038/nrclinonc.2012.204.
[16] Trepel J, Mollapour M, Giaccone G, Neckers L. Targeting the dynamic HSP90
complex in cancer. Nat Rev Cancer 2010;10:537–49. https://doi.org/10.1038/nrc2887.
[17] Sasame J, Ikegaya N, Kawazu M, Natsumeda M, Hayashi T, Isoda M, et al.
HSP90 Inhibition Overcomes Resistance to Molecular Targeted Therapy in
BRAFV600E-mutant High-grade Glioma. Clin Cancer Res 2022;28:2425–39.
https://doi.org/10.1158/1078-0432.CCR-21-3622.
[18] Wei S, Yin D, Yu S, Lin X, Savani MR, Du K, et al. Antitumor Activity of a
Mitochondrial-Targeted HSP90 Inhibitor in Gliomas. Clin Cancer Res 2022;28:2180–
95. https://doi.org/10.1158/1078-0432.CCR-21-0833.
[19] Hanahan D. Hallmarks of Cancer: New Dimensions. Cancer Discov
2022;12:31–46. https://doi.org/10.1158/2159-8290.CD-21-1059.
[20] Cheng Q, Chang JT, Geradts J, Neckers LM, Haystead T, Spector NL, et al.
Amplification and high-level expression of heat shock protein 90 marks aggressive
phenotypes of human epidermal growth factor receptor 2 negative breast cancer. Breast
Cancer Res 2012;14:R62. https://doi.org/10.1186/bcr3168.
[21] Kubota H, Yamamoto S, Itoh E, Abe Y, Nakamura A, Izumi Y, et al. Increased
expression of co-chaperone HOP with HSP90 and HSC70 and complex formation in
human colonic carcinoma. Cell Stress Chaperones 2010;15:1003–11.
https://doi.org/10.1007/s12192-010-0211-0.
[22] McCarthy MM, Pick E, Kluger Y, Gould-Rothberg B, Lazova R, Camp RL, et
al. HSP90 as a marker of progression in melanoma. Ann Oncol 2008;19:590–4.
https://doi.org/10.1093/annonc/mdm545.
[23] Pick E, Kluger Y, Giltnane JM, Moeder C, Camp RL, Rimm DL, et al. High
HSP90 expression is associated with decreased survival in breast cancer. Cancer Res
2007;67:2932–7. https://doi.org/10.1158/0008-5472.CAN-06-4511.
[24] Schopf FH, Biebl MM, Buchner J. The HSP90 chaperone machinery. Nat Rev
Mol Cell Biol 2017;18:345–60. https://doi.org/10.1038/nrm.2017.20.
[25] Fukuyo Y, Hunt CR, Horikoshi N. Geldanamycin and its anti-cancer activities.
Cancer Lett 2010;290:24–35. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.canlet.2009.07.010.
[26] Blagosklonny MV. Hsp-90-associated oncoproteins: Multiple targets of
geldanamycin and its analogs. Leukemia 2002;16:455–62.
https://doi.org/10.1038/sj.leu.2402415.
[27] Gaspar N, Sharp SY, Eccles SA, Gowan S, Popov S, Jones C, et al. Mechanistic
evaluation of the novel HSP90 inhibitor NVP-AUY922 in adult and pediatric
glioblastoma. Mol Cancer Ther 2010;9:1219–33. https://doi.org/10.1158/1535-
7163.MCT-09-0683.

[28]   Newman B, Liu Y, Lee HF, Sun D, Wang Y. HSP90 inhibitor 17-AAG
selectively eradicates lymphoma stem cells. Cancer Res 2012;72:4551–61.
https://doi.org/10.1158/0008-5472.CAN-11-3600.
[29]   Eccles SA, Massey A, Raynaud FI, Sharp SY, Box G, Valenti M, et al. NVP-
AUY922: a novel heat shock protein 90 inhibitor active against xenograft tumor growth,
angiogenesis, and metastasis. Cancer Res 2008;68:2850–60.
https://doi.org/10.1158/0008-5472.CAN-07-5256.
[30]   Kim HB, Lee SH, Um JH, Oh WK, Kim DW, Kang CD, et al. Sensitization of
multidrug-resistant human cancer cells to Hsp90 inhibitors by down-regulation of
SIRT1. Oncotarget 2015;6:36202–18. https://doi.org/10.18632/oncotarget.5343.
[31]   Shimamura T, Perera SA, Foley KP, Sang J, Rodig SJ, Inoue T, et al.
Ganetespib (STA-9090), a nongeldanamycin HSP90 inhibitor, has potent antitumor
activity in in vitro and in vivo models of non-small cell lung cancer. Clin Cancer Res
2012;18:4973–85. https://doi.org/10.1158/1078-0432.CCR-11-2967.
