Heterogeneous Sensitivity to Src Inhibitors in Oral Squamous Cell

Carcinoma and Its Implications for Combination Therapy with

Cisplatin

Yuri Ofusa[1], Tadahide Noguchi[2], Hiroaki Mizukami[1] & Kenji Ohba[1,3]

1. Division of Genetic Therapeutics, Center for Molecular Medicine, Jichi Medical

University, Shimotsuke, Tochigi, Japan

2. Department of Dentistry, Oral and Maxillofacial Surgery, Jichi Medical University,

Shimotsuke, Tochigi, Japan

3. Center for Gene Therapy Research, Jichi Medical University, Shimotsuke, Tochigi,

Japan

Running title; Suppression of oral cancers by Src inhibitors

Competing interests

The authors declare no competing financial interests.

This work was supported by AMED under Grant Number, JP23bm1323001, JMU

Graduate Student Start-Up Award, and JST SPRING, Grant Number JPMJSP2183.

* Correspondence should be addressed to K.O. (ohbak@jichi.ac.jp)

3311-1 Yakushiji, Shimotsuke, Tochigi, 329-0498, Japan

Tel: +81-258-58-7402, Fax: +81-258-44-8675

email: ohbak@jichi.ac.jp

Abstract

Purpose:

Treatment options of advanced oral squamous cell carcinomas (OSCC) are limited, and

cisplatin toxicity and drug resistance are major clinical issues. Src is a central kinase

that integrates multiple oncogenic pathways and a promising therapeutic target.

However, Src inhibitors have shown suboptimal efficacy as monotherapies and their

sensitivity in OSCC remains elusive.

Experimental Design:

We examined the activation of major oncogenic signaling pathways and the antitumor

effects of six Src inhibitors (dasatinib, ponatinib, vandetanib, saracatinib, PP2,

bosutinib) in seven human OSCC cell lines (HSC-2, HSC-3, HSC-4, SAS, HO-1-u-1,

CAL27, SCC-25). BALB/cAJcl nu/nu mice bearing CAL27 xenografts received

dasatinib (30 mg/kg, intraperitoneally, daily), bosutinib (50 mg/kg, intraperitoneally,

daily), cisplatin (2 mg/kg or 4 mg/kg, intraperitoneally, weekly), or combinations.

Tumor volume, bioluminescence imaging, and body weight were monitored for 17 or 21

days, followed by histopathological assessment.

Results:

The activation of the key pathways, including Src and MAPK, considerably differed

among the cell lines and was linked to heterogeneous sensitivity to Src inhibitors.

Effective growth suppression required Src dephosphorylation and downstream MAPK

pathway inhibition, which vary depending on the cell line. Additionally, combination

treatment with a Src inhibitor and cisplatin showed additive antitumor effects, allowing

the reduction of cisplatin doses by half without efficacy loss. Notably, dasatinib alone

and in combination with cisplatin decreased tumor burden with characteristic internal

tumor death *in vivo*.

Conclusions:

These findings elucidate Src signaling dependency on OSCC and the potential of Src

inhibition to decrease cisplatin toxicity, paving way for Src targeted therapeutic

strategies.

Introduction

Oral squamous cell carcinoma (OSCC) is a malignant disease on the mucosal surfaces of the tongue, gingiva, and lips, and is the most common subtype of head and neck malignancy(1). Approximately 390,000 new cases of OSCC were reported worldwide in 2022, and the rate of increase is predicted to reach nearly 60% by 2050, according to the Global Cancer Observatory (2).

Almost 60% of patients with oral cancer are diagnosed at advanced stages (stage III–IV), with a 5-year survival rate of less 60%(3–6). Managing patients with advanced cancer requires multimodal treatment including surgery, radiotherapy, and chemotherapy(6). Although multidisciplinary therapy is effective for managing advanced cancer, it is quite invasive, resulting in treatment-related cosmetic and functional impairments such as dysphagia and speech difficulties, which considerably compromise the quality of life(QOL) patients (7). Moreover, 10–50% of patients experience local recurrence or distant metastasis following initial therapy, and only a minority are eligible for salvage surgery or radiotherapy(8–10). Palliative or supportive care is the last option for most patients with recurrent or metastatic cancer, with a median survival of 4–9 months(3,11). Thus, improving the prognosis and QOL of patients with OSCC remains an urgent clinical challenge.

Systemic chemotherapy plays a key role, especially in patients with recurrent or

metastatic cancer. Cisplatin is the standard systemic therapy in definitive

chemoradiotherapy and recurrent/metastatic settings. However, owing to severe toxicities,

few patients with adequate performance status (PS) can be prescribed cisplatin(12). No

alternative systemic therapy with efficacy comparable to that of cisplatin has been

established for patients ineligible due to age, comorbidities, or poor PS(3). In addition,

cisplatin resistance occurs in approximately 30–40% of patients with OSCC, substantially

limiting its therapeutic effect(13). Therefore, drugs that decrease cytotoxicity and

overcome cisplatin resistance are necessary.

Several studies have explored the use of cisplatin substitutes. While carboplatin shows

lower toxicity than cisplatin, its antitumor activity is inferior to cisplatin at equivalent

doses(14). Cetuximab is the only molecular-targeted drug approved for OSCC. However,

it has not shown clear superiority over cisplatin yet (15). Even though immune checkpoint

inhibitors such as pembrolizumab and nivolumab have recently been approved for

treating recurrent/metastatic OSCC, their response rates are limited to approximately 10–

20%(16,17). The identification of new effective therapeutic agents for OSCC is a crucial

unmet clinical need.

A central non-receptor tyrosine kinase within the Src family of kinases (SFKs), c-Src

(hereafter, Src), regulates multiple cellular processes involved in malignant progression,

including proliferation, survival, migration, invasion and angiogenesis(18). Src

hyperactivation has been noted in solid tumors, including breast, colorectal, pancreatic,

ovarian, gastric, esophageal, and lung cancers and is strongly liked to poor prognosis(19).

This indicates that Src inhibitors are potential candidates for cancer chemotherapy. Src

activation is correlated with poor clinical outcomes and invasive and metastatic potential

in head and neck squamous cell carcinoma (HNSCC)(20). Particularly, in OSCC, high

Src expression is markedly linked to tumor size, lymph node metastasis, advanced stage

and recurrence, and has been identified as an independent prognostic factor. This suggests

that Src plays a crucial role in OSCC progression(21).

Preclinical studies have revealed that FDA-approved Src inhibitors, including dasatinib

and saracatinib, suppress proliferation, migration and invasion, and induce apoptosis in

HNSCC/OSCC models(19,22,23). Despite these promising results, Src inhibitors have

demonstrated suboptimal efficacy as monotherapies in clinical trials(24,25). Possible

mechanisms behind this discrepancy include the non-lethal nature of Src inhibition in

HNSCC/OSCC cells, compensatory activation of alternative pathways, such as

PI3K/AKT and STAT3(22,26), and variations in EMT status or cell adhesion molecules

that affect drug sensitivity(27,28). Substantial efforts have been directed toward

elucidating the mechanisms of action of Src inhibitors and identifying biomarkers that

predict the therapeutic response in lung, colorectal, and breast cancers, where oncogenic

driver mutations are well characterized. However, the molecular determinants of Src

inhibitor sensitivity in OSCC remain elusive.

HNSCC/OSCC is characterized by profound molecular heterogeneity, with distinct

dependencies on kinases, such as EGFR, EPHA2, AURKA, WEE1, and JAK1 across

various cell lines(29). This heterogeneity suggests that sensitivity to Src inhibition may

markedly differ among the OSCCs. However, there is no report systematically

investigating Src inhibitor sensitivity in OSCC, especially using animal models.

Moreover, recent the combined effects of Src inhibitors and cisplatin may provide a

strategy to overcome cisplatin resistance and decrease toxicity in gastric cancer and

tubular epithelial cells(30,31).

Based on this evidence, we sought to reassess the therapeutic potential of Src inhibition

in OSCC and generate foundational insights that may guide the optimization of future

treatment strategies. We analyzed Src inhibitor sensitivity across multiple OSCC cell lines

and a mouse model and assessed the therapeutic effect of combining Src inhibition with

cisplatin.

