

## Title

**Cisplatin induces the release of extracellular vesicles from ovarian cancer cells that can induce invasiveness and drug resistance in bystander cells.**

## Authors

Priya Samuel<sup>\*1</sup>, Laura Ann Mulcahy<sup>\*1</sup>, Fiona Furlong<sup>2</sup>, Helen O. McCarthy<sup>2</sup>, Susan Brooks<sup>1</sup>, Muller Fabbri<sup>3</sup>, Ryan Charles Pink<sup>1</sup>, David Raul Francisco Carter<sup>†1</sup>.

## Author Affiliations

\* Contributed equally to the work

1. Department of Biological and Medical Sciences. Faculty of Health and Life Sciences. Oxford Brookes University. Gypsy Lane. Headington. Oxford, England. OX3 0BP.
2. School of Pharmacy, Queen's University Belfast, Belfast BT9 7BL, Northern Ireland
3. Department of Pediatrics and Microbiology & Molecular Immunology, University of Southern California-Keck School of Medicine Norris Comprehensive, Cancer Center Children's Center for Cancer and Blood Diseases, Children's Hospital, Los Angeles, CA 90027, USA

† Corresponding author. [dcarter@brookes.ac.uk](mailto:dcarter@brookes.ac.uk)

## Abstract

Ovarian cancer has a poor overall survival which is partly caused by resistance to drugs such as cisplatin. Resistance can be acquired as a result of changes to the tumour or due to altered interactions within the tumour microenvironment. Extracellular vesicles (EVs), small lipid-bound vesicles that are loaded with macromolecular cargo and released by cells, are emerging as mediators of communication in the tumour microenvironment. We previously showed that EVs mediate the bystander effect, a phenomenon in which stressed cells can communicate with neighbouring naïve cells leading to various effects including DNA damage; however, the role of EVs released following cisplatin treatment has not been tested. Here we show that treatment of cells with cisplatin led to the release of EVs that could induce invasion and increased resistance when taken up by bystander cells. This coincided with changes in p38 and JNK signalling, suggesting that these pathways may be involved in mediating the effects. We also show that EV uptake inhibitors could prevent this EV-mediated adaptive response and thus sensitise cells *in vitro* to the effects of cisplatin. Our results suggest that preventing pro-tumourigenic EV crosstalk during chemotherapy is a potential therapeutic target for improving outcome in ovarian cancer patients.

## Keywords

Extracellular vesicles, exosomes, drug resistance, tumour microenvironment, bystander effect.

## Intro

Ovarian cancer is the most fatal gynaecological cancer with more than 150,000 women succumbing to the disease each year worldwide (1). The five-year survival rate is less than 50% (2). Reasons for this high mortality rate include diagnosis at advanced stages and acquired resistance to chemotherapeutic drugs such as cisplatin and carboplatin (3-5). The causes for cisplatin resistance are complex and multifactorial (6-9). Along with numerous intracellular modulators, intercellular factors involving the tumour microenvironment have also been shown to play a crucial role in

cisplatin resistance; this can occur via altered communication between tumour cells and stromal cells (10), macrophages (11) or endothelial cells (12) as well as between tumour cells (13, 14).

In recent years, exosomes and microvesicles (collectively referred to as extracellular vesicles (EVs)) have gained prominence as mediators of intercellular communication. They have been shown to transfer RNAs and proteins that are functional in the recipient cells (15, 16). They can be found in various body fluids and in the tumour microenvironment and can transmit messages to neighbouring cells as well as to distant cells (17, 18). miRNAs, short non-coding RNAs whose levels can be altered during stress response (19), can also be shuttled between cells in the tumour microenvironment via EVs. Extracellular vesicles have been shown to modulate numerous factors in tumour cells including proliferation (20), viability (21) and metastatic capability (22). The tumour microenvironment has also been shown to be modulated by EV-mediated communication between the tumour and other cells such as cancer associated fibroblasts (23, 24) and mesenchymal stem cells (25). EVs are able to modulate angiogenesis, an important factor in cancer progression (26-29). EVs have also been shown to modulate the anti-tumoral response by affecting the immune response, T-cell activation and natural killer cell induction (30-33). EVs can also contribute to drug resistance via various mechanisms, including the sequestration of drugs (34, 35) and the transfer of proteins or RNA (36-39) (40-45). The morphology and the proteomic profile of EVs from multi-drug resistant tumours has been shown to be different from those from sensitive tumours (46) and EVs could be used as prognostic and diagnostic biomarkers in cancer (47).

Interestingly, EVs are involved in bystander effect (BE) (48). BE is a phenomenon in which stressed cells release soluble factors that when taken up by naïve recipient cells can induce phenotypic effects, including DNA damage (48-53). The potential roles for EVs released from cisplatin-stressed ovarian cancer cells, particularly in the context of the tumour microenvironment, have not been investigated. Here we show that chemotherapeutic treatment of ovarian tumour cells induces the release of EVs that can influence the phenotype of neighbouring naïve cells. Specifically, we show that the EVs released following cisplatin-stress response can induce increased invasiveness and drug-resistance in bystander cells. These effects coincided with changes in signalling via several pathways including p38 and JNK. Blocking the uptake of EVs during cisplatin treatment appeared to sensitise cells to the effect of the cytotoxic drug. Taken together these results suggest that EVs released by cells into the tumour microenvironment during chemotherapy could have an important role in mediating the progression of ovarian cancer.

## **Materials and Methods**

### **Cell culture**

All cell lines were maintained in RPMI media (Hyclone) supplemented with 10% foetal bovine serum (Gibco) and sub-cultured every 5-6 d using 0.05% trypsin with EDTA (Thermo Fisher Scientific). Cells were maintained at 37°C in a humidified incubator at 5% CO<sub>2</sub>; fresh media was added every 2-3 d. A2780 and CP70 were kindly donated by Professor Robert Brown (University College London). IGROV-1 cells were purchased from National Cancer Institute, Frederick Cancer Division of Cancer Treatment and Diagnosis Tumor/Cell Line Repository (Bethesda, USA).

### **EV extraction**

Foetal bovine serum was ultracentrifuged at 120 000 xg for 16 hours; RPMI or DMEM was then supplemented with 10% EV-depleted bovine serum to obtain EV-depleted media (EDM). Cells in T175 flasks at 70-80% confluence ( $\sim 2.0 \times 10^7$ ) were grown overnight in EDM. For cisplatin treatments cells at 70% confluence were treated with a final concentration of 40  $\mu$ M cisplatin for 2 h at 37°C, cisplatin-containing media was removed, cells were washed with PBS, replenished with EDM and incubated for a further 2 h. After this time, media was removed to eliminate any cisplatin secreted by the treated cells and replenished with fresh EDM and this media was conditioned for 24 h. EVs were extracted from this conditioned medium by differential ultracentrifugation. Initially, it was centrifuged at 300 G for 5 min followed by centrifugation at 16,500 G for 20 min at 4°C. The media was then filtered using 0.22  $\mu$ m syringe filters blocked with 0.1% bovine serum albumin (BSA) (Sigma Aldrich). The supernatant was ultracentrifuged at 120,000 xg using Beckman Coulter Optima LE-80K ultracentrifuge for 90 mins at 4°C to pellet EVs. The extracted EVs were resuspended in PBS, and finally pelleted once more at 120,000 xg. EVs were resuspended in 50  $\mu$ L PBS and used in subsequent experimentation. When not used immediately after extraction EVs were stored at -80°C.

