### Supplemental materials for:

Maximizing the Value of Cancer Drug Screening in Multicellular Tumor Spheroid Cultures: A Case Study in Five Squamous Cell Carcinoma Cells Lines. Kochanek et al.

### Supplemental Figures 1 and 2, and Supplemental Tables 1-5, and Supplemental References 51-65.

Corresponding Author: Paul A. Johnston Ph.D., Associate Professor, Department of Pharmaceutical Sciences, School of Pharmacy, Room 4101 Pittsburgh Technology Center, 700 Technology Drive, Pittsburgh PA 15219. Email: paj18@pitt.edu



Supplemental Figure 1. Head and Neck Squamous Cell Carcinoma Multicellular Tumor Spheroid Growth Inhibition Drug Screening Assays; Transmitted Light and Live/Dead Color Composite Images of 3- & 6-day HNSCC MCTSs.

The five HNSCC cell lines were seeded in 384-well ULA-plates and cultured for 3 days to allow for MCTS formation, before the test compounds and plate controls were added to assay plates which were returned to the incubator for an additional 72h. MCTSs were then stained with the live cell CAM (green) and dead cell EHD (red) reagents and 4X images were acquired on the IXM in the TL, FITC and Texas Red channels. Greyscale TL images are presented along with color composite fluorescent images of live cell CAM and dead cell EHD staining depicted as green and red, respectively. Representative images from multiple independent experiments are presented. All scale bars represent 300 um.

### Supplemental Figure 2. 2D Monolayer Head and Neck Squamous Cell Carcinoma Cell Titer Blue® Growth Curves.



The five HNSCC cell lines were seeded into 384-well assay plates at 500 cells per well and cultured for the indicated time periods before the addition of the CTB detection reagent and subsequent measurement of RFU signals. CTB RFUs were measured in 32 wells  $(n=32)$  and are presented as the mean  $\pm$  SD for the following HNSCC cell lines; FaDu (blue circle,  $\bullet$ ), UM-22B (magenta circle,  $\bullet$ ), Cal33 (red circle,  $\bullet$ ), OSC-19 (green circle,  $\bullet$ ), and BIRC56 (black circle, ). The data were then analyzed GraphPad Prism 6 software using an exponential growth equation Y=Y0\*exp(k\*X) which describes the growth with a constant doubling time. Y0 is the Y value (RFU's) when X (time in h) is zero. K is the rate constant, expressed in reciprocal of the X axis time units (h). Tau is the time constant, expressed in the same units as the X axis and computed as the reciprocal of K. The doubling-time in h is computed as ln(2)/K. The 2D HNSCC monolayers exhibited exponential growth rates ( $r^2 > 0.93$ ) and their doubling times provided a rank order of growth; Cal33 (33.6h) = UM-22B (35.5h) = FaDu (37.4h) < BIRC56 (39.5h) << OSC19 (61.8h). Representative data from one of

three independent experiments are presented.



# Supplemental Table 1. Anticancer Test Drug Set: Mechanism of Action and Approved Cancer Therapy.

Max Conc = maximum concentration.

MOA = Mechanism of Action.

HNSCC = head and neck squamous cell carcinoma.

\* = drugs approved for HNSCC therapy.

EGFR = epidermal growth factor receptor

Drug mechanisms of action and clinical trial information were extracted from the National Cancer Institute (NCI) drug dictionary (https://www.cancer.gov/publications/dictionaries/cancer-drug) and clinical trial databases (https://www.cancer.gov/about-cancer/treatment/clinical-trials/search).

Supplemental Table 2. 2D Monolayer and Multicellular Tumor Spheroid Head and Neck Squamous Cell Carcinoma Culture Cell Titer Blue® Growth Inhibition Assay Performance Statistics.



To define 2D-monolyer and MCTS HNSCC culture growth inhibition assay signal windows and normalize the data for GI<sup>50</sup> determinations, we used 0.2% DMSO control wells to represent uninhibited growth (0% GI, Max controls, n=32), and 200μM Doxorubicin + 0.2% DMSO control wells to represent fully inhibited growth (100% GI, Min controls, n=32) respectively, and to calculate signal-to-background (S:B) ratios and Z'-factor coefficient assay performance statistics



Supplemental Table 3. 2D Monolayer and Multicellular Tumor Spheroid Head and Neck Squamous Cell Carcinoma Culture Growth Inhibition Drug Impact Scores

CTB GI drug impact scores for the 19 test drugs in both 2D-monolayer and MCTS HNSCC culture formats were based on GI<sub>50</sub> determination concentration response curves (Table 1). If a drug produced a calculable GI<sub>50</sub> it scored 1. If a drug didn't produce a calculable GI<sub>50</sub> but exhibited a concentration dependent GI response and achieved ≥25% GI it scored 0.5. If a drug didn't produce a calculable GI<sub>50</sub> or exhibit a concentration dependent GI response with ≥25% GI it received a score of 0. Maximum drug impact score per HNSCC culture = 1, and across all cultures = 5. Minimum drug impact score per HNSCC culture = 0, and across all cultures = 0. \* = Drugs approved by the Federal Drug Administration for HNSCC therapy.



Supplemental Table 4A. Cancer Drug Effects on Head and Neck Squamous Cell Carcinoma Multicellular Tumor Spheroid Calcein AM and Ethidium Homodimer Mean Integrated Fluorescent Intensity Values.

MIFI = mean integrated fluorescent intensity.

EHD = ethidium homodimer dead stain

CAM = Calcein AM live stain

CAM & EHD dead cell MIFI values were normalized and expressed as % of DMSO controls.

5-FU = 5-fluorouracil

\* = Drugs approved by the Federal Drug Administration for HNSCC therapy.