Materials and Methods

Cell culture

Seven human OSCC cell lines were utilized. RIKEN BRC (Tsukuba, Japan) provided HSC-2 (RCB1945), HSC-3 (RCB1975), HSC-4 (RCB1902), SAS (RCB1974), and HO-1-u-1 (RCB2102). CAL27 (CRL-2095) and SCC-25 (CRL-1628) cells were purchased from the American Type Culture Collection (ATCC, VA). HSC-2 and HSC-3 cells were maintained in E-MEM (051-07615, Wako, Osaka, Japan). HSC-4, SAS, and HO-1-u-1 cells were maintained in RPMI-1640 (189-02023, Wako). Furthermore, CAL27 cells were maintained in high-glucose DMEM supplemented with L-glutamine, phenol red, and sodium pyruvate (041-30081, Wako). SCC-25 cells were maintained in a 1:1 mixture of DMEM and Ham's F-12 medium containing L-glutamine, phenol red, HEPES, and sodium pyruvate (042-30555, Wako) supplemented with 400 ng/mL hydrocortisone. All mediums cultivating cells mentioned above were further supplemented with 10% fetal bovine serum (Gibco, CA) and 1% penicillin-streptomycin (100×, Wako), and cells were maintained at 37°C in a humidified atmosphere containing 5% CO_2 before use. All cell lines used were cultured within three months of the second passage.

Reagents

Src inhibitors used in this study are as follows. Dasatinib (SML2589, TCI TC-I 201,

and D5949) was obtained from Sigma-Aldrich. Ponatinib (AMBH303C5EAB),

vandetanib (SML2983), and saracatinib (SML3195) were purchased from Sigma-

Aldrich. Additionally, PP2 (529573) was purchased from Calbiochem (MA). Bosutinib

(T0152) was obtained from TargetMol, MA. The Src inhibitors were dissolved in

dimethyl sulfoxide (DMSO). Cisplatin (033-20091) was obtained from Wako and was

dissolved in 0.9% NaCl.

Antibodies

The following primary antibodies were utilized: p53 (7F5) Rabbit mAb (#2527),

Phospho-p53 (Ser15) Antibody (#9284), Src (32G6) Rabbit mAb (#2123), Phospho-Src

Family (Tyr416) (D49G4) Rabbit mAb (#6943), Ras (D2C1) Rabbit mAb (#8955), p38

MAPK (D13E1) XP Rabbit mAb (#8690), Phospho-p38 MAPK (Thr180/Tyr182)

(D3F9) XP Rabbit mAb (#4511), p44/42 MAPK (Erk1/2) (137F5) Rabbit mAb (#4695),

Phospho-p44/42 MAPK (Erk1/2) (Thr202/Tyr204) (D13.14.4E) XP Rabbit mAb

(#4370), SAPK/JNK Antibody (#9252), Phospho-SAPK/JNK (Thr183/Tyr185) (81E11)

Rabbit mAb (#4668), and β-Actin Antibody (#4967) (all from Cell Signaling

Technology, MA). The K-Ras Monoclonal Antibody (9.13) was purchased from

Invitrogen (Carlsbad, CA). For detection, Anti-rabbit IgG, HRP-linked Antibody (Cell

Signaling Technology) was used for all primary antibodies except K-Ras and β-actin,

for which HRP-conjugated anti-mouse IgG secondary antibodies (Cell Signaling

Technology) were used.

Western blotting

HSC-2, HSC-3, HSC-4, SAS, HO-1-u-1, CAL27, and SCC-25 cells were lysed using

M-PER Mammalian Protein Extraction Reagent (Thermo Fisher Scientific, NY)

supplemented with 10× Complete protease inhibitor and 10× PhosSTOP phosphatase

inhibitor (Roche, Basel, Switzerland), mixed with an equal volume of 2× sodium

dodecyl sulfate (SDS) buffer, and boiled at 90 °C for 10 min. Proteins were separated

using SDS-polyacrylamide gel electrophoresis (PAGE) and transferred onto

polyvinylidene fluoride membranes. Membranes were blocked with Every Blot

Blocking Buffer (Bio-Rad Laboratories, Hercules, CA) and incubated with primary

antibodies for 1 h at 25 ℃. After washing with Tris-buffered saline containing 0.1%

Tween-20 (TBS-T), the membranes were incubated with secondary antibodies for 1 h at

25 ℃. Protein bands were visualized using Clarity Western ECL Substrate (Bio-Rad

Laboratories) and imaged using a ChemiDoc Toch MP Imaging System (Bio-Rad

Laboratories).

For phosphorylation analysis following Src inhibitor treatment, HSC-2, HSC-3, HSC-4,

SAS, HO-1-u-1, CAL27, and SCC-25 cells were treated with dasatinib, ponatinib,

vandetanib, or bosutinib for 18 h. The cells were seeded in 12 well plates at densities

that yielded approximately 80% confluence at the treatment time. Supplementary Table

S1 provides the concentrations utilized for each cell line. Cells were harvested using the

same lysis procedure described above, and protein samples were subjected to SDS-

PAGE and western blotting, as previously described. The following primary antibodies

were used: Phospho-Src Family (Tyr416) (D49G4) Rabbit mAb (#6943), Phospho-

p44/42 MAPK (Erk1/2) (Thr202/Tyr204) (D13.14.4E) XP Rabbit mAb (#4370),

Phospho-p38 MAPK (Thr180/Tyr182) (D3F9) XP Rabbit mAb (#4511), and Phospho-

SAPK/JNK (Thr183/Tyr185) (81E11) Rabbit mAb (#4668) (all from Cell Signaling

Technology). Detection and imaging were conducted as previously described.

Cell viability assays

Cell viability was evaluated using the CellTiter-Glo® 2.0 Reagent (Promega, WI). Cells

were seeded into Costar 96-well flat white plates (3917, Costar, NY) at the following

densities: HSC-2 (0.8×10^4), HSC-3 (1.0×10^4), HSC-4 (0.8×10^4), SAS (2.0×10^4),

HO-1-u-1 (1.5×10^4), CAL27 (1.5×10^4), and SCC-25 (0.7×10^4) cells per well, and

allowed to adhere overnight. HSC-2, HSC-3, HSC-4, SAS, HO-1-u-1, CAL27, and

SCC-25 cells were treated with the Src inhibitors dasatinib (100 nM), ponatinib (2 μM),

vandetanib (10 μM), saracatinib (5 μM), PP2 (50 μM), bosutinib (5 μM), or cisplatin

(10 μM) for 72 h. All compounds were diluted in a culture medium at the final

concentration of DMSO with 1%, and cell viability was calculated relative to the 1%

DMSO control. Following drug treatment, CellTiter-Glo® 2.0 reagent was added at a

1:1 ratio to the culture medium, mixed for 2 min on an orbital shaker and incubated for

10 min at 25 ℃ to stabilize the luminescent signal. The luminescence was measured

using a Tecan Spark microplate reader (TECAN, Männedorf, Switzerland). All

experiments were conducted in triplicates (n = 3).

For IC_{50} determination, cells were seeded into Costar 96-well flat white plates (3917,

Costar) at the same densities described above for each cell line and allowed to adhere

overnight. Cells were subsequently treated with serial dilutions of dasatinib, ponatinib,

saracatinib, or bosutinib for 36 h. Cell viability was measured using the CellTiter-Glo®

2.0 Reagent (Promega) as described above. IC_{50} values were calculated from dose-

response curves using nonlinear regression in R (version 4.5.2). All experiments were

conducted in triplicates (n = 3).

For combination treatment assays, cell viability was evaluated using the CellTiter-Glo®

2.0 Reagent (Promega). Cells were seeded in Costar 96-well flat white plates (3917,

Costar) at the cell line-specific densities described above and allowed to adhere

overnight. Cells were treated with cisplatin (10 μM or 5 μM), each Src inhibitor alone,

or their combinations for 36 h. Supplementary Table S2 provides the Src inhibitor

concentrations used for each cell line. All compounds were diluted in the culture

medium to a final concentration of DMSO (1%), and cell viability was calculated

relative to the 1% DMSO control. Luminescence was measured using a Tecan Spark

microplate reader (TECAN). All experiments were performed in triplicates (n = 3).