### **Western blotting of whole cell and EV protein extracts**

Cells were scraped from the surface of a culture flask into ice cold PBS and pelleted at 300 G, washed with PBS and re-pelleted at 300 G. Cell preparations were then lysed in 1X radioimmunoprecipitation assay (RIPA) buffer (0.1 M Tris–hydrogen chloride, 0.3 M sodium chloride, 0.1% sodium dodecyl sulphate (SDS), 0.5% sodium deoxycholate, 1% Triton X 100) under constant agitation for 30 min at 4°C. Nuclei and cell debris were removed by centrifugation at 14,000 xg. For exosomal protein, EVs were resuspended in RIPA buffer and sonicated thrice for 5 min each in Decon FS100 frequency sweep sonicating water bath (Decon) with 15 sec of vortex mixing between each cycle with a final centrifugation at 14,000 G for 20 min at 4°C to pellet non-protein debris. Protein concentration was quantified by the BCA assay kit (Life Technologies). Approximately 10  $\mu$ g of cellular or exosomal protein was prepared in SDS–PAGE loading dye with dithiothreitol (DTT) and heated to 100 °C for 10 min. Samples were loaded onto a 12% denaturing polyacrylamide gel, electrophoresed and transferred to a PVDF membrane (Bio-Rad). The membrane was blocked with 5% non-fat dried milk powder (Marvel) in TBS–0.05% Tween (TBST) for 1 h at room temperature (RT) and then incubated overnight at 4°C with rabbit or mouse anti-human primary antibodies (Abcam) specific to HSP70 (ab5439) (EV marker) (1:2,000), cytochrome C oxidase (ab150422) (apoptotic body/mitochondrial marker) (1:1,700), GAPDH (ab128915) (cytoplasmic marker) (1:15,000), calnexin (ab22595) (endoplasmic reticulum marker) (1:120,000) and GM130 (ab31561) (Golgi marker) (1:1,000). Secondary anti-mouse Cy3- (Fisher) or anti-rabbit horseradish peroxidase (HRP)-tagged antibody (Abcam) (1: 2,000) incubations were then performed for 60 min at room temperature. Blots were digitally imaged for chemiluminescence with ECL solution (Bio-Rad) according to manufacturer's instructions or fluorescence for Cy3 using ChemiDoc MP (Bio-Rad).

### **Transmission electron microscopy of EV samples**

A 12 $\mu$ l aliquot of each EV sample was combined with an equal volume of 4% paraformaldehyde (Sigma Aldrich) and incubated on ice for 15 min. A droplet of each sample was distributed using a pipette onto Parafilm (Thermo Fisher Scientific). Carbon-formvar coated copper 300 mesh grids (Agar Scientific, Stanstead) were placed dull-side downwards onto each sample droplet and left to incubate at room temperature for 30 min. Grids were then washed three times by placing dull-side downwards onto a droplet of 0.22  $\mu$ m filtered ultrapure water. Between each wash, excess water

was removed using filter paper. Finally, each grid was placed onto a 30  $\mu$ L droplet of 2% uranyl acetate (aqueous) (Sigma Aldrich) for 2 min. Excess solution was removed using filter paper and the samples were left to air dry for 60 min. Two grids were prepared from each aliquot. Grids were visualised using Hitachi H7650 Transmission Electron Microscope at 100 kV with x40,000 magnification. EV diameter was measured using the measurement function in AMT software (Advanced Microscopy Techniques, Massachusetts, USA).

#### **EV size determination and quantification by Nanoparticle Tracking Analysis (NTA)**

EV size and concentration were determined by NTA with a NanoSight LM10 instrument equipped with the NTA 2.0 analytical software (Malvern Instruments Ltd, Malvern). Five 30 sec videos of each sample were recorded and from these the software calculated the mean diameter (nm) and EV concentrations ( $\times 10^8$ /ml). Each sample was measured in duplicate.

#### **Matrigel transwell cell invasion assay**

A2780 or IGROV-1 cells were treated with EVs extracted from cisplatin treated cells or untreated cells and starved of serum for 24 h prior to seeding in transwell inserts. The cells were harvested by trypsinisation and seeded at 100 000 cells/ well in Matrigel-coated 8  $\mu$ m pore membrane transwell inserts (BD Biosciences); a second dose of EVs was added into the respective wells at the same time. Complete medium supplemented with 10% FBS was loaded in the receiver wells to act as a chemoattractant. Cells were then incubated at 37°C for 24 h. The media was then removed from the inserts and the upper surface of the inserts swabbed with a cotton bud to remove any cells that had not invaded the membrane. The inserts were then washed with PBS and stained with 1% crystal violet (Sigma Aldrich) for 10 min, washed again with distilled water and mounted onto glass slides using di-N-butyle phthalate in xylene (DEPEX) and glass coverslips. The membranes were visualised using a Zeiss Axioplan inverted microscope using x125 magnification in differential interference contrast and all the cells were counted.

#### **Proteome Profiler**

EVs derived from control cells or cisplatin treated cells were added to fresh A2780 cells (EVs derived from 1 T175 flask to  $1 \times 10^6$  cells) and incubated for 24 h. The Proteome Profiler Human PhosPho-MAPK Array (R&D Systems, Abingdon) array procedure was performed as outlined in the manufacturer's protocol.

#### **Effect of EVs on cell viability and cisplatin response**

A2780 cells were seeded into 96 well plates (day 0) at 10 000 cells per well. 24 h later (day 1), cells were treated with EVs extracted from cisplatin-treated or untreated A2780 cells or PBS. On day 2, half of the wells in all groups were treated with 20  $\mu$ M cisplatin (Fisher; stock solution - 16.7 mM made up in PBS) for 3 h diluted in media. For experiments with heparin, cells were pre-treated with 10 $\mu$ g/ml heparin (Sigma, H3393) diluted in media for 30 min prior to cisplatin treatment at a final concentration of 20 $\mu$ M. 3 h after commencement of cisplatin treatment, the media containing cisplatin was removed, cells were washed with PBS and fresh media was added; heparin treatment was continued for cells in the heparin-treatment group. On day 4, MTT assay was performed as previously described (54, 55) to assess the viability of the cells in each group.

#### **Effect of EV uptake inhibitors on cisplatin response**

Cells were seeded in 96 well plates at 6,000, 10,000 and 15,000 cells per well for CP70, A2780 and IGROV-1 cells respectively. 48 h later, cells were pre-treated with EV uptake inhibitor as follows.

Heparin (Sigma Aldrich, H3393) was diluted to a concentration of 10 mg/ml in deionised distilled water, filtered through 0.22 µm filters and stored at -20°C; it was diluted in media and added to cells at a final concentration of 10 µg/ml. Amiloride (5-(N-ethyl-N-isopropyl) amiloride, or EIPA) (Sigma Aldrich, A3085) was stored in DMSO at a concentration of 108 mM and added to cells at 50 µM concentration. Dynasore (Sigma, D7693) was diluted in DMSO to a concentration of 31 mM, stored at -20°C and added to cells at a concentration of 50 µM. 30 min after the drug treatment, cisplatin was added at varying concentrations to give a cisplatin response curve. Three hours later, cisplatin was removed, cells were washed with PBS and fresh media added; inhibitors were added to the same wells as before. An MTT assay was carried out 48 h after cisplatin treatment to assess the viability of cells in each group.