There are no MIFI values for Doxorubicin because of autofluorescence and potential cross talk in the FITC and Texas Red channels. 22, 31



Supplemental Table 4B. Head and Neck Squamous Cell Carcinoma Multicellular Tumor Spheroid Culture Live and Dead Staining Cancer Drug Impact Scores.

CAM live and EHD dead drug impact scores based on the % of MIFI data presented in Supplemental Table 4A. In CAM stained MCTS cultures, if a drug reduced the CAM MIFI by ≥50% relative to DMSO controls it scored 1, if it reduced the CAM MIFI by ≥20% but <50% it scored 0.5, and if it reduced the CAM MIFI by <20% it scored 0. In EHD stained MCTS cultures, if a drug increased the EHD MIFI by ≥50% relative to DMSO controls it scored 1, if it increased the EHD MIFI by ≥20% but <50% it scored 0.5, and if it increased the EHD MIFI by <20% it scored 0. Maximum CAM/EHD drug impact score per HNSCC MCTS culture = 1, and across all cultures = 5. Minimum drug CAM/EHD impact score per HNSCC MCTS culture = 0, and across all cultures = 0. \* = Drugs approved by the Federal Drug Administration for HNSCC therapy. No scores for Doxorubicin due to autofluorescence and potential cross talk in the FITC and Texas Red channels.  $^{22,\,31}$ 



## Supplemental Table 5A. Cancer Drug Effects on Head and Neck Squamous Cell Carcinoma Multicellular Tumor Spheroid Morphology

5-FU = 5-fluorouracil

\* = Drugs approved by the Federal Drug Administration for HNSCC therapy.

P/S = perimeter or shape of MCTS

D/C = density or compactness of MCTS

 $ΔD = change in diameter$ 

Dec = decrease in diameter

Inc = increase in diameter

Unc = diameter unchanged



Supplemental Table 5B. Head and Neck Squamous Cell Carcinoma Multicellular Tumor Spheroid Culture Morphology Cancer Drug Impact Scores.

The morphology drug impact scores are based on Supplemental Table 5A which summarizes the changes in MCTS morphology parameters relative to DMSO controls in MCTS cultures exposed to the top concentrations of the 19 drugs. If a drug altered ≥2 of the 3 MCTS morphology parameters it scored 1, if it only altered 1 of 3 morphology parameters it scored 0.5, and if it did not change any of the morphology parameters it scored 0. Maximum morphology drug impact score per HNSCC MCTS culture = 1, and across all cultures = 5. Minimum morphology drug impact score per HNSCC MCTS culture  $= 0$ , and across all cultures  $= 0.$  \* = Drugs approved by the Federal Drug Administration for HNSCC therapy.

#### Supplemental References 51-65

- 51. Schmidt, M., Scholz, CJ, Polednik, C, Roller, J. Spheroid-based 3-dimensional culture models: Gene expression and functionality in head and neck cancer. Oncology Reports 2016, 35, 2431-2440.
- 52. Grantab, R., Sivananthan, S, Tannock, IF. The penetration of anticancer drugs through tumor tissue as a function of cellular adhesion and packing density of tumor cells. Cancer Res. 2006, 66, 1033-1039.
- 53. Grantab, R., Tannock, IF. Penetration of anticancer drugs through tumour tissue as a function of cellular packing density and interstitial fluid pressure and its modification by bortezomib. BMC Cancer 2012, 12.
- 54. Tredan, O.; Galmarini, C. M.; Patel, K.; et al. Drug resistance and the solid tumor microenvironment. J Natl Cancer Inst 2007, 99, 1441-54.
- 55. Kyle, A., Huxham, LA, Chiam, AS, et al. Direct assessment of drug penetration into tissue using a novel application of threedimensional cell culture. Cancer Res. 2004, 64, 6304-6309.
- 56. Kyle, A., Huxham, LA, Yeoman, DM, Minchinton, AI. Limited tissue penetration of taxanes: a mechanism for resistance in solid tumors. Clin. Cancer Res. 2007, 13, 2804-2810.
- 57. Kuh, H., Jang, SH, Wientjes, MG, et al. Determinants of paclitaxel penetration and accumulation in human solid tumor. J Pharmacol Exp Ther 1999, 290, 871-880.
- 58. Au, J., Jang, SH, Zheng, J, et al. Determinants of drug delivery and transport to solid tumors. J Control Release. 2001, 74, 31-46.
- 59. Zheng, J., Chen, CT, Au, JL, Wientjes, MG. Time- and concentration-dependent penetration of doxorubicin in prostate tumors. AAPS PharmSci. 2001, 3, E15.
- 60. Cribbes, S., Kessel, S, McMenemy, S, et al. A Novel Multiparametric Drug-Scoring Method for High-Throughput Screening of 3D Multicellular Tumor Spheroids Using the Celigo Image Cytometer. SLAS Discov. 2017, 22, 547-557.
- 61. Kang, H., Kiess, A, Chung, CH. Emerging biomarkers in head and neck cancer in the era of genomics. Nat Rev Clin Oncol. 2015, 12, 11-26.
- 62. Network, T. C. G. A. Comprehensive genomic characterization of head and neck squamous cell carcinomas. Nature 2015, 517, 576–582.
- 63. Sun, W., Califano, JA. Sequencing the head and neck cancer genome: implications for therapy. Ann N Y Acad Sci. 2014, 1333, 33-42.
- 64. Holohan, C., Van Schaeybroeck, S, Longley, DB, Johnston, PG. Cancer drug resistance: an evolving paradigm. Nat Rev Cancer. 2013, 13, 714-26.

65. Lovly, C., Shaw, AT. Molecular pathways: resistance to kinase inhibitors and implications for therapeutic strategies. Clin Cancer Res. 2014, 20, 2249-56.