Lentiviral production and generation of Renilla luciferase (RLuc)-expressing

CAL27 cells

RLuc-expressing CAL27 (CAL27-Rluc) cells were generated by infecting parental

CAL27 cells with lentiviral particles produced by HEK293T cells. Lentiviruses were

produced by co transfecting HEK293T cells with the packaging plasmids pCMV-VSVG

-RSV-Rev (1 μg/μL) and pCAG-HIVgp-RRE (1 μg/μL), together with the transfer

vector CSII-EGFP-P2A-RLuc-IRES-Bsd at a ratio of 1:1:2. Viral infection of CAL27

cells was conducted in the presence of polybrene at a 10 μg/mL final concentration.

Seven independent CAL27-Rluc clones were established following infection and

blasticidin selection. RLuc activity in each clone was confirmed using EnduRen live

cell Renilla luciferase substrate (Promega) according to the manufacturer's instructions.

The drug responsiveness of the clones was assessed 36 h following treatment with Src

inhibitors and cisplatin under the same conditions used for the Cell-Titer Glo® assay.

Supplementary Fig. 1 shows the detailed screening results for the seven clones.

Animal experiments

CAL27-Rluc cells (clone 7; 2×10^7 cells/mouse) were subcutaneously implanted into

the right flank of 5-week-old male BALB/cAJcl nu/nu mice (CLEA Japan, Tokyo,

Japan). The mice were kept in a 12-hour light-dark cycle and were given free access to

food and water. Three days following implantation, the mice were randomly assigned to

six treatment groups based on their body weight (n = 5-6 in each group): vehicle control

(DMSO), dasatinib alone (30 mg/kg), cisplatin alone (4 mg/kg), cisplatin alone (2

mg/kg), dasatinib (30 mg/kg) + cisplatin (4 mg/kg), and dasatinib (30 mg/kg) + cisplatin

(2 mg/kg). Dasatinib and DMSO were dissolved in 10 mM Tris-HCl (pH 7.4), and

cisplatin was dissolved in 0.9% NaCl. All drugs were intraperitoneally administered at a

volume of 100 μL per mouse. Dasatinib and DMSO were administered once daily,

whereas cisplatin was administered once weekly for two consecutive weeks. This

dosing schedule was designed to approximate the clinical dosing frequencies in humans.

In a separate experiment conducted under identical implantation and monitoring

conditions, the mice were assigned to three groups: vehicle control (DMSO), dasatinib

alone (30 mg/kg), and bosutinib alone (50 mg/kg). Bosutinib was dissolved in 10 mM

Tris HCl (pH 7.4) and intraperitoneally administered once daily at a volume of 100 μL

per mouse, following the same dosing schedule as in the dasatinib experiment.

To detect Renilla luciferase activity, ViviRen™ In Vivo Renilla Luciferase Substrate

(Promega) was dissolved in dimethyl sulfoxide at 10 mg/mL to prepare a stock solution,

which was subsequently diluted 1,000-fold in PBS containing 0.1% bovine serum

albumin. A total of 100 μL (1 mg) of the diluted substrate was intravenously

administered. Mice were anesthetized with isoflurane, and bioluminescence imaging

was conducted using an IVIS system. Bioluminescence signals were quantified 10 min

following ViviRen injection according to the manufacturer's instructions(32). IVIS

image analysis was performed on days 5, 7, 10, and 13 after subcutaneous tumor

transplantation and on days 7, 13, and 20, respectively.

Tumor volumes were measured using calipers and calculated as $L \times W^2 \times 0.52$. Body

weight was monitored every 2-3 d throughout the treatment period. At the end of the

treatment, the mice were perfusion-fixed, and the tumor, kidney, and liver were

harvested (N＝5-6). All animal experiments were conducted in accordance with the

Animal Experimentation Regulations of the Jichi Medical University. The Institutional

Animal Care and Use Committee of Jichi Medical University reviewed and approved

the study protocol. The study subsequently received final authorization from the

University President.

Hematoxylin and Eosin (H&E) staining

Excised tumor, kidney, and liver tissues were fixed in 1% paraformaldehyde at 4 °C

overnight. The tissues were subsequently cryoprotected by sequential incubation in 10%

sucrose/PBS and 20% sucrose/PBS at 4 °C, each for 24 h. After cryoprotection, the

tissues were embedded in OCT compound (Sakura Finetek, Tokyo, Japan) and snap-

frozen in liquid nitrogen. Frozen blocks were sectioned at 8 μm thickness, and the

sections were stained with H&E using standard procedures. The sections were post-

fixed in 2% paraformaldehyde, stained with hematoxylin, rinsed under running tap

water, counterstained with eosin, dehydrated using graded ethanol, cleared in xylene,

and mounted with coverslips. Histological images were obtained using a light

microscope.

Statistical analysis

No statistical methods were used to predetermine sample size. Mouse studies were

randomized; however, the investigators were not blinded to group allocation during the

experiments or outcome assessment. Western blot analysis was independently

performed three times. IC_{50} values for the Src inhibitors were calculated from three

independent CellTiter-Glo assays, and mean ± standard deviation (SD) was obtained

using Microsoft Excel. For *in vitro* combination assays of the Src inhibitors and

cisplatin, data are presented as mean ± SD from n = 3, and P values were calculated

using paired t-tests in Microsoft Excel. Statistical significance was defined as follows: p

< 0.01 **, $p < 0.05$ *, and $p \geqq 0.05$ ns.

For *in vivo* experiments, tumor volume and body weight were analyzed using data from

surviving mice at each time point (n = 5–6), and mean ± SD was calculated using R

(version 4.5.2).

Results

OSCC cell lines show substantial heterogeneity in the activation of major oncogenic signaling pathways

Cancer develops through the accumulation of genetic and epigenetic changes in oncogenic signaling pathways, eventually resulting in the acquisition of malignant phenotypes(33). In OSCC, p53 mutations frequently occur(34), and multiple oncogenic pathways including EGFR, PI3K/AKT/mTOR, JAK/STAT, MET, Wnt/β-catenin and RAS/RAF/MAPK are aberrantly activated and contribute to tumor progression(35). Besides, the activation of MAPK signaling (ERK1/2, JNK, p38, and ERK5) is involved in HNSCC oncogenicity(35). These observations suggest that the activity of signaling networks in the OSCC cell lines may markedly vary.

To test this hypothesis, we investigated the phosphorylation status of key signaling molecules by western blotting (Fig. 1A). HSC-4 and CAL27 revealed increased protein levels of p53 and phosphor-p53 (p-p53) (Ser15). Total Src expression was consistent in all cell lines; however, its active form, phospho-Src (p-Src) (Tyr416), was detected in all cell lines except HSC-3 and SCC-25. K-Ras expression was augmented in SAS, HO-1-u-1, and CAL27, and the discrepancy between Ras expression and activation in HSC-2 and SAS suggested N-Ras or H-Ras activation. Within the MAPK pathway, all seven

cell lines exhibited strong p38 and ERK1/2 activation, as shown by elevated

phosphorylation levels (p-p38 and p-ERK1/2), which closely paralleled the activation

pattern of p-Src (Tyr416). This concordant activation pattern suggested that Src activity

was closely associated with downstream MAPK signaling in the OSCC cells.

Contrastingly, SAPK/JNK expression was relatively high in HSC-2, SAS, HO-1-u-1,

and CAL27, whereas enhanced SAPK/JNK phosphorylation was only noted in SAS and

HO-1-u-1, indicating a more selective activation profile. Thus, broadly activated Src,

together with the downstream signaling activation patterns noted in the OSCC cell lines,

could be a promising target for chemotherapy in OSCCs.

