

**Genotoxicity and functionality
assessment of a bone marrow
stromal cell line following
chemotherapy in an *in vitro*
model of multiple myeloma.**

Simon William Andrews

This thesis is submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements of the
University of the West of England for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in
Biomedical Science

Faculty of Health and Applied Sciences, University of the West of England

Abstract

Multiple myeloma (MM) is a haematological malignancy characterized by terminally differentiated plasma cells and their accumulation in the bone marrow (BM). Despite significant advances in therapeutic strategies it currently remains incurable. The interactions between the BM microenvironment and malignant plasma cells have been pivotal to understanding this disease. Previous reports have shown that patients with a haematological malignancy sustain “damage” to their BM, but how much of this is due to the disease and/or the treatment is currently unknown. Furthermore MM plasma cells have been documented to harness the BM microenvironment to their advantage, improving their growth and survival. However, little is known about the functionality of BM mesenchymal stem cells (MSC) in patients with MM disease which form an essential compartment of the BM microenvironment. It was hypothesised that MSC altruistically protect MM cells from therapy and consequently become phenotypically and genetically compromised.

To facilitate the study of the effects of chemotherapeutic agents and MM cells on MSC, a non-contact co-culture model was developed that allowed the investigation of functional and genetic damage. In line with previous studies, the MM cell line, U266B1 were found to be protected from drug-induced cell death when in co-culture with the stromal cell line HS5. However, the promoting effects of the BM appear to be at the detriment to their own survival. HS5 cells were found to have lower viability, altered morphology and disrupted differentiation when in a non-contact co-culture with U266B1 cells.

Results from this study have revealed that interactions of MSC with MM cells lead to an altruistic protection of MM cells by the BM. This work demonstrates that U266B1 cells have an improved viability following exposure to chemotherapy when in a non-contact co-culture with MSC/HS5. Furthermore, genotoxic assays also revealed that HS5/MSC interactions with U266B1 cells protect U266B1 from the genotoxic effects of melphalan in co-culture, whilst for the first time HS5 morphology was shown to be severely altered following exposure to chemotherapy and when in co-culture with U266B1 cells.

This work has demonstrated, for the first time, the cytotoxic effects of novel agents bortezomib and carfilzomib on HS5 cells when in co-culture with U266B1 cells. Results from this study also demonstrate that melphalan severely effects the ability of HS5 cells to differentiate in an osteogenic lineage with a further deficiency in differentiation when in co-culture with U266B1. Adipogenic differentiation of HS5 was unable to take place when in co-culture with MM cells and was again further impaired by chemotherapy. This is the first study to reveal that primary MSC secrete significantly high concentrations of IL-6 compared to the stromal cell line HS5. A further increase in expression of IL-6 was also shown when in co-culture with U266B1 cells.

Increased multi-nucleation was also identified in both HS5 and U266B1 cells when exposed to either thalidomide, lenalidomide and bortezomib with abnormalities providing possible explanations for the therapy related malignancies and neurotoxicity that is seen in some patients. Genotoxicity to the MSC/HS5 compartment of the co-culture measured by the micronucleus assay was also found to be reduced suggesting that the BM is protected from the DNA damaging effects of some agents when in co-culture with MM cells.

Combined work on the functionality and genotoxicity of the interactions between the BM and MM reveal a tropism of MSC and HS5 towards the MM cell line U266B1. With this research being conducted in a non-contact co-culture, it has indicated that cell-cell contact is not essential to provide protection of both the BM and MM cells against chemotherapy. This research provides further understanding of the MSC and MM interactions' impact on the functionality of the BM and their protection from genotoxic damage. Elucidating the consequence of cytotoxic and genotoxic damage to MSC via chemotherapy treatment and/or through haematological disease may allow for the development of effective therapies and improve the quality of life for patients with MM.

Acknowledgements

This thesis could not have been accomplished without the support and encouragement of numerous people including my family, friends and colleagues. It is my great pleasure to acknowledge all those people who made this thesis possible and an unforgettable experience for me.

Firstly I must acknowledge the invaluable guidance, understanding, and unceasing assistance that I have received from my director of studies, Dr Ruth Morse, and from which I have benefitted throughout my time at UWE. I am so grateful for her having constantly made time to discuss extensively my research, giving valuable suggestions and constructive criticism, whilst always providing encouragement. I also express my sincere gratitude to my supervisors Dr Craig Donaldson and Dr Jennifer May for all the help and guidance that they have afforded throughout my study.

In addition I would like to express my appreciation for the assistance and technical advice provided by Mr David Corry and Dr Jeff Davey. I am grateful to Dr David Patton, for his assistance with scanning electron microscopy, Mr Scott Lake for his involvement in the development of the ELISA for IL-6 and Ms Jennifer Razik for her contribution and help with the study of immunomodulatory agents on TK6 cells. My research would not have been possible without their help.

