

The Increment of Genoprotective Effect of Melatonin due to “Autoptic” Effect versus the Genotoxicity of Mitoxantrone

Zamani M.^{1*}, Etebari M.², Moradi Sh.¹

ABSTRACT

Background: Mitoxantrone is a chemotherapy anti-cancer drug, which can have side effects on healthy cells like secondary cancers. On the other side, Melatonin is a hormone that is responsible for the daily rhythm adjustment and has several properties to be anticancer and anti-inflammatory. Recently, it has been shown that all living cells produce ultraweak photon emission (UPE) spontaneously and continuously. The intensity of UPE is in the order of a few, up to 10^4 photon/($\text{cm}^2 \text{ sec}$) (or 10^{-19} to 10^{-14} W/ cm^2) measurable by photodetectors. UPEs are produced from diverse natural oxidative and biochemical reactions, especially free radical reactions and the simple cessation of excited molecules. Also, it has been evidenced that UPE has a signaling role at a distance among different cell cultures.

Objective: Here, we investigate the effect of UPE among similar cells (i.e. “Autoptic effect”) by using mirrors around the cell plate(s).

Material and Methods: In this experimental research, the HepG2 cells were co-treated by melatonin as a genoprotective and silver nanoparticles as a carrier against mitoxantrone’s genotoxicity. Our results are analyzed based on the Comet assay method, and the genoprotective effect of melatonin is investigated in presence of (and without) mirrors against the genotoxicity of mitoxantrone. Additionally, the autoptic effect is investigated in presence of Ag nanoparticles (NPs).

Results: The results indicated that Ag NPs with lower concentrations of melatonin made more protection as genoprotective agent, and the same results obtained by increasing access’ cells to drug.

Conclusion: The autoptic effect could increase the genoprotective effect of melatonin.

Citation: Zamani M, Etebari M, Moradi Sh. The Increment of Genoprotective Effect of Melatonin due to “Autoptic” Effect versus the Genotoxicity of Mitoxantrone. *J Biomed Phys Eng*. 2020;10(6):771-782. doi: 10.31661/jbpe.v0i0.508.

Keywords

Genoprotective Effect; Melatonin; Genotoxicity; Mitoxantrone; Biophoton; Autoptic Effect; Free Radicals

Introduction

Mitoxantrone (or Novantrone) is an injective anti-cancer drug [1-2] and though its connection to DNA causes cytotoxic and treating behavior in cancer cells, nevertheless this mechanism also has undesired consequences in the healthy cells like secondary cancers. For example, the treatment of MS and cancerous patients via mitoxantrone increased the risk of the secondary acute ‘myeloid’ leukemia. Genotoxicity due to the effect of anti-cancer drugs on the healthy cells of cancerous patients, which increases the danger of the emergence of

¹MSc, Department of Pharmacology, Isfahan Pharmaceutical Sciences Research Center, School of Pharmacy and Pharmaceutical Sciences, Isfahan University of Medical Sciences, Isfahan, Iran

²PhD, Department of Pharmacology, Isfahan Pharmaceutical Sciences Research Center, School of Pharmacy and Pharmaceutical Sciences, Isfahan University of Medical Sciences, Isfahan, Iran

*Corresponding author: M. Zamani
Department of Pharmacology, Isfahan Pharmaceutical Sciences Research Center, School of Pharmacy and Pharmaceutical Sciences, Isfahan University of Medical Sciences, Isfahan, Iran
E-mail: zamani.man-soure@yahoo.com

Received: 7 January 2016
Accepted: 8 April 2016

secondary cancers, is one of the problems of chemotherapy [3]. The DNA damage due to its contact to mitoxantrone via free radicals or direct connections has been proven in different studies. The free radical production by mitoxantrone metabolites had higher concentrations relative to by mitoxantrone [4-5]. Melatonin is a hormone that is responsible for the daily rhythm adjustment and has several properties to be anti-cancer and anti-inflammatory [6-7]. Melatonin also has useful effects versus intense stress and it can keep the strength of the immune system against the weakening effects of the drugs. It is used besides the interleukin 2 for immunotherapy of cancer [8]. Moreover, Melatonin is an antioxidant that decreases the effect of free radicals, reactive oxygen species (ROS) and reactive nitrogen species (RNS) [9-12]. It has the ability to cross through all membranes of living cells and penetrate the nucleus to be populated and protect DNA against harmful factors and even treat the harms [13].