[32]   Clinical Trials 2020.
https://clinicaltrials.gov/ct2/results?cond=Cancer&term=HSP90+inhibitor&cntry=&stat
e=&city=&dist=.
[33]   Solit DB, Ivy SP, Kopil C, Sikorski R, Morris MJ, Slovin SF, et al. Cancer
Therapy : Clinical Phase I T rial of 17-Allylamino-17-Demethoxygeldanamycin in
Patients with Advanced Cancer 2007;13:1775–82. https://doi.org/10.1158/1078-
0432.CCR-06-1863.
[34]   Zhou D, Liu Y, Ye J, Ying W, Ogawa LS, Inoue T, et al. A rat retinal damage
model predicts for potential clinical visual disturbances induced by Hsp90 inhibitors.
Toxicol Appl Pharmacol 2013;273:401–9. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.taap.2013.09.018.
[35]   Hallur G, Sivramakrishnan A, Bhat SV. Three New Tetranortriterpenoids from
Neem Seed Oil. J Nat Prod 2002;65:1177–9. https://doi.org/10.1021/np0105174.
[36]   Brandt GEL, Schmidt MD, Prisinzano TE, Blagg BSJ. Gedunin, a novel hsp90
inhibitor: semisynthesis of derivatives and preliminary structure-activity relationships. J
Med Chem 2008;51:6495–502. https://doi.org/10.1021/jm8007486.
[37]   Patwardhan CA, Fauq A, Peterson LB, Miller C, Blagg BSJ, Chadli A. Gedunin
inactivates the co-chaperone p23 protein causing cancer cell death by apoptosis. J Biol
Chem 2013;288:7313–25. https://doi.org/10.1074/jbc.M112.427328.
[38]   Matts RL, Brandt GEL, Lu Y, Dixit A, Mollapour M, Wang S, et al. A
systematic protocol for the characterization of Hsp90 modulators. Bioorg Med Chem
2011;19:684–92. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bmc.2010.10.029.
[39]   Subramani R, Gonzalez E, Nandy SB, Arumugam A, Camacho F, Medel J, et al.
Gedunin inhibits pancreatic cancer by altering sonic hedgehog signaling pathway.
Oncotarget 2017;8:10891–904. https://doi.org/10.18632/oncotarget.8055.
[40]   Kamath SG, Chen N, Xiong Y, Wenham R, Apte S, Humphrey M, et al.
Gedunin, a novel natural substance, inhibits ovarian cancer cell proliferation. Int J
Gynecol Cancer 2009;19:1564–9. https://doi.org/10.1111/IGC.0b013e3181a83135.
[41]   Uddin SJ, Nahar L, Shilpi JA, Shoeb M, Borkowski T, Gibbons S, et al.
Gedunin, a limonoid from Xylocarpus granatum, inhibits the growth of CaCo-2 colon
cancer cell line in vitro. Phytother Res 2007;21:757–61.
https://doi.org/10.1002/ptr.2159.
[42]   Kishore T KK, Ganugula R, Gade DR, Reddy GB, Nagini S. Gedunin abrogates
aldose reductase, PI3K/Akt/mToR, and NF-κB signaling pathways to inhibit

angiogenesis in a hamster model of oral carcinogenesis. Tumor Biol 2016;37:2083–93.
https://doi.org/10.1007/s13277-015-4003-0.
[43]　Li H, Wu JG, Zhang HW, Wang W, Zhang YX, Zhang JN. Inhibition of
proliferation, invasion and migration in U-251 MG glioblastoma cell line by gedunin.
Int J Pharmacol 2018. https://doi.org/10.3923/ijp.2018.522.527.
[44]　Stouffer M, Wandling E, Dickson L, Lin S, Duan H, Powe E, et al. Gedunin
modulates cellular growth and apoptosis in glioblastoma cell lines. Cancer Rep
2024;7:e2051. https://doi.org/10.1002/cnr2.2051.
[45]　Kilkenny C, Browne WJ, Cuthill IC, Emerson M, Altman DG. Improving
Bioscience Research Reporting: The ARRIVE Guidelines for Reporting Animal
Research. PLOS Biol 2010;8:e1000412. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pbio.1000412.
[46]　Schneider CA, Rasband WS, Eliceiri KW. NIH Image to ImageJ: 25 years of
image analysis. Nat Methods 2012;9:671–5. https://doi.org/10.1038/nmeth.2089.
[47]　Liang C-C, Park AY, Guan J-L. In vitro scratch assay: a convenient and
inexpensive method for analysis of cell migration in vitro. Nat Protoc 2007;2:329–33.
https://doi.org/10.1038/nprot.2007.30.