I am most grateful to UWE for providing the funding of this research. My time here was made enjoyable in large part by members of the CRIB lab and in particular the PhD students who were a source not only of friendship, but also sound advice and encouragement. You have all made the lab and the university a great place to work.

This PhD would not have been possible without the unfailing support of my family. Foremost, an enormous thank you to my parents for their love, unwavering support and immeasurable sacrifice. I am grateful for their having allowed me to move back home these last two years to complete my thesis and for their financial support. Thank you to my sister Kate and brother in law Steve, who have also encouraged me through the ups and downs of these last

few years. I am deeply indebted to my late grandparents, for their everlasting love, care and encouragement. Together they had always been enthusiastic supporters of my education and will always be remembered. Finally but definitely not least, I express my deep gratitude to my girlfriend Abbie. I am so appreciative of all her love and patience over the last few years and who has always been there to cheer me up and stood by me through the good times and bad. I would not have been able to do this without you.

Contents

Abstract.....	i
Acknowledgements.....	iii
Contents.....	v
List of Figures.....	x
List of Tables.....	xv
Abbreviations.....	xvi

Chapter 1: Introduction.....	1
1.1 Multiple Myeloma.....	1
1.1.2 Clinical features.....	1
1.1.3 Epidemiology.....	3
1.1.4 Aetiology.....	5
1.1.5 Prognosis and staging.....	5
1.2 Bone marrow microenvironment.....	7
1.2.1 Mesenchymal stem cells.....	8
1.2.2 Effects of chemotherapy on MSC.....	10
1.2.3 Effects of MM cells on MSC.....	11
1.3 Adhesion molecules and cytokines.....	12
1.4 Multiple myeloma bone disease.....	16
1.4.1 Normal bone remodelling.....	16
1.4.2 Bone remodelling in multiple myeloma.....	18
1.5 Treatment of multiple myeloma.....	20
1.5.1 Autologous stem cell transplant.....	21
1.5.2 Melphalan and prednisone.....	22
1.5.3 Thalidomide.....	24
1.5.4 Lenalidomide.....	25
1.5.5 Proteasome inhibitors.....	27
1.5.5.1 The ubiquitin proteasome system.....	27
1.5.5.2 Bortezomib.....	28
1.5.5.3 Carfilzomib.....	30
1.5.6 Bisphosphonates.....	31
1.5.7 Monoclonal antibodies.....	31
1.5.8 HSP90 Inhibitors.....	32
1.5.9 Side effects of treatment.....	32
1.6 Drug resistance.....	33
1.7 Genotoxic effects following chemotherapeutic insult.....	35
1.7.1 DNA Damage.....	35
1.7.2 DNA repair mechanisms.....	37
1.7.3 Therapy related malignancy.....	39
1.8 Current culture systems.....	40
1.9 Aims and objectives.....	43
Chapter 2: Materials and Methods.....	44
2.1 General methods.....	44
2.1.1 Materials.....	44
2.1.2 Samples.....	44
2.1.3 MSC sample collection.....	44
2.1.4 Cell lines.....	45

2.1.5	Resistant cells.....	45
2.2	Cell culture.....	47
2.2.1	MSC isolation.....	47
2.2.2	MSC and HS5 standard culture conditions.....	47
2.2.3	Multiple myeloma and TK6 cell lines standard culture conditions.....	48
2.2.4	Thawing of cryopreserved cells.....	48
2.2.5	Trypsinisation of the adherent MSC/HS5 cells.....	48
2.2.6	Cryopreserving cells.....	49
2.2.7	Establishment of culture conditions.....	49
2.3	Chemotherapeutic agents.....	50
2.3.1	Treatment conditions.....	51
2.3.2	Trypan blue exclusion assay.....	53
2.4	Microscope examination.....	53
2.4.1	Light and phase contrast microscopy.....	53
2.4.2	Scanning electron microscope.....	53
2.4.3	Confocal microscopy.....	54
2.5	Genotoxic assays.....	55
2.5.1	<i>In vitro</i> micronucleus assay.....	55
2.5.1.1	Cell preparation.....	55
2.5.1.2	Slide preparation and staining.....	55
2.5.1.3	Slide analysis.....	56
2.5.1.4	Scoring of micronuclei.....	58
2.5.2	Comet assay.....	58
2.5.2.1	Harvesting cells for comet analysis.....	59
2.5.2.2	Electrophoresis.....	59
2.5.2.3	Comet evaluation/analysis.....	60
2.5.2.4	Positive quality control; hydrogen peroxide (H ₂ O ₂).....	60
2.6	Enzyme linked immunosorbent assay (ELISA).....	61
2.7	Functionality assays.....	63
2.7.1	Cell differentiation.....	63
2.7.2	Flow cytometry.....	64
2.8	Mitotic analysis.....	65
2.8.1	Thymidine double block for cell synchronisation.....	65
2.8.2	Propidium iodide staining for cell cycle analysis.....	65
2.9	Statistical analysis.....	66
Chapter 3:	Development of an <i>in vitro</i> model of MM.....	67
3.1	Introduction.....	67
3.1.1	Culture medium.....	67
3.1.2	Aims of chapter 3.....	69
3.2	Methods.....	69
3.2.1	Culture medium assessment.....	69
3.2.2	Trypan blue exclusion assay.....	69
3.2.3	Microscopy.....	69
3.2.4	Statistical analysis.....	69
3.3	Results.....	70
3.3.1	Evaluation of MSC, HS5 and MM culture medium.....	70
3.3.1.1	U266B1 and RPMI 8226.....	70
3.3.1.2	BM-MSC.....	74
3.3.1.3	HS5.....	77
3.3.2	Establishing a co-culture model of myeloma bone marrow.....	80
3.3.3	MSC seeding density for the co-culture model.....	82

