A role for mitochondrial oxidative stress in sulfur mustard analog CEES-induced lung cell injury and antioxidant protection
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Abstract

Sulfur mustards (SM) have been used as warfare agents since World War I and still pose a significant threat against civilian and military personnel. SM exposure can cause significant blistering of the skin as well as respiratory injury and fibrosis. Currently, no antidote exists for SM exposure but recent studies, using the SM analog 2-chloroethyl ethyl sulfide (CEES), have focus on the ability of antioxidants to prevent toxicity. Though antioxidants can prevent CEES-induced toxicity, the mechanisms by which these compounds are effective against SM agents are largely unknown. Using human bronchial epithelial (16HBE) cells and primary small airway epithelial (SAE) cells, we show that CEES causes a significant increase in mitochondrial dysfunction as early as 4h which is followed by increases in mitochondrial ROS peaking 12h after exposure. We have also identified a catalytic antioxidant metalloporphyrin that can rescue airway cells from CEES-induced toxicity when added 1h after CEES exposure. In addition, the cytoprotective effects of the catalytic antioxidant are associated with correcting mitochondrial dysfunction, ROS, DNA oxidation, and decreases in intracellular GSH. These findings suggest a role for oxidative stress in CEES toxicity and provide a rationale to investigate antioxidants as rescue agents in SM exposures.
Introduction

Bis(2-chloroethyl sulfide) or sulfur mustard (SM) was first synthesized in the late 1880’s and since has been used as a warfare agent on a number of occasions. SM was first used in World War I and has been used in warfare as recently as the Iran-Iraq conflict of the late 1980’s (Blanc 1999). Although SM is less of a threat in warfare as it once was; it still posses a threat to military and civilian personnel due to current concerns for its deployment in a terrorist attack.

Sulfur mustards are classic vesicating agents that mainly affect the skin, eyes, and respiratory system. There is no known antidote or specific treatment for SM exposure and the current therapy is largely supportive. SM on the skin can be decontaminated with soap and water or a dilute bleach solution, but internal exposure, such as the respiratory system, is considerably more difficult to treat (Munro, 1990; Watson and Griffin, 1992). SM produces airway damage that includes necrosis, inflammation and edema (Kehe and Szinicz, 2005). The exact mechanism of SM toxicity is unknown. 2-Chloroethyl ethyl sulfide (CEES, half mustard), is a monofunctional analog of SM (Fig. 1) that provides a useful model for SM injury without the need for a specialized containment facility. CEES, like SM, is an alkylating agent which can bind DNA and other macromolecules within the cell. Recent research into counteragents has focused on bolstering the endogenous antioxidant defenses by supplementation with N-acetyl-cysteine (McClintock et al., 2002; McClintock et al., 2006; Hoesel et al., 2008), Vitamin E (Hoesel et al., 2008), GSH (Han et al., 2004) or addition of exogenous SOD or catalase (McClintock et al., 2002; Das et al., 2003;
McClintock et al., 2006). Though bolstering endogenous antioxidants can be effective, it is largely unknown how or why this protection occurs. We have developed a class of small molecule metalloporphyrin catalytic antioxidants that possess both high SOD and catalase activities among other detoxifying properties (Day, 2008). Metalloporphyrins have also shown promise as therapeutic agents in several ROS-mediated animal models of human disease states (Day, 2004).

In this study, we show that CEES not only causes an increase in ROS, but that it is a delayed response that may involve the mitochondria of the airway epithelium. We hypothesize that CEES is causing mitochondrial dysfunction that drives increased ROS production and resulting oxidative stress. We also identify a catalytic antioxidant metalloporphyrin, AEOL 10150, which is able to rescue airway epithelial cells from CEES-induced cytotoxicity when treated one hour after CEES exposure. Our findings support the rationale for antioxidant therapy in the treatment of SM exposures.
Methods

Cell Culture

Human primary small airway epithelial (SAE) cells (Lonza, Walkersville, MD) were grown in SAGM media (Lonza) supplemented with bovine pituitary extract, insulin, hydrocortisone, gentamicin sulfate, amphotericin B, retinoic acid, bovine serum albumin, transferrin, triiodothyronine, epinephrine, and recombinant human epidermal growth factor. To preserve the characteristics of a primary cell, SAE cells were not used after about 10 doubling times. 16HBE, a transformed human bronchial epithelial cell was grown in MEMα + Glutamax (Gibco) supplemented with 10% FBS and penicillin/streptomycin.

