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**Objectives** Taxane resistance is a serious problem in the successful treatment of ovarian carcinoma. New generations of taxane analogs (Stony Brook taxanes; SB-Ts) seem to be effective against resistant solid tumors. Our aim was to estimate in vitro and in vivo efficacy of SB-Ts in comparison to paclitaxel and discover underlying changes of gene expression profile connected with the treatment of taxanes.

**Methods** NCI/ADR-RES and SKOV-3/PCT-RES human ovarian cancer cell lines were used as multidrug-resistant model. The efficacy of taxanes was compared via assessment of IC50 values. Flow cytometry was used for analysis of cell cycle changes. In vivo efficacy of taxanes was measured after intraperitoneal application of paclitaxel alone (10 mg/kg) or combined with SB-Ts (1–5 mg/kg) twice a week in resistant ovarian cell line-derived xenograft (CDX) models. Gene expression profiles were followed by quantitative real-time PCR in CDX tumors.

**Results** In vitro experiments revealed the third generation SB-Ts – SB-T-121605 and SB-T-121606 as the most effective. In vivo, both SB-Ts effectively suppressed tumor growth at low doses (<3 mg/kg) in combination with paclitaxel, limiting their adverse effects. Treatment of SB-Ts also led to significant deregulation of many genes involved in resistance.

**Conclusions** SB-T-121605 and SB-T-121606 are promising candidates for further studies, aimed at development of novel therapeutics for therapy of resistant ovarian tumors. Supported by projects of the Czech Science Foundation no. 21-14082S, the Czech Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports: INTERACTION, project no. LTAUSA19032, and the National Institutes of Health (NIH), U.S.A. grant R01 CA103314.
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**Objectives** Myelosuppression is one of the evident side effects of Niraparib. The aim of this study was to investigate the prophylactic effect of the red ginseng (RG) on Niraparib-induced myelosuppression.
Methods Female C57BL/6 mice were divided into 5 groups: Normal, Tumor, Model, RG-L or RG-H group. Cell-derived xenograft model was established for mice in all groups in advance except Normal group. On D1–7, mice were administered by gavage once in the morning: Normal group, Tumor group and Model group were given distilled water, RG-L group and RG-H group were given RG solution at the doses of 100 mg·kg⁻¹ or 200 mg·kg⁻¹ respectively. On D5–7, mice were also administered by gavage once every afternoon: Normal and Tumor group were given distilled water, Model group, RG-L Group and RG-H group were given Niraparib solution 80 mg·kg⁻¹. Samples were collected on D8.

Results With the increase of concentration, the effect of RG on protecting the hematopoietic function of bone marrow might improve (figures 1 and 2). The mechanisms of RG ameliorating myelosuppression were that it protected the differentiation ability, promoted the repair of DNA double-strand breaks and improved the cell cycle transition of bone marrow nucleated cells (figure 3). There was no evidence suggesting that RG worsened the efficacy of Niraparib (figure 4).

Conclusions 1. RG may have the advantage of relieving myelosuppression induced by Niraparib. High concentration of RG may be more effective. 2. RG may be a safe agent which does not negatively affect the efficacy of Niraparib.