AD-A220 807 SR90-5 NAME OF PERFORMING ORGANIZATION Armed Forces Radiobiology Research Institute ADDRESS (City, State, and ZIP Code) Bethesda, MD 20814-5145 VAME OF FUNDING/SPONSORING Defense Nuclear Agency NDDRESS (City, State, and ZIP Code) Bethesda, MD 20305 Number of Funding (Sponsoring) Defense Nuclear Agency NDDRESS (City, State, and ZIP Code) Washington, DC 20305 TITLE (Include Security Classification) (see reprint) Sersonal AUTHOR(S) MicChesney et al.	RESTRICTIVE DISTRIBUTION Approved unlimite MONITORING NAME OF M ADDRESS (C)	MARKINGS	REPORT NUMB SANIZATION IP Code)					
AD-A220 807 SR90-5 SR90-5 VAME OF PERFORMING ORGANIZATION Armed Forces Radiobiology Research Institute ADDRESS (City, State, and ZIP Code) Bethesda, MD 20814-5145 VAME OF FUNDING / SPONSORING Defense Nuclear Agency DNA DORESS (City, State, and ZIP Code) Mashington, DC 20305 TITLE (Include Security Classification) (see reprint) VERSONAL AUTHOR(S) McChesney et al. TYPE OF REPORT TO SUPPLEMENTARY NOTATION ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse if necessary and identify by block number ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse if necessary and identify by block number SR 200 A State of the on reverse if necessary and identify by block number ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse if necessary and identify by block number ST 200 A State of the on reverse if necessary and identify by block number ST 200 A State of the on reverse if necessary and identify by block number ST 200 A State of the on reverse if necessary and identify by block number ST 200 A State of the on reverse if necessary and identify by block number ST 200 A State of the on reverse if necessary and identify by block number ST 200 A State of the on reverse if necessary and identify by block number ST 200 A State of the on reverse if necessary and identify by block number ST 200 A State of the on reverse if necessary and identify by block number ST 200 A State of the on reverse if necessary and identify by block number ST 200 A State of the on reverse if necessary and identify by block number ST 200 A State of the on reverse if necessary and identify by block number A State of the on reverse if necessary and identify by block number ST 200 A State of the on reverse if necessary and identify by block number A State of the one of t	Approved unlimite MONITORING NAME OF M ADDRESS (C/ PROCUREMEN SOURCE OF GRAM MENT NO.	N/AVAILABILITY I for public ed. ORGANIZATION MONITORING ORC ity, State, and Zi NT INSTRUMENT FUNDING NUMB PROJECT	REPORT NUMB SANIZATION IP Code)	ER(S)				
AD-A220 807 SR90-5 VAME OF PERFORMING ORGANIZATION Armed Forces Radiobiology Research Institute 6b. OFFICE SYMBOL (If applicable) AFRRI NDDRESS (Gry, State, and ZIP Code) 7b. Bethesda, MD 20814-5145 7b. VAME OF FUNDING/SPONSORING DRGANIZATION Defense Nuclear Agency 8b. OFFICE SYMBOL (If applicable) 9. F NDDRESS (Gry, State, and ZIP Code) 10. 10. Washington, DC 20305 10. 10. TYPE OF REPORT Reprint 13b. TIME COVERED FROM	Approved unlimite MONITORING NAME OF M ADDRESS (C/ PROCUREMEN SOURCE OF GRAM MENT NO.	I for public ed. ORGANIZATION MONITORING ORC Vity, State, and Zi VIT INSTRUMENT FUNDING NUMB PROJECT	REPORT NUMB SANIZATION IP Code)	ER(S)				
AD-A220 807 SR90-5 VAME OF PERFORMING ORGANIZATION Armed Forces Radiobiology Research Institute 6b. OFFICE SYMBOL (If applicable) AFRRI NDDRESS (Gry, State, and ZIP Code) 7b. Bethesda, MD 20814-5145 7b. VAME OF FUNDING/SPONSORING DRGANIZATION Defense Nuclear Agency 8b. OFFICE SYMBOL (If applicable) 9. F NDDRESS (Gry, State, and ZIP Code) 10. 10. Washington, DC 20305 10. 10. TYPE OF REPORT Reprint 13b. TIME COVERED FROM	Approved unlimite MONITORING NAME OF M ADDRESS (C/ PROCUREMEN SOURCE OF GRAM MENT NO.	I for public ed. ORGANIZATION MONITORING ORC Vity, State, and Zi VIT INSTRUMENT FUNDING NUMB PROJECT	REPORT NUMB SANIZATION IP Code)	ER(S)				
SR90-5 S. F VAME OF PERFORMING ORGANIZATION Armed Forces Radiobiology Research Institute 6b. OFFICE SYMBOL (# applicable) AFRRI 7a. ADDRESS (Gty, State, and ZIP Code) Bethesda, MD 20814-5145 7b. Bethesda, MD 20814-5145 Sb. OFFICE SYMBOL (# applicable) 7b. Defense Nuclear Agency DNA 9. F ADDRESS (City, State, and ZIP Code) DNA 10. Defense Nuclear Agency DNA 10. NODRESS (City, State, and ZIP Code) INA INA NUPLE (Include Security Classification) (see reprint) Intime COVERED INA Stapplicabley et al. Type OF REPORT 13b. TIME COVERED IA. D StuppLeMENTARY NOTATION IB. SUBJECT TERMS (Contin IA. D ADSTRACT (Continue on reverse if necessary and identify by block number IDENTIFY ADSTRACT (Continue on reverse	MONITORING NAME OF M ADDRESS (C/ PROCUREMEN SOURCE OF GRAM MENT NO.	ORGANIZATION MONITORING ORG ity, State, and Zi VT INSTRUMENT FUNDING NUMB PROJECT	GANIZATION IP Code) IDENTIFICATION					