Figure 1   Src activity and its inhibitory effect of tumor growth by specific inhibitors in various oral cancer cell lines

Src activity and its inhibitory effect of tumor growth by specific inhibitors in

different oral cancer cell lines

Some Src inhibitors have already been approved for clinical cancer therapies(19,22,23),

suggesting that these Src inhibitors can be easily utilized for oral cancers if their

anticancer effect is prospective. Next, we evaluated the sensitivity of the OSCC cell lines

to FDA-approved Src inhibitors. Despite PP2 is not FDA-approved, it was included for

comparison because it is frequently used as a research-grade Src inhibitor. Treatment of

seven OSCC cell lines with each Src inhibitor at concentrations close to their mean IC_{50}

showed variation in cell line viability (Fig. 1B). HSC-2 and SCC-25 were broadly

sensitive to all the inhibitors tested, whereas SAS showed lower sensitivity (Fig. 1B).

Comparison of the IC_{50} values obtained following 36 h of treatment indicated differences

between the inhibitors (Table 1, Fig. 1C). Dasatinib, vandetanib, saracatinib, and PP2

revealed pronounced variability in their IC_{50} values across cell lines. In contrast, ponatinib

and bosutinib showed broad antitumor effects with less variability in cell lines (Table 1,

Fig. 1C). Notably, HO-1-u-1 showed resistance to cisplatin. Thus, OSCC cell lines show

distinct pharmacological vulnerabilities resulting from the differences in the activating

pathways for Src signaling.

We examined p-Src (Tyr416) levels 18 h following inhibitor treatment to determine

whether the differences in antitumor activity were attributable to the degree of Src

inhibition (Fig. 1D). All inhibitors suppressed Src activation, although vandetanib

exhibited a relatively weaker inhibition. This effect was especially modest in SAS and

HO-1-u-1, which is consistent with their reduced sensitivity (Figs. 1B and 1C).

Table 1   The half maximal inhibitory concentration (IC50) of Src inhibitors in various oral cancer cell lines after 36 h of treatment

	Dasatinib	Ponatinib	Vandetanib	Saracatinib	PP2	Bosutinib	Cisplatin
HSC-2	0.1 μM	2 μM	5 μM	5 μM	50 μM	5 μM	10 μM
HSC-3	10 μM	2 μM	8 μM	10 μM	100~250 μM	5 μM	1~5 μM
HSC-4	25 μM	5~10 μM	25 μM	100 μM	600 μM	15 μM	10 μM
SAS	10 μM	5~10 μM	50 μM	100 μM	>600 μM	25 μM	10 μM
Ho-1-u-1	50 μM	5~10 μM	25 μM	50~100 μM	>600 μM	25 μM	>50 μM
CAL27	10~25 μM	5~10 μM	10~50 μM	25 μM	>600 μM	15 μM	10 μM
SCC-25	10 μM	2~5 μM	8~10 μM	50 μM	200 μM	10 μM	10 μM

We further assessed whether Src inhibition suppressed the phosphorylation of MAPK

subpathways (ERK1/2, p38, and JNK; Fig. 1E). Dasatinib completely suppressed all

MAPK components in all the cell lines. Ponatinib completely inhibited p38 and largely

inhibited JNK phosphorylation, whereas the suppression was partial in CAL27.

Vandetanib inhibited distinct MAPK components, depending on the cell line used.

Bosutinib typically inhibited the phosphorylation of all MAPK components except ERK

in SAS and p38 in SCC-25. Thus, while the pathway associated with the upregulation of

Src varies in cells, different inhibitors targeting Src activity are effective in suppressing

the growth of OSCC cell lines.

Taken together, these results suggest that the activation status of major signaling pathways

involving Src significantly differs across the OSCC cell lines and that such molecular

differences may underlie the observed variation in sensitivity to Src inhibitors.

Tumor inhibitory effect by combination therapy using cisplatin and Src inhibitors

OSCC cell lines showed considerable heterogeneity such as variable susceptibilities to

Src inhibitors and cisplatin (Fig. 1). Next, we assessed the combinatorial effects of Src

inhibitors with cisplatin at 10 µM and 5 µM (Fig. 2).

Compared with cisplatin at 10 µM, Src inhibitors alone revealed equal or lower antitumor

activity in most OSCC cell lines, except for HO-1-u-1 and SCC-25, indicating that Src

inhibition was effective in the OSCC cell lines. The combination treatment showed

additive effects in HSC-3, HSC-4, CAL27, and SCC-25, especially with dasatinib and

bosutinib, and these effects increased in a cisplatin dose-dependent manner. Although

cisplatin at 5 µM alone showed limited activity, its combination with Src inhibitors

produced antitumor effects comparable to or more for 10 µM cisplatin alone in HSC-4,

CAL27, and SCC-25.

On the other hand, cisplatin-resistant HO-1-u-1 responded better to Src inhibitors alone

than to cisplatin, and no enhancement was noted with the combination treatment. This

indicates that the efficacy of Src-cisplatin combination therapy may be determined by the

intrinsic cisplatin sensitivity of each OSCC cell line and its degree of dependence on Src

signaling.

These results suggest that combining Src inhibitors with cisplatin may reduce the cisplatin

dose to half of the standard *in vitro* therapeutic concentration while maintaining its

efficacy in cisplatin-sensitive OSCC.

Figure 2   The tumor inhibitory effect by combination therapy using Cisplatin and Src inhibitor

Tumor growth inhibition by single treatment of dasatinib and bosutinib *in vivo*

Next, we examined whether dasatinib and bosutinib, which showed additive effects *in*

vitro, could suppress tumor growth as single agents *in vivo* (Fig. 3, Fig. S2, Fig. S3).

Since dasatinib and bosutinib demonstrated additive effects with cisplatin in more cell

lines than the other Src inhibitors (Fig. 2) and both are relatively inexpensive and thus

more suitable for clinical applications; these two inhibitors were selected for further *in*

vivo analysis. CAL27 cells were selected as the subcutaneous xenograft model because

their cells showed reliable tumor formation in preliminary experiments and demonstrated

high sensitivity to Src inhibitors with additive effects with cisplatin *in vitro*. To monitor

tumor size using *in vivo* imaging system, we established stable Rluc-expressing CAL27

(CAL27-Rluc) cells and checked their susceptibility to Src inhibitors (Fig. S1). Src

inhibitors suppressed the growth of CAL27-Rluc clones in a similar manner as the CAL27

Wt cells. Clone7, which exhibited a median susceptibility to Src inhibitors, was selected

for *in vivo* analysis. CAL27-Rluc cells-inoculated BALB/cAJcl nu/nu mice were treated

with inhibitors by indicated schedule which were designed to approximate clinically

relevant regimens (Fig. 3A). Furthermore, dasatinib (30 mg/kg) and bosutinib (50 mg/kg)

were compared in a separate experiment (Fig. S3A). Cisplatin 4 mg/kg was selected as a

positive control based on previous reports, and this dose is within the range of the

maximum repeated tolerated dose in the mouse model(36).

The physical tumor volumes in the cisplatin group at 4 and 2 mg/kg were decreased

compared to those in the control group, whereas their size in the dasatinib group continued

to increase (Fig 3B). In contrast, IVIS bioluminescence live imaging showed a substantial

reduction in the tumor signal in the dasatinib group relative to the control group. In some

cases, it exceeded the effect of cisplatin (Fig. 3C, Fig. S2). Body weight gain was

impaired in the cisplatin 4 mg/kg group, whereas mice treated with dasatinib or cisplatin

(2 mg/kg) maintained stable weight without apparent toxicity (Fig. 3D).

Bosutinib treatment led to antitumor activity; one of the three mice died, and the

remaining animals showed weight loss, indicating considerable toxicity (Fig. S3B–D).

Histological analyses on day 17 showed that tumors from the control and cisplatin groups

were solid, well-differentiated squamous cell carcinomas with keratin pearls (Fig. 3E).

Contrastingly, tumors from the dasatinib group showed cyst-like structures with hollow

interiors and serous fluids. Under magnification, the cells remaining in the lumen had

blurred outlines, lost nuclei, and died. In addition, the cancer pearls in the epithelial

regions disappeared. In the kidneys, normal kidney structure was maintained in the

control group (DMSO) and the dasatinib group. On the other hand, degeneration and

atrophy of the renal tubular epithelium and localized rupture were observed in the

cisplatin 4 mg/kg group, while only mild renal tubular epithelial atrophy was observed in

the cisplatin 2 mg/kg group. These results suggest that renal damage occurred in a dose-

dependent manner only in mice treated with cisplatin. The liver tissues retained normal

architecture in all groups, corresponding to no apparent tissue damage.