Cell treatments

Cells were plated in 24-well plates and grown to about 90% confluence before treatment. 2-Chloroethyl ethyl sulfide (CEES, TCI, Portland, OR) was freshly diluted from the stock in DMSO, which was then further diluted into the media to the desired final concentration. The amount of DMSO did not exceed 0.1% in any treatment. The metalloporphyrins were dissolved in distilled H2O and added directly to the treatment media to the desired final concentration. SAE cells were treated with 900µM CEES for 48h. Due to the increased sensitivity of the 16HBE cells, they were treated with the same concentration of CEES for only 24h.
Cell Viability

Cell viability was measured using the calcein AM dye (Invitrogen, Carlsbad, CA), a cell permeable non-fluorescent probe that once cleaved by intracellular esterases becomes fluorescent. The treatment media was removed, and cells were washed with PBS to remove remaining compound or extracellular esterases, and fresh media was added back to the cells containing 1µM calcein AM dye and allowed to incubate for 1h. Fluorescence was measured with an excitation wavelength of 485nm and emission wavelength of 530nm using a CytoFluor series 4000 fluorescent plate reader (PerSeptive Biosystems, Framingham, MA). Calcein AM results were verified using the MTT assay as a second cell viability test. Briefly 200µL of fresh media was added to the cells and 50µL MTT reagent (2 mg/mL) was added to each well and incubated for 1h at 37°C. Media was then removed, and 200µL of DMSO was added followed by 25µL of Sorensen’s glycine buffer (0.75g glycine and 0.58g NaCl in 1L of H₂O pH to 10.5 using 1N NaOH). Samples were then transferred to a 96-well plate and read in triplicate at 550nm.

Mitochondrial Reactive Oxygen Species

Mitochondrial ROS was measured using MitoSOX red (Invitrogen, Carlsbad, CA) added to cells at a final concentration of 5 µM and incubated for 1h at 37°C. Media was then removed, and the cells were washed with warm PBS (500µL) and the cells were scraped and placed into 1.2mL micro-titer tubes (Life Science Products, Frederick, CO). Fluorescence was measured using a Becton Dickinson FACScalibur cytometer running Cellquest Pro version 4.0.2. Results were obtained by gating on a FSC-H versus SSC-
H live cell population. Mean fluorescence was measured on FL2 and expressed as percent of the controls. The mean control fluorescence values in the SAE and 16HBE cells were 142 and 134, respectively.

**Determination of Mitochondrial dysfunction**

Mitochondrial membrane potential was measured using the cell permeant fluorescent dye Rhodamine 123 (Kodak, Rochester, NY). Cells were treated with Rho 123 dissolved in DMSO for 30 min at a final concentration of 20µM in the media. Media was then removed and the cells were washed once with PBS and scraped in 500µL PBS for analysis via Flow Cytometry. Fluorescence was measured using an Accuri C6 cytometer (Accuri Cytometers, Ann Arbor, MI) running Cflow software or a Becton Dickinson FACScalibur cytometer running Cellquest Pro version 4.0.2. The mean fluorescence was quantified and expressed as percent of the controls. Fluorescence is inversely correlated with mitochondrial membrane potential (Darzynkiewicz et al., 1981).

**Total Glutathione Levels**

Human lung 16HBE cells were exposed to CEES for a total of 12h, after which the treatment media was removed and replaced with 300µL of room temperature PBS. The cells were lysed by sonication and samples were centrifuged at 12,000 x g for 10 min to pellet cell debris. Total GSH was measured specrophotometrically using a modified Tietze assay (Tietze, 1969) described by Rahman et. al (Rahman et al., 2007). Essentially 5,5’-dithio-bis(2-nitrobenzoic acid) (DTNB) solution (1.33mg/mL), glutathione reductase (13.3µL/mL), and NADPH (1.33mg/mL) is dissolved in KPE buffer (0.1M potassium phosphate buffer with 5mM EDTA, pH 7.5). Standard or sample
(20µL) was added in triplicate to a 96-well plate along with 100µL equal part mixture of DTNB and GR, let stand for 1 min, then 50µL NADPH is added, shaken and read at 412 nm for 5 min. GSH concentration is determined using a GSH standard curve run in tandem with the samples. Protein was measured using Coomassie Blue (Thermo Fisher Pittsburgh, PA) and GSH was normalized to the amount of protein per sample, results are expressed as nmol GSH per mg protein.