SR90-5 S. F VAME OF PERFORMING ORGANIZATION Armed Forces Radiobiology Research Institute 6b. OFFICE SYMBOL (# applicable) AFRRI 7a. ADDRESS (Gty, State, and ZIP Code) Bethesda, MD 20814-5145 7b. Bethesda, MD 20814-5145 Sb. OFFICE SYMBOL (# applicable) 7b. Defense Nuclear Agency DNA 9. F ADDRESS (City, State, and ZIP Code) DNA 10. Defense Nuclear Agency DNA 10. NODRESS (City, State, and ZIP Code) INA INA NUPLE (Include Security Classification) (see reprint) Intime COVERED INA Stapplicabley et al. Type OF REPORT 13b. TIME COVERED IA. D StuppLeMENTARY NOTATION IB. SUBJECT TERMS (Contin IA. D ADSTRACT (Continue on reverse if necessary and identify by block number IDENTIFY ADSTRACT (Continue on reverse	NAME OF M ADDRESS (C) PROCUREMEN SOURCE OF GRAM MENT NO.	AONITORING ORC ity, State, and Zi NT INSTRUMENT FUNDING NUMB PROJECT	GANIZATION IP Code) IDENTIFICATION					
VAME OF PERFORMING ORGANIZATION Armed Forces Radiobiology Research Institute 6b. OFFICE SYMBOL (If applicable) AFRRI 7a. VAME OF FUNDING / SPONSORING DRGANIZATION Defense Nuclear Agency NODRESS (City, State, and ZIP Code) 8b. OFFICE SYMBOL (If applicable) DNA 9. F VAME OF FUNDING / SPONSORING DRGANIZATION Defense Nuclear Agency NODRESS (City, State, and ZIP Code) 10. 9. F Washington, DC 20305 10. 9. F Washington, DC 20305 10. FITLE (Include Security Classification) (see reprint) 10. PERSONAL AUTHOR(S) McChesney et al. 13b. TIME COVERED FROM 14. D SUPPLEMENTARY NOTATION 18. SUBJECT TERMS (Contin FIELD 14. D ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse if necessary and identify by block number ELECC 0.	ADDRESS (C/ PROCUREMEN SOURCE OF OGRAM MENT NO.	ity, State, and Zi NT INSTRUMENT FUNDING NUMB PROJECT	IP Code)	NUMBER				
VAME OF PERFORMING ORGANIZATION Armed Forces Radiobiology Research Institute 6b. OFFICE SYMBOL (If applicable) AFRRI 7a. VAME OF FUNDING / SPONSORING DRGANIZATION Defense Nuclear Agency NODRESS (City, State, and ZIP Code) 8b. OFFICE SYMBOL (If applicable) DNA 9. F VAME OF FUNDING / SPONSORING DRGANIZATION Defense Nuclear Agency NODRESS (City, State, and ZIP Code) 10. 9. F Washington, DC 20305 10. 9. F Washington, DC 20305 10. FITLE (Include Security Classification) (see reprint) 10. PERSONAL AUTHOR(S) McChesney et al. 13b. TIME COVERED FROM 14. D SUPPLEMENTARY NOTATION 18. SUBJECT TERMS (Contin FIELD 14. D ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse if necessary and identify by block number ELECC 0.	ADDRESS (C/ PROCUREMEN SOURCE OF OGRAM MENT NO.	ity, State, and Zi NT INSTRUMENT FUNDING NUMB PROJECT	IP Code)	NUMBER				
Armed Forces Radiobiology (# applicable) Research Institute AFRRI ADDRESS (City, State, and ZIP Code) 7b. Bethesda, MD 20814-5145 8b. Office SYMBOL (# applicable) 9. F VAME OF FUNDING/SPONSORING ORGANIZATION 8b. Office SYMBOL (# applicable) 9. F Defense Nuclear Agency DNA 10. NDORESS (City, State, and ZIP Code) 10. PRC Washington, DC 20305 10. FELE Number of Report 13b. TIME COVERED Number of the cover of the	ADDRESS (C/ PROCUREMEN SOURCE OF OGRAM MENT NO.	ity, State, and Zi NT INSTRUMENT FUNDING NUMB PROJECT	IP Code)	NUMBER				
ADDRESS (City, State, and ZIP Code) Bethesda, MD 20814-5145 VAME OF FUNDING / SPONSORING Defense Nuclear Agency Defense Nuclear Agency ADDRESS (City, State, and ZIP Code) Washington, DC 20305 IIILE (Include Security Classification) (see reprint) PERSONAL AUTHOR(S) IIICChesney et al. TYPE OF REPORT Reprint SUPPLEMENTARY NOTATION ICOSATI CODES III. SUBJECT TERMS (Contin FIELD GROUP SUB-GROUP ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse if necessary and identify by block number III. Continue on reverse if necessary and identify by block number III. Continue on reverse if necessary and identify by block number III. Continue on reverse if necessary and identify by block number III. III. IIII. IIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIII	PROCUREMEN SOURCE OF GRAM MENT NO.	FUNDING NUMB	DENTIFICATION	NUMBER				
Bethesda, MD 20814-5145 VAME OF FUNDING/SPONSORING DEFENSE Nuclear Agency ADDRESS (City, State, and ZIP Code) Washington, DC 20305 Multiple (Include Security Classification) (see reprint) PERSONAL AUTHOR(S) McChesney et al. TYPE OF REPORT Reprint SUPPLEMENTARY NOTATION COSATI CODES FIELD GROUP SUBJECT TERMS (Contin FIELD GROUP SUBJECT TERMS (CONTIN FIELD GROUP FIELD GROUP FIELD GROUP FIELD GROUP FIELD GROUP FIELD GROUP FIELD GROUP FIELD GROUP FIELD GROUP FIELD GROUP FIELD GROUP FIELD FIELD GROUP FIELD GROUP FIELD FIELD FIELD FIELD FIELD FIELD FIELD FIELD FIELD FIELD FIELD FI	PROCUREMEN SOURCE OF GRAM MENT NO.	FUNDING NUMB	DENTIFICATION	NUMBER				