Together, these results show that dasatinib exerts antitumor activity *in vivo* by inducing

extensive intratumoral cell death, even in cases in which the tumor size appears to

increase. Especially, dasatinib achieved tumor suppression that exceeded that by cisplatin

under certain conditions, strongly supporting its therapeutic potential. Contrastingly,

bosutinib revealed antitumor efficacy comparable to that of cisplatin, but was linked to

toxicity, which may limit its clinical utility.

Figure 3   The inhibition of tumor growth by single treatment of Dasatinib in vivo

Enlargement of the yellow frame

Tumor growth inhibition by the combination treatment of cisplatin and dasatinib *in*

vivo

We finally evaluated the antitumor efficacy of combination treatment with dasatinib and

cisplatin to determine whether the additive effects of Src inhibitors and cisplatin could be

reproduced *in vivo*. The dosing schedule was identical to that used for the single-agent

treatment (Fig. 3）, and mice bearing subcutaneous tumors were assigned to three groups:

control, dasatinib 30 mg/kg + cisplatin 4 mg/kg, and dasatinib 30 mg/kg + cisplatin

2 mg/kg; Fig. 4A).

Tumor volumes in the dasatinib 30 mg/kg + cisplatin 4 mg/kg group showed a slight

decrease compared with those in the control group on day 16, whereas tumor size in the

dasatinib 30 mg/kg + cisplatin 2 mg/kg group increased relative to the control group and

single-agent cisplatin (Fig. 3B, Fig. 4B). Similar to single-agent treatment, tumor volume

alone might not completely capture the therapeutic effects of the combination treatment.

Thus, we evaluated the tumor burden using IVIS bioluminescence live imaging, which

showed substantially decreased tumor signals in both combination groups compared with

those in the control group (Fig. 4C, Fig. S4). This finding was consistent with the pattern

noted in the dasatinib monotherapy group. Thus, IVIS bioluminescence live imaging on

day 13 showed that the antitumor effect of the combination was comparable to the

expected additive effect derived from each monotherapy. Body weight in the dasatinib

30 mg/kg + cisplatin 4 mg/kg group gradually decreased compared with that in the control

group, whereas that in the dasatinib 30 mg/kg + cisplatin 2 mg/kg group slightly increased,

especially on days 13 and 16 (Fig. 4D). This suggested that reducing the cisplatin dose

may mitigate its toxicity.

Histological analysis of the excised tumors showed extensive intratumoral cell death in

both combination groups, similar to that noted with dasatinib monotherapy, supporting an

antitumor effect that was not reflected by tumor size alone (Fig. 4E). In the kidneys, the

dasatinib 30 mg/kg + cisplatin 4 mg/kg group showed tubular epithelial degeneration and

atrophy, as well as localized rupture, similar to the cisplatin 4 mg/kg group alone. In the

dasatinib 30 mg/kg + cisplatin 2 mg/kg group, only mild tubular epithelial atrophy was

observed, like the cisplatin 2 mg/kg group. These results suggest that renal damage occurs

in a dose-dependent manner in cisplatin-treated mice, and that concomitant use of

dasatinib did not enhance toxicity. Additionally, liver sections revealed no apparent organ

toxicity, which is consistent with the results from the single-agent treatment.

Collectively, these findings indicate that combination treatment with dasatinib and

cisplatin additively improves the antitumor activity *in vivo*. Notably, reducing the

cisplatin dose in combination with dasatinib treatment preserved the antitumor efficacy

and may help attenuate treatment-related toxicity.

Figure 4　The inhibition of tumor growth by combination treatment of Cisplatin and Dasatinib in vivo

Discussion

Herein, we examined the signaling pathway associated with tumorigenicity in OSCC

(Fig. 1A), involvement of Src activity in broad oral cancer cell lines (Fig. 1A and D),

sensitivity of OSCC cells to Src inhibitors (Fig. 1B and C, Table-1) and, molecular basis

underlying this variability, and the therapeutic effect of combining Src inhibition with

cisplatin in *in vitro* and *in vivo* models (Fig. 2 and 4). Particularly, dasatinib showed a

distinctive antitumor effect, characterized by extensive intratumoral cell death, leading

to a substantial decrease in the tumor burden *in vivo* (Fig. 3E). Additionally, the

dasatinib and cisplatin combination markedly decreased tumor volume, even under

cisplatin-dose-reduced conditions (Fig. 4), suggesting its potential to maintain antitumor

efficacy while mitigating toxicity.

OSCC is a molecularly heterogeneous malignancy characterized by aberrant activation

of multiple oncogenic signaling pathways, including EGFR, PI3K/AKT/mTOR,

JAK/STAT, MET, Wnt/β catenin, and RAS/RAF/MAPK(35). These pathways are

closely linked to Src, which serves as a central signaling node that regulates diverse

malignant phenotypes. Screening using multiple Src inhibitors showed considerable

variability in Src inhibitor sensitivity among the OSCC cell lines (Fig. 1B). This

heterogeneity likely reflects the underlying molecular diversity of OSCC and may

explain why therapies targeting a single pathway, including the Src pathway, often fail

to achieve sufficient efficacy.

Previous studies on HNSCC have attributed Src inhibitors' limited efficacy to numerous

factors *in vivo*, including the non-lethal nature of Src inhibition in some tumor cells,

compensatory activation of alternative pathways such as PI3K/AKT and STAT3(22,26),

and differences in EMT status or cell adhesion molecules(27,28). Consistent with these

observations, our findings support the notion that the therapeutic response to Src

inhibition in OSCC is strongly influenced by molecular diversity. Our data did not

support a high phosphorylated-Src/total-Src ratio, although this has been proposed as a

predictor of dasatinib sensitivity(30). Although Src activation has been reported in

93.75% of OSCC tissues(37), our results suggest that assessing the Src activation status

and the degree of downstream pathway suppression are necessary for predicting Src

inhibitor sensitivity.

An especially striking finding in this study was that dasatinib induced extensive

intratumoral cell death *in vivo*, resulting in a considerable decrease in viable tumor

mass, even when the overall tumor size remained unchanged or increased (Fig. 3). IVIS

data from *in vivo* imaging and histological analyses confirmed a clear dissociation

between tumor size and tumor burden, showing an antitumor effect that could not be

captured by size-based evaluation alone in some cases. From this perspective, dasatinib

showed tumor-suppressive activity comparable to or exceeding that of cisplatin,

indicating that the effect underscores its therapeutic potential.

Although dasatinib-induced intratumoral cavitation and cell death have not been

previously reported, studies on bladder cancer cells have revealed that dasatinib

suppresses the phosphorylation of the PI3K/Akt/mTOR pathway and activates

apoptosis- and autophagy related proteins(38). These mechanisms may contribute to cell

death noted in OSCC. Furthermore, inhibition of angiogenesis may also play a role in

necrotic formation because Src activation is necessary for VEGF expression(39).

Whether these effects are specific to CAL27 cells or represent a broader OSCC

phenotype requires further *in vivo* investigations. Especially, this necrosis-inducing

effect was not noted with bosutinib (Fig. S3E). Although this suggests a dasatinib-

specific response, the current data are insufficient to determine its specificity, indicating

that comparisons with additional Src inhibitors are required.

The dasatinib and cisplatin combination markedly decreased the tumor burden, even

under cisplatin dose-reduced conditions, indicating its potential to maintain antitumor

efficacy while decreasing toxicity (Fig. 4). This combination produced additive rather

than synergistic effects *in vitro*, likely reflecting the independent actions of the

inhibition of Src downstream signaling by dasatinib and the impairment of DNA repair

mechanisms by cisplatin. Despite previous studies have reported that dasatinib

suppresses cisplatin-induced Src activation(40) and reverses Src-dependent cisplatin

resistance(41), such effects were not noted in the cisplatin-resistant OSCC cell line HO-

1-u-1 (Fig. 2E). This may be owing to the Src-independent nature of cisplatin resistance

in HO-1-u-1 and its low sensitivity to Src inhibitors. Nevertheless, our results suggest

that combining Src inhibitors with cisplatin may enable dose reduction and mitigate

toxicity (Fig 2 and 4), offering a clinically meaningful strategy for overcoming

resistance and enhancing tolerability.