Ultraweak Photon Emission in Living Cells

It has been clearly demonstrated that all living cells (without external excitation) spontaneously and continuously produce ultraweak photon emission (UPE) and the intensity of UPE is of the order of a few, up to 10^4 photon/cm²s (or equivalently 10^{-19} to 10^{-14} W/cm²) [14]. In fact, in different literature sources the UPE is referred to by different names such as ultraweak emission, biophotons, ultraweak bioluminescence, self-bioluminescent emission, photoluminescence, delayed luminescence, ultraweak luminescence, spontaneous chemiluminescence, ultraweak glow, biochemiluminescence, metabolic chemiluminescence, dark photobiochemistry, and bioluminescence [15]. It seems that biophotons are byproducts of metabolism inside the cells and therefore they may appear as trivial signals. Nevertheless, increasing evidence are beginning to emerge that UPE may play important

roles in cellular functions. The question about a functional role for weak intrinsic UPE has a rather long tradition [16], and particularly the question about a pure biological significance beyond the chemical role in electronic-photon interactions is still very speculative and a matter of debate. Measuring this radiation requires single photon detectors, e.g., photomultipliers (PMTs). The measurement process itself has to take place in a dark room because the measurement of UPE, e.g., from the human hand surface, results in only a few photons per 100ms. UPEs are produced from diverse naturally occurring oxidative and biochemical reactions, especially free radical reactions and the simple quenching of excited molecules. Examples include non-enzymatic and enzymatic lipid peroxidation, the reactions in the mitochondrial respiration chain and peroxisomal reactions, oxidation of tyrosine and tryptophan residues in proteins, etc. [17, 18]. The main source of UPE derives from oxidative metabolism of mitochondria and lipid peroxidation that generate photon-emitting molecules such as excited triplet carbonyls ($R=O^*$) and singlet oxygen (1O_2) [17, 18]. The spectrum of UPE from electronically excited species is mostly in the UV and visible region, i.e., 200-800 nm. For example, Triplet excited carbonyls produce UPE in the range 350-550 nm, singlet excited pigments in 360-560 nm, dimolar singlet oxygen in 634 nm and 703 nm [18], and hydrogen peroxide in the range 520-650 nm [19].

Non-Chemical Distant Cellular Interaction (NCDCI)

Basically, the cell-to-cell communication involves chemical or electrical signaling. In contrast, our understanding of non-chemical, non-electrical and non-mechanical forms of communication is still under debate [20]. There is growing experimental evidence that cells and tissues may interact over distances even when chemically and mechanically isolated, probably via electromagnetic (EM)

fields [15]. Stemming from the pioneering experiments of Gurwitsch in 1923 and 1924 [21], some researchers confirmed that cellular interactions may be mediated by EM fields [20]. There is no doubt that different EM fields can affect living cells and no question that living cells can generate EM fields, but the question is whether cells can affect each other via their EM fields? One of the possible candidates for non-chemical distant cellular interaction is UPE [18]. In fact, the intensity of UPE is so weak and looks unlikely to affect neighboring cells since under light condition the “competition between UPE and room-light” is not in favour of UPE, depending on room light intensity there are billions of photons per biophoton. Taking into account the modulation through absorption, the negative feedback loop and the relative amount of photons, it is understandable that not a high amount of photons will have a high amount of information, but a low amount of photons is more effective and the ratios and therefore the shape of wavelength spectra of the emission patterns are the key factors, and not the high intensity of light.

Autooptic Effect

One way to investigate the treatment based on UPE is to “optically” enclose the sample with mirrors (Figure 1) [22]. In this case, the sample cells receive their UPE and not from the distant isolated neighbor cells. It can be called auto-optic effect or self-NCDCI. Initially, this method was used to treat only psychosomatic problems [22].