### **Xenograft experiments**

Xenograft experiments were carried out at the animal testing facility at Queen's University, Belfast by Prof Helen McCarthy; A2780s for this experiment were kindly provided by Dr Fiona Furlong, Queen's University, Belfast. Five million A2780 cells in matrigel were implanted subcutaneously into the flanks of BALB/c SCID mice. Animals were monitored regularly and body weights were measured three times a week. Tumour volume was calculated using the formula

$$V = \frac{4}{3}\pi r^3$$

Where r is half of the geometric mean diameter (GMD), calculated as

$$\sqrt[3]{L*B*D}$$

Treatment was started when the tumour measured 100 mm<sup>3</sup>. Twenty four mice were then divided into four treatment groups (1) cisplatin 5mg/kg once weekly i.p. (2) Heparin (Sigma, H3393) only – 10 mg/kg every day i.p. (3) combination group – cisplatin 5mg/kg once weekly i.p. and heparin 10 mg/kg once daily i.p. and (4) control group. Tumour volume was monitored three times a week; when the tumour quadrupled in size, the animal was sacrificed. Any mice that lost 20% of body weight during the experiment were sacrificed as the treatment was deemed too toxic. All animal experiments were performed in adherence to our home office license (PPL2678).

### **Statistical Analysis**

The Student's T-test was used to determine statistical significance unless otherwise stated. GraphPad Prism was used to calculate IC50s for curves and to analyse significance in differences between IC50s of curves using the extra sum-of-squares F test. For all experiments at least three biological replicates for each point were performed to enable statistical comparisons. P-values in figures are depicted as follows: <0.05 - \*, <0.01 - \*\*, <0.001 - \*\*\*.

## **Results and discussion**

### **Characteristics of EVs from control and cisplatin treated cells**

As a first step in assessing the role of EVs in the tumour microenvironment following drug treatment we compared the characteristics of EVs from control cells (control EVs) and those from cells treated with cisplatin (cisplatin EVs). EVs were extracted by ultracentrifugation of media conditioned overnight with A2780 control cells or A2780 cells treated with cisplatin. Western blotting (figure 1A) confirmed the presence of GAPDH and HSP70 which are known to be present in EVs; the absence of

calnexin and cytochrome C in both EV pellets established the absence of cellular contamination in the EV preparations. Total particle number was estimated by nanoparticle tracking analysis. There was no significant difference between the concentration of control EVs ( $13.0 \times 10^8$  particles/mL) and cisplatin EVs ( $17.2 \times 10^8$  particles/mL) (figure 1B). Some groups have reported increases in EV-production following various types of stress (49, 56-58); however, in our hands we observe small but non-significant increases in EV release following cisplatin (present work) and heat stress (59). This discrepancy could be due to experimental difference such as doses of treatment or the period of EV conditioning. Nevertheless, our results confirm the presence of EVs released by cancer cells following treatment.

To further characterise EVs from the tumour cells we performed transmission electron microscopy (TEM). TEM of the EVs from both control and cisplatin-treated cells showed vesicles of the expected size and morphology (figure 1C), with diameters ranging from 30nm to 160nm; however, the mean diameter of the cisplatin EVs (49.3 nm) was significantly smaller than that of the control EVs (87.6 nm) (student's t-test  $p = 2.1 \times 10^{-8}$ ) (figure 1D). Interestingly, we also find that TEM measurements of EVs released following heat (59) are smaller compared to those released under normal conditions. That the imaged EVs from stressed cells appear smaller could represent a genuine difference in size, or could represent a different biophysical property that causes an artefact of preparation in the TEM that leads to the EVs appearing smaller. Nevertheless, the results suggest there are qualitative differences between EVs that are released following cisplatin treatment, and is consistent with studies that have also demonstrated differences in the content of EVs that are released under conditions of stress (57, 58, 60-62).

#### **EVs released by cisplatin-treated cells have the capacity to induce invasion**

We hypothesise that treatment of cells with cytotoxic compounds such as cisplatin leads to the release of EVs into the tumour microenvironment with the capacity to influence other tumour cells. To test the effect of cisplatin EVs on invasiveness of A2780s we used the matrigel invasion assay. Treatment with cisplatin EVs increased the invasiveness of A2780s by approximately 6-fold compared to A2780s treated with control EVs ( $p = 0.0082$ ) (figure 2A). Similar results were obtained from IGROV-1, with cisplatin EVs increasing invasiveness by about 5-fold ( $p = 0.042$ ) (figure 2B). Various studies have shown that EVs can induce an invasive and motile phenotype in recipient cells (63-65). Our results suggest that, at least in the case of A2780 and IGROV1 cells, the EVs released under normal conditions cannot induce greater levels of invasion when added to cells. However, the qualitative changes in EVs induced by cisplatin treatment confer the ability to induce greater invasion. Interestingly our unpublished data also show that EVs released following heat stress can also induce greater invasion in recipient cells(59), and others have shown that EVs released following exposure of cells to ionising radiation can induce increased metastatic ability (57). These results suggest that the release of EVs with the ability to induce invasiveness in recipient cells may be part of a more general intercellular response to stress which could be occurring in the tumour microenvironment.

#### **Cisplatin EVs can cause bystander effect and an adaptive response to cisplatin**

The bystander effect (BE) is a phenomenon in which stressed cells can communicate with other cells, leading to apparently detrimental effects such as DNA damage in these bystander cells (48-50, 52, 53, 66). Our recent work showed that EVs mediate BE following irradiation (48, 67). Subsequent findings have confirmed that EVs mediate BE following different stresses, including radiation (48, 49,

67) and heat shock(59). We therefore hypothesised that cancer cells stressed by the addition of cytotoxic chemotherapeutics could release EVs into the tumour microenvironment, which could then be taken up by other cells (including other cancer cells) leading to potential effects on tumour progression.

To test the hypothesis that EVs released by stressed ovarian cancer cells could modulate the activity of bystander cells we studied the effect of cisplatin on A2780 cells. EVs derived from cisplatin-treated cells appear to decrease the viability of bystander A2780 cells by 10% compared to cells treated with EVs from unstressed cells ( $p = 0.027$ ) (figure 3A). Heparin has been shown to inhibit uptake of EVs (68, 69). Treating bystander cells with heparin, which in our hands also inhibits EV uptake by >95% (data not shown), abrogates the ability of cisplatin-EVs to mediate BE (figure 3A). These results are consistent with previous findings showing that cytotoxic agents including mitomycin C (53, 66, 70), bleomycin (66, 71) and vincristine (53) can induce BE. Our findings, which to our knowledge are the first to reveal an EV-mediated bystander effect induced by cisplatin, support the hypothesis that a wide range of stressors can induce the release of EVs into the tumour microenvironment that can potentially modulate an inter-cellular stress response in a tumour.

The BE has been observed in several species, suggesting it provides a beneficial effect that has been conserved through evolution (72-74). One consequence of BE is an adaptive response which renders bystander cells more resistant to future stressors (52). Indeed, we have observed that bystander cells that take up EVs released from heat-shocked cells are more resistant to a repeated dose of heat-shock (59). To test whether a similar effect occurs in ovarian cancer cells following treatment with chemotherapeutics, we performed EV-mediated BE as described above, treated these bystander cells with a dose of cisplatin and by performing an MTT assay on these cells we effectively measured the effect of EV treatment on their resistance to cisplatin. When cells were pre-treated with cisplatin-EVs and then challenged with cisplatin they were significantly protected compared to cells pre-treated with PBS (figure 3B). This protective effect was reduced (but not completely abrogated,  $p = 0.052$ ) when the cells were also treated with heparin to block the uptake of the EVs (figure 3B). The observation that heparin does not completely block this adaptive response could be because either additional non-vesicular factors are required for the response, or because some of the effects could be mediated by interaction of the EV with receptors at the cell surface without the need for EV uptake and cargo delivery. A recent study has also demonstrated that EVs released following treatment of pancreatic cancer cells with gemcitabine can induce an adaptive response in recipient cells, which may be mediated by enhanced reactive oxygen species detoxification and miR-155-induced suppression of a gemcitabine metabolising enzyme (75). Taken together, our results are consistent with the hypothesis that treatment of cells with cisplatin- EVs induces a survival mechanism that allows them to adapt to resist the effects of cisplatin.