VAME OF FUNDING / SPONSORING DEGANIZATION Bb. OFFICE SYMBOL (If applikable) 9. F Defense Nuclear Agency DNA 10. NA DDA 10. NDORESS (City, State, and ZIP Code) I0. Washington, DC 20305 I0. With the security Classification) (see reprint) PERSONAL AUTHOR(S) I. McChesney et al. TYPE OF REPORT Reprint I3b. TIME COVERED FROM TO SUPPLEMENTARY NOTATION	SOURCE OF GRAM MENT NO.	FUNDING NUMB		NUMBER				
ORGANIZATION (if applicable) Defense Nuclear Agency DNA ADORESS (City, State, and ZIP Code) 10. Washington, DC 20305 PRC Washington, DC 20305 III. NTITLE (Include Security Classification) (see reprint) PERSONAL AUTHOR(S)	SOURCE OF GRAM MENT NO.	FUNDING NUMB		NUMBER				
ORGANIZATION (if applicable) Defense Nuclear Agency DNA ADORESS (City, State, and ZIP Code) 10. Washington, DC 20305 PRC Washington, DC 20305 III. NTITLE (Include Security Classification) (see reprint) PERSONAL AUTHOR(S)	SOURCE OF GRAM MENT NO.	FUNDING NUMB		NUMBER				
Defense Nuclear Agency DNA ADDRESS (City, State, and ZIP Code) 10. Washington, DC 20305 PRC Washington, DC 20305 NW TITLE (Include Security Classification) (see reprint) PERSONAL AUTHOR(S) NMCChesney et al. TYPE OF REPORT 13b. TIME COVERED 14. D Reprint FROM TO SUPPLEMENTARY NOTATION 18. SUBJECT TERMS (Contin	GRAM MENT NO.	PROJECT	ERS					
Washington, DC 20305 PRC MITLE (Include Security Classification) (see reprint) (see reprint) PERSONAL AUTHOR(S) McChesney et al. TYPE OF REPORT TYPE OF REPORT 13b. TIME COVERED Reprint 13b. TIME COVERED FROM TO SUPPLEMENTARY NOTATION Image: Cosati Codes 18. SUBJECT TERMS (Conting FIELD GROUP SUB-GROUP ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse if necessary and identify by block number of the conting by block number of the conting of the c	GRAM MENT NO.	PROJECT	ERS					
Washington, DC 20305 ELE With the security Classification) (see reprint) (see reprint) (see reprint) PERSONAL AUTHOR(S) McChesney et al. TYPE OF REPORT 13b. TIME COVERED Reprint 13b. TIME COVERED FROM TO SUPPLEMENTARY NOTATION 18. SUBJECT TERMS (Contin	MENT NO.		10. SOURCE OF FUNDING NUMBERS					
NTALE (Include Security Classification) (see reprint) PERSONAL AUTHOR(S) McChesney et al. TYPE OF REPORT 13b. TIME COVERED 14. D Reprint TO TO 14. D FROM TO 16. SUBJECT TERMS (Contin SUPPLEMENTARY NOTATION COSATI CODES 18. SUBJECT TERMS (Contin FIELD GROUP SUB-GROUP ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse if necessary and identify by block number DTIL ELEC	ED QAXM		TASK NO.	WORK UNIT				
(see reprint) PERSONAL AUTHOR(S) McChesney et al. TYPE OF REPORT Reprint SUPPLEMENTARY NOTATION				00129				
PERSONAL AUTHOR(S) McChesney et al. TYPE OF REPORT Reprint SUPPLEMENTARY NOTATION COSATI CODES FIELD GROUP SUB-GROUP ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse if necessary and identify by block number DTI ELEC								
McChesney et al. TYPE OF REPORT 13b. TIME COVERED Reprint TO FROMTO TO SUPPLEMENTARY NOTATION 18. SUBJECT TERMS (Contin FIELD GROUP SUB-GROUP ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse if necessary and identify by block number DTI ELEC TO								
McChesney et al. TYPE OF REPORT 13b. TIME COVERED Reprint TO FROMTO TO SUPPLEMENTARY NOTATION 18. SUBJECT TERMS (Contin FIELD GROUP SUB-GROUP ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse if necessary and identify by block number DTI ELEC TO			<u></u>					
Reprint FROMTO								
COSATI CODES 18. SUBJECT TERMS (Contin FIELD GROUP SUB-GROUP ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse if necessary and identify by block number DTI ELEC	ATE OF REPO	ORT (Year, Mont	h, Day) 15. PA	GE COUNT				
COSATI CODES FIELD GROUP SUB-GROUP ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse if necessary and identify by block number DTI ELEC			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·					
ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse if necessary and identify by block number DTI ELEC								
ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse if necessary and identify by block number DTI ELEC								
ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse if necessary and identify by block number DTI ELECT	we on revers	se it necessary a	nd identity by L	Nock number)				
		Acces	sion For					
S DTI APRIS	ir)	1	GRA&I	Ř				
S DTI ELEC APR13 E	~	DTIC TAB						
S ELEC APR13 E			ouncea fication					
APR13	т с —							
INTERIO E		By						
(MERITING) E	3 1990 Availability Codes							
				ode				
Weining UU -		1	Avail and/	or				
		Dist	Special					
		A-1	20					
DISTRIBUTION / AVAILABILITY OF ABSTRACT			ICATION	r				
UNCLASSIFIEDAUNLIMITED SAME AS RPT. DTIC USERS	ABSTRACT SI	ECURITY CLASSIF						
Claria Dugaiara		ECURITY CLASSIF	de) 22c. OFFICE ISDP					
FORM 1473, 84 MAR 83 APR edition may be used until ex		(Include Area Co		N OF THIS PAGE				