Although bosutinib also showed antitumor activity *in vivo*, its pronounced toxicity,

including loss of body weight, may limit its clinical applicability (Fig. S4). The

considerable differences in toxicity profiles among the Src inhibitors underscore the

criticality of careful drug selection when considering Src-targeted therapies for OSCC.

Dasatinib showed a favorable balance between tumor reduction and tolerability,

suggesting that it may be a more suitable Src inhibitor for clinical use.

This study has some limitations. First, Src inhibitors were ineffective in all the OSCC

cell lines, and based on the seven cell lines examined, the molecular determinants of

sensitivity could not be conclusively defined. Future studies incorporating a larger and

more diverse panel, including patient-derived cell lines, are necessary for identifying the

molecular features that predict the responsiveness of the Src inhibitor. Second, complete

tumor disappearance could not be confirmed in any of the groups because the endpoint

of this study was defined as visible tumor enlargement in mice. Importantly, dasatinib-

treated tumors frequently showed extensive central cell death, raising the possibility that

they may eventually collapse and regress, even though the time course of this process

remains elusive. Further examination is necessary to optimize the combination

strategies and treatment schedules. Nonetheless, FDA-approved Src inhibitors are orally

administered and are generally less toxic than cytotoxic chemotherapies, leaving

considerable room for their clinical application in settings such as neoadjuvant therapy

or palliative treatment.

In summary, this study reassessed the therapeutic potential of Src inhibition in OSCC

and showed that Src inhibitors, especially dasatinib, are promising candidates, both as

monotherapy and in combination with cisplatin. Dasatinib's ability to decrease tumor

burden and the potential for toxicity reduction through a reduction in cisplatin dose

provide a foundation for developing new therapeutic strategies aimed at expanding

treatment options and enhancing outcomes in patients with OSCC. Thus, our results

provide new insights that may allow the establishment of future therapeutic strategies

for oral cancer.

Acknowledgements

We thank all of our laboratory members, especially Akemi Takada, who supported the

handling of our budgets. This work was supported by AMED under Grant Number,

JP23bm1323001, JMU Graduate Student Start-Up Award, and JST SPRING, Grant

Number JPMJSP2183.

Author Contributions

K.O. conceived and designed the study. Y.O. performed all the experiments and

analyzed the data. Y.O. and K.O. interpreted experimental results. Y.O. and K.O. wrote

the manuscript. Y.O., T.N., H.M., and K.O. edited the manuscript. All the authors have

reviewed and approved the final manuscript.

Competing Interests

The authors declare no competing interests.

Data Availability Statement

The authors declare that the data supporting the findings of this study are available in

the article and its Supplementary Information files. All relevant data are available from

the authors upon reasonable request.

References

1. Rumgay H, Colombet M, Ramos da Cunha A, Filho AM, Warnakulasuriya S, Conway DI, et al. Global incidence of lip, oral cavity, and pharyngeal cancers by subsite in 2022. CA Cancer J Clin [Internet]. 2026. Available from: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/41335400

2. Cancer Today [Internet]. [cited 2026 Mar 3]. Available from: https://gco.iarc.who.int/today/

3. Chow LQM. Head and Neck Cancer. Reply. N Engl J Med. 2020. p. e57.

4. Liu F, Chen F, Huang J, Yan L, Wu J, Qiu Y, et al. Prospective study on factors affecting the prognosis of oral cancer in a Chinese population. Oncotarget. 2017. p. 4352–9.

5. Kim MJ, Ahn KM. Prognostic factors of oral squamous cell carcinoma: the importance of recurrence and pTNM stage. Maxillofac Plast Reconstr Surg. 20240304th ed. 2024. p. 8.

6. Leemans CR, Braakhuis BJ, Brakenhoff RH. The molecular biology of head and neck cancer. Nat Rev Cancer. 20101216th ed. 2011. p. 9–22.

7. Mäkitie AA, Alabi RO, Pulkki-Råback L, Almangush A, Beitler JJ, Saba NF, et al.

Psychological Factors Related to Treatment Outcomes in Head and Neck Cancer.

Adv Ther. 20240807th ed. 2024. p. 3489–519.

8. Blatt S, Krüger M, Sagheb K, Barth M, Kämmerer PW, Al-Nawas B. Tumor

Recurrence and Follow-Up Intervals in Oral Squamous Cell Carcinoma. J Clin Med

[Internet]. 20221129th ed. 2022. Available from:

https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/36498636

9. Ghanaati S, Udeabor SE, Winter A, Sader R, Heselich A. Cancer Recurrence in

Operated Primary Oral Squamous Cell Carcinoma Patients Seems to Be

Independent of the Currently Available Postoperative Therapeutic Approach: A

Retrospective Clinical Study. Curr Oncol [Internet]. 20250401st ed. 2025. Available

from: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/40277765

10. Slieker FJB, Rombout DAA, de Bree R, Van Cann EM. Local recurrence and

survival after treatment of oral squamous cell carcinoma of the maxilla: A

systematic review and meta-analysis. Oral Surg Oral Med Oral Pathol Oral Radiol.

20211013th ed. 2022. p. 626–38.

11. Lefebvre JL. Current clinical outcomes demand new treatment options for SCCHN.

Ann Oncol. 2005. p. vi7–12.

12. Rabik CA, Dolan ME. Molecular mechanisms of resistance and toxicity associated

with platinating agents. Cancer Treat Rev. 20061103rd ed. 2007. p. 9–23.

13. Atashi F, Vahed N, Emamverdizadeh P, Fattahi S, Paya L. Drug resistance against 5-

fluorouracil and cisplatin in the treatment of head and neck squamous cell

carcinoma: A systematic review. J Dent Res Dent Clin Dent Prospects. 20210825th

ed. 2021. p. 219–25.

14. Lokich J, Anderson N. Carboplatin versus cisplatin in solid tumors: an analysis of

the literature. Ann Oncol. 1998. p. 13–21.

15. Gebre-Medhin M, Adrian G, Engström P, Cange HH, Hammarstedt-Nordenvall L,

Reizenstein J, et al. Chemoradiation therapy With Cisplatin Versus Cetuximab in

Patients With Locoregionally Advanced Head and Neck Squamous Cell Cancer-

Mature Results of the ARTSCAN III Trial. Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys.

20250619th ed. 2025. p. 681–90.

16. Ferris RL, Blumenschein G, Fayette J, Guigay J, Colevas AD, Licitra L, et al.

Nivolumab for Recurrent Squamous-Cell Carcinoma of the Head and Neck. N Engl

J Med. 20161008th ed. 2016. p. 1856–67.

17. Larkins E, Blumenthal GM, Yuan W, He K, Sridhara R, Subramaniam S, et al. FDA

Approval Summary: Pembrolizumab for the Treatment of Recurrent or Metastatic

Head and Neck Squamous Cell Carcinoma with Disease Progression on or After

Platinum-Containing Chemotherapy. Oncologist. 20170522nd ed. 2017. p. 873–8.

18. Irby RB, Yeatman TJ. Role of Src expression and activation in human cancer.

Oncogene. 2000. p. 5636–42.

19. Aleshin A, Finn RS. SRC: a century of science brought to the clinic. Neoplasia.

2010. p. 599–607.

20. Mandal M, Myers JN, Lippman SM, Johnson FM, Williams MD, Rayala S, et al.

Epithelial to mesenchymal transition in head and neck squamous carcinoma:

association of Src activation with E-cadherin down-regulation, vimentin expression,

and aggressive tumor features. Cancer. 2008. p. 2088–100.

21. Cheng SJ, Kok SH, Lee JJ, Yen-Ping Kuo M, Cheng SL, Huang YL, et al.

Significant association of SRC protein expression with the progression, recurrence,

and prognosis of oral squamous cell carcinoma in Taiwan. Head Neck. 20111102nd

ed. 2012. p. 1340–5.

22. Yang Z, Liao J, Cullen KJ, Dan H. Inhibition of IKKβ/NF-κB signaling pathway to

improve Dasatinib efficacy in suppression of cisplatin-resistant head and neck

squamous cell carcinoma. Cell Death Discov. 20200515th ed. 2020. p. 36.