However, its modification proved to have a broader range of therapeutic applications [22]. An important point of the first clinical observations [22, 23] was the spectrometric detection of the response in patient blood. Namely, after treatment, there were significant increases in the enzymatic and antioxidant activities of the blood (absorption changes in the 230-240 and 400-415 nm regions of wavelengths, respectively). We attempted to explain cellular interactions via light. Roughly speaking, our




Figure 1: The scheme of placing (1) mirrors relative to (2) the sample (i.e. HepG2 cells).

approach can be described as follows: first, the UPE is produced by excited species in the emitter cells. The signal is then transformed through absorption or/and spectrally modified by auto-fluorescence, by the emitter cell’s contents, to then escape the emitter cells. Finally, they hit the mirrors around the plate to increase the absorption of the light information to the nucleus or other biochemical pathways.

The Effect of Nanoparticles

Numerous studies have been published reporting DNA damage by silver nanoparticles (Ag NPs) [24-26]. Despite having different surface chemistry type of Ag NPs induce different DNA damage response, Ag NPs’ size is involved [27]. In this study, the HepG2 cells were co-treated by melatonin as a genoprotective and silver nanoparticles as a carrier against mitoxantrone’s genotoxicity.

Material and Methods

Chemicals

In this experimental research, tris, Triton X-100, H₂O₂, NaCl, EDTA, NaOH and NaH₂PO₄ were obtained from Merck Co. (Germany), Melatonin and mitoxantrone were respectively purchased from Sigma (USA) and Kocak Farma (Istanbul). LMA and NMA were

respectively gained from Sigma (USA) and CinnaGen (Iran). Melatonin kept at -20 °C, Mitoxantrone was selected for present study due to their extensive clinical use in Iran.

Preparation of drug solution: The concentrations of 0.05 μM for Mitoxantrone and 50 μM for Melatonin in 0.01 % ethanol were prepared.

Cells

HepG2 cells (1×10^6 cells/ml) were incubated at 37 °C and cultured in dishes in modified medium supplemented with 10% fetal bovine serum (FBS) and antibiotics.

Group 1 of treatment

The present study includes the following experimental groups (Figure 2):

- 1) The Positive control (Mitoxantrone: 0.05 μM)
- 2) Mirror free (Mitoxantrone: 0.05 μM + Melatonin: 50 μM)
- 3) With mirror (Mitoxantrone: 0.05 μM + Melatonin: 50 μM + mirror)

Cells were treated with MLT (melatonin) (50 μM), for one hour using 2 mirrors up and down of plate (group 3) and without a mirror (group 2), then Mitoxantrone (0.05 μM) as a mutagenic factor was added for next one-hour incubation.

After treatment, cells were washed with PBS

(Phosphate buffered saline, pH= 7.4), then centrifuged, the supernatant discarded and cells were resuspended in low melting point agarose (LMA) and plated on slides which were covered with normal melting point agarose (NMA). The slides were placed in a cool (-4 °C) and dark condition for 10 minutes. Slides were immersed in lysing solution (pH= 10.5) for 40 minutes and washed out with distilled water.

Then the slides were electrophoresed for 40 minutes (PH= 13-13.5, 25 V and 280 mA).

At the next stage, slides were placed in tries buffer (PH= 7.4) for 10 min. The slides were colored with ethidium bromide for 5 min and washed with PBS and water. A fluorescence microscope (CETI) was used in preparation of images. The comets were analyzed with the Comet Score program and three factors of tail length, Percentage of DNA in tail, and Tail moment were used in statistical analysis.

Comet assay

We used the Comet method [28] for the evaluation of chemotherapy drugs (e.g. mitoxantrone) genotoxicity, protection and recovery. The Comet assay (or SCGE) is a cheap, sensitive and standard experimental method for evaluation of DNA damage and has many applications in human biomonitoring, ecologic monitoring and DNA damage evaluation




Figure 2: The scheme of experimental groups

before (and during) the treatment. The comet assay procedure has been described in our previous studies [28-30]. Briefly, incubated cell suspensions (1×10^6 cells/ml) were mixed with LMA and were placed on the precoated slides (1 % NMA (Sigma)). The slides were respectively incubated with lysis solution (pH = 10.0) and electrophoresis buffer (pH > 13.0) for 40 minutes. Electrophoresis was done for 40 minutes (25 V, 280 mA). After this stage, the slides were placed in neutralization solution (pH = 7.5) for 10 minutes, covered by sufficient dye solution (20 μ g/ml ethidium bromide) for 10 minutes and washed with PBS (two times 10 minute each) and distilled water. Finally, comets were visualized under $\times 400$ magnification using fluorescence microscopy with an excitation filter of 510-560 nm and barrier filter of 590 nm. All stages of comet assay were performed at a cold place in dark conditions and all solutions were prepared

freshly and used cool.

