

**Table S1.** Statistical significance between different treatment groups in Ca-Ski cells

NPs Conc. ( $\mu\text{g/mL}$ )	<b>0.78</b>	<b>1.56</b>	<b>3.125</b>	<b>6.25</b>	<b>12.5</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>100</b>
IMQ vs. CS-IMQ NPs	ns	**	ns	****	****	****	****	****
<b>IMQ vs. IMQ NPs</b>	ns	***	ns	**	****	****	****	****
IMQ vs. CS-NPs	ns	ns	****	****	****	****	****	****
IMQ vs. NPs	ns	ns	****	****	****	****	****	****
<b>CS-IMQ NPs vs. IMQ NPs</b>	ns	ns	ns	***	****	****	****	****
CS-IMQ NPs vs. CS-NPs	ns	***	****	****	****	****	****	****
CS-IMQ NPs vs. NPs	ns	**	****	****	****	****	****	****
<b>IMQ NPs vs. CS-NPs</b>	*	****	****	****	****	****	****	****
<b>IMQ NPs vs. NPs</b>	*	****	****	****	****	****	****	****
CS-NPs vs. NPs	ns	ns	ns	ns	***	*	***	****

p-values of  $< 0.05$  were considered statistically significance, where \*  $p < 0.05$ , \*\*  $p < 0.005$ , \*\*\*  $p < 0.001$ , and \*\*\*\*  $p < 0.0001$

**Table S2.** Statistical significance between different treatment groups in HeLa cells

NPs Conc. ( $\mu\text{g/mL}$ )	<b>0.78</b>	<b>1.56</b>	<b>3.125</b>	<b>6.25</b>	<b>12.5</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>100</b>
IMQ vs. CS-IMQ NPs	ns	***	ns	ns	***	ns	ns	ns
<b>IMQ vs. IMQ NPs</b>	ns	****	****	****	****	****	****	****
IMQ vs. CS-NPs	ns	**	****	****	****	****	****	****
IMQ vs. NPs	ns	***	****	****	****	****	****	****
<b>CS-IMQ NPs vs. IMQ NPs</b>	ns	**	****	****	****	****	****	****
CS-IMQ NPs vs. CS-NPs	ns	****	****	****	****	****	****	****
CS-IMQ NPs vs. NPs	ns	****	****	****	****	****	****	****
<b>IMQ NPs vs. CS-NPs</b>	ns	****	****	****	****	****	****	****
<b>IMQ NPs vs. NPs</b>	ns	****	****	****	****	****	****	****
CS-NPs vs. NPs	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns

p-values of  $< 0.05$  were considered statistically significance, where \*  $p < 0.05$ , \*\*  $p < 0.005$ , \*\*\*  $p < 0.001$ , and \*\*\*\*  $p < 0.0001$

**Table S3.** Statistical significance between different treatment groups in C-33 A cells

NPs Conc. ( $\mu\text{g/mL}$ )	<b>0.78</b>	<b>1.56</b>	<b>3.125</b>	<b>6.25</b>	<b>12.5</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>100</b>
IMQ vs. CS-IMQ NPs	ns	ns	ns	****	****	****	ns	*
<b>IMQ vs. IMQ NPs</b>	ns	*	****	****	****	****	****	****
IMQ vs. CS-NPs	ns	ns	****	****	****	****	****	****
IMQ vs. NPs	ns	ns	****	****	****	****	****	****
<b>CS-IMQ NPs vs. IMQ NPs</b>	ns	*	****	****	****	****	****	****
CS-IMQ NPs vs. CS-NPs	ns	ns	****	****	****	****	****	****
CS-IMQ NPs vs. NPs	ns	ns	****	****	****	****	****	****
<b>IMQ NPs vs. CS-NPs</b>	ns	**	****	****	****	****	****	****
<b>IMQ NPs vs. NPs</b>	ns	**	****	****	****	****	****	****
CS-NPs vs. NPs	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns

p-values of  $< 0.05$  were considered statistically significance, where \*  $p < 0.05$ , \*\*  $p < 0.005$ , \*\*\*  $p < 0.001$ , and \*\*\*\*  $p < 0.0001$

**Table S4.** Statistical significance between different treatment groups in VK/E6E7 cells

NPs Conc. ( $\mu\text{g/mL}$ )	<b>0.78</b>	<b>1.56</b>	<b>3.125</b>	<b>6.25</b>	<b>12.5</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>100</b>
IMQ vs. CS-IMQ NPs	ns	*	ns	ns	*	**	ns	ns
<b>IMQ vs. IMQ NPs</b>	ns	ns	****	****	****	****	****	****
IMQ vs. CS-NPs	ns	****	****	****	****	****	****	****
IMQ vs. NPs	ns	****	****	****	****	****	****	****
<b>CS-IMQ NPs vs. IMQ NPs</b>	ns	ns	****	****	****	****	****	****
CS-IMQ NPs vs. CS-NPs	ns	****	****	****	****	****	****	****
CS-IMQ NPs vs. NPs	ns	****	****	****	****	****	****	****
<b>IMQ NPs vs. CS-NPs</b>	ns	****	****	****	****	****	****	****
<b>IMQ NPs vs. NPs</b>	ns	****	****	****	****	****	****	****
CS-NPs vs. NPs	ns	ns	ns	ns	***	**	ns	ns

p-values of  $< 0.05$  were considered statistically significance, where \*  $p < 0.05$ , \*\*  $p < 0.005$ , \*\*\*  $p < 0.001$ , and \*\*\*\*  $p < 0.0001$