[48]　Esteve PO, Tremblay P, Houde M, St-Pierre Y, Mandeville R. In vitro
expression of MMP-2 and MMP-9 in glioma cells following exposure to inflammatory
mediators. Biochim Biophys Acta - Mol Cell Res 1998;1403:85–96.
https://doi.org/10.1016/S0167-4889(98)00020-2.
[49]　Cha S, Johnson G, Wadghiri YZ, Jin O, Babb J, Zagzag D, et al. Dynamic ,
Contrast-Enhanced Perfusion MRI in Mouse Gliomas : Correlation With
Histopathology 2003;855:848–55. https://doi.org/10.1002/mrm.10446.
[50]　Paxinos G, Franklin KBJ. The mouse brain in stereotaxic coordinates: hard
cover edition. Acad Press 2001;2nd Editio:360.
[51]　CCAC GUIDELINES. Can Vet J 2003;44:631.
[52]　Pereira JX, Azeredo MCB, Martins FS, Chammas R, Oliveira FL, Santos SN, et
al. The deficiency of galectin-3 in stromal cells leads to enhanced tumor growth and
bone marrow metastasis. BMC Cancer 2016;16:636. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12885-
016-2679-1.
[53]　Vermes I, Haanen C, Steffens-Nakken H, Reutellingsperger C. A novel assay for
apoptosis Flow cytometric detection of phosphatidylserine expression on early apoptotic
cells using fluorescein labelled Annexin V. J Immunol Methods 1995;184:39–51.
https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-1759(95)00072-I.
[54]　Barroso G, Taylor S, Morshedi M, Manzur F, Gaviño F, Oehninger S.
Mitochondrial membrane potential integrity and plasma membrane translocation of
phosphatidylserine as early apoptotic markers: a comparison of two different sperm
subpopulations. Fertil Steril 2006;85:149–54.
https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fertnstert.2005.06.046.
[55]　Skommer J, Wlodkowic D, Telford W, Skommer J, Darzynkiewicz Z. Apoptosis
and beyond: cytometry in studies of programmed cell death. Methods Cell Biol
2011;103:55–98. https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-385493-3.00004-8.
[56]　Schmid I, Uittenbogaart CH, Giorgi JV. Sensitive method for measuring
apoptosis and cell surface phenotype in human thymocytes by flow cytometry.
Cytometry 1994;15:12–20. https://doi.org/10.1002/cyto.990150104.
[57]　Ormerod MG, Paul F, Cheetham M, Sun X -M. Discrimination of apoptotic
thymocytes by forward light scatter. Cytometry 1995;21:300–4.
https://doi.org/10.1002/cyto.990210311.

[58]   Wells A, Grahovac J, Wheeler S, Ma B, Lauffenburger D. Targeting tumor cell
motility as a strategy against invasion and metastasis. Trends Pharmacol Sci
2013;34:283–9. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tips.2013.03.001.
[59]   Eddy RJ, Weidmann MD, Sharma VP, Condeelis JS. Tumor Cell Invadopodia:
Invasive Protrusions that Orchestrate Metastasis. Trends Cell Biol 2017;27:595–607.
https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tcb.2017.03.003.
[60]   Winkler J, Abisoye-Ogunniyan A, Metcalf KJ, Werb Z. Concepts of
extracellular matrix remodelling in tumour progression and metastasis. Nat Commun
2020;11:5120. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-020-18794-x.
[61]   Chen D, Zuo D, Luan C, Liu M, Na M, Ran L, et al. Glioma cell proliferation
controlled by ERK activity-dependent surface expression of PDGFRA. PLoS ONE
2014;9. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0087281.
[62]   Frattini V, Trifonov V, Chan JM, Castano A, Lia M, Abate F, et al. The
integrated landscape of driver genomic alterations in glioblastoma. Nat Genet
2013;45:1141–9. https://doi.org/10.1038/ng.2734.
[63]   Miyai M, Tomita H, Soeda A, Yano H, Iwama T, Hara A, et al. Current trends in
mouse models of glioblastoma. J Neurooncol 2017;135:423–32.
https://doi.org/10.1007/s11060-017-2626-2.
[64]   Newcomb EW, Zagzag D. CNS Cancer. CNS Cancer 2009:227–41.
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-60327-553-8.
[65]   Hofman MA. Size and Shape of the Cerebral Cortex in Mammals. Brain Behav
Evol 1988;32:17–26. https://doi.org/10.1159/000116529.
[66]   Hofman M. Evolution of the human brain: when bigger is better. vol. 8. 2014.
[67]   Welch A, Mingarelli M, Riedel G, Platt B. Mapping changes in mouse brain
metabolism with PET/CT. J Nucl Med Off Publ Soc Nucl Med 2013;54:1946–53.
https://doi.org/10.2967/jnumed.113.121509.