DNA Oxidation

Human lung 16HBE cells were exposed to CEES for a total of 12h, after which the treatment media was removed and replaced with 300µL of room temperature PBS. The cells were lysed by sonication and samples were centrifuged at 12,000 x g for 10 min to pellet cell debris. DNA from 16HBE cells was extracted using DNeasy tissue kit (No. 69504, Qiagen, Valencia, CA). DNA purity was measured using a Nanodrop 1000 spectrophotometer (Thermo Fisher, Pittsburgh, PA). Roughly 6 µg purified DNA was incubated with 4 units of Nuclease P1 (US Biological #N7000, Swampscott, MA) at 60°C for 20 min then 4 units of Alkaline Phosphatase (Sigma, St. Louis, MO) at 37°C for 60 min. The samples where then analyzed for 8-hydroxy-2-deoxyguanosine (8OHdG) and 2-deoxyguanosine (2dG) respectively by HPLC coupled with UV and electrochemical detection (CoulArray model 5600; ESA Inc., Chelmford, MA). Mobile phase A consisting of 50 mM sodium acetate, pH 4.0, and mobile phase B consisting of 50 mM sodium acetate with acetonitrile 85:15 (v:v), pH 4.2 with a flow rate of 1 mL/min using a gradient of 100% A for 5 min; 60% A, 40% B for 12 min; 20% A, 80% B for 5 min; and 100% A for 8 min. Analysis consisted of a 4.6 by 250 mm, C18 reverse phase column (Tosoh Bioscience #K3121, Montgomeryville, PA) with the detection of 2dG by
UV and 8OHdG using electrode potentials of 140, 200, 260, and 320 mV. The retention times for 2dG and 8OHdG were 13.0 and 14.1 min, respectively. Concentrations were determined using an 11 point standard curve containing increasing concentrations of 8OHdG and 2dG and expressed as a ratio of $\frac{8OHdG}{10^5 2dG}$.

**Statistics**

Results are expressed as mean ± standard error of the mean. One way ANOVA with Dunnett’s comparison test or two way ANOVA with Bonferroni post test was performed using Prizm version 5 (Graph Pad, San Diego, CA). A P value < 0.05 was considered statistically significant.
Results

CEES-induced airway epithelial cell injury

Human lung 16HBE cells were grown to about 90% confluence and treated with increasing concentrations of CEES ranging from 600 to 1000 µM. Cell viability was determined by measuring the fluorescence of calcein AM and was found to decrease in a dose-dependent manner from 80% with the 600 µM CEES to below 10% with 1000 µM CEES (Fig. 2). We used 900µM CEES as the optimal dose to carry out our cytoprotection studies because it provides enough cell injury (~50%) for potential therapeutics to demonstrate efficacy and the most consistent cell injury response in the two cell systems. Due to observed increased resistance of SAE cells to CEES toxicity as seen with 16HBE cells, these exposures were prolonged to 48 hours in the SAE cells to provide similar injury responses for comparison of antioxidant protective effects between cell systems.

Delayed increase in mitochondrial ROS and dysfunction with CEES exposure

Mitochondria are a major source of cellular ROS production and we sought to determine whether CEES exposure increases mitochondrial ROS production using the mitochondrial targeted ROS probe, mitoSOX. Both SAE and 16HBE cells were exposed to 900 µM CEES for 2, 4, 6, 8, 12, 24, and 48h after which the cells were incubated with MitoSOX and fluorescence was measured using flow cytometry. CEES exposure increased ROS levels that peaked at 12 hours and this time-dependent increase was
seen in both SAE (Fig 3A) and 16HBE (Fig 3B) cells. Consequently, further exposure studies measuring markers of cellular stress were examined after 12 hours of exposure.