	3.3.4 HS5 seeding density for the co-culture model.....	86
	3.3.5 BM-MSC seeded on the underside of the insert.....	89
	3.3.6 Scanning electron microscopy assessment of the co-culture model.....	92
	3.3.7 IL-6 ELISA development.....	95
3.4	Discussion.....	101
	3.4.1 Development of IL-6 ELISA.....	107
3.5	Conclusion.....	110
Chapter 4:	Functionality of HS5 cell line in MM.....	111
4.1	Introduction.....	111
4.2	Methods.....	112
	4.2.1 Trypan blue exclusion assay.....	112
	4.2.2 Microscopy.....	112
	4.2.3 Differentiation of HS5.....	113
	4.2.4 Flow Cytometry.....	113
	4.2.5 ELISA.....	113
	4.2.6 Statistical analysis.....	113
4.3	Results.....	114
	4.3.1 Trypan blue assessment of primary MSC, HS5 and U266B1 cell lines following chemotherapy.....	114
	4.3.1.1 Melphalan.....	114
	4.3.1.1.1 MSC cultured alone and exposed to melphalan.....	114
	4.3.1.1.2 U266B1 cultured alone and exposed to melphalan.....	116
	4.3.1.1.3 MSC co-cultured with U266B1 and exposed to melphalan.....	117
	4.3.1.1.4 U266B1 co-cultured with MSC and exposed to melphalan.....	119
	4.3.1.1.5 MSC bystander model.....	121
	4.3.1.1.6 U266B1 bystander model.....	123
	4.3.1.1.7 HS5 cells cultured alone and exposed to melphalan....	125
	4.3.1.1.8 Melphalan resistant U266B1 cultured alone and exposed to melphalan.....	126
	4.3.1.1.9 HS5 cells co-cultured with U266B1 sensitive and melphalan resistant U266B1 cells.....	128
	4.3.1.1.10 Melphalan resistant U266B1 cells in co-culture with HS5 cells.....	130
	4.3.1.2 Immunomodulatory agents.....	132
	4.3.1.2.1 HS5 cells cultured alone treated with thalidomide or lenalidomide.....	132
	4.3.1.2.2 U266B1 cultured alone and treated with thalidomide or lenalidomide.....	134
	4.3.1.2.3 HS5 cells co-cultured with U266B1 and exposed to thalidomide or lenalidomide.....	135
	4.3.1.2.4 U266B1 cells co-cultured with HS5 cells and exposed to thalidomide or lenalidomide.....	136
	4.3.1.2.5 HS5 bystander model.....	138
	4.3.1.2.6 U266B1 bystander model.....	140
	4.3.1.3 Proteasome inhibitors.....	142
	4.3.1.3.1 HS5 cells cultured alone and exposed to bortezomib or carfilzomib.....	142