Group 2 of treatment

The following experimental groups were obtained: negative control group (HepG2 cells without drug or Mitoxantrone); positive control group (HepG2 cells + Mitoxantrone (0.05 μ M)), different concentrations of Ag NPs (0.00 5 or 0. 01 μ l) + melatonin (25 or 50 μ M) an one-hour period incubation (co-treatment) + Mitoxantrone (0.05 μ M); different concentration of Ag NPs (0.00 5 or 0. 01 μ l) + melatonin (25 or 50 μ M) an one-hour period incubation (co-treatment) + Mitoxantrone (0.05 μ M) + Mirror group (Figure 3).

Results

Statistical analysis

In order to compare the drug treated and untreated samples we used the analysis of




Figure 3: The scheme of treatment’s groups

variance (ANOVA), results of tail length, percentage of DNA in tail and tail moment were reported as mean \pm SE. Furthermore, post hoc analysis using Graphpad software Inc, USA were performed [28]. One-way analysis of variance [31] was used to compare the results of comet assay, followed by Tukey's multiple comparison post hoc test. The significance level of 0.05 was considered as statistically significant.

The results of One way analysis of variance (ANOVA) for the Tail length and Percentage of DNA in tail showed significance of $p < 0.001$. Moreover, the results of Tukey's post hoc test determined significant differences (***) and (### $p < 0.001$) respectively incompared with the positive control group and Mirror free group for both of parameters (Figures 4 and 5).

The result of One way analysis of variance (ANOVA) for the Tail moment showed significance of $p < 0.001$. Moreover, the results of Tukey's post hoc test determined significant differences (***) and (# $p < 0.05$) respectively incompared with the positive control group and Mirror free group (Figure 6).

To determine the effect of Ag NPs on genoprotective concentration of melatonin, HepG2 cells were separately incubated with different concentrations of Ag NPs for 2 hours followed by the comet assay. Three factors including tail length, percentage of DNA in tail and tail moment (% DNA in tail \times tail length) were measured and compared with the control group. Concentrations of melatonin (25 and 50 μ M) (Figure 7), Mitoxantrone (0.05 μ M) and Ag NPs (0.005 and 0.01 μ l) were selected as a suitable dose and comet properties were studied (Figure 8).

Based on our analysis it looks that the high protection could take more melatonin up by penetration of membrane which created by Ag NPs [32]. The three comet assay parameters of DNA damage (tail length, %DNA in tail and tail moment) are utilized, and our data revealed a significant decrease in all three parameters in




Figure 4: The comparison of tail length for the studied groups (Positive Control, Mirror free and with mirror groups). Each group has represented as Mean \pm SEM. The signs of *** and ### represents significance of $p < 0.001$ respectively in compare with the Positive control and the Mirror free group.




Figure 5: The comparison of Percentage of DNA in tail for the studied groups (Positive Control, Mirror free and with mirror groups). Each group has represented as Mean \pm SEM. The signs of *** and ### represents significance of $p < 0.001$ respectively in compare with the Positive control and the Mirror free group.

presence of silver nanoparticles compared to the control group. When we examined the relationship between dosages of nanoparticles, significant correlations were found between all comet parameters and dosage of silver




Figure 6: The comparison of Tail moment for the studied groups (Positive Control, Mirror free and with mirror groups). Each group has represented as Mean ± SEM. The signs of *** and # represents signficancy of $p < 0.001$ and $p < 0.05$ respectively comparing with the Positive control and Mirror free group.

nanoparticles. Two concentrations of Ag NPs were compared, which the higher dosage was significantly more protecting contrast to half-concentration of Ag NPs subjects.

Discussion

Often, chemotherapy with mitoxantrone causes side effects and sometimes induces cancer drug resistance. Baced on evidences most anticancer drugs are highly cytotoxic and/or genotoxic which may engage normal cells too [33-37].

Mitoxantrone causes secondary malignancies by preventing topoisomerase II and raising of oxidative stress [38-42].

The genoprotective effects of melatonin on wide range of malignancies, by antioxidant propertes, has been shown by several studies [43, 44].