We next examined whether CEES exposure was associated with any mitochondrial dysfunction. Mitochondria need to maintain a membrane potential to actively make ATP. To examine this, we measured Rhodamine 123 fluorescence (Rho 123) which is inversely correlated with mitochondrial membrane potential (Darzynkiewicz et al., 1981). Human lung 16HBE cells were exposed to CEES for 2, 4, 6, 8, 12, 24, and 48h after which the cells were incubated with Rho 123 and fluorescence was measured using flow cytometry. We found that CEES produced a decrease in mitochondrial membrane potential by 4h which persisted for 24h as evidence by the increase in Rho 123 fluorescence (Fig 3C). Interestingly, there was a significant decrease in rho 123 fluorescence at 48h which can be attributed to the cell death that would be expected to occur based on previous cell viability tests.

**Metalloporphyrins rescue human lung cells from CEES-induced toxicity**

We hypothesized that catalytic antioxidant metalloporphyrins would be able to rescue the cells from CEES-induced toxicity based on the delayed mitochondrial ROS and dysfunction response to CEES. Several structurally different metalloporphyrins (AEOL 10150, 10113, 10303, and MnTBAP) were screened in 16HBE cells for efficacy against CEES toxicity 1h after the initial exposure (Fig 4). Our previous experience with these compounds have found that the maximal tolerated concentration of metalloporphyrins is around 50 μM and this concentration was used for screening. Cells were treated with CEES for 1h at 37°C, after which AEOL 10150, 10113, 10303 and
MnTBAP were added at a final concentration of 50µM. After 24h, cell viability was measured using calcein AM fluorescence. Three catalytic antioxidant compounds significantly increased cell viability in CEES exposed cells to 60, 56, and 41% in AEOL 10150, 10113, and 10303 groups compared to only 20% in CEES only exposed cells (Fig 5). Of the four compounds tested, only MnTBAP did not show any protection. None of the compounds significantly changed cell viability by themselves.

**AEOL 10150 rescues human primary airway cells from CEES-induced toxicity**

Primary human lung SAE cells and 16HBE cells were exposed to 900 µM CEES for 48 hours. Treatment with AEOL 10150 (10, 25, and 50 µM) occurred 1h after the initial CEES exposure. AEOL 10150 (50µM) alone did not change the viability of the cells as measured by both the calcein AM (Fig. 6A, C) as well as the MTT assay (Fig. 6B, D). CEES alone caused a 50% decrease in cell viability and this was significantly attenuated at the highest concentration of AEOL 10150 to 80% of the control in SAE cells (Fig. 6A, B) and nearly 90% in 16HBE cells (Fig 6C, D). Although neither the 10 nor 25 µM AEOL 10150 showed a significant increase in viability in the SAE cells, 25 µM AEOL 10150 did show a significant increase in viability in the 16HBE cells. Similar results were obtained in both the calcein AM and the MTT assays used to assess cell viability.

**AEOL 10150 prevents CEES-mediated mitochondrial ROS and dysfunction**

We next assessed whether the cytoprotective effects of AEOL 10150 are associated with CEES-mediated changes in mitochondrial ROS and dysfunction. Cells were grown to about 90% confluence and exposed to 900 µM CEES with and without
AEOL 10150 (50 µM). Cells were incubated with MitoSOX 12 hours after CEES exposure and fluorescence was measured using flow cytometry. AEOL 10150 added 1h after CEES treatments significantly decreased mitochondrial ROS compared with CEES exposed cells in both SAE (Fig 7A) and 16HBE (Fig 7B) cells. AEOL 10150 alone did not cause a change in mitochondrial ROS. We also wanted to determine if AEOL 10150 can protect the mitochondria from CEES-induced dysfunction. Lung 16HBE cells were exposed to 900 µM CEES for 4h with 50 µM AEOL 10150 added 1h after the initial CEES exposure. The CEES only treated groups showed an increase in rhodamine 123 fluorescence, indicating a significant loss of mitochondrial membrane potential that was attenuated in the AEOL 10150 treated cells (Fig 7C).

**AEOL 10150 prevents CEES-induced oxidative stress**

Oxidative stress can result from an imbalance between oxidant production and antioxidant defense. GSH is a major cellular antioxidant and we sought to determine the effect of CEES on total cellular GSH levels and whether AEOL 10150 altered CEES-mediated changes in GSH levels. Human lung 16HBE cells were exposed for 12h to CEES and AEOL 10150 (50 µM) was added 1h post CEES treatment. AEOL 10150 alone did not alter intracellular GSH levels, while CEES caused a significant decrease in intracellular GSH levels (Fig 8A). AEOL 10150 treatment prevented the CEES-induced decrease in GSH further implicating an imbalance in redox status of the cells caused by CEES that was reversible by AEOL 10150.