[68]   Palmowski K, Winz O, Rix A, Bzyl J, Behrendt FF, Verburg FA, et al. Accuracy
of a clinical PET/CT vs. a preclinical μPET system for monitoring treatment effects in
tumour xenografts. Eur J Radiol 2013;82:1318–24.
https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejrad.2013.01.028.
[69]   Kirschner S, Mürle B, Felix M, Arns A, Groden C, Wenz F, et al. Imaging of
Orthotopic Glioblastoma Xenografts in Mice Using a Clinical CT Scanner: Comparison
with Micro-CT and Histology. PLoS One 2016;11:e0165994.
https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0165994.
[70]   Kudryavtsev VA, Khokhlova AV, Mosina VA, Selivanova EI, Kabakov AE.
Induction of Hsp70 in tumor cells treated with inhibitors of the Hsp90 activity: A
predictive marker and promising target for radiosensitization. PLOS ONE
2017;12:e0173640-.
[71]   Bagatell R, Paine-Murrieta GD, Taylor CW, Pulcini EJ, Akinaga S, Benjamin IJ,
et al. Induction of a Heat Shock Factor 1-dependent Stress Response Alters the
Cytotoxic Activity of Hsp90-binding Agents1. Clin Cancer Res 2000;6:3312–8.
[72]   Kelland LR, Sharp SY, Rogers PM, Myers TG, Workman P. DT-Diaphorase
expression and tumor cell sensitivity to 17-allylamino, 17-demethoxygeldanamycin, an
inhibitor of heat shock protein 90. J Natl Cancer Inst 1999;91:1940–9.
[73]   BADISA RB, DARLING-REED SF, JOSEPH P, COOPERWOOD JS,
LATINWO LM, GOODMAN CB. Selective Cytotoxic Activities of Two Novel
Synthetic Drugs on Human Breast Carcinoma MCF-7 Cells. Anticancer Res
2009;29:2993 LP – 2996.

[74] Faisal SM, Comba A, Varela ML, Argento AE, Brumley E, Abel C, et al. The
complex interactions between the cellular and non-cellular components of the brain
tumor microenvironmental landscape and their therapeutic implications. vol. 12. 2022.
[75] Seker-Polat F, Pinarbasi Degirmenci N, Solaroglu I, Bagci-Onder T. Tumor Cell
Infiltration into the Brain in Glioblastoma: From Mechanisms to Clinical Perspectives.
Cancers 2022;14. https://doi.org/10.3390/cancers14020443.
[76] Newcomb EW, Lukyanov Y, Schnee T, Esencay M, Fischer I, Hong D, et al.
The geldanamycin analogue 17-allylamino-17-demethoxygeldanamycin inhibits the
growth of GL261 glioma cells in vitro and in vivo. Anticancer Drugs 2007;18:875–82.
https://doi.org/10.1097/CAD.0b013e3281430df8.
[77] Eustace BK, Sakurai T, Stewart JK, Yimlamai D, Unger C, Zehetmeier C, et al.
Functional proteomic screens reveal an essential extracellular role for hsp90 alpha in
cancer cell invasiveness. Nat Cell Biol 2004;6:507–14. https://doi.org/10.1038/ncb1131.
[78] Duron DI, Lei W, Barker NK, Stine C, Mishra S, Blagg BSJ, et al. Inhibition of
Hsp90 in the spinal cord enhances the antinociceptive effects of morphine by activating
an ERK-RSK pathway. Sci Signal 2020;13. https://doi.org/10.1126/scisignal.aaz1854.
[79] Streicher JM. The role of heat shock proteins in regulating receptor signal
transduction. Mol Pharmacol 2019;95:468–74. https://doi.org/10.1124/mol.118.114652.
[80] Lailler C, Louandre C, Morisse MC, Lhossein T, Godin C, Lottin M, et al.
ERK1/2 signaling regulates the immune microenvironment and macrophage recruitment
in glioblastoma. Biosci Rep 2019;39. https://doi.org/10.1042/BSR20191433.
[81] Zhuang S, Schnellmann RG. A death-promoting role for extracellular signal-
regulated kinase. J Pharmacol Exp Ther 2006;319:991–7.
https://doi.org/10.1124/jpet.106.107367.
[82] Hong SK, Wu PK, Park JI. A cellular threshold for active ERK1/2 levels
determines Raf/MEK/ERK-mediated growth arrest versus death responses. Cell Signal
2018;42:11–20. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cellsig.2017.10.001.
[83] Cagnol S, Chambard JC. ERK and cell death: Mechanisms of ERK-induced cell
death - Apoptosis, autophagy and senescence. FEBS J 2010;277:2–21.
https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1742-4658.2009.07366.x.
[84] Cagnol S, Van Obberghen-Schilling E, Chambard JC. Prolonged activation of
ERK1,2 induces FADD-independent caspase 8 activation and cell death. Apoptosis
2006. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10495-006-4065-y.