4.3.1.3.2	U266B1 cultured alone and exposed to bortezomib or carfilzomib.....	144
4.3.1.3.3	HS5 cells co-cultured with U266B1 cells and exposed to bortezomib or carfilzomib.....	145
4.3.1.3.4	U266B1 cells co-cultured with HS5 cells and exposed to bortezomib or carfilzomib.....	147
4.3.1.3.5	HS5 bystander model.....	149
4.3.1.3.6	U266B1 bystander model.....	151
4.3.2	Phase contrast microscopy.....	153
4.3.2.1	HS5 morphology when cultured independently.....	153
4.3.2.2	HS5 morphology when co-cultured with U266B1 cells....	158
4.3.3	HS5 Cell Differentiation.....	163
4.3.3.1	Osteogenic differentiation.....	163
4.3.3.2	Adipogenic differentiation.....	168
4.3.4	HS5 CD expression following chemotherapy exposure.....	172
4.3.5	ELISA.....	175
4.3.5.1	Levels of IL-6 in the MM model.....	175
4.3.5.2	IL-6 measured in MSC following exposure to melphalan.....	175
4.3.5.3	Levels of IL-6 in MSC and HS5 cells when cultured alone.....	177
4.3.5.4	IL-6 in HS5 cells following exposure to chemotherapy when cultured alone.....	178
4.3.5.5	IL-6 in U266B1 cells following exposure to chemotherapy when cultured alone.....	179
4.3.5.6	IL-6 in a non-contact co-culture of HS5 and U266B1 cells.....	180
4.4	Discussion.....	182
4.4.1	Cytotoxic assessment of MM model.....	182
4.4.2	HS5 Morphology following chemotherapy exposure.....	189
4.4.3	HS5 Cell differentiation.....	192
4.4.4	HS5 CD expression after chemotherapy treatment.....	197
4.4.6	Expression of IL-6 in the MM model.....	199
4.5	Conclusion.....	201
Chapter 5:	Genotoxic assessment of MM.....	202
5.1	Introduction.....	202
5.2	Methods.....	203
5.2.1	Alkaline comet assay.....	203
5.2.2	Micronucleus assay.....	203
5.2.2.1	Cytochalasin-B protocol.....	204
5.2.3	Cell cycle analysis.....	204
5.2.4	Statistical analysis.....	204
5.3	Results.....	205
5.3.1	Alkaline comet assay results.....	205
5.3.1.1	Melphalan.....	205
5.3.1.2	Thalidomide.....	215
5.3.1.3	Lenalidomide.....	218
5.3.1.4	Bortezomib.....	221
5.3.1.5	Carfilzomib.....	224
5.3.2	Micronucleus assay results.....	227
5.3.2.1	Cytochalasin-B treatment of U266B1 cells.....	227

5.3.2.2	Non cytochalasin-B micronucleus assay.....	228
5.3.3	Synchronisation of TK6 lymphoblast cells.....	252
5.3.4	Cell synchronisation impact on induction of multi-nucleation following exposure to thalidomide and lenalidomide.....	253
5.4	Discussion.....	257
5.4.1	Assessment of genotoxic damage following chemotherapeutic treatment using the comet assay.....	258
5.4.2	Detection of genotoxicity following chemotherapy using the micronucleus assay.....	261
5.4.3	Genotoxic effects of immunomodulatory agents on TK6 lymphoblast cells following cell synchronisation.....	265
5.5	Conclusion.....	266
Chapter 6:	Final Discussion.....	267
6.1	Overall summary of research findings.....	267
6.2	Limitations of the study.....	275
6.3	Future considerations.....	276
6.4	Thesis summary and conclusion.....	277
References	279
Appendix	339
	Research Output.....	339
	Publications.....	339
	Presentations.....	339