One consequence of oxidative stress is an increase in the oxidation of cellular macromolecules. A classic marker for DNA oxidation is the formation of 8-hydroxy-2-
deoxyguanosine (8OHdG) which we determined 12h after CEES exposure. CEES caused a significant increase in 8OHdG levels in lung 16HBE cells as measured by HPLC (Fig 8B). We also found that AEOL 10150 added 1h post CEES exposure decreased CEES-mediated DNA oxidation. These data further support the role of oxidative stress in CEES-mediated injury that is ameliorated by the catalytic antioxidant metalloporphyrin, AEOL 10150.
Discussion

These studies suggest that CEES produces mitochondrial dysfunction that is followed by an increase in mitochondrial ROS production and cellular oxidative stress. In addition, we have identified a small molecule catalytic antioxidant, AEOL 10150, that can rescue airway epithelial cells from CEES-induced toxicity and oxidative stress. These studies further shed insight into the mechanism of CEES toxicity and suggest that it is due, at least in part, to a delayed mitochondrial dysfunction and oxidative stress. These studies provide a rationale for the protective effects of antioxidants in CEES injury and why there may be a rescue window opportunity for therapeutics.

Currently there is no antidote for SM poisoning. Upon exposure, the best recourse is decontamination and supportive treatment (Munro, 1990; Watson and Griffin, 1992). Decontamination of the skin is relatively straightforward and beneficial whereas an internal exposure such as inhalation of sulfur mustards is much more difficult to treat (Munro, 1990). Medical surveillance of individuals exposed to mustard gas in the early 1980’s has documented a number of respiratory conditions including bronchiolitis obliterans, asthma, and lung fibrosis that can persist throughout the victims’ lifetimes (Ghanei and Harandi, 2007).

2-chloroethyl ethyl sulfide (CEES) is a close SM analog and provides a useful model for SM toxicity. CEES is termed monofunctional because of the single terminal chlorine, whereas SM has two chlorines (Fig 1) giving it the additional ability to crosslink biological molecules (Watson and Griffin, 1992). Depending on route of administration, CEES is about 10 times less toxic than SM (Gautam et al., 2006). It is important to note
that studies done with CEES, especially with therapeutics, need to be viewed with caution and is only a first step that needs to be repeated using SM.

Not much is known about the mechanism of SM toxicity despite its use for over a century. Early work focused on the alkylation of DNA and corresponding activation of PARP (Korkmaz et al., 2006), depletion of cellular NAD⁺ (Brookes and Lawley, 1961; Lawley and Brookes, 1967; Papirmeister et al., 1985) and inhibition of transcription factor binding (Gray, 1995) as a mechanism of toxicity. Papirmeister and colleagues showed that the difference in amount of radioactively labeled DNA that is degraded due to alkylation by SM or CEES in E. coli crude extract is only about 10%. This indicated that CEES may be a useful model to study molecular effects of SM despite the lack of crosslinking and lower toxicity. It was also suggested that PARP would be activated which in turn leads to a decrease in cellular NAD⁺ which would inhibit cellular energy processes and eventually lead to toxicity (Papirmeister et al., 1985). It was found that the SM-induced depletion of NAD⁺ is time-dependant and doesn’t occur until at least 1h (Meier et al., 1987), being maximal by 4h after exposure (Papirmeister et al., 1985). This research is some of the first to suggest a delayed nature of the cellular response to SM exposure and some of the earliest characterization of cellular effects of SM. Unfortunately, the majority of earlier work was done in skin exposure models and it is not clear whether it is relevant to the lung’s response to SM.