Trehalose Dimycolate Enhances Survival of Fission Neutron-Irradiated Mice and *Klebsiella pneumoniae*-Challenged Irradiated Mice^{1,2}

D. G. McChesney,³ G. D. Ledney, and G. S. Madonna

Department of Experimental Hematology, Armed Forces Radiobiology Research Institute, Bethesda, Maryland 20814-5145

MCCHESNEY, D. G., LEDNEY, G. D., AND MADONNA, G. S. Trehalose Dimycolate Enhances Survival of Fission Neutron-Irradiated Mice and *Klebsiella pneumoniae*-Challenged Irradiated Mice. *Radiat. Res.* **121**, 71–75 (1990).

The survival of B6D2F1 female mice exposed to lethal doses of fission neutron radiation is increased when trehalose dimycolate (TDM) preparations are given either 1 h after exposure or 1 day before exposure to radiation. TDM in an emulsion of squalene. Tween 80, and saline was the most effective formulation for increasing the 30-day survival of mice when given 1 day before (90%) or 1 h after (88%) exposure to radiation. An aqueous suspension of a synthetic analog of TDM was less effective at increasing 30-day survival (60%) when given 1 day prior to radiation exposure and not effective when given 1 h after radiation. Mice receiving a sublethal dose (3.5 Gy) of fission neutron radiation and either the TDM emulsion or synthetic TDM 1 h after irradiation were substantially more resistant to challenge with 10, 100, 1000, or 5000 times the LD_{50/A0} dose of *Klebsiella pneumoniae* than untreated mice. $\rightarrow 1990$ Academic Press, Inc.

INTRODUCTION

The effects of radiation on mammalian hematopoietic, myelopoietic, and gastrointestinal systems are diverse and depend on both the exposure dose and the quality of radiation. Several studies have focused on the effects of X rays (1-4) and $^{60}Co \gamma$ rays (5, 6) on these systems in mice. Other studies have examined the effect various specific and non-specific immunomodulators have on survival in mice given $^{60}Co \gamma$ rays (7, 8). However, there are a limited number of reports (5, 9, 10) on the effects of fission neutron radiation on these systems and the effect immunomodulators have on these animals' survival.

⁴ Supported by the Armed Forces Radiobiology Research Institute, Defense Nuclear Agency, under Research Work Unit 00129. The views presented in this paper are those of the authors. No endorsement by the Defense Nuclear Agency has been given or should be inferred.

² Research was conducted according to the principles enuciated in the "Guide for the Care and use of Laboratory Animals" prepared by the Institute of Laboratory Animal Resources, National Research Council.

³ To whom correspondence should be addressed.

Nuclear weapons detonations or nuclear criticality accidents can produce mixed radiation fields of various proportions of photon and neutron radiations. Therefore, it is important to determine the response of animals to mixed-field radiation in order to evaluate realistically the effect cytokines and immunomodulators of nonspecific resistance to infection might have on the animals' survival. Several different formulations of the immunomodulator trehalose dimycolate (TDM) have been shown to be effective in increasing survival of mice exposed to 60 Co γ rays (7). Therefore it is of interest to evaluate TDM formulations for their ability to increase survival in animals irradiated with mixed-field fission neutrons.

Exposure to fission neutron radiation is more effective in causing severe leukocytopenia in mice within 4 days than exposure to ⁶⁰Co γ radiation (11, 12). Hemopoietic recovery occurs in animals exposed to 7.0 Gy ⁶⁰Co radiation by Day 14 after exposure (13, 14). Mice exposed to 3.5 Gy fission neutrons recover in a similar time period. Exposure to higher levels of radiation produces leukocytopenia and irreversible gastrointestinal damage. Death normally occurs in these mice in less than 14 days due to denudation of the intestinal mucosa, fluid and electrolyte imbalance, and bacteremia (15). Infection is a major cause of death in animals exposed to radiation doses sufficient to depress the immune system severely but not to produce irreversible gastrointestinal damage, for example, 5.75 Gy fission neutrons or 10.5 Gy ⁶⁰Co. The source of the infection can be translocation of normal intestinal flora or an external source. In these circumstances, bacteria of the family Enterobacteriaceae often become opportunistic pathogens. One member of this family, Klebsiella pneumoniae, is associated with a high incidence of mortality in immunocompromised patients (16, 17).

In this paper, we report on the effects of TDM on the survival of fission neutron-irradiated mice when TDM is used as a protectant (before exposure) and as a therapeutic agent (after exposure) in irradiated mice. We also report the effects of TDM as a therapeutic agent for irradiated mice challenged with *K. pneumoniae*.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

 $Mice_{-}$ JAX:B6D2F1 female mice, 12–15 weeks of age (20–25 g), were quarantined on arrival and screened for evidence of disease before being

1 (2)



released for experimental use. They were maintained in an AAALAC-accredited facility in plastic Micro-Isolator cages containing autoclaved hardwood chip, contact bedding. Mice were provided commercial rodent chow and acidified tap water (pH 2.5 with concentrated HCI) *ad libitum*. Animal rooms were maintained at $70 \pm 2^{\circ}$ F with $50 \pm 10\%$ relative humidity using at least 10 air changes per hour of 100% conditioned fresh air. The mice were on a 12-h light/dark full spectrum lighting cycle with no twilight. All research was conducted in accordance with NIH and our Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee guidelines for the care and use of laboratory animals.