List of Figures

Figure 1.1:	Radiographs from patients with multiple myeloma.....	2
Figure 1.2:	Average number of new cases of multiple myeloma per year and age-specific incidence rates of multiple myeloma in males and females in the UK.....	4
Figure 1.3:	Number of new cases of MM per 100,000 persons by race and gender.....	4
Figure 1.4:	Confluent bone marrow mesenchymal stem cells in culture.....	9
Figure 1.5:	Cell-cell interactions in MM.....	13
Figure 1.6:	Schematic diagram depicting Ras/Raf/MAPK/ERK and JAK/STAT signalling pathways that are activated in MM.....	16
Figure 1.7:	Mechanisms of bone remodelling in health.....	18
Figure 1.8:	Chemical structure of melphalan.....	22
Figure 1.9:	Schematic image indicating the formation of DNA crosslinks as a result of melphalan treatment.....	23
Figure 1.10:	Chemical structure of thalidomide and lenalidomide.....	26
Figure 1.11:	Diagram of the structure and function the ubiquitin–proteasome protein degradation pathway.....	28
Figure 1.12:	Chemical structures of major proteasome inhibitors used in the treatment of MM.....	30
Figure 2.1:	The experimental set up of a 12 well culture plate used in this study.....	52
Figure 2.2:	Photomicrographs of the typical morphologies seen when scoring MN slides.....	57
Figure 3.1:	Morphology of U266B1 cells in different culture media.....	71
Figure 3.2:	Proliferation of U266B1 cells in different culture media.....	72
Figure 3.3:	Morphology of RPMI 8226 cells in different culture media.....	73
Figure 3.4:	Proliferation of RPMI 8226 cells in different culture media.....	74
Figure 3.5:	Morphology of primary MSC cells in different culture media.....	75
Figure 3.6:	Proliferation of MSC in different culture media.....	76
Figure 3.7:	Morphology of HS5 cells in different culture media.....	77
Figure 3.8:	Proliferation of HS5 in different culture media.....	78
Figure 3.9:	Cell viability of HS5 in different culture medium.....	79
Figure 3.10:	Images of initial co-culture of adhered MSC/HS5 and suspended U266B1 cells in complete DMEM/F12 medium.....	81
Figure 3.11:	Schematic diagram indicating the construction of a non-contact model of co-culture.....	82
Figure 3.12:	Determination of confluency of MSC seeded in a 12 well plate.....	84
Figure 3.13:	Determination of confluency of MSC seeded in a 12 well plate 6 days post initial seeding	85
Figure 3.14:	Comparison of cell size of BM-MSC vs HS5 stromal cell line.....	86
Figure 3.15:	Determination of confluency of HS5 seeded in a 12 well plate.....	87
Figure 3.16:	Determination of confluency of HS5 seeded in a 12 well plate 6 days post initial seeding.....	88
Figure 3.17:	Schematic diagram of the contact model of co-culture.....	89
Figure 3.18:	Co-culture set up of MSC/HS5 seeded on the underside of an insert.....	90

Figure 3.19:	Representative image of MSC in the base of a 12 well plate, 24 hrs after the insert was returned to its original position.....	90
Figure 3.20:	Lipophilic tracer images of MSC on the underside of a 0.4 µm pore insert (A – x 10 magnification; B x 40 magnification).....	91
Figure 3.21:	Representative image of HS5 in the base of a 12 well plate, 24 hrs after the insert was returned to its original position.....	92
Figure 3.22:	SEM image of an MSC on the underside of a 0.4 µm pore insert (x 2013 magnification).....	93
Figure 3.23:	SEM images of U266B1 in the basket of a 0.4 µm pore insert (A – x 400, B – x 6396 magnification, C x 25600 magnification).....	94
Figure 3.24:	IL-6 ELISA titration assay set up.....	95
Figure 3.25:	Comparison of three ELISA plates with four standard curves on each plate.....	98
Figure 3.26:	Comparison images of plates and standard curves produced using streptavidin peroxidase (A) and Pierce™ Streptavidin Poly-HRP (B).....	99
Figure 3.27:	Comparison of HQC and LQC IL-6 concentrations from standard curves produced using streptavidin peroxidase (A) and Pierce™ Streptavidin Poly-HRP (B).....	100
Figure 3.28:	Schematic diagram comparing the detection methods of streptavidin peroxidase (A) and poly HRP (B).....	109
Figure 4.1:	Total cell numbers (A) and viability (B) of MSC after exposure to melphalan when cultured alone.....	115
Figure 4.2:	Total cell numbers (A) and viability (B) of U266B1 cells after exposure to melphalan when cultured alone.....	116
Figure 4.3:	Total cell numbers (A) and viability (B) of MSC after exposure to melphalan when in co-culture with U266B1 cells.....	118
Figure 4.4:	Total cell numbers (A) and viability (B) of U266B1 cells after exposure to melphalan when in co-culture with MSC.....	120
Figure 4.5:	Total cell numbers (A) and viability (B) of MSC after exposure to melphalan either directly or when in culture with previously exposed U266B1 cells.....	122
Figure 4.6:	Total cell numbers (A) and viability (B) of U266B1 cells after exposure to melphalan either directly or when in culture with previously exposed MSC.....	124
Figure 4.7:	Total cell numbers (A) and viability (B) of HS5 cells after exposure to melphalan when cultured alone.....	125
Figure 4.8:	Total cell numbers (A) and viability (B) of melphalan resistant U266B1 compared to non-resistant (sensitive) U266B1 cells following exposure to melphalan and cultured alone.....	127
Figure 4.9:	Total cell numbers (A) and viability (B) of HS5 cells after exposure to melphalan in co-culture with melphalan resistant U266B1 cells.....	129
Figure 4.10:	Total cell numbers (A) and viability (B) of U266B1 sensitive and melphalan resistant U266B1 after exposure to melphalan when in co-culture with HS5 cells.....	131
Figure 4.11:	Total cell numbers (A) and viability (B) of HS5 cells cultured alone and after exposure to immunomodulatory agents.....	133
Figure 4.12:	Total cell numbers (A) and viability (B) of U266B1 cells after exposure to immunomodulatory agents alone.....	134
Figure 4.13:	Total cell numbers (A) and viability (B) of HS5 cells after exposure to immunomodulatory agents while in co-culture with U266B1 cells.....	135