More recent work with SM on DNA has characterize genomic changes which show increases in markers of apoptosis, cell cycle regulation, and various other response genes (Dillman et al., 2005). Furthermore, exploring the role of oxidative stress in CEES-mediated injury and supplementation with antioxidants as a treatment
has been a major area of interest. Studies have indicated that TNF-α is increased in lung macrophages of guinea pigs 1h after intratracheal instillation with CEES (Chatterjee et al., 2003). Other studies suggest a role for oxidative stress mediated by CEES that include changes in SOD (Mukhopadhyay et al., 2006), catalase, glutathione reductase (Gautam et al., 2006), and glutathione-S-transferase activities (Kim, 1996; Jafari, 2007), inhibition of iNOS (Qui et al., 2006), depletion of glutathione (Elsayed et al., 1989) and increases in ROS (Elsayed et al., 1992; Gautam et al., 2006). Consequently supplementation with catalase, resveratrol, N-acetyl-L-cysteine, and GSH can be effective in treating mustard exposures (McClintock et al., 2002; McClintock et al., 2006; Hoesel et al., 2008; Paromov et al., 2008). In rats, liposomes containing NAC, GSH, or a combination of the two can provide protection when administered between 1-1.5h after CEES exposure (McClintock et al., 2006; Hoesel et al., 2008). Although these studies have suggested an oxidative stress environment, there is little mechanistic characterization of the increase in ROS levels caused by CEES. Recent reported finding suggest that CEES can alter cellular electron transfer systems as a mechanism for increased ROS production (Brimfield et al.). In the current study we have shown that there is delayed ROS production that is maximal 12 h after CEES exposure that may be localized to the mitochondria. We have also shown that in addition to the formation of ROS there is also significant mitochondrial dysfunction. The delayed nature of the ROS response suggests a reason why antioxidants such as NAC, GSH, or AEOL 10150 have beneficial effects even when administered after CEES exposure. The ability of a catalytic antioxidant like AEOL 10150, that has been show to have both
SOD and catalase activity (Milano and Day, 2000; Day, 2008), to rescue cells from CEES further demonstrates a role for ROS in CEES injury.

In addition to the ability of CEES to alkylate DNA, we have also demonstrated that CEES exposure can lead to DNA oxidation. Whether this oxidation is directly due to CEES, its metabolites, or the ROS that is formed is yet to be determined. The increased ROS we have seen in mitochondria may be due to mitochondrial dysfunctional which we have seen in our CEES model as well as what others have seen following SM exposure (Sourdeval et al., 2006). The mitochondrion, specifically the respiratory chain, can produce a substantial amount of endogenous ROS (Fridovich, 1978; Drose and Brandt, 2008), and, if CEES causes mitochondrial uncoupling, this could explain oxidation products seen in other areas of the cell as well as markers of apoptosis (Dillman et al., 2005; Sourdeval et al., 2006). This idea is supported by recent findings that suggest sulfur and nitrogen mustards can react with cellular reductases and increase free radical production (Brimfield et al.).

Our study shows that 900 µM CEES causes a reduction of cell viability to about 50%. Interestingly in our cell model we found that the transformed cell line 16HBE appears more susceptible to CEES toxicity than primary human SAE cells. 16HBE cells showed only about 50% change in cell viability when exposed to CEES for 24h while the same concentration in SAE cells took 48h to decrease viability to about 55%. Recent studies have also seen this effect with SM in two other cell systems due to the degree of proteolytic processing of caspases induced by sulfur mustards [Ray et al. 2008]. Another factor could be that the genetic background of the SAE cell donors was unknown. It also supports the notion that CEES may be bioactivated by specific cellular
protein systems and different lung cell types and cell lines may vary in their expression levels of these proteins.

In summary, we have established that there is delayed production of ROS and mitochondrial damage caused by CEES which was prevented by AEOL 10150. We have established a role for CEES in initiating an oxidative stress environment within the cell by causing an overall decrease in intracellular GSH as well as increased DNA oxidation. Our results suggest that metalloporphyrins and other antioxidants can prevent oxidative stress caused by CEES in vitro through the delayed production of ROS in response to CEES.
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Legends for Figures

Figure 1. Structures of bis(2-chloroethyl sulfide) also known as sulfur mustard (SM), and its analog 2-chloroethyl ethyl sulfide (CEES).

Figure 2. CEES exposure causes a concentration dependent injury of human airway epithelial cells. Human lung 16HBE cells were grown to about 90% confluence and treated with concentrations of CEES ranging from 600 to 1000 µM for 24h. Cell viability decreased in a dose dependent manner as measured by quantifying Calcein AM fluorescence. Data represented as mean ± SEM, n=4 where control group fluorescence was defined as 100% viability.

