



# A dynamic *in vitro* model approach towards deducing the hazard of long-term nanomaterial exposure to the alveolar epithelial barrier

Kirsty Meldrum<sup>1</sup>, Sarah M. Mitchell, Gareth J. S. Jenkins<sup>1</sup>, Shareen H. Doak<sup>1</sup> and Martin J. D. Clift<sup>1</sup>

1. In Vitro Toxicology Group, Swansea University Medical School, Swansea University, Singleton Campus, Centre for NanoHealth, Institute of Life Sciences, SA2 8PP, Swansea, Wales, UK

Transwell Insert

equilibrate for 24 hours before C. exposure to the ENM via a quasi-ALI exposure.

## **Introduction:**

- Exposure to engineered nanomaterials (ENM) poses an inevitable health risk to both humans and the environment through long-term, repetitive, low-dose exposures.
- The focus of this part of the study was to develop and expose an advanced lung model.
- Current *in vitro* lung models have both advantages and disadvantages (Table 1.) Table 1. Advantages and disadvantages of current *in vitro* models. Not one model is perfect!

	Heterogeous Cell Population	3D Conformation	Chemical Cues	Mechanical Stimulus	Low Cost	Easy use	Low Equipment/ Facilities
2D plastic cell culture	$\odot$	$\otimes$	$\otimes$	$\bigotimes$	0	0	$\odot$
Inserts	$\odot$	$\bigotimes$	$\otimes$	$\bigotimes$	$\odot$	$\odot$	$\odot$
Organoids	$\odot$	$\odot$	$\odot$	$\otimes$	$\odot$	$\odot$	$\odot$
Microfluids	$\bigotimes$	$\bigotimes$	$\otimes$	$\odot$	$\otimes$	$\otimes$	$\bigotimes$
Synthetic Scaffolds	$\bigotimes$	$\odot$	$\odot$	$\bigotimes$	$\odot$	$\odot$	$\odot$
Biological Scaffolds	$\bigotimes$	$\odot$	$\odot$	$\bigotimes$	$\odot$	$\odot$	$\odot$
3D Bioprinting	$\bigotimes$	$\odot$	$\odot$	$\odot$	$\bigotimes$	$\bigotimes$	$\bigotimes$

## Aims:

We aim to develop systems to allow key long-term studies to be achieved in vitro, by optimising lung models and establishing dosing strategies to enable long-term, repeated nanomaterial exposures.

#### **Methods:**

Cells on Apica

Surface

Characterise and determine optimal exposure time point for both A549 and NCI-H441 epithelial cells. Additional of macrophages (dTHP-1 (Risby *et al.*, (in prep), THP-1 cells were differentiated using PMA (20nM) for 48hours with a 48hour recovery period) to the A549 cells.

B Cells on Apica'

Surface

Initial exposure to a standard ENM (DQ<sub>12</sub>) for single and repeat exposures over a range of time points (24hours-72hours) in both monocultures of A549 and co-cultures of A549+dTHP-1.

ENM sonicated for 16mins using a probe sonicator DQ<sub>12</sub> 100µl of EMN Suspension C Cells on Apical Surface

 Grow cells at an air-liquid interface (ALI)

Expose them to standard ENMs that are commercially available (Figure 1.).

#### Measure:

Membrane integrity (blue dextran),
cell counts and viability (trypan blue method)
IL-8 and IL-6 basal concentrations measured



Figure 1. Exposure schematic A. Cells initially grow in submerged conditions. B. Cells witched to an ALI and allowed to

Current *i n vitro* models advantages ( 📀 ) and disavantages (😣 ).