#### **Pathways differentially modulated by cisplatin EVs in cells**

To investigate the potential mechanisms by which cisplatin-EVs induce bystander effects (including increased invasiveness and the adaptive response) we analysed changes in phosphorylation status of important signalling proteins. A2780 cells were treated with cisplatin-EVs or control-EVs, proteins were extracted and changes in phosphorylation were measured using a Phospho-MAPK Array (figure 4). Seven proteins had significantly different relative levels of phosphorylation between the cells treated with cisplatin EVs compared with control EV. CREB ( $p = 0.019$ ), extracellular signal-regulated kinases (ERK) 2 ( $p = 0.050$ ) and TOR ( $p = 0.0021$ ) kinases were down-regulated in A2780s treated

with cisplatin EVs, whilst JNK2 ( $p = 0.00087$ ), JNK-pan ( $p = 0.044$ ), p38 $\alpha$  ( $p = 0.038$ ) and p53 ( $p = 0.015$ ) were up-regulated. These results suggest the involvement of these pathways in the effects specifically mediated by cisplatin EVs, some of which are consistent with previously implicated roles in cisplatin resistance. Knockdown of p38, for example, can lead to increased sensitivity to cisplatin (76), suggesting that the activation of p38 we observe in our cells could lead to increased resistance and therefore an adaptive response. JNK signaling is known to be involved in stress response and JNK phosphorylation is activated by a variety of stressors (77). In the context of cisplatin treatment JNK may be a 'double-edged sword', in that it can have pro-apoptotic effects but can also be associated cisplatin resistance (78). These context-dependent effects may explain the observation that bystander cells appear to be simultaneously more stressed and more protected against future stress. Interestingly, JNK activation can also enhance the invasive and migratory behavior of cells (79), suggesting that this may also underlie our observation that EVs released following cisplatin-mediated stress induce greater invasion. Additional experiments are needed to elucidate whether delivery of vesicular cargo is required, whether signalling changes are responsible for the increased invasion, and whether increased vesicular delivery of matrix metalloproteinases to the extracellular environment is an important factor. Taken together our results suggest that changes in signalling activity are associated with the range of EV-mediated bystander effects observed following cisplatin treatment. Further work is needed to assess whether these effects occur within the tumour microenvironment and how these could contribute to tumour progression *in vivo*.

#### **EV uptake inhibitors sensitise cells to cisplatin**

The results above indicate that EVs released by cisplatin-treated cells can induce an adaptive response in bystander cells. When treating a population of cells with cisplatin it would be difficult to disentangle the direct effect of the drug from any bystander effects that may be occurring; nevertheless, we reasoned that when such a cohort of cells is undergoing stress the transfer of cisplatin-EVs will occur, which could lead to the invasive and adaptive response we observe in bystander cells. If this is the case then the EV-mediated communication during cisplatin treatment would help the population to become more resistant to the drug. We therefore hypothesised that inhibiting this communication using heparin as an EV uptake blocker should prevent the adaptive response and thus sensitise the cells to the effects of cisplatin. To test this hypothesis, ovarian cancer cell lines were treated with EV uptake inhibitors and cisplatin and the effects on overall survival were measured using the MTT assay. Treatment of cells with heparin alone did not reduce overall survival of cells (data not shown), suggesting that heparin itself was not toxic at the doses used. Interestingly, pre-treatment of cells with heparin significantly decreased the IC<sub>50</sub> of A2780 cells from 31.3  $\mu\text{M}$  to 21.2  $\mu\text{M}$  ( $p < 0.0001$ ) (figure 5A). Similar results were obtained in IGROV-1 (figure 5B) and CP70 (figure 5C) cell lines with the IC<sub>50</sub> decreasing from 60.4  $\mu\text{M}$  and 146.8  $\mu\text{M}$  to 52.6  $\mu\text{M}$  and 118.9  $\mu\text{M}$ , respectively ( $p < 0.0001$ ). To test whether other EV uptake inhibitors also have the same cisplatin-sensitising effect we used amiloride and dynasore, which inhibit micropinocytosis and dynamin-requiring uptake pathways, respectively (80). As expected, amiloride and dynasore both significantly sensitised A2780 cells to cisplatin (figure 5D). These results suggest that blocking EV transfer between cells in the tumour microenvironment during chemotherapy could lead to more effective killing of cancer cells.

Interestingly, heparin has previously been shown to increase sensitivity to cisplatin. In a recent study tinzaparin, a low-molecular weight heparin, was shown to sensitise A2780 cells to cisplatin, and that



cell surface heparan sulfate proteoglycans were involved (81). Heparin has also been shown to decrease invasion and migration in breast and lung cancer cell lines (82-84). Heparin was also shown to increase cytotoxicity caused by chemotherapeutic drugs in breast cancer cells; an effect on drug efflux transporters ABCG2 and ABCC1 was noted that led to increasing levels of cytotoxic drugs within cells (85). Our results suggest that sensitising effect of heparin may be at least in part due to inhibiting the EV-mediated cross-talk between cells during treatment.

### **Heparin does not appear to increase cisplatin sensitivity *in vivo***

The finding that treating ovarian cancer cells with heparin sensitises them to cisplatin has obvious therapeutic implications. To test whether heparin could sensitise ovarian cancer cells *in vivo* we utilised a xenograft model. A2780 cells were implanted subcutaneously in the flank of BALB/c SCID mice. The mice were then assigned to one of four groups a) control b) cisplatin treatment only c) heparin treatment only and d) heparin and cisplatin treatment; tumour volume was regularly monitored to test the effect of treatment on tumour progression. Tumour doubling-time, volume, and survival are shown in figures 6A, 6B and 6C, respectively. Contrary to our expectations, heparin when given alongside cisplatin did not slow the growth of the tumour nor did it decrease the survival. Indeed, the addition of heparin appeared to speed up doubling time compared to adding cisplatin alone. Thus, it appears from this experiment that either heparin does not have the same effect on EV communication *in vivo*, or that the drug has other pro-tumour side-effects in the xenograft setting that negate any beneficial effects.

The discrepancy between *in vitro* and *in vivo* results could be due to the experimental conditions being used. The xenografts, for example, were injected into flanks and may not represent the best possible model for studying behaviour of ovarian cancer *in situ*. Heparin could also help tumour growth by other means, for example by inducing a higher degree of angiogenesis (86). Results from other xenograft studies that investigated the effect of xenograft sensitivity to drugs appear to be at odds with our own data. In one study, both tinzaparin (a low molecular weight heparin) and a non-anticoagulant heparin, S-NACH, decreased tumour growth and increased apoptosis in pancreatic cancer cells (87, 88); S-NACH also increased chemotherapy sensitivity in breast cancer xenografts (89). Xenograft studies appear to suggest that heparin decreased tumour growth in lung cancer (90) and to confer sensitivity to gefitinib, a chemotherapeutic agent (91). Another study revealed that heparin decreases cisplatin resistance of lung cancer cells (92). However other studies appear to suggest no benefit of adding heparin to conventional chemotherapy (93-95). The differences observed in these disparate studies may be down to subtle differences in methodology or the study model. Future experiments should be performed to ascertain the potential of heparin, and other EV uptake inhibitors in sensitising cancer cells to drug treatment.