23. Ammer AG, Kelley LC, Hayes KE, Evans JV, Lopez-Skinner LA, Martin KH, et al.

Saracatinib Impairs Head and Neck Squamous Cell Carcinoma Invasion by

Disrupting Invadopodia Function. J Cancer Sci Ther. 2009. p. 52–61.

24. Brooks HD, Glisson BS, Bekele BN, Johnson FM, Ginsberg LE, El-Naggar A, et al.

Phase 2 study of dasatinib in the treatment of head and neck squamous cell

carcinoma. Cancer. 20101129th ed. 2011. p. 2112–9.

25. Fury MG, Baxi S, Shen R, Kelly KW, Lipson BL, Carlson D, et al. Phase II study of

saracatinib (AZD0530) for patients with recurrent or metastatic head and neck

squamous cell carcinoma (HNSCC). Anticancer Res. 2011 Jan;31(1):249–53.

26. Sen B, Saigal B, Parikh N, Gallick G, Johnson FM. Sustained Src inhibition results

in signal transducer and activator of transcription 3 (STAT3) activation and cancer

cell survival via altered Janus-activated kinase-STAT3 binding. Cancer Res.

20090217th ed. 2009. p. 1958–65.

27. Lee S, Park S, Ryu JS, Kang J, Kim I, Son S, et al. c-Src inhibitor PP2 inhibits head

and neck cancer progression through regulation of the epithelial-mesenchymal

transition. Exp Biol Med (Maywood). 20221217th ed. 2023. p. 492–500.

28. Ortiz MA, Mikhailova T, Li X, Porter BA, Bah A, Kotula L. Src family kinases,

adaptor proteins and the actin cytoskeleton in epithelial-to-mesenchymal transition.

Cell Commun Signal. 20210630th ed. 2021. p. 67.

29. Wu Z, Doondeea JB, Gholami AM, Janning MC, Lemeer S, Kramer K, et al.

Quantitative chemical proteomics reveals new potential drug targets in head and

neck cancer. Mol Cell Proteomics. 20110928th ed. 2011. p. M111.011635.

30. Levitt JM, Yamashita H, Jian W, Lerner SP, Sonpavde G. Dasatinib is preclinically

active against Src-overexpressing human transitional cell carcinoma of the

urothelium with activated Src signaling. Mol Cancer Ther. 20100420th ed. 2010. p.

1128–35.

31. Wang H, Lu Y, Wang M, Shen A, Wu Y, Xu X, et al. Src inhibitor dasatinib

sensitized gastric cancer cells to cisplatin. Med Oncol. 20221216th ed. 2022. p. 49.

32. Futami M, Sato K, Miyazaki K, Suzuki K, Nakamura T, Tojo A. Efficacy and Safety

of Doubly-Regulated Vaccinia Virus in a Mouse Xenograft Model of Multiple

Myeloma. Mol Ther Oncolytics. 20170722nd ed. 2017. p. 57–68.

33. Hanahan D, Weinberg RA. The hallmarks of cancer. Cell. 2000. p. 57–70.

34. Zhou Y, Wang L, Liu M, Jiang H, Wu Y. Oral squamous cell carcinoma: Insights

into cellular heterogeneity, drug resistance, and evolutionary trajectories. Cell Biol

Toxicol. 20250612th ed. 2025. p. 101.

35. Tan Y, Wang Z, Xu M, Li B, Huang Z, Qin S, et al. Oral squamous cell carcinomas:

state of the field and emerging directions. Int J Oral Sci. 20230922nd ed. 2023. p.

44.

36. Perše M. Cisplatin Mouse Models: Treatment, Toxicity and Translatability.

Biomedicines. 2021 Oct 7;9(10):1406. doi:10.3390/biomedicines9101406 PubMed

PMID: 34680523; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC8533586.

37. Theocharis S, Klijanienko J, Giaginis C, Alexandrou P, Patsouris E, Sastre-Garau X.

FAK and Src expression in mobile tongue squamous cell carcinoma: associations

with clinicopathological parameters and patients survival. J Cancer Res Clin Oncol.

20120410th ed. 2012. p. 1369–77.

38. Ho JN, Byun SS, Kim D, Ryu H, Lee S. Dasatinib induces apoptosis and autophagy

by suppressing the PI3K/Akt/mTOR pathway in bladder cancer cells. Investig Clin

Urol. 2024. p. 593–602.

39. Gray MJ, Zhang J, Ellis LM, Semenza GL, Evans DB, Watowich SS, et al. HIF-

1alpha, STAT3, CBP/p300 and Ref-1/APE are components of a transcriptional

complex that regulates Src-dependent hypoxia-induced expression of VEGF in

pancreatic and prostate carcinomas. Oncogene. 2005. p. 3110–20.

40. Ceppi P, Papotti M, Monica V, Lo Iacono M, Saviozzi S, Pautasso M, et al. Effects

of Src kinase inhibition induced by dasatinib in non-small cell lung cancer cell lines

treated with cisplatin. Mol Cancer Ther. 20091027th ed. 2009. p. 3066–74.

41. Masumoto N, Nakano S, Fujishima H, Kohno K, Niho Y. v-src induces cisplatin

resistance by increasing the repair of cisplatin-DNA interstrand cross-links in

human gallbladder adenocarcinoma cells. Int J Cancer. 1999. p. 731–7.

Figure Legends

Figure 1 Src activity and its inhibitory effect of tumor growth by specific inhibitors

in different oral cancer cell lines

A Western blot analysis of the oral squamous carcinoma cell lines to monitor numerous

signaling pathways. The phosphorylated and total protein levels were determined as

indicated. **B** Cell viability (%) of the oral squamous carcinoma cell lines treated with

each Src inhibitor for 72 h. Viability was measured using CellTiter-Glo, and values are

indicated relative to the 1% dimethyl sulfoxide (DMSO) control. Data represent

mean ± standard deviation from three independent experiments (n = 3). **C** IC_{50} curves of

the oral squamous carcinoma cell lines treated with each Src inhibitor for 36 h. Viability

was measured using CellTiter-Glo and normalized to that of the 1% DMSO control.

Values represent the mean of n = 3. **D, E** Western blot analysis of the oral squamous

carcinoma cell lines to investigate Src (D) and MAPK (E) activity induced by different

Src inhibitors. Oral squamous carcinoma cell lines were treated with an Src inhibitor for

18 h, followed by western blot analysis. D indicates the Src phosphorylation (Tyr416),

and E reveals MAPK pathway-related proteins. Supplementary Table S1 lists the

concentrations of the Src inhibitors used.

Figure 2 The tumor inhibitory effect by combination therapy using cisplatin and Src inhibitor.

Cells were treated with cisplatin (10 µM or 5 µM), each Src inhibitor (dasatinib, ponatinib, vandetanib, or bosutinib) alone, or their combinations for 36 h. Cell viability is indicated as the percentage relative to the 1% dimethyl sulfoxide (DMSO) control. Data represent mean ± standard deviation from three independent experiments. A–G show the data for the indicated cells. P-values were calculated using paired t-tests in Microsoft Excel. Statistical significance was indicated as $p < 0.01$ **, $p < 0.05$ *, and $p \geqq 0.05$ ns.

Figure 3 Tumor growth inhibition by single treatment of dasatinib *in vivo*.