Figure 2. Epithelial cell culture characterisation of A, A549 and B, NCI-H441 cells. Membrane integrity measured by trans-epithelial membrane resistance (TEER) and blue dextran (200kDa – measures the translocation of the blue dye from the apical to the basal side of the membrane in a normal culture method. Higher fold against the negative control represents lower membrane integrity). **1.** Membrane integrity of the culture **2.** Cell count and viability of the cells over the life of the culture. A549 cells N=6 and NCI-H441 N=1-3 with all assays performed in triplicate. The data is presented as the mean  $\pm$ SEM. Significance is denoted as the following: compared to either Sub or ALI day 1 p<0.05(\*), <0.001(\*\*\*), <0.001(\*\*\*), <0.001(\*\*\*), <0.001(\*\*\*), <0.001(\*\*\*), <0.001(\*\*\*), <0.001(\*\*\*), <0.001(\*\*\*), <0.001(\*\*\*), <0.001(\*\*\*), <0.001(\*\*\*), <0.001(\*\*\*), <0.001(\*\*\*), <0.001(\*\*\*), <0.001(\*\*\*), <0.001(\*\*\*), <0.001(\*\*\*), <0.001(\*\*\*), <0.001(\*\*\*), <0.001(\*\*\*), <0.001(\*\*\*), <0.001(\*\*\*), <0.001(\*\*\*), <0.001(\*\*\*), <0.001(\*\*\*), <0.001(\*\*\*), <0.001(\*\*\*), <0.001(\*\*\*), <0.001(\*\*\*), <0.001(\*\*\*), <0.001(\*\*\*), <0.001(\*\*\*), <0.001(\*\*\*), <0.001(\*\*\*), <0.001(\*\*\*), <0.001(\*\*\*), <0.001(\*\*\*), <0.001(\*\*\*), <0.001(\*\*\*), <0.001(\*\*\*), <0.001(\*\*\*), <0.001(\*\*\*), <0.001(\*\*\*), <0.001(\*\*\*), <0.001(\*\*\*), <0.001(\*\*\*), <0.001(\*\*\*), <0.001(\*\*\*), <0.001(\*\*\*), <0.001(\*\*\*), <0.001(\*\*\*), <0.001(\*\*\*), <0.001(\*\*\*), <0.001(\*\*\*), <0.001(\*\*\*), <0.001(\*\*\*), <0.001(\*\*\*), <0.001(\*\*\*), <0.001(\*\*\*), <0.001(\*\*\*), <0.001(\*\*\*), <0.001(\*\*\*), <0.001(\*\*\*), <0.001(\*\*\*), <0.001(\*\*\*), <0.001(\*\*\*), <0.001(\*\*\*), <0.001(\*\*\*), <0.001(\*\*\*), <0.001(\*\*\*), <0.001(\*\*\*), <0.001(\*\*\*), <0.001(\*\*\*), <0.001(\*\*\*), <0.001(\*\*\*), <0.001(\*\*\*), <0.001(\*\*\*), <0.001(\*\*\*), <0.001(\*\*\*), <0.001(\*\*\*), <0.001(\*\*\*), <0.001(\*\*\*), <0.001(\*\*\*), <0.001(\*\*\*), <0.001(\*\*\*), <0.001(\*\*\*), <0.001(\*\*\*), <0.001(\*\*\*), <0.001(\*\*\*), <0.001(\*\*\*), <0.001(\*\*\*), <0.001(\*\*\*), <0.001(\*\*\*), <0.001(\*\*\*), <0.001(\*\*\*), <0.001(\*\*\*), <0.001(\*\*\*), <0.001(\*\*\*), <0.001(\*\*\*), <0.001(\*\*\*), <0.001(\*\*\*), <0.001(\*\*\*), <0.001(\*\*\*), <

## **Single DQ<sub>12</sub> Exposures**

### **Repeat DQ<sub>12</sub> Exposures**



Figure 3. Single and Repeat DQ<sub>12</sub> exposures in both A549 monocultures and A549+dTHP-1 co-cultures. IL-8 and IL-6 concentrations measured in the basal compartment of the ALI culture after a single DQ<sub>12</sub> exposure (A) to either an A549 monoculture or an A549+dTHP-1 co-culture. IL-8 and IL-6 concentrations measured in the basal compartment of the ALI culture after a single DQ<sub>12</sub> exposure (A) to either an A549 monoculture or an A549+dTHP-1 co-culture (D). Concentrations were measured after a pre-determined exposure time (24-72 hours post exposure) indicated by the various exposure scenarios (E). N=3 with all assays performed in triplicate. The data is presented as the mean ±SEM. Significance is denoted as the following: compared to a single exposure p<0.01(\*).



Acknowledgments:

Thanks go to the *in vitro* toxicology group at Swansea University and all WP3 members of PATROLS This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under grant agreement No 760813



https://www.patrols-h2020.eu