### **Conclusion**

Here we have demonstrated that EVs released following treatment of cells with a cisplatin are able to induce a range of effects in recipient cells. These include an adaptive response which yields greater resistance to drug treatment, and increased invasiveness. Blocking the transfer of EVs between cells may represent a means to sensitise tumours to chemotherapy, though further work is needed to establish whether these benefits can be translated to the *in vivo* setting. Future work is also needed to fully elucidate the pathways involved and how they contribute to tumour progression. These data further highlight the importance of intercellular communication via EVs in the tumour microenvironment.

## **Ethics**

All animal experiments were performed at the animal testing facility at Queen's University, Belfast in adherence to our home office license (PPL2678).

## **Competing Interests**

The authors state that we have no competing interests.

## **Authors contributions**

Conceived project – DRFC; conceived and designed experiments – DRFC, PS, LAM, SB, RCP; performed experiments – PS, LAM, FF, HOM; analysed data – DRFC, PS, LAM; supervision of work – DRFC, SB, RCP; wrote the paper – DRFC, PS; critically reviewed manuscript – DRFC, PS, LAM, SB, RCP, FF, HOM.

## **Acknowledgements**

We are grateful to the Cancer and Polio Research Fund and Oxford Brookes University for funding this work. We apologise to the authors whose excellent work we could not include in this paper due to space constraints.

## **References**

1. Fitzmaurice C, Dicker D, Pain A, Hamavid H, Moradi-Lakeh M, MacIntyre MF, et al. The Global Burden of Cancer 2013. *JAMA Oncol.* 2015;1(4):505-27.
2. Siegel RL, Miller KD, Jemal A. Cancer statistics, 2016. *CA Cancer J Clin.* 2016;66(1):7-30.
3. Jayson GC, Kohn EC, Kitchener HC, Ledermann JA. Ovarian cancer. *Lancet.* 2014;384(9951):1376-88.
4. Chekerov R, Braicu I, Castillo-Tong DC, Richter R, Cadron I, Mahner S, et al. Outcome and clinical management of 275 patients with advanced ovarian cancer International Federation of Obstetrics and Gynecology II to IV inside the European Ovarian Cancer Translational Research Consortium-OVCAD. *Int J Gynecol Cancer.* 2013;23(2):268-75.
5. Wright JD, Chen L, Tergas AI, Patankar S, Burke WM, Hou JY, et al. Trends in relative survival for ovarian cancer from 1975 to 2011. *Obstet Gynecol.* 2015;125(6):1345-52.
6. Galluzzi L, Senovilla L, Vitale I, Michels J, Martins I, Kepp O, et al. Molecular mechanisms of cisplatin resistance. *Oncogene.* 2012;31(15):1869-83.
7. Galluzzi L, Vitale I, Michels J, Brenner C, Szabadkai G, Harel-Bellan A, et al. Systems biology of cisplatin resistance: past, present and future. *Cell Death Dis.* 2014;5:e1257.
8. Samuel P, Pink RC, Brooks SA, Carter DR. miRNAs and ovarian cancer: a miRiad of mechanisms to induce cisplatin drug resistance. *Expert Rev Anticancer Ther.* 2016;16(1):57-70.
9. Drayton RM. The role of microRNA in the response to cisplatin treatment. *Biochem Soc Trans.* 2012;40(4):821-5.
10. Sherman-Baust CA, Weeraratna AT, Rangel LB, Pizer ES, Cho KR, Schwartz DR, et al. Remodeling of the extracellular matrix through overexpression of collagen VI contributes to cisplatin resistance in ovarian cancer cells. *Cancer Cell.* 2003;3(4):377-86.
11. Zheng P, Chen L, Yuan X, Luo Q, Liu Y, Xie G, et al. Exosomal transfer of tumor-associated macrophage-derived miR-21 confers cisplatin resistance in gastric cancer cells. *J Exp Clin Cancer Res.* 2017;36(1):53.
12. Vecchione A, Belletti B, Lovat F, Volinia S, Chiappetta G, Giglio S, et al. A microRNA signature defines chemoresistance in ovarian cancer through modulation of angiogenesis. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A.* 2013;110(24):9845-50.
13. Peterson-Roth E, Brdlik CM, Glazer PM. Src-Induced cisplatin resistance mediated by cell-to-cell communication. *Cancer Res.* 2009;69(8):3619-24.

14. Zhang Y, Tao L, Fan L, Peng Y, Yang K, Zhao Y, et al. Different gap junction-propagated effects on cisplatin transfer result in opposite responses to cisplatin in normal cells versus tumor cells. *Sci Rep.* 2015;5:12563.
15. Valadi H, Ekstrom K, Bossios A, Sjostrand M, Lee JJ, Lotvall JO. Exosome-mediated transfer of mRNAs and microRNAs is a novel mechanism of genetic exchange between cells. *Nat Cell Biol.* 2007;9(6):654-9.
16. Yanez-Mo M, Siljander PR, Andreu Z, Zavec AB, Borrás FE, Buzas EI, et al. Biological properties of extracellular vesicles and their physiological functions. *J Extracell Vesicles.* 2015;4:27066.
17. Belting M, Christianson HC. Role of exosomes and microvesicles in hypoxia-associated tumour development and cardiovascular disease. *J Intern Med.* 2015;278(3):251-63.
18. Becker A, Thakur BK, Weiss JM, Kim HS, Peinado H, Lyden D. Extracellular Vesicles in Cancer: Cell-to-Cell Mediators of Metastasis. *Cancer Cell.* 2016;30(6):836-48.
19. Jacobs LA, Bewicke-Copley F, Poolman MG, Pink RC, Mulcahy LA, Baker I, et al. Meta-analysis using a novel database, miRStress, reveals miRNAs that are frequently associated with the radiation and hypoxia stress-responses. *PLoS One.* 2013;8(11):e80844.
20. Clark DJ, Fondrie WE, Yang A, Mao L. Triple SILAC quantitative proteomic analysis reveals differential abundance of cell signaling proteins between normal and lung cancer-derived exosomes. *J Proteomics.* 2015 133(Feb 5):161-9.
21. Kogure T, Lin WL, Yan IK, Braconi C, Patel T. Intercellular nanovesicle-mediated microRNA transfer: a mechanism of environmental modulation of hepatocellular cancer cell growth. *Hepatology.* 2011;54(4):1237-48.
22. Gorczyński RM, Erin N, Zhu F. Serum-derived exosomes from mice with highly metastatic breast cancer transfer increased metastatic capacity to a poorly metastatic tumor. *Cancer Med.* 2016;5(2):325-36.
23. Maida Y, Takakura M, Nishiuchi T, Yoshimoto T, Kyo S. Exosomal transfer of functional small RNAs mediates cancer-stroma communication in human endometrium. *Cancer Med.* 2015;5(2):304-14.
24. Sanchez CA, Andahur EI, Valenzuela R, Castellon EA, Fulla JA, Ramos CG, et al. Exosomes from bulk and stem cells from human prostate cancer have a differential microRNA content that contributes cooperatively over local and pre-metastatic niche. *Oncotarget.* 2015;7(4):3993-4008.
25. Wang S, Li X, Zhu R, Han Q, Zhao RC. Lung cancer exosomes initiate global long non-coding RNA changes in mesenchymal stem cells. *Int J Oncol.* 2016;48(2):681-9.
26. Hegmans JP, Bard MP, Hemmes A, Luider TM, Kleijmeer MJ, Prins JB, et al. Proteomic analysis of exosomes secreted by human mesothelioma cells. *Am J Pathol.* 2004;164(5):1807-15.
27. Al-Nedawi K, Meehan B, Micallef J, Lhotak V, May L, Guha A, et al. Intercellular transfer of the oncogenic receptor EGFRvIII by microvesicles derived from tumour cells. *Nat Cell Biol.* 2008;10(5):619-24.
28. Hood JL, Pan H, Lanza GM, Wickline SA. Paracrine induction of endothelium by tumor exosomes. *Lab Invest.* 2009;89(11):1317-28.
29. Taverna S, Flugy A, Saieva L, Kohn EC, Santoro A, Meraviglia S, et al. Role of exosomes released by chronic myelogenous leukemia cells in angiogenesis. *Int J Cancer.* 2012;130(9):2033-43.
30. Wolfers J, Lozier A, Raposo G, Regnault A, Thery C, Masurier C, et al. Tumor-derived exosomes are a source of shared tumor rejection antigens for CTL cross-priming. *Nat Med.* 2001;7(3):297-303.
31. Admyre C, Johansson SM, Paulie S, Gabrielsson S. Direct exosome stimulation of peripheral human T cells detected by ELISPOT. *Eur J Immunol.* 2006;36(7):1772-81.
32. Graner MW, Alzate O, Dechkovskaia AM, Keene JD, Sampson JH, Mitchell DA, et al. Proteomic and immunologic analyses of brain tumor exosomes. *Faseb j.* 2009;23(5):1541-57.