Radiation. The techniques and dosimetry of exposing mice to mixed radiation fields produced by the AFRRI TRIGA reactor were previously described (18). All radiation doses reported in this paper are the midline tissue dose as measured using ionization chambers (19). In the present study, a neutron to γ kerma ratio of 1:1 (N:G = 1) at midline in the animals was achieved by using a 15.2-cm lead shield in front of the reactor wall. The neutron to γ -ray kerma was chosen as representative of conditions which might prevail during a nuclear weapons detonation or nuclear criticality incident. Mice challenged with *K. pneumoniae* were given a nonlethal total (neutron plus γ -ray) dose of 3.5 Gy midline tissue dose at 0.4 Gy/ min. Mice not challenged with *K. pneumoniae* received 5.75 Gy; this is the radiation dose that kills 80% of the mice of this strain receiving no supportive therapy within 30 days (LD_{80.40}). Mice were exposed individually in well-ventilated aluminum restraining tubes that rotated at 1.5 rpm.

Dose reduction factor – The dose reduction factor was determined for irradiated mice receiving intraperitoneal (ip) injections of the various TDM formulations or control formulations either 1 day before or 1 h after irradiation with fission neutrons. Groups of 10 mice were exposed to increasing doses of radiation and their 30-day survival was monitored. Probit analysis of the survival data was used to determine the best fit, and thus the $LD_{8,30}$ to $LD_{98,30}$ values, and to determine the dose reduction factor (DRF).

Immunomodulators. Synthetic trehalose dimycolate (S-TDM), a produet containing corynomycolic acid and trehalose, and native TDM in a mixture of 2% squalene and 0.2% Tween 80 were produced by Ribi ImmunoChem Research Inc. (Hamilton, MT), S-TDM was prepared as previously described (7, 20). The native TDM was suspended in saline to give a native TDM-squalene-Tween 80-saline emulsion (TDM-O). The concentration of both TDM formulations was 200 μ g TDM/ml. Controls for these preparations were 0.2% Tween 80-saline (TS) and 2% squalene in 0.2% TS (squalene emulsion). Mice received intraperitoneal injections of 0.5 ml of the appropriate TDM formulation or control formulations.

Bacteria. A clinical isolate of *K. pneumoniae*, serotype 5, was prepared as previously described (7). The pellet was washed twice with cold saline and suspended to an optical density at 650 nm, known to yield 1×10^9 viable bacteria/ml. The actual number of viable bacteria was determined by plate counts on Trypticase Soy Agar (BBL, Cockeysville, MD). Dilutions for injection into mice and plate counts were made in sterile saline.

Bacterial LD_{50-40} . The dose of *K. pneumoniae* lethal to 50% of mice within 30 days ($LD_{50:40}$) was determined for control and irradiated mice by subcutaneously injecting 10-fold dilutions of *K. pneumoniae* ($10^{1}-10^{8}$ bacteria/0.1 ml) and monitoring survival for 30 days. Mice were injected with bacteria on Days 1, 4, 7, 10, and 14 postirradiation. To assure precise delivery of bacteria and prevent injury to the animal, mice were anesthetized by inhalation of methoxyflurane prior to injection of bacteria. Eight mice were used for each treatment group and a total of six bacteria challenge concentrations were used to determine each $LD_{50/40}$ end point for irradiated mice; four challenge concentrations were used for unirradiated control mice. Groups of irradiated mice challenged on Days 1, 4, and 7 received 10¹, 10², 10⁴, 10⁶, or 10⁶ CFU/mouse. Irradiated groups challenged on Days 10 and 14 received 10³, 10⁴, 10⁵, 10⁶, 10⁷, or 10⁸ CFU/ mouse. Groups of unirradiated control mice were injected with 10⁵, 10⁶, 10⁷, or 10⁸ CFU/mouse.



FIG. 1. Percentage 30-day survival of B6D2F1 female mice that received 5.75 Gy, N:G = 1 ($LD_{80,50}$), and 0.5 ml of Tween-saline, squalene emulsion, TDM-O, or S-TDM. The above formulations were injected ip into groups of 10 mice either 1 day before (filled) or 1 h after (hatched) radiation exposure.

Hematology. Mice received either 3.5 or 5.75 Gy of mixed-field radiation. Experimental groups received either 100 μ g/0.5 ml S-TDM or 0.5 ml of 0.2% Tween-saline 1 h postirradiation. Mice were anesthetized by inhalation of methoxyflurane immediately before blood was obtained by cardiac puncture. Immediately after blood was drawn, mice were euthanized by CO₂ inhalation. Hematology studies were performed by certified technicians of the Hematology section of our Institute's Veterinary Sciences Department.

RESULTS

In a series of protection experiments, mice were injected ip with the TDM preparations 1 day prior to exposure to a 5.75-Gy MLT dose of fission neutron radiation. TDM-O provided greater protection (90%) than S-TDM (60%), while 10% of mice receiving Tween-saline survived and 20% of those receiving the 2% squalene emulsion survived (Fig. 1). The TDM-O (P < 0.01) and S-TDM (P < 0.05) were significantly better than TS at increasing 30-day survival of the mice exposed to radiation. The TDM-O was significantly better (P < 0.01) than the 2% squalene emulsion.

When the TDM preparations were given therapeutically 1 h after exposure to 5.75 Gy fission neutron radiation, TDM-O provided the most benefit (88%) (Fig. 1). The TDM-O formulation was significantly better than the squalene emulsion alone (P < 0.001) when given 1 h after radiation. No mice survived in the groups receiving S-TDM, TS, or 2% squalene emulsion. Incremental increases in the amount of S-TDM given up to 800 µg/mouse did not significantly increase the survival of mice when given 1 h after mixed-field radiation over that observed with 100 µg/mouse (data not shown).