Figure 4.14:	Total cell numbers (A) and viability (B) of U266B1 cells after exposure to immunomodulatory agents when in co-culture with HS5 cells.....	137
Figure 4.15:	Total cell numbers (A) and viability (B) of HS5 cells after exposure to immunomodulatory agents either directly or indirectly via culture with treated U266B1 cells.....	139
Figure 4.16:	Total cell numbers (A) and viability (B) of U266B1 cells after exposure to immunomodulatory agents either directly or indirectly via culture with treated HS5 cells.....	141
Figure 4.17:	Total cell numbers (A) and viability (B) of HS5 cells after exposure to proteasome inhibitors when cultured alone.....	143
Figure 4.18:	Total cell numbers (A) and viability (B) of U266B1 cells after exposure to proteasome inhibitors when cultured alone.....	144
Figure 4.19:	Total cell numbers (A) and viability (B) of HS5 cells after exposure to proteasome inhibitors in co-culture with U266B1 cells.....	146
Figure 4.20:	Total cell numbers (A) and viability (B) of U266B1 cells after exposure to proteasome inhibitors when in co-culture with HS5 cells.....	148
Figure 4.21:	Total cell numbers (A) and viability (B) of HS5 cells after exposure to proteasome inhibitors either directly or when co-cultured with previously exposed U266B1 cells.....	150
Figure 4.22:	Total cell numbers (A) and viability (B) of U266B1 cells after exposure to proteasome inhibitors either directly or when co-cultured with previously exposed HS5 cells.....	152
Figure 4.23:	Representative images of HS5 morphology following 1 hr exposure to melphalan at the clinically relevant dose compared to an untreated control.....	155
Figure 4.24:	Representative Images of HS5 morphology following 1 hr exposure with immunomodulatory agents at the clinically relevant dose compared to an untreated control.....	156
Figure 4.25:	Representative Images of HS5 morphology following 1 hr exposure with proteasome inhibitors compared to an untreated control.....	157
Figure 4.26:	Phase contrast images of HS5 cells following co-culture with U266B1 with and without treatment with melphalan at the biologically relevant dose for 1 hr.....	160
Figure 4.27:	Phase contrast images of HS5 cells following co-culture with U266B1 with and without treatment with immunomodulatory agents at clinically relevant doses for 1 hr.....	161
Figure 4.28:	Phase contrast images of HS5 cells following co-culture with U266B1 with and without treatment with proteasome inhibitors at biologically relevant concentrations for 1 hr.....	162
Figure 4.29:	Representative images of HS5 cells cultured independently and differentiated along osteogenic lineages following chemotherapy exposure.....	165
Figure 4.30:	Representative images of HS5 cells co-cultured with U266B1 and differentiated along osteogenic lineage following chemotherapy exposure.....	167
Figure 4.31:	Images depicting HS5 cells cultured alone, differentiated along adipogenic lineages following chemotherapy exposure.....	169
Figure 4.32:	Images depicting HS5 cells co-cultured with U266B1, differentiated along adipogenic lineages following chemotherapy exposure.....	171