33. Hellwinkel JE, Redzic JS, Harland TA, Gunaydin D, Anchordoquy TJ, Graner MW. Glioma-derived extracellular vesicles selectively suppress immune responses. *Neuro Oncol.* 2015;18(4):497-506.
34. Safaei R, Larson BJ, Cheng TC, Gibson MA, Otani S, Naerdemann W, et al. Abnormal lysosomal trafficking and enhanced exosomal export of cisplatin in drug-resistant human ovarian carcinoma cells. *Mol Cancer Ther.* 2005;4(10):1595-604.
35. Muralidharan-Chari V, Kohan HG, Asimakopoulos AG, Sudha T, Sell S, Kannan K, et al. Microvesicle removal of anticancer drugs contributes to drug resistance in human pancreatic cancer cells. *Oncotarget.* 2016;7(31):50365-79.
36. Bebawy M, Combes V, Lee E, Jaiswal R, Gong J, Bonhoure A, et al. Membrane microparticles mediate transfer of P-glycoprotein to drug sensitive cancer cells. *Leukemia.* 2009;23(9):1643-9.
37. Lu JF, Luk F, Gong J, Jaiswal R, Grau GE, Bebawy M. Microparticles mediate MRP1 intercellular transfer and the re-templating of intrinsic resistance pathways. *Pharmacol Res.* 2013;76:77-83.
38. Pokharel D, Padula MP, Lu JF, Jaiswal R, Djordjevic SP, Bebawy M. The Role of CD44 and ERM Proteins in Expression and Functionality of P-glycoprotein in Breast Cancer Cells. *Molecules.* 2016;21(3):290.
39. Lv MM, Zhu XY, Chen WX, Zhong SL, Hu Q, Ma TF, et al. Exosomes mediate drug resistance transfer in MCF-7 breast cancer cells and a probable mechanism is delivery of P-glycoprotein. *Tumour Biol.* 2014;35(11):10773-9.
40. Chen WX, Liu XM, Lv MM, Chen L, Zhao JH, Zhong SL, et al. Exosomes from drug-resistant breast cancer cells transmit chemoresistance by a horizontal transfer of microRNAs. *PLoS One.* 2014;9(4):e95240.
41. Mao L, Li J, Chen WX, Cai YQ, Yu DD, Zhong SL, et al. Exosomes decrease sensitivity of breast cancer cells to adriamycin by delivering microRNAs. *Tumour Biol.* 2016;37(4):5247-56.
42. Zhang J, Liu J, Xu X, Li L. Curcumin suppresses cisplatin resistance development partly via modulating extracellular vesicle-mediated transfer of MEG3 and miR-214 in ovarian cancer. *Cancer Chemother Pharmacol.* 2017.
43. Mikamori M, Yamada D, Eguchi H, Hasegawa S, Kishimoto T, Tomimaru Y, et al. MicroRNA-155 Controls Exosome Synthesis and Promotes Gemcitabine Resistance in Pancreatic Ductal Adenocarcinoma. *Sci Rep.* 2017;7:42339.
44. Takahashi K, Yan IK, Kogure T, Haga H, Patel T. Extracellular vesicle-mediated transfer of long non-coding RNA ROR modulates chemosensitivity in human hepatocellular cancer. *FEBS Open Bio.* 2014;4:458-67.
45. Takahashi K, Yan IK, Wood J, Haga H, Patel T. Involvement of extracellular vesicle long noncoding RNA (linc-VLDLR) in tumor cell responses to chemotherapy. *Mol Cancer Res.* 2014;12(10):1377-87.
46. Lopes-Rodrigues V, Di Luca A, Sousa D, Seca H, Meleady P, Henry M, et al. Multidrug resistant tumour cells shed more microvesicle-like EVs and less exosomes than their drug-sensitive counterpart cells. *Biochim Biophys Acta.* 2015;1860(3):618-27.
47. Samuel P, Carter DR. The Diagnostic and Prognostic Potential of microRNAs in Epithelial Ovarian Carcinoma. *Mol Diagn Ther.* 2017;21(1):59-73.
48. Al-Mayah AH, Irons SL, Pink RC, Carter DR, Kadhim MA. Possible role of exosomes containing RNA in mediating nontargeted effect of ionizing radiation. *Radiat Res.* 2012;177(5):539-45.
49. Jella KK, Rani S, O'Driscoll L, McClean B, Byrne HJ, Lyng FM. Exosomes are involved in mediating radiation induced bystander signaling in human keratinocyte cells. *Radiat Res.* 2014;181(2):138-45.
50. Marin A, Martin M, Linan O, Alvarenga F, Lopez M, Fernandez L, et al. Bystander effects and radiotherapy. *Rep Pract Oncol Radiother.* 2015;20(1):12-21.
51. Xu S, Wang J, Ding N, Hu W, Zhang X, Wang B, et al. Exosome-mediated microRNA transfer plays a role in radiation-induced bystander effect. *RNA Biol.* 2015;12(12):1355-63.