Dose reduction factors were determined for irradiated mice which received S-TDM, TDM-O, Tween-saline (con-

TABLE I Probit Analysis of Mortality Data for Mixed-Field Irradiated Mice Receiving Formulations Pre- or Postirradiation

Time of treatment	Vehicle	Treatment	LD _{50/30} (Gy)	DRF
l Day	Tween-saline	Tween-saline	530	1.00
	Tween-saline	S-TDM	569	1.07
	Squalene emulsion	Squalene emulsion	555	1.00
	Squalene emulsion	TDM-O	596	1.07
	Tween-saline	None	542	0.98
+ l h	Tween-saline	Tween-saline	514	1.00
	Tween-saline	S-TDM	548	1.07
	Squalene emulsion	Squalenc emulsion	540	1.00
	Squalene emulsion	TDM-O	581	1.08
	Tween-saline	None	542	0.95

Note Dose-response survival factors in irradiated mice receiving TDM formulations. B6D2F1 mice received increasing amounts of mixed radiation (N:G = 1). One day before or 1 h after irradiation, groups of 20 mice received 0.5 ml of one of the following formulations (Treatment) by ip injection: Tween-saline, 2% squalene emulsion, 100 μ g TDM-O, or 100 μ g S-TDM. Mice used in this experiment received only one ip injection: the formulation in the Vehicle column was not injected unless it also appears in the Treatment column. Survival was followed for 30 days. Probit analysis of the results showed the slopes of the probit lines in the comparisons to be parallel: all reported DRFs are based on the LD₅₀₋₃₀ radiation dose for ease of comparison.

" DRF 1.D₅₀₋₃₀ vehicle.

trol), or the squalene emulsion (control) (Table I). Probit analysis of the results showed the slopes of the probit lines in the comparisons to be parallel; all DRFs are reported at the $LD_{50/30}$ radiation dose for ease of comparison. For both time courses, the DRFs for TDM-O and S-TDM were similar when compared to the appropriate controls. Tweensaline lowered the DRF below that of irradiated animals not receiving injections.

The bacterial $LD_{50/30}$ for mice exposed to 3.5 Gy fission neutron radiation and challenged with *K. pneumoniae* fell by 5 orders of magnitude by Day 4 and remained depressed (2.5 orders of magnitude) on Day 7 (Fig. 2). On Day 10 postirradiation the increased $LD_{50/30}$ indicated that the mice were recovering. By Day 14 the $LD_{50/30}$ returned to nearly that of controls (overlapping 95% confidence intervals). These data indicate that the animals are at greatest risk between Days 1 and 7 postirradiation because it is during this time that an exogenous bacterial challenge has the greatest effect on mortality.

The TDM formulations given 1 h after exposure to 3.5 Gy fission neutron radiation had an effect on the 30-day survival of mice challenged with 10, 100, 1000, or 5000 times the $LD_{50/30}$ dose of *K. pneumoniae* on Day 4 after exposure to radiation (Fig. 3). At the relatively low challenge dose of 10 times the $LD_{50/30}$, all of the TDM formulations increased 30-day survival, as did the squalene emulsion. When the challenge dose of *K. pneumoniae* was in-



FIG. 2. Bacterial LD_{50/30} of mice challenged with *K. pneumoniae* following radiation exposure. B6D2F1 mice were given 3.5 Gy (N:G = 1) radiation. *K. pneumoniae* was injected into groups of eight mice on Days 1, 4, and 7 (10¹, 10², 10³, 10⁴, 10⁵, 10⁶ CFU/mouse); and on Days 10 and 14 (10³, 10⁴, 10⁵, 10⁶, 10⁷, 10⁸ CFU/mouse). Groups of eight unirradiated control mice were injected with 10⁵, 10⁶, 10⁷, or 10⁸ CFU/mouse. The LD_{50/30} was determined by probit analysis and plotted for each time of injection after radiation. Vertical bars represent the upper and lower 95% confidence limits for each LD_{50/30}.

creased to 100 times the LD_{50/30}, only the TDM-O, S-TDM, and squalene emulsion increased the number of mice surviving over that of the control. The therapeutic effect provided by the squalene emulsion was not significantly (P > 0.25) different than control. At 1000 and 5000 times the LD_{50/30} dose of *K. pneumoniae*, only TDM-O and S-TDM



FIG. 3. Thirty-day survival of B6D2F1 female mice given 3.5 Gy (N: G = 1) radiation and treated with TDM prior to challenge with *K. pneumoniae*. One hour after irradiation, 0.5 ml of one of the following was injected ip into groups of 20 mice: (\blacksquare) Tween-saline; (\blacksquare) squalene emulsion; (\blacksquare) 100 mg TDM-O; (\blacksquare) 100 mg S-TDM; (\blacksquare) controls. Mice were challenged on Day 4 after irradiation with either 10, 100, 1000, or 5000 times the LD_{50/30} of *K. pneumoniae* serotype 5.

increased survival. TDM-O increased survival to twice that of the S-TDM-treated group. The $LD_{20,30}$ (i.e., 80% survival) for unirradiated mice is 2.08×10^6 with a lower confidence limit of 7.95×10^5 , while for the irradiated mice treated with TDM-O the corresponding $LD_{20,30}$ is 4.38×10^5 . Thus TDM-O is capable of increasing the irradiated mouse's resistance to bacterial challenge to nearly that of a normal mouse.

White blood cell (WBC), red blood cell (RBC), and platelet counts were obtained from mice given 3.5 or 5.75 Gy of mixed-field radiation and treated with either 100 μ g S-TDM,0.5 ml or an equal volume of the vehicle (0.2% Tween-saline) 1 h postirradiation. White blood cell counts were similar for mice receiving either 3.5 or 5.75 Gy until Day 14 after radiation exposure. At this time the values were significantly lower (P = 0.05) for mice exposed to 5.75 Gy (data not shown). This is true whether or not mice received S-TDM 1 h after exposure to radiation.