Ultraweak photon emission, called biophotoemission too, have been made by reflection of natural oxidative and biochemical reactions in living cells [45].

Taken together, in this research we were looking for a correlation between UPE and promoting genoprotective effects of melatonin




Figure 7: Comparison of (A): Tail length, (B): % DNA in tail and (C): Tail moment of concentrations of melatonin (25 and 50 μM) and mitoxantrone (0.05 μM) as positive control. Each graph has been represented as Mean ± SEM. Signs (***) and (*) show respectively signficancy of ($P < 0.001$) and ($P < 0.05$) in comparison with the positive control group.

by using enclosing mirrors againts the genotoxicity of mitoxantrone. Our results indicated that the genoprotective effect of melatonin in presence of mirrors had significant difference with one without mirrors ($p < 0.05$) against




Figure 8: Comparison of (A): Tail length, (B): % DNA in tail and (C): Tail moment of Melatonin (50 μM), A: Melatonin (25 μM) in presence of mirror, B: Melatonin (25 μM) + Ag nanoparticles (0.005 μl), C: Melatonin (25 μM) + Ag nanoparticles (0.01 μl), D: Melatonin (25 μM) + Ag nanoparticles (0.005 μl) in presence of mirror, E: Melatonin (25 μM) + Ag nanoparticles (0.01 μl) in presence of mirror. Each graph has been represented as Mean ± SEM. Sign (*) shows significance of (P<0.05) in compare with the negative control group.

the genotoxicity of mitoxantrone (Figure 9). Therefore, it appears that Autooptic and Genoprotectivity of Melatonin the autooptic effect could increase the genoprotective effect of melatonin. Regarding the presence of Ag NPs, the genoprotective effect of Ag NPs is dose dependent. Indeed, Ag NPs with lower.

Conclusion

Our results indicated that the genoprotective effect of melatonin in presence of mirrors had significant difference with one without mirrors ($p < 0.05$) against the genotoxicity of mitoxantrone. Therefore, it appears that the autooptic effect could increase the genoprotective effect

of melatonin. Regarding the presence of Ag NPs, the genoprotective effect of Ag NPs is dose dependent. Indeed, Ag NPs with lower concentrations of melatonin made more protection as genoprotective agent, and the same results obtained by increasing access' cells to drug.

Acknowledgment

The authors would like to take this opportunity to express their profound gratitude and deep regard to Dr. vahid salari (Department of Physics, Isfahan University of Technology, Isfahan) for his guidance, valuable feedback and constant encouragement throughout the dura-




Figure 9: Left) The image of HepG2 cells taken by fluorescent microscope (400x), Right) The image of HepG2 cells imposed to Mitoxantrone.

tion of the project. His valuable suggestions were of immense help throughout our project work. His perceptive criticism kept us working to make this project in a much better way.