52. Savu D, Petcu I, Temelie M, Mustaciosu C, Moiso N. Compartmental stress responses correlate with cell survival in bystander effects induced by the DNA damage agent, bleomycin. *Mutat Res.* 2015;771:13-20.
53. Testi S, Azzara A, Giovannini C, Lombardi S, Piaggi S, Facioni MS, et al. Vincristine-induced bystander effect in human lymphocytes. *Mutat Res.* 2016;789:39-47.
54. Pink RC, Samuel P, Massa D, Caley DP, Brooks SA, Carter DR. The passenger strand, miR-21-3p, plays a role in mediating cisplatin resistance in ovarian cancer cells. *Gynecol Oncol.* 2015;137(1):143-51.
55. Samuel P, Pink RC, Caley DP, Currie JM, Brooks SA, Carter DR. Over-expression of miR-31 or loss of KCNMA1 leads to increased cisplatin resistance in ovarian cancer cells. *Tumour Biol.* 2015;37(2):2565-73.
56. Atienzar-Aroca S, Flores-Bellver M, Serrano-Heras G, Martinez-Gil N, Barcia JM, Aparicio S, et al. Oxidative stress in retinal pigment epithelium cells increases exosome secretion and promotes angiogenesis in endothelial cells. *J Cell Mol Med.* 2016;20(8):1457-66.
57. Arscott WT, Tandle AT, Zhao S, Shabason JE, Gordon IK, Schlaff CD, et al. Ionizing radiation and glioblastoma exosomes: implications in tumor biology and cell migration. *Transl Oncol.* 2013;6(6):638-48.
58. Lehmann BD, Paine MS, Brooks AM, McCubrey JA, Renegar RH, Wang R, et al. Senescence-associated exosome release from human prostate cancer cells. *Cancer Res.* 2008;68(19):7864-71.
59. Bewicke-Copley F, Mulcahy LA, Jacobs LA, Samuel P, Akbar N, Pink RC, et al. Extracellular vesicles released following heat stress induce bystander effect in unstressed populations. *J Extracell Vesicles.* 2017;6(1):1340746.
60. Hurwitz MD, Kaur P, Nagaraja GM, Bausero MA, Manola J, Asea A. Radiation therapy induces circulating serum Hsp72 in patients with prostate cancer. *Radiother Oncol.* 2010;95(3):350-8.
61. Jelonek K, Wojakowska A, Marczak L, Muer A, Tinhofer-Keilholz I, Lysek-Gladysinska M, et al. Ionizing radiation affects protein composition of exosomes secreted in vitro from head and neck squamous cell carcinoma. *Acta Biochim Pol.* 2015;62(2):265-72.
62. de Jong OG, Verhaar MC, Chen Y, Vader P, Gremmels H, Posthuma G, et al. Cellular stress conditions are reflected in the protein and RNA content of endothelial cell-derived exosomes. *J Extracell Vesicles.* 2012;1.
63. Rahman MA, Barger JF, Lovat F, Gao M, Otterson GA, Nana-Sinkam P. Lung cancer exosomes as drivers of epithelial mesenchymal transition. *Oncotarget.* 2016;7(34):54852-66.
64. Franzen CA, Blackwell RH, Todorovic V, Greco KA, Foreman KE, Flanigan RC, et al. Urothelial cells undergo epithelial-to-mesenchymal transition after exposure to muscle invasive bladder cancer exosomes. *Oncogenesis.* 2015;4:e163.
65. Lugini L, Valtieri M, Federici C, Cecchetti S, Meschini S, Condello M, et al. Exosomes from human colorectal cancer induce a tumor-like behavior in colonic mesenchymal stromal cells. *Oncotarget.* 2016;7(31):50086-98.
66. Asur RS, Thomas RA, Tucker JD. Chemical induction of the bystander effect in normal human lymphoblastoid cells. *Mutat Res.* 2009;676(1-2):11-6.
67. Al-Mayah A, Bright S, Chapman K, Irons S, Luo P, Carter D, et al. The non-targeted effects of radiation are perpetuated by exosomes. *Mutat Res.* 2015;772:38-45.
68. Christianson HC, Svensson KJ, van Kuppevelt TH, Li JP, Belting M. Cancer cell exosomes depend on cell-surface heparan sulfate proteoglycans for their internalization and functional activity. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A.* 2013;110(43):17380-5.
69. Atai NA, Balaj L, van Veen H, Breakefield XO, Jarzyna PA, Van Noorden CJ, et al. Heparin blocks transfer of extracellular vesicles between donor and recipient cells. *J Neurooncol.* 2013;115(3):343-51.
70. Kumari R, Sharma A, Ajay AK, Bhat MK. Mitomycin C induces bystander killing in homogeneous and heterogeneous hepatoma cellular models. *Mol Cancer.* 2009;8:87.

71. Chinnadurai M, Chidambaram S, Ganesan V, Baraneedharan U, Sundaram L, Paul SF, et al. Bleomycin, neocarzinostatin and ionising radiation-induced bystander effects in normal diploid human lung fibroblasts, bone marrow mesenchymal stem cells, lung adenocarcinoma cells and peripheral blood lymphocytes. *Int J Radiat Biol.* 2011;87(7):673-82.
72. Tang H, Chen L, Chen B, Wang T, Yang A, Zhan F, et al. Interaction between Radioadaptive Response and Radiation-Induced Bystander Effect in *Caenorhabditis elegans* : A Unique Role of the DNA Damage Checkpoint. *Radiat Res.* 2016;186(6):662-8.
73. Kovalchuk A, Mychasiuk R, Muhammad A, Hossain S, Ilnytskyy S, Ghose A, et al. Liver irradiation causes distal bystander effects in the rat brain and affects animal behaviour. *Oncotarget.* 2016;7(4):4385-98.
74. Smith RW, Seymour CB, Moccia RD, Mothersill CE. Irradiation of rainbow trout at early life stages results in trans-generational effects including the induction of a bystander effect in non-irradiated fish. *Environ Res.* 2016;145:26-38.
75. Patel GK, Khan MA, Bhardwaj A, Srivastava SK, Zubair H, Patton MC, et al. Exosomes confer chemoresistance to pancreatic cancer cells by promoting ROS detoxification and miR-155-mediated suppression of key gemcitabine-metabolising enzyme, DCK. *Br J Cancer.* 2017;116(5):609-19.
76. Liu CL, Chen SF, Wu MZ, Jao SW, Lin YS, Yang CY, et al. The molecular and clinical verification of therapeutic resistance via the p38 MAPK-Hsp27 axis in lung cancer. *Oncotarget.* 2016;7(12):14279-90.
77. Johnson GL, Nakamura K. The c-jun kinase/stress-activated pathway: regulation, function and role in human disease. *Biochim Biophys Acta.* 2007;1773(8):1341-8.
78. Yan D, An G, Kuo MT. C-Jun N-terminal kinase signalling pathway in response to cisplatin. *J Cell Mol Med.* 2016;20(11):2013-9.
79. Ma X, Wang H, Ji J, Xu W, Sun Y, Li W, et al. Hippo signaling promotes JNK-dependent cell migration. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A.* 2017;114(8):1934-9.
80. Mulcahy LA, Pink RC, Carter DR. Routes and mechanisms of extracellular vesicle uptake. *J Extracell Vesicles.* 2014;3.
81. Pfankuchen DB, Stolting DP, Schlesinger M, Royer HD, Bendas G. Low molecular weight heparin tinzaparin antagonizes cisplatin resistance of ovarian cancer cells. *Biochem Pharmacol.* 2015;97(2):147-57.
82. Li Y, Liu H, Huang YY, Pu LJ, Zhang XD, Jiang CC, et al. Suppression of endoplasmic reticulum stress-induced invasion and migration of breast cancer cells through the downregulation of heparanase. *Int J Mol Med.* 2013;31(5):1234-42.
83. Zhong GX, Gong Y, Yu CJ, Wu SF, Ma QP, Wang Y, et al. Significantly inhibitory effects of low molecular weight heparin (Fraxiparine) on the motility of lung cancer cells and its related mechanism. *Tumour Biol.* 2015;36(6) 4689-97.
84. Liao WY, Ho CC, Hou HH, Hsu TH, Tsai MF, Chen KY, et al. Heparin co-factor II enhances cell motility and promotes metastasis in non-small cell lung cancer. *J Pathol.* 2015;235(1):50-64.
85. Chen Y, Scully M, Petralia G, Kakkar A. Binding and inhibition of drug transport proteins by heparin: a potential drug transporter modulator capable of reducing multidrug resistance in human cancer cells. *Cancer Biol Ther.* 2014;15(1):135-45.
86. Ashikari-Hada S, Habuchi H, Kariya Y, Kimata K. Heparin regulates vascular endothelial growth factor165-dependent mitogenic activity, tube formation, and its receptor phosphorylation of human endothelial cells. Comparison of the effects of heparin and modified heparins. *J Biol Chem.* 2005;280(36):31508-15.
87. Sudha T, Phillips P, Kanaan C, Linhardt RJ, Borsig L, Mousa SA. Inhibitory effect of non-anticoagulant heparin (S-NACH) on pancreatic cancer cell adhesion and metastasis in human umbilical cord vessel segment and in mouse model. *Clin Exp Metastasis.* 2012;29(5):431-9.
88. Sudha T, Yalcin M, Lin HY, Elmetwally AM, Nazeer T, Arumugam T, et al. Suppression of pancreatic cancer by sulfated non-anticoagulant low molecular weight heparin. *Cancer Lett.* 2014;350(1-2):25-33.