Figure 4.33:	Representative histogram plots of CD makers on HS5 cells not exposed to chemotherapy.....	172
Figure 4.34:	Median fluorescence intensity (MFI) of CD markers on HS5 cells following 1 hr exposure of chemotherapeutic agents.....	173
Figure 4.35:	Concentration of IL-6 in primary MSC following exposure to melphalan when cultured alone or in co-culture (non-contact) with U266B1 cells.....	176
Figure 4.36:	Comparison of the levels of IL-6 in primary MSC and HS5 cells when cultured independently and left untreated.....	177
Figure 4.37:	Concentration of IL-6 in the supernatant of HS5 cells when cultured alone following exposure to chemotherapy.....	178
Figure 4.38:	Levels of IL-6 in U266B1 cells following exposure to chemotherapy when cultured alone.....	179
Figure 4.39:	Concentration of IL-6 in a non-contact co-culture of HS5 and U266B1 cells compared to when cells are cultured alone (A) and concentration of IL-6 in a non-contact co-culture of HS5 and U266B1 cells following exposure to chemotherapy (B).....	181
Figure 5.1:	DNA damage as measured by comet assay following melphalan exposure.....	207
Figure 5.2:	Representative images of DNA damage in MSC following melphalan exposure when cultured alone as assessed by alkaline comet assay.....	209
Figure 5.3:	Representative images of DNA damage in U266B1 cells following melphalan exposure when cultured alone as assessed by comet assay.....	210
Figure 5.4:	DNA damage as measured by comet assay following melphalan exposure either directly or by the exposure of U266B1 or MSC....	212
Figure 5.5:	DNA damage as measured by comet assay in HS5 stromal cells and melphalan resistant U266B1 cells following melphalan exposure.....	213
Figure 5.6:	DNA damage as measured by comet assay following melphalan exposure either directly or by the indirect exposure of melphalan resistant U266B1 or HS5.....	214
Figure 5.7:	DNA damage as measured by comet assay following thalidomide exposure.....	216
Figure 5.8:	DNA damage as measured by comet assay following thalidomide exposure either directly or by the indirect exposure of U266B1 or HS5.....	217
Figure 5.9:	DNA damage as measured by comet assay following lenalidomide exposure.....	219
Figure 5.10:	DNA damage as measured by comet assay following lenalidomide exposure either directly or by the exposure of U266B1 or HS5.....	220
Figure 5.11:	DNA damage as measured by comet assay following bortezomib exposure.....	222
Figure 5.12:	DNA damage as measured by comet assay following bortezomib exposure either directly or by the indirect exposure of U266B1 or HS5.....	223
Figure 5.13:	DNA damage as measured by comet assay following carfilzomib exposure.....	225
Figure 5.14:	DNA damage as measured by comet assay following carfilzomib exposure either directly or by the indirect exposure of U266B1 or HS5.....	226

Figure 5.15:	Representative image of U266B1 cells following exposure to cytochalasin-B.....	228
Figure 5.16:	Numbers of micronuclei (MN) in primary MSC and HS5 stromal cells over a 72 hr period following exposure to Melphalan.....	230
Figure 5.17:	Numbers of micronuclei (MN) in U266B1 sensitive and melphalan resistant cells over a 72 hr period following exposure to Melphalan.....	232
Figure 5.18:	Representative images of micronuclei in HS5 cells following exposure to chemotherapy.....	233
Figure 5.19:	Numbers of micronuclei (MN) in HS5 stromal cells over a 72 hr period following exposure to chemotherapy.....	234
Figure 5.20:	Numbers of micronuclei (MN) in U266B1 cells over a 72 hr period following exposure to chemotherapy.....	237
Figure 5.21:	Representative images of bi-nucleated HS5 and U266B1 cells....	238
Figure 5.22:	Numbers of bi-nucleated (BN) cells over a 72 hr period in HS5 stromal cells following exposure to chemotherapy.....	240
Figure 5.23:	Numbers of bi-nucleated (BN) cells over a 72 hr period in U266B1 cells following exposure to chemotherapy.....	242
Figure 5.24:	Representative images of multi-nucleated HS5 cells.....	243
Figure 5.25:	Numbers of multi-nucleated HS5 cells following exposure to chemotherapy over a 72 hr period.....	245
Figure 5.26:	Numbers of multi-nucleated cells over a 72 hr period in U266B1 cells following exposure to chemotherapy.....	247
Figure 5.27:	Representative images of multi-nucleated U266B1 cells following exposure to chemotherapy.....	248
Figure 5.28:	Numbers of multi-nucleated HS5 cells following exposure to chemotherapy either directly or when in culture with previously exposed U266B1 cells over a 72 hr period.....	250
Figure 5.29:	Numbers of multi-nucleated U266B1 cells following exposure to chemotherapy either directly or when in culture with previously exposed HS5 cells over a 72 hr period.....	251
Figure 5.30:	Flow cytometry analysis of cell cycle in TK6 cells.....	252
Figure 5.31:	Frequency of bi-nucleation on TK6 cells following cell synchronisation and exposure to immunomodulatory agents.....	254
Figure 5.32:	Frequency of multi-nucleation on TK6 cells following cell synchronisation and exposure to immunomodulatory agents.....	255
Figure 5.33:	Representative images of bi-nucleated and multi-nucleated on synchronised TK6 cells following thalidomide or lenalidomide exposure.....	256

List of Tables

Table 1.1:	The Durie-Salmon staging system for MM.....	6
Table 1.2:	The International Staging System of MM.....	7
Table 2.1:	The cell lines analysed in this study.....	46
Table 2.2:	Details of antibodies used for ELISA in this study.....	62
Table 3.1:	Representative data from antibody titration.....	96
Table 3.2:	Plate format/template during the standard curve development.....	97
Table 5.1:	RICC of MSC and HS5 cells cultured independently or in co-culture with U266B1 sensitive or melphalan resistant cells.....	229
Table 5.2:	RICC of U266B1 sensitive and U266B1 melphalan resistant cells cultured independently or in co-culture with either MSC or HS5.....	231
Table 5.3:	RICC of HS5 cells either cultured independently or in co-culture with U266B1 cells.....	233
Table 5.4:	RICC of U266B1 cells cultured independently or in co-culture with HS5 cells.....	236
Table 5.5:	RICC of HS5 cells in bystander model.....	250
Table 5.6:	RICC of U266B1 cells in bystander model.....	251
Table 5.7:	Percentage of TK6 cells in each phase of cell cycle.....	253
Table 5.8:	RICC of TK6 cells treated with chemotherapy following cell synchronisation.....	254