The effect of the two doses of radiation on the RBC and platelet counts appeared to be similar until Day 14 for mice treated with S-TDM (data not shown). By Day 14, the RBC and platelet counts in mice exposed to 3.5 Gy were recovering, and by Day 28 they were within 20% of unirradiated contro® values. On Day 14, the surviving mice of the group given 5.75 Gy and S-TDM 1 h after radiation had RBC and platelet levels significantly lower (P < 0.05) than those of mice receiving S-TDM 1 h after 3.5 Gy.

DISCUSSION

For an immunomodulator to be useful as a therapeutic or radioprotective agent in the context of mixed-field radiation, it must be effective over a range of neutron to photon ratios and have a low potential for toxicity. Madonna et al. (7) showed that TDM and a synthetic analog. S-TDM, are capable of increasing survival in mice exposed to an LD_{subsu} dose of ⁶⁰Co radiation. Additionally, they showed that TDM-O and S-TDM increase the survival of mice exposed to a sublethal dose of 60 Co γ radiation and challenged with K. pneumoniae serotype 5. In our experiments, we have used the more severe radiation challenge generated by a mixed radiation field of equal doses of fission neutrons and photons. Our results demonstrate that both TDM-O and S-TDM formulations are effective in increasing survival when given 1 day before exposure to an LD_{80/30} dose of mixed-field radiation. However, only TDM-O is effective at increasing survival at this radiation level when given 1 h after radiation. The inability of S-TDM to increase survival at the $LD_{80,30}$ radiation level when given 1 h after mixedfield radiation is unclear, especially since S-TDM is effective in increasing survival to an equivalent radiation dose when the radiation is only photons (7). The differences observed are most likely due to the slightly different effect each type of radiation has on cells (21). Specifically, the difference might be related to a difference in the ability of each type of radiation, mixed-field or pure γ radiation, to generate oxygen-derived free radicals and hydrogen peroxide that cause peroxidation of membrane-polyunsaturated fatty acids (22). Additionally, squalene, a long-chain, polyunsaturated hydrocarbon, may act as a quencher to destroy free radicals and hydrogen peroxide before these agents can affect membrane-polyunsaturated fatty acids. This concept is consistent with the increased survival observed (Figs. 1 and 3) when squalene alone is given and might also explain the increased effectiveness of the TDM-O formulation.

Synthetic TDM is an effective therapeutic agent for both endogenous and exogenous infections in irradiated mice. Mixed-field radiation doses of either 3.5 or 5.75 Gy both reduce the number of WBCs, RBCs, and platelets on Days 1 through 7 to similar levels. However, with the sublethal dose, recovery of these cellular fractions begins by Day 14. while with the 5.75-Gy dose they remained depressed. If the mice receiving the sublethal dose of radiation are challenged with K. pneumoniae on Day 14 after radiation the number of organisms required for an $LD_{50,30}$ is equivalent to unirradiated controls, 1.4×10^{7} . However, if these mice are challenged on Day 4, the LD_{50/30} is reduced to 81 organisms. If, however, mice receive S-TDM 1 h after irradiation. 40% of those challenged are able to survive 5000 times the $LD_{50,30}$ dose of the organisms. An identical experiment using TDM-O had 80% survival at this level of bacterial challenge. From our results, it is clear that S-TDM is an effective therapeutic agent at moderate mixed-field radiation levels and an effective therapeutic agent at both moderate and high levels of 60 Co (7).

Preliminary data suggest that S-TDM increases the amount of tumor necrosis factor (TNF) present in the 24-h supernatants of macrophages isolated from B6D2F1 mice given S-TDM either 1 day before or 1 h after exposure to an $LD_{50,30}$ dose of mixed-field radiation, compared to radiation and S-TDM controls. Measurement of interleukin 1 (IL-1) in the same supernatants showed a decrease in the amount of IL-1 present when S-TDM is given in conjunction with radiation, compared to radiation alone. If these results are confirmed, they suggest that the ratio of TNF to IL-1 may be an important aspect in determining whether mice survive. These results would also be consistent with the work of Neta using γ -irradiated C3H/HEN mice (8) and the work of Cross with unirradiated and bacterial-challenged C3H/HEN mice (23). Furthermore, they would be consistent with the recent finding of Slordal et al. (24), who showed that murine rTNF- α given before sublethal irradiation reduced the decline of neutrophils and total blood counts after irradiation and also accelerated the subsequent normalization of peripheral blood cell counts.

In conclusion, both S-TDM and TDM-O offer substantial protection to endogenous infection when given 1 day before high levels of mixed-field radiation but only TDM- O is effective at this level when given after irradiation. Additionally, both S-TDM and TDM-O are effective in increasing survival in irradiated and bacteria-challenged mice when given 1 h after mixed-field radiation. The use of TDM-O in future experiments because of its greater effectiveness when compared to S-TDM must be weighed against the reported toxicity of native TDM preparations delivered in oil emulsions and the absence of toxicity of synthetic analogs of TDM at equivalent concentrations (25). We are continuing to explore the interaction of different types of radiation and S-TDM stimulation of TNF and IL-1.