89. Phillips PG, Yalcin M, Cui H, Abdel-Nabi H, Sajjad M, Bernacki R, et al. Increased tumor uptake of chemotherapeutics and improved chemoresponse by novel non-anticoagulant low molecular weight heparin. *Anticancer Res.* 2011;31(2):411-9.
90. Kim JY, Al-Hilal TA, Chung SW, Kim SY, Ryu GH, Son WC, et al. Antiangiogenic and anticancer effect of an orally active low molecular weight heparin conjugates and its application to lung cancer chemoprevention. *J Control Release.* 2015;199:122-31.
91. Pan Y, Li X, Duan J, Yuan L, Fan S, Fan J, et al. Enoxaparin sensitizes human non-small-cell lung carcinomas to gefitinib by inhibiting DOCK1 expression, vimentin phosphorylation, and Akt activation. *Mol Pharmacol.* 2015;87(3):378-90.
92. Niu Q, Wang W, Li Y, Ruden DM, Wang F, Song J, et al. Low molecular weight heparin ablates lung cancer cisplatin-resistance by inducing proteasome-mediated ABCG2 protein degradation. *PLoS One.* 2012;7(7):e41035.
93. Sanford D, Naidu A, Alizadeh N, Lazo-Langner A. The effect of low molecular weight heparin on survival in cancer patients: an updated systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized trials. *J Thromb Haemost.* 2014;12(7):1076-85.
94. Macbeth F, Noble S, Evans J, Ahmed S, Cohen D, Hood K, et al. Randomized Phase III Trial of Standard Therapy Plus Low Molecular Weight Heparin in Patients With Lung Cancer: FRAGMATIC Trial. *J Clin Oncol.* 2015;34(5):488-94.
95. Sideras K, Schaefer PL, Okuno SH, Sloan JA, Kutteh L, Fitch TR, et al. Low-molecular-weight heparin in patients with advanced cancer: a phase 3 clinical trial. *Mayo Clin Proc.* 2006;81(6):758-67.

### Figures and figure legends

**Figure 1 Characterisation of cisplatin and control EVs derived from A2780 cells** A) Control and cisplatin treated cell and EV protein lysates were characterised by Western blotting, samples were probed for GAPDH, Calnexin, HSP70 and Cytochrome C Oxidase. B) Quantification of EVs secreted by control and cisplatin treated A2780 cells by nanoparticle tracking analysis (at least two replicates). C) Images of electron microscopy grids of control and cisplatin EVs visualised by transmission electron microscopy. D) Average diameter of EVs secreted by cisplatin treated and control A2780 cells measured on electron microscopy grids (C).

**Figure 2 The effect of cisplatin treated cell-derived EVs upon the invasive capacity of ovarian cancer cell lines** The Matrigel transwell invasion assay was used to determine the effect of cisplatin treated cell-derived EVs on invasive potential of two ovarian cancer cell lines, A2780 (A) and IGROV-1 (B). Extracted EVs were administered to approximately 1 million cells and after 24 h 100,000 cells were distributed into each insert of the transwell assay and another dose of EVs was added. After 24 h the Matrigel membranes were cleared of non-invasive cells and invasive cells were stained with crystal violet. The number of invasive cells on each membrane was counted. The graphs represent fold change in terms of the total number of cells that invaded the Matrigel membrane following treatment with either control or cisplatin treated cell-derived EVs. Each sample group contained six biological replicates. Error bars represent standard error of the mean of the biological replicates. P values were calculated using T-test. Representative images are shown below each group.

**Figure 3 Cisplatin derived EVs cause bystander effect and an adaptive response to cisplatin** A. A2780 cells were seeded in 96-well plates. They were treated with PBS (control), EVs from cisplatin-treated cells (cis EV) or EVs from control cells (control EV) with or without 30 minutes pre-treatment with 10µg/ml heparin to inhibit EV uptake. 4 d later overall viability was measured using the MTT assay. Cis EVs caused a significant decrease in viability; this effect was not present in the group treated with heparin. B. A2780 cells were treated with PBS, Cis EVs or Control EV (as in panel

A) with or without pre-treatment with heparin (10µg/ml); after 24 h cells were further treated with cisplatin and survival was assayed using the MTT assay (results are normalised to control). Cells pre-treated with cis EVs are more resistant to cisplatin; this effect is decreased with heparin. Each column shows the mean of at least 6 replicates; error bars show standard error of mean.

**Figure 4 Relative phosphorylation levels of 26 proteins in A2780 cells following treatment with either control or cisplatin EVs determined using the Proteome Profiler Human Phospho-MAPK Array** A) Blots showing intensity for each kinase on duplicate spots for each EV treatment. B) Intensity levels of each kinase in A-2780 cells treated with either control or cisplatin EVs. Differences in kinase phosphorylation were calculated using the two tailed T-test.

**Figure 5 EV inhibitors alter the cisplatin sensitivity of ovarian cancer cell lines**

Cells were seeded in 96-well plates (day 0); they were pre-treated on day 2 for 30 min with heparin (panels A, B and C), amiloride or dynasore (panel D). They were then treated with varying concentrations of cisplatin for 3 h. Viability was quantified by the MTT assay after 48 h. There was a significant increase in sensitivity to cisplatin in A2780 (A) ( $p < 0.0001$ ), IGROV-1 (B) ( $p = 0.0006$ ) and CP70 (C) ( $p < 0.0001$ ) on pre-treatment with heparin. Similarly, there was an increased sensitivity to cisplatin in A2780 cells on pre-treatment with amiloride (D) ( $p < 0.0001$ ) and dynasore (D) ( $p < 0.0001$ )

**Figure 6 The effect of heparin on cisplatin treatment in A2780 xenografts in mice**

A2780s were injected subcutaneously into the flanks of nude BALB/c SCID mice; when the tumours were 100 mm<sup>3</sup> in volume 24 mice were divided into four treatment groups - control (no treatment), heparin only, cisplatin only or heparin and cisplatin. Tumour volume was assessed regularly; the animal was sacrificed when the tumour quadrupled in size. Panel A shows tumour doubling times in the four groups; panel B shows average tumour volume in the four treatment groups while the Kaplan-Meier curve in Panel C shows survival after treatment.