Conflict of Interest

None

References

1. Alberts DS, Peng YM, Bowden GT, Dalton WS, Mackel C. Pharmacology of mitoxantrone: mode of action and pharmacokinetics. *Investigational New Drugs*. 1985;**3**(2):101-7.
2. Dogra S, Awasthi P, Nair M, Barthwal R. Interaction of anticancer drug mitoxantrone with DNA hexamer sequence d-(CTCGAG)₂ by absorption, fluorescence and circular dichroism spectroscopy. *J Photochem Photobiol B*. 2013;**123**:48-54. doi: 10.1016/j.jphoto-biol.2013.03.015. PubMed PMID: 23624101.
3. Mishra S, Mishra RP. A comparison of the in vitro Genotoxicity of Anticancer Drugs Melphalan and Mitoxantrone. *American Journal of Biomedical Sciences*. 2013;**5**(3). doi: 10.5099/aj130300171.
4. Blanz J, Mewes K, Ehninger G, Proksch B, Waidelich D, Greger B, et al. Evidence for oxidative activation of mitoxantrone in human, pig, and rat. *Drug Metab Dispos*. 1991;**19**:871-80. PubMed PMID: 1686230.
5. Buschini A, Poli P, Rossi C. Saccharomyces cerevisiae as an eukaryotic cell model to assess cytotoxicity and genotoxicity of three anticancer anthraquinones. *Mutagenesis*. 2003;**18**:25-36. doi: 10.1093/mutage/18.1.25. PubMed PMID: 12473732.
6. Ferguson LR, Denny WA. Genotoxicity of non-covalent interactions: DNA intercalators. *Mutat Res*. 2007;**623**:14-23. doi: 10.1016/j.mrfmmm.2007.03.014. PubMed PMID: 17498749.
7. Kolodziejczyk P, Reszka K, Lown JW. Enzymatic oxidative activation and transformation of the antitumor agent mitoxantrone. *Free Radic Biol Med*. 1988;**5**:13-25. doi: 10.1016/0891-5849(88)90058-5. PubMed PMID: 3254299.
8. Galano A, Tan DX, Reiter RJ. Melatonin as a natural ally against oxidative stress: a physicochemical examination. *J Pineal Res*. 2011;**51**:1-16. doi: 10.1111/j.1600-079X.2011.00916.x. PubMed PMID: 21752095.
9. Sliwinski T, Rozej W, Morawiec-Bajda A, Morawiec Z, Reiter R, Blasiak J. Protective action of melatonin against oxidative DNA damage: chemical inactivation versus base-excision repair. *Mutat Res*. 2007;**634**:220-7. doi: 10.1016/j.mrgentox.2007.07.013. PubMed PMID: 17851115.
10. Hardeland R. Neurobiology, pathophysiology, and treatment of melatonin deficiency and dysfunction. *The Scientific World Journal*. 2012;**2012**:1-18. doi: 10.1100/2012/640389.
11. Motilva V, Garcia-Maurino S, Talero E, Illanes M. New paradigms in chronic intestinal inflammation and colon cancer: role of melatonin. *J Pineal Res*. 2011;**51**:44-60. doi:

- 10.1111/j.1600-079X.2011.00915.x. PubMed PMID: 21752096.
- 12.Ferreira SG, Peliciari-Garcia RA, Takahashi-Hyodo SA, Rodrigues AC, Amaral FG, Berra CM, et al. Effects of melatonin on DNA damage induced by cyclophosphamide in rats. *Braz J Med Biol Res.* 2013;**46**:278-86. doi: 10.1590/1414-431X20122230. PubMed PMID: 23471360. PubMed PMCID: 3854377.
- 13.Tozan-Beceran A. Melatonin protects against acrylamide-induced oxidative tissue damage in rats. *Marmara Pharmaceutical Journal.* 2012;**3**(16):213-21. doi: 10.12991/201216401.
- 14.Cifra M, Fields JZ, Farhadi A. Electromagnetic cellular interactions. *Progress in biophysics and molecular biology.* 2011;**105**(3):223-46. doi: 10.1016/j.pbiomolbio.2010.07.003.