RECEIVED: April 21, 1989; ACCEPTED: August 28, 1989

REFERENCES

- I H. QUASTIER. The nature of intestinal radiation death. *Radiat. Res.* 4, 303–320 (1956).
- F. OTTO and U. PFFIFFER, Mortality response of mice after wholebody exposure to 1.7-5 MeV neutrons and X-rays. *Radiat. Res.* 50, 125-135 (1972).
- 3 V. P. BOND. Comparison of mortality response of different species to x-rays and fast neutrons. In *Biological Effects of Neutron and Proton Irradiation*. Vol. 2, pp. 365–377. IAEA, Vienna, 1965.
- B. GIGER and R. GALLIEY, Effect of x-irradiation on various functions of murine macrophages. *Clin. Exp. Immunol.* 16, 643–655 (1974).
- 5 H. H. VOGEL and D. L. JORDAN, Comparison of damage to the small intestine by fission neutrons or gamma rays from 60-Co. In *Gastrointestinal Radiation Injury* (M. F. Sullivan, Ed.), pp. 327–329. Excerpta Medica, Amsterdam, 1966.
- 6 V. P. BOND, M. FLIEDNER, and J. O. ARCHAMBEAU, Effects of radiation on the hemopoietic system: The bone marrow syndrome. In *Mammalian Radiation Lethality* (V. Bond, T. Fliedner, and J. Archambeau, Eds.), pp. 159–230. Academic Press, New York, 1965.
- G. S. MADONNA, G. D. LEDNEY, T. B. ELLIOTT, I. BROOK, J. T. ULRICH, K. B. MEYERS, M. L. PATCHEN, and R. I. WALKER, Trehalose dimycolate enhances resistance to infection in neutropenic animals. *Infect. Immun.* 57, 2495–2501 (1989).
- 8 R. NETA, J. J. OPPENHEIM, and S. D. DOUCHES, Interdependence of the radioprotective effects of human recombinant interleukin 1 alpha, tumor necrosis factor alpha, granulocyte colony-stimulating factor, and murine recombinant granulocyte-macrophage colony-stimulating factor. J. Immunol. 140, 108–111 (1988).
- 9 J. P. GERACI, K. J. JACKSON, G. M. CHRISTENSEN, P. D. THOWER, and M. S. FOX, Cyclotron fast neutrons RBE for various normal tissues. *Radiobiology* 115, 459-463 (1975).
- 10 C. P. SIGDESTAD, D. J. GRDINA, A. M. CONNOR, and W. R. HAN-SON, A comparison of radioprotection from three neutron sources and ^{MI}Co by WR-2721 and WR-151327. *Radiat. Res.* **106**, 224–233 (1986).

- 11. S. GLASSTONE and P. J. DOLAN, *The Effects of Nuclear Weapons*, 3rd ed., U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, DC, 1977.
- K. F. BAVERSTOCK and P. J. N. D. ASH, A review of radiation accidents involving whole body exposure and the relevance to the LD50/ 60 in man. Br. J. Radiol. 56, 837-849 (1983).
- 13. M. L. PATCHEN, T. J. MACVITTIE, and L. M. WATHEN, Effects of pre and post-irradiation glucan treatment on pluripotent stem cells, granulocyte, macrophage and erythroid progenitor cells and hemopoietic stromal cells. *Experientia* 40, 1240–1244 (1984).
- R. L. WALKER, G. D. LEDNEY, and C. B. GALLEY, Aseptic endotoxemia in radiation injury and graft-versus-host disease. *Radiat. Res.* 62, 242-249 (1975).
- P. GUNTER-SMITH, Effect of ionizing radiation on gastrointestinal physiology. In *Military Radiobiology* (J. J. Conklin and R. I. Walker, Eds.), pp. 135–151. Academic Press, New York, 1987.
- D. CAVANAGH, R. A. KNUPPEL, J. H. SHEPARD, and R. ANDERSON, Septic shock and the obstetrician/gynecologist. *South. Med. J.* 75, 809–813 (1982).
- J. J. ZIMMERMAN and K. A. DIETRICH, Current perspectives on septic shock. *Pediatr. Clin. North Am.* 34, 131–163 (1987).
- D. A. STEWART, G. D. LEDNEY, W. H. BAKER, E. G. DAXON, and P. A. SHEEHY, Bone marrow transplantation on mice exposed to a modified fission neutron (N/G 30:1) field. *Radiat. Res.* 92, 268–279 (1982).
- G. H. ZEMAN, M. DOOLEY, D. M. EAGLESON, L. J. GOODMAN, R. B. SCHWARTZ, C. M. EISENHAUER, and J. C. MCDONALD, Intercomparison of neutron dosimetry techniques at the AFFRI TRIGA reactor. *Radiat. Prot. Dosim.* 23, 317–320 (1988).
- G. J. VOSIKA and G. R. GRAY, Phase I study of iv mycobacterial cell wall skeleton and cell wall skeleton combined with TDM. *Cancer Treat. Rep.* 67, 785–790 (1983).
- B. A. CARNES, Genetic injury in hybrid male mice exposed to low doses of ⁶⁰Co gamma-rays or fission neutrons. III. Frequencies of abnormal sperm and reciprocal translocations measured during and following long-term weekly exposure. *Mutat. Res.* 198, 285-294 (1988).
- G. BATIST, A. RAYNAUD, A. G. KATKI, E. L. TRAVIS, M. C. SHOE-MAKER, R. F. GREENE, and C. E. MYERS, Enzymatic defense against radiation damage in mice. Effect of sclenium and Vitamin E depletion. *Biochem. Pharmacol.* 35, 601-606 (1986).
- A. S. CROSS, J. C. SADOFF, N. KELLY, E. BERNTON, and P. GEMSKI, Pretreatment with recombinant murine tumor necrosis/cachectin and murine interleukin-1 alpha protects mice from lethal bacterial infection. J. Exp. Med. 169, 2021–2027 (1989).
- L. SLORDAL, D. J. WARREN, and M. A. S. MOORE, Effect of recombinant murine tumor necrosis factor on hemopoietic reconstitution in sublethally irradiated mice. J. Immunol. 142, 833–835 (1989).
- 25. E. LEDERER, An update on natural and synthetic trehalose-diesters. In Immunomodulators and Nonspecific Host Defense Mechanisms against Microbial Infections (K. N. Masihi and W. Lange, Eds.), pp. 73-83. Pergamon, New York, 1988.