Figure 3. CEES exposure produces increased levels of mitochondrial ROS and dysfunction. SAE (A) and 16HBE (B) cells were treated with 900 µM CEES for 2, 4, 6, 8, 12, 24, and 48h. After which cells were incubated with the mitochondrial ROS probe MitoSOX (A, B) for 1h or mitochondrial membrane potential indicator Rhodamine 123 (C) for 30 min. Cells were washed then scraped and placed in microtiter tubes. Fluorescence was determined via flow cytometry gated on the live cell population. MitoSOX fluorescence correlated with increased ROS while Rhodamine 123 fluorescence is inversely correlated with mitochondrial membrane potential. Data is expressed as percent of the control, where the control fluorescence was set to 100%. *p<0.05, **p<0.01 compared to control group n=3.

Figure 4. Chemical structures of several catalytic antioxidant metalloporphyrins.
Figure 5. The protective effects of metalloporphyrins on CEES-induced cell injury. 16HBE cells were grown to 90% confluence and exposed to 900 µM CEES for a total of 24h. Cells were treated 1h after the initial CEES exposure with AEOL 10150, 10113, 10303 or MnTBAP at a final concentration of 50µM in the presence (black bars) or absence (white bars) of 900 µM CEES. Data represented as mean ± SEM, n=4. *** p < 0.001 compared to CEES only treatment group.

Figure 6. Rescue effect of AEOL 10150 on CEES induced cell death. SAE cells (A, B) and 16HBE cells (C, D) were exposed to 900 µM CEES with AEOL 10150 at 10, 25, and 50 µM concentrations added 1h after CEES. Cell viability was measured using both Calcein AM (A, C) and MTT (B, D) staining with control values being defined as 100% viability. Data represented as mean ± SEM, n=4. **p< 0.01, ***p<0.001 compared to CEES only treated group.

Figure 7. AEOL 10150 rescues CEES induced increases in mitochondrial ROS and dysfunction. SAE (A) and 16HBE (B) cells were exposed to 900 µM CEES for 12h. 50 µM AEOL 10150 was added 1h after CEES exposure and ROS was determined using MitoSOX with flow cytometry. (C) 16HBE Cells were exposed similar as before except for 4h. Mitochondrial membrane potential was determined using Rhodamine 123 where fluorescence is inversely correlated with mitochondrial membrane potential. Mean fluorescence was normalized to control levels with controls being 100%. Data represents mean ± SEM n=3-6, *p<0.05, ***p<0.001 compared to control values. Two-way ANOVA of (A) AEOL 10150 p=0.0563, CEES p=0.0033, interaction p=0.042. (B) AEOL 10150 p=0.1073, CEES p=0.0004, interaction p<0.0001. (C) AEOL 10150 p=0.2876, CEES p=0.0007, interaction p=0.0051.
Figure 8. The effects of CEES on markers of cellular oxidative stress and prevention by AEOL 10150 in 16HBE cells. Cells exposed to 900 µM CEES for 12h had decreased total cellular GSH levels (A) and AEOL 10150 (50 µM) rescued this decrease when treated 1h after CEES exposure. Total GSH levels were normalized to the amount of protein and expressed as nmol GSH per mg protein. CEES also increased the levels of the DNA oxidation marker 8OHdG (B) and AEOL 10150 (50 µM) post CEES treatment decreased the levels of DNA oxidation. Data expressed as a ratio of 8OHdG per $10^5$ 2dG. Data presented as mean ± SEM n=4-8, *p<0.05, ***p<0.001 compared to control levels. Two-way ANOVA of (A) AEOL 10150 p=0.1444, CEES p=0.0001, interaction p=0.0481. (B) AEOL 10150 p=0.1394, CEES p<0.0001, interaction p=0.0004.
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Legend: Viability (% Ctrl) against CEES (µM) concentrations.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R</th>
<th>Drug Code</th>
<th>Substitutions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CO₂H</td>
<td>MnTBAP</td>
<td>(R₁ &amp; R₂)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO₂H</td>
<td>AEOL 10303</td>
<td>(R₂)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO₂CH₃</td>
<td></td>
<td>(R₁)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>AEOL-10113</td>
<td>(R₁ &amp; R₂)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>AEOL-10150</td>
<td>(R₁ &amp; R₂)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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