- 15.Salari V, Tuszyński J, Bokkon I, Rahnama M, Cifra M. On the photonic cellular interaction and the electric activity of neurons in the human brain. *Journal of Physics: Conference Series.* 2011;**329**(1). doi: 10.1088/1742-6596/329/1/012006.
- 16.Gurwitsch A. Physikalisches über mitogene Strahlen. *Development Genes and Evolution.* 1924;**103**:490-8. doi: 10.1007/bf02107498.
- 17.Cifra M, Pospisil P. Ultra-weak photon emission from biological samples: definition, mechanisms, properties, detection and applications. *J Photochem Photobiol B.* 2014;**139**:2-10. doi: 10.1016/j.jphotobiol.2014.02.009. PubMed PMID: 24726298.
- 18.Petrash VV, Borovkov EI, Dovgusha VV, Ivanova VA, Egorov YN, Il'ina LV, editors. Auto-optic Effect. *Doklady Biochemistry and Biophysics.* 2004;**396**:174-6. doi: 10.1023/B:DOBI.0000033522.90775.95.
- 19.Tice RR, Agurell E, Anderson D, Burlinson B, Hartmann A, Kobayashi H, et al. Single cell gel/comet assay: guidelines for in vitro and in vivo genetic toxicology testing. *Environ Mol Mutagen.* 2000;**35**:206-21. doi: 10.1002/(SICI)1098-2280(2000)35:3<206::AID-EM8>3.0.CO;2-J. PubMed PMID: 10737956.
- 20.Devaraj B, Scott R, Roschger P, Inaba H. Ultraweak light emission from rat liver nuclei. *Photochemistry and photobiology.* 1991;**54**:289-93. doi: 10.1111/j.1751-1097.1991.tb02018.x.
- 21.Prasad PN. Introduction to biophotonics. John Wiley & Sons; 2004.
- 22.Nakano M. Low-level chemiluminescence during lipid peroxidations and enzymatic reactions. *J Biolumin Chemilumin.* 1989;**4**:231-40. doi: 10.1002/bio.1170040133. PubMed PMID: 2801214.
- 23.Prasad A, Pospisil P. Linoleic acid-induced ultra-weak photon emission from *Chlamydomonas reinhardtii* as a tool for monitoring of lipid peroxidation in the cell membranes. *PLoS One.* 2011;**6**:e22345. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0022345. PubMed PMID: 21799835. PubMed PMCID: 3143142.
- 24.Stoyanova II, Gulubova MV. Mast cells and inflammatory mediators in chronic ulcerative colitis. *Acta Histochem.* 2002;**104**:185-92. doi: 10.1078/0065-1281-00641. PubMed PMID: 12086339.
- 25.Hackenberg S, Scherzed A, Kessler M, Hummel S, Technau A, Froelich K, et al. Silver nanoparticles: evaluation of DNA damage, toxicity and functional impairment in human mesenchymal stem cells. *Toxicol Lett.* 2011;**201**:27-33. doi: 10.1016/j.toxlet.2010.12.001. PubMed PMID: 21145381.
- 26.Pospisil P, Prasad A, Rac M. Role of reactive oxygen species in ultra-weak photon emission in biological systems. *J Photochem Photobiol B.* 2014;**139**:11-23. doi: 10.1016/j.jphotobiol.2014.02.008. PubMed PMID: 24674863.
- 27.Ahn JM, Eom HJ, Yang X, Meyer JN, Choi J. Comparative toxicity of silver nanoparticles on oxidative stress and DNA damage in the nematode, *Caenorhabditis elegans*. *Chemosphere.* 2014;**108**:343-52. doi: 10.1016/j.chemosphere.2014.01.078. PubMed PMID: 24726479.
- 28.Etebari M, Ghannadi A, Jafarian-Dehkordi A, Ahmadi F. Genotoxicity evaluation of aqueous extracts of *Co-tonaster discolor* and *Alhagi pseudalhagi* by comet assay. *Journal of Re-*