Abbreviations

°C	Degree Celsius
µg	Microgram
µl	Microlitre
µM	Micro molar
µm	Micrometre
nM	Nanomolar
g/l	Grams per litre
g/dl	Grams per decilitre
pg/ml	Picograms per millilitre
µg/ml	Micrograms per millilitre
cm	Centimetre
I.U	International unit
U/ml	International unit per millilitre
V/cm	Volt per centimetre
mA	Milliamperes
mmol/L	Millimoles per litre
2D	Two dimensional
3D	Three dimensional
Ab	Antibody
ALP	Alkaline phosphatase
AOC	Avon Orthopaedic Centre
ASCT	Autologous stem cell transplant
ATCC	American Type Culture Collection
β2M	Beta 2 microglobulin
BER	Base excision repair
BM	Bone marrow

BM-MSC	Bone marrow mesenchymal stem cell
BSA	Bovine serum albumin
bFGF	Basic fibroblast growth factor
CAM-DR	Cell adhesion mediated drug resistance
CFU-F	Colony forming unit fibroblast
CD	Cluster of differentiation
LFA-1/CD18	Lymphocyte function associated antigen / CD marker 18
VLA-4/CD49d	Very late antigen 4 / CD marker 49d
NCAM/CD56	Neural cell adhesion molecule / CD marker 56
VCAM-1/CD106	Vascular cell adhesion molecule 1 / CD marker 106
DiI/DiO	Long chain dialkylcarbocyanine lipophilic tracer
Dkk1	Dickkopf 1
DMEM/LG	Dulbecco's Modified Eagle Medium low glucose
DMEM/HG	Dulbecco's Modified Eagle Medium high glucose
DMEM/F12	Dulbecco's Modified Eagle Medium and Ham's F-12 Nutrient Mixture
DMSO	Dimethyl sulphoxide
DNA	Deoxyribonucleic acid
DSB	Double strand break
ECACC	European Collection of Cell Culture
EBV	Epstein Barr virus
EDTA	Ethylenediaminetetraacetic acid
ELISA	Enzyme Linked Immunosorbent Assay
FITC	Fluorescein isothiocyanate
FBS	Foetal bovine serum
H2O2	Hydrogen peroxide
HDT	High dose therapy
Hsp90	Heat shock protein 90

HQC	High quality control
HMDS	Hexadimethylsilazane
Hr	Hour (s)
HR	Homologous repair
HRP	Horseradish peroxidase
IL	Interleukin
Ig	Immunoglobulin
ISCT	International Society for Cellular Therapy
JAK	Janus kinase
LFA-1	Lymphocyte function associated antigen-1
LMA	Low melt agarose
LQC	Low quality control
M-CSF	Macrophage colony stimulating factor
MDR	Multidrug-resistant
MGUS	Monoclonal gammopathy of undetermined significance
MNC	Mononuclear cells
MSC	Mesenchymal stem cell
MM	Multiple myeloma
MIP1- α	Macrophage inflammatory protein 1-alpha
Min	Min (s)
NaCl	Sodium chloride
NCAM	Neural cell adhesion molecule
NER	Nucleotide excision repair
NF- κ B	Nuclear factor κ B
NHEJ	Non-homologous end-joining
NRES	National Research Ethics Service
OECD	Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development

OPG	Osteoprotegerin
PBS	Phosphate buffered saline
PE	Phycoerythrin
PI	Propidium iodide
PN	Peripheral neuropathy
RANK	Receptor activator of nuclear factor kappa-B
RANKL	Receptor activator of nuclear factor kappa-B ligand
RPMI	Roswell Park Memorial Institute
ROS	Reactive oxygen species
SE	Standard error
SEM	Scanning electron microscopy
SSB	Single strand break
STAT3	Signal transducer of transcription 3
SMM	Smouldering multiple myeloma
TGF β	Transforming Growth Factor-Beta
TNF- α	Tumour necrosis factor alpha
UPS	Ubiquitin-proteasome system
UREC	University of the West of England Ethics Committee
VEGF	Vascular endothelial growth factor
ZOL	Zoledronic acid