A Experimental schedule for a single treatment with dasatinib *in vivo*. RLuc-expressing CAL27 (CAL27-Rluc) cells (clone 7) (2×10^7 cells/mouse) were subcutaneously implanted into the right flank of 5-week-old male BALB/cAJcl nu/nu mice. Three days following implantation, the mice were randomly assigned to four treatment groups: vehicle control (dimethyl sulfoxide [DMSO]), dasatinib alone (30 mg/kg), cisplatin alone (4 mg/kg), and cisplatin alone (2 mg/kg).(n=5–6). **B** Tumor volumes in each time point (mean ± s.d., n = 5–6). Tumor volumes were measured using calipers and calculated as L

× W² × 0.52. Measurements were conducted every 2 to 3 days. The tumor volumes were

normalized to the volume on day 5 for each mouse. **C** IVIS bioluminescence live imaging

of the tumor burden (additional mice are indicated in Fig. S2). Bioluminescence signals

were quantified 10 min following ViviRen injection according to the manufacturer's

instructions. D Body weights of nude mice from various treatment regimens implanted

with CAL27-Rluc xenografts. Dasatinib was intraperitoneally administered at 30 mg/kg

once daily and cisplatin was intraperitoneally administered at 4 or 2 mg/kg once weekly

for two consecutive weeks. Body weights are presented as mean ± standard deviation (n

= 5–6) and were normalized to the weight on Day 3 for each mouse. **E** Hematoxylin and

eosin staining of the tumor, kidney, and liver sections. Mice were perfusion-fixed on

day 17 and the harvested tissues were processed to generate frozen sections for

histological analysis. Representative images of each organ are presented. Tumor

histology: Control (DMSO) and cisplatin groups showed solid squamous cell carcinoma.

Dasatinib group exhibited a hollow, cyst-like structure with evidence of cell death within

the lumen. Kidney histology: Control (DMSO) and dasatinib groups displayed normal

renal architecture. Cisplatin 4 mg/kg group caused tubular epithelial degeneration and

atrophy with focal rupture (*), while cisplatin 2 mg/kg groups induced mild tubular

epithelial atrophy. Liver histology: All groups showed normal hepatic morphology

without detectable abnormalities. Scale bars: 500 µm (×40, ×100); 50 µm (×400).

Figure 4 Tumor growth inhibition by combination treatment of cisplatin and

dasatinib *in vivo*

A Experimental schedule for the combination treatment with dasatinib and cisplatin *in*

vivo. CAL27-Rluc cells (clone 7) (2×10^7 cells per mouse) were subcutaneously

implanted into the right flank of 5-week-old male BALB/cAJcl nu/nu mice. Three days

following implantation, the mice were randomly assigned to three treatment groups:

vehicle control (dimethyl sulfoxide [DMSO]), dasatinib (30 mg/kg) plus cisplatin

(4 mg/kg), and dasatinib (30 mg/kg) plus cisplatin (2 mg/kg). (n=5–6). **B** Tumor

volumes normalized to Day 3 at the final Day 16 time point (mean ±standard deviation

(s.d.), n = 5–6). Tumor volumes were measured using calipers and calculated as L × W²

× 0.52. Measurements were conducted every 2 to 3 days. **C** IVIS bioluminescence live

imaging of the tumor burden (additional mice are illustrated in Fig. S2).

Bioluminescence signals were quantified 10 min following ViviRen injection according

to the manufacturer's instructions. **D** Body weight of nude mice normalized to Day 3 at

the final Day 16 time point (mean ± s.d., n = 5–6). **E** Hematoxylin and eosin staining of

the tumor, kidney, and liver sections. Mice were perfusion-fixed on day 17 and

796 harvested tissues were processed to generate frozen sections for histological analysis.

797 Representative images of each organ are indicated. Tumor histology: Control group

798 showed solid squamous cell carcinoma. Dasatinib + cisplatin 4 mg/kg and dasatinib +

799 cisplatin 2 mg/kg group exhibited a hollow, cyst-like structure with evidence of cell

800 death within the lumen. Kidney histology: Control (DMSO) group displayed normal

801 renal architecture. dasatinib + cisplatin 4 mg/kg group caused tubular epithelial

802 degeneration and atrophy with focal rupture (*), while dasatinib + cisplatin 2 mg/kg

803 groups induced mild tubular epithelial atrophy. Liver histology: All groups showed

804 normal hepatic morphology without detectable abnormalities. Scale bars: 500 μm (×40,

805 ×100); 50 μm (×400).

807 **Supplementary Figures and tables**

809 **Supplementary Table 1.**

810 **Concentrations of Src inhibitors used for the Western blot analyses.**

	Dasatinib	Ponatinib	Vandetanib	Bosutinib
HSC-2	20 μM	5 μM	10 μM	9 μM
HSC-3	10 μM	2 μM	10 μM	10 μM
HSC-4	40 μM	7 μM	30 μM	15 μM
SAS	40 μM	10 μM	40 μM	15 μM
Ho-1-u-1	70 μM	9 μM	30 μM	30 μM
CAL27	15 μM	7 μM	15 μM	10 μM
SCC-25	10 μM	3 μM	10 μM	10 μM

813 **Supplementary Table 2.**

814 **Concentrations of Src inhibitors used for the cell viability and combination**

815 **treatment assays.**

	Dasatinib	Ponatinib	Vandetanib	Bosutinib
HSC-2	0.1 μM	2 μM	5 μM	5 μM
HSC-3	10 μM	2 μM	8 μM	5 μM
HSC-4	10 μM	5 μM	25 μM	15 μM
SAS	10 μM	5 μM	50 μM	25 μM
Ho-1-u-1	10 μM	5 μM	25 μM	25 μM
CAL27	10 μM	5 μM	10 μM	10 μM
SCC-25	10 μM	2 μM	8 μM	10 μM

Supplementary Figure 1 Comparison of drug sensitivity in RLuc-labeled CAL27

bulk cells and clones 1–7 using CellTiter-Glo and EnduRen assays.

Drug sensitivity of stable Renilla luciferase (Rluc)-expressing CAL27 (CAL27-Rluc)

bulk cells and clones 1–7 was evaluated 36 h following treatment using CellTiter-Glo

(A) and EnduRen (B) assays.

Supplementary Figure 2 Supplementary IVIS bioluminescence images

corresponding to Fig. 3

Additional IVIS bioluminescence live images corresponding to Fig. 3. These images

include mice scanned at various time points, which are not indicated in the main figure

but contribute to the total sample size (n = 5–6). One of three mice in the dasatinib group

died on day 16.

833 **Supplementary Figure 3 Tumor growth inhibition by single treatment of dasatinib**

834 **and bosutinib *in vivo***

A Experimental schedule for single treatment with dasatinib and bosutinib *in vivo*.

CAL27-Rluc cells (clone 7) (2×10^7 cells/mouse) were subcutaneously implanted into

the right flank of 5-week-old male BALB/cAJcl nu/nu mice. Three days following

implantation, the mice were randomly assigned to four treatment groups: vehicle control

(dimethyl sulfoxide [DMSO]), dasatinib alone (30 mg/kg), and bosutinib alone

(50 mg/kg). Dasatinib, bosutinib, and DMSO were dissolved in 10 mM Tris-HCl

(pH 7.4). All drugs were intraperitoneally administered at a volume of 100 µL per

mouse. Dasatinib, bosutinib, and DMSO were administered once daily (n=3). **B** Tumor

volumes normalized to Day 7 at the final Day 20 time point (mean ± standard deviation

[s.d.], n = 2–3). Tumor volumes were measured using calipers and calculated as $L \times W^2$

× 0.52. Measurements were conducted every 2–3 days. **C** IVIS bioluminescence live

imaging of tumor burden. One of three mice in the bosutinib group died on day 6. **D**

Body weights of nude mice from various treatment regimens implanted with CAL27-

Rluc xenografts. Body weights are presented as mean ± standard deviation [s.d.] (n = 5–

6) and were normalized to the wight on Day 3 for each mouse.(mean ± s.d., n = 2–3). **E**

Hematoxylin and eosin staining of the tumor, kidney, and liver sections. Mice were

perfusion-fixed on day 21 and the harvested tissues were processed to generate frozen

sections for histological analysis. Representative images of each organ are presented.

Tumor histology: Bosutinib group showed solid squamous cell carcinoma. Kidney

histology: Bosutinib group displayed normal renal architecture. Liver histology:

Bosutinib group showed normal hepatic morphology without detectable abnormalities.

Scale bars: 500 μm (×40, ×100); 50 μm (×400).

Supplementary Figure 4 Supplementary IVIS bioluminescence images

corresponding to Fig. 4

Additional IVIS bioluminescence live images corresponding to Fig. 4. These images

included mice scanned at various time points, which were not included in the main figure

but contributed to the total sample size (n = 5–6). One of three mice in the dasatinib

30 mg/kg + cisplatin 2 mg/kg group died on day 14.