- search in Medical Sciences. 2012;**17**.
29. Etebari M, Zolfaghari B, Jafarian-Dehkordi A, Rakian R. Evaluation of DNA damage of hydro-alcoholic and aqueous extract of *Echium amoenum* and *Nardostachys jatamansi*. *J Res Med Sci*. 2012;**17**:782-6. PubMed PMID: 23798947. PubMed PMCID: 3687887.
 30. Tavakoli M, Bateni E, Rismanchian M, Fathi M, Doostmohammadi A, Rabiei A, et al. Genotoxicity effects of nano bioactive glass and Novabone bioglass on gingival fibroblasts using single cell gel electrophoresis (comet assay): An in vitro study. *Dent Res J (Isfahan)*. 2012;**9**:314-20. PubMed PMID: 23087738. PubMed PMCID: 3469899.
 31. Park MV, Neigh AM, Vermeulen JP, De La Fonteyne LJ, Verharen HW, Briede JJ, et al. The effect of particle size on the cytotoxicity, inflammation, developmental toxicity and genotoxicity of silver nanoparticles. *Biomaterials*. 2011;**32**:9810-7. doi: 10.1016/j.biomaterials.2011.08.085. PubMed PMID: 21944826.
 32. McShan D, Ray PC, Yu H. Molecular toxicity mechanism of nanosilver. *J Food Drug Anal*. 2014;**22**:116-27. doi: 10.1016/j.jfda.2014.01.010. PubMed PMID: 24673909. PubMed PMCID: 4281024.
 33. Poljaková J, Eckschlager T, Hraběta J, Hřebočková J, Smutný S, Frei E, Martínek V, Kizek R, Stiborová M. The mechanism of cytotoxicity and DNA adduct formation by the anticancer drug ellipticine in human neuroblastoma cells. *Biochemical Pharmacology*. 2009;**77**(9):1466-79. doi: 10.1016/j.bcp.2009.01.021.
 34. Tacar O, Sriamornsak P, Dass CR. Doxorubicin: an update on anticancer molecular action, toxicity and novel drug delivery systems. *J Pharm Pharmacol*. 2013;**65**(2):157-70. doi: 10.1111/j.2042-7158.2012.01567.x.
 35. Kizek R, Adam V, Hrabeta J, Eckschlager T, Smutny S, Burda JV, Frei E, Stiborova M. Anthracyclines and ellipticines as DNA-damaging anticancer drugs: recent advances. *Pharmacology & Therapeutics*. 2012;**133**(1):26-39. doi:10.1016/j.pharmthera.2011.07.006.
 36. Ferreira SG, Peliciari-Garcia RA, Takahashi-Hyodo SA, Rodrigues AC, Amaral FG, Berra CM, Bordin S, Curi R, Cipolla-Neto J. Effects of melatonin on DNA damage induced by cyclophosphamide in rats. *Braz J Med Biol Res*. 2013;**46**(3):278-86. doi: 10.1590/1414-431X20122230. PubMed PMID: 23471360. PubMed PMCID: PMC3854377.
 37. Ma D, Tremblay P, Mahngar K, Akbari-Asl P, Pandey S, Collins J, Hudlicky T. Induction of apoptosis and autophagy in human pancreatic cancer cells by a novel synthetic C-1 analogue of 7-deoxypancratistatin. *Am J Biomed Sci*. 2011;**3**(4):278-91. doi: 10.5099/aj110400278.
 38. Carli PM, Sgro C, Parchin-Geneste N, Isambert N, Mugneret F, Girodon F, Maynadie M. Increase therapy-related leukemia secondary to breast cancer. *Leukemia*. 2000;**14**(6):1014-7. doi: 10.1038/sj.leu.2401787. PubMed PMID: 10865966.
 39. Franke SI, Prá D, Erdtmann B, Henriques JA, Da Silva J. Influence of orange juice over the genotoxicity induced by alkylating agents: an in vivo analysis. *Mutagenesis*. 2005;**20**(4):279-83. doi: 10.1093/mutage/gei034. PubMed PMID: 15956044.
 40. Jamil K, Shaik AP. Pesticide induced cytogenetic risk assessment in human lymphocyte culture in vitro. *Bull Environ Contam Toxicol*. 2005;**75**(1):7-14. doi: 10.1007/s00128-005-0711-2. PubMed PMID: 16228866.
 41. Le Deley MC, Suzan F, Cutuli B, Delalogue S, Shamsaldin A, Linassier C, Clisant S, De Vathaire F, Fenaux P, Hill C. Anthracyclines, mitoxantrone, radiotherapy, and granulocyte colony-stimulating factor: risk factors for leukemia and myelodysplastic syndrome after breast cancer. *Journal of clinical oncology*. 2007;**25**(3):292-300. doi: 10.1200/JCO.2006.05.9048.
 42. Rivero MT, Vázquez-Gundín F, Goyanes V, Campos A, Blasco M, Gosálvez J, Fernández JL. High frequency of constitutive alkali-labile sites in mouse major satellite DNA, detected by DNA breakage detection-fluorescence in situ hybridization. *Mutation Research/Funda-*

- mental and Molecular Mechanisms of Mutagenesis*. 2001;**483**(1-2):43-50. doi: 10.1016/S0027-5107(01)00218-4 PubMed PMID: 11600131.
43. Allegra M, Reiter RJ, Tan DX, Gentile C, Tesoriere L, Livrea MA. The chemistry of melatonin's interaction with reactive species. *Journal of Pineal Research*. 2003;**34**(1):1-0. doi: 10.1034/j.1600-079X.2003.02112.x.
44. Hardeland R, Balzer I, Poeggeler B, Fuhrberg B, Una H, Behrmann G, Wolf R, Meyer TJ, Reiter RJ. On the primary functions of melatonin in evolution: mediation of photo-periodic signals in a unicell, photooxidation, and scavenging of free radicals. *Journal of Pineal Research*. 1995;**18**(2):104-11. doi: 10.1111/j.1600-079X.1995.tb00147.x.
45. Salari V, Valian H, Bassereh H, Bókkon I, Barkhordari A. Ultraweak photon emission in the brain. *Journal of integrative neuroscience*. 2015;**14**(03):419-29. doi: 10.1142/S0219635215300012.