HAL
archives-ouvertes.fr

CAR T-Cell Immunotherapy in Human and Veterinary Oncology: Changing the Odds Against Hematological Malignancies

Jonathan Mochel, Stephen Ekker, Chad Johannes, Albert Jergens, Karin Allenspach, Agnes Bourgois-Mochel, Michael Knouse, Sébastien Benzekry, Wesley Wierson, Amy Leblanc, et al.

▶ **To cite this version:**

Jonathan Mochel, Stephen Ekker, Chad Johannes, Albert Jergens, Karin Allenspach, et al.. CAR T-Cell Immunotherapy in Human and Veterinary Oncology: Changing the Odds Against Hematological Malignancies. AAPS Journal, American Association of Pharmaceutical Scientists, 2019, 21 (3), 10.1208/s12248-019-0322-1 . hal-02099159

HAL Id: hal-02099159
https://hal.inria.fr/hal-02099159

Submitted on 14 Apr 2019

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

CAR T-Cell Immunotherapy in Human and Veterinary Oncology: Changing the Odds Against Hematological Malignancies

Jonathan P Mochel[1], Stephen C Ekker[2], Chad M Johannes[3], Albert E Jergens[3], Karin Allenspach[3], Agnes Bourgois-Mochel[3], Michael Knouse[1], Sebastien Benzekry[4], Wesley Wierson[5], Amy K LeBlanc[6], Saad S Kenderian[7,8]

[1]Iowa State University, Department of Biomedical Sciences, Ames, IA 50011, USA.

[2]Mayo Clinic Cancer Center Department of Biochemistry and Molecular Biology, Rochester, MN 55905, USA.

[3]Iowa State University, Department of Veterinary Clinical Sciences, Ames, IA 50011, USA.

[4]Institut National de Recherche en Informatique et en Automatique, Team MONC, Bordeaux, France.

[5]Iowa State University, Department of Genetics, Development, and Cell Biology, Ames, IA 50011, USA.

[6]Comparative Oncology Program, Center for Cancer Research National Cancer Institute, Bethesda, MD 20892, USA.

[7]Mayo Clinic Division of Hematology, Department of Medicine, Rochester, MN 55905, USA.

[8]Department of Immunology, Mayo Clinic, Rochester, MN 55905.

Correspondence:

Jonathan P. Mochel, DVM, MS, Ph.D, DECVPT
Associate Professor of Pharmacology
Iowa State University College of Vet. Medicine
2448 Lloyd, 1809 S Riverside Dr.
Ames, IA 50011-1250
Phone 515-294-7424
Email: jmochel@iastate.edu

Running head: CAR T-Cell Immunotherapy in Comparative Oncology.

Abstract

The advent of the genome editing era brings forth the promise of adoptive cell transfer using engineered chimeric antigen receptor (CAR) T-cells for targeted cancer therapy. CAR T-cell immunotherapy is probably one of the most encouraging developments for the treatment of hematological malignancies. In 2017, two CAR T-cell therapies were approved by the U. S Food and Drug Administration; one for the treatment of pediatric Acute Lymphoblastic Leukemia (ALL), the other for adult patients with advanced lymphomas. However, despite significant progress in the area, CAR T-cell therapy is still in its early days and faces significant challenges, including the complexity and costs associated with the technology. B-cell lymphoma is the most common hematopoietic cancer in dogs, with an incidence approaching 0.1% and a total of 20-100 cases per 100,000 individuals. It is a widely accepted naturally occurring model for human non-Hodgkin's lymphoma. Current treatment is with combination chemotherapy protocols, which prolong life for less than a year in canines and are associated with severe dose-limiting side effects, such as gastrointestinal and bone marrow toxicity. To date, one canine study generated CAR T-cells by transfection of mRNA for CAR domain expression. While this was shown to provide a transient anti-tumor activity, results were modest, indicating that stable, genomic integration of CAR modules is required in order to achieve lasting therapeutic benefit. This Commentary summarizes the current state of knowledge on CAR T-cell immunotherapy in human medicine and its potential applications in animal health, while discussing the potential of the canine model as a translational system for immuno-oncology research.

Keywords: Immuno-Oncology; CAR T-cell; Lymphoma; One Health.

1 Introduction

Research in cancer immunotherapy has two major current and complementary approaches: (1) immune checkpoint inhibitors such as those that recently garnered a Nobel Prize in Medicine [1], and (2) chimeric antigen receptor (CAR) T-cell programming. The former focuses on activation of intrinsic properties of T-cells. The latter involves the exogenous 'education' of T cells to seek-out and target cells expressing a particular antigen found on specific cancer cell types [2]. These methods are considered complementary, and progress on combining these approaches is being reported [3]. Cancer immunotherapy is an extremely promising new approach in oncology that has the profound potential for curative endpoints. CAR T-cell therapies are particularly promising for hematologic malignancies, garnering two FDA approvals in 2017 [4,5] representing the first for both these classes of immunotherapies in addition to serving as the inaugural class of gene therapy-based strategies. Over 700 potential Investigative New Drug applications are in the queue for cellular and/or gene therapy applications [6] demonstrating the sustained future for these classes of drugs in the therapeutic pipeline. B-cell neoplasms are the most common hematopoietic cancer in both humans and dogs [7]. In canine, genetic background can impact disease onset and progression as some breeds show a substantially higher risk of this blood disease, including 11 small-breed dogs, with English Bulldogs presenting years earlier than the overall cohort [8].

The present Commentary provides a review of the current knowledge on the biology of CAR T-cell therapy and its current applications in human oncology. With the success at treating B-cell lymphoma using CAR T-cell therapies in people, and the conserved nature of the blood systems between dogs and humans, this review also provides a perspective for developing these and related living therapies for conquering canine cancer.

2 Definition and Process of Manufacturing CAR T-cells for Cancer Therapy

What are CAR T-cells?

The original CAR structure was described in 1989 and included a receptor fused to a signaling domain composed of CD3ζ (Fig. 1). This first-generation CAR T-cell therapy resulted in weak proliferation, short survival and limited anti-tumor effect in patients [9-11]. Subsequently, it was found that T-cells require a second signal for full activation and, therefore, second-generation CAR T-cells were developed, with two recently FDA approved products in the U.S and Europe. The structure of this new CAR includes a co-stimulatory molecule (e.g. CD28 or 4-1BB) that leads not only to improved expansion and persistence but also to superior anti-tumor effect [12,13]. The basic second-generation CAR T includes an antigen-binding domain, usually derived from a single chain variable fragment (scFv) or a protein receptor, a hinge that connects the scFv to a transmembrane

34 domain, a co-stimulatory domain, and a CD3ζ signaling domain. This allows for antigen presentation
35 bypassing the major histocompatibility complex and results in direct activation of T cells upon
36 exposure to tumor surface antigens. In most cases, the scFv has been murine derived and been
37 implicated in anti-CAR cytotoxic T-cell responses upon subsequent CAR T infusion, rendering them
38 ineffective [14,15]. It is hypothesized that such responses against autologous T-cells expressing
39 CAR transgene may be less pronounced with the human derivatives.

40 The transmembrane hinge region allows for optimal structure of antigen binding while the activation
41 domains direct CAR T-cell phenotype and function into specific ways. CD28 and 4-1BB (CD137)
42 are the two most commonly used co-stimulatory molecules thus far. CD28 is a member of the
43 immunoglobulin family of co-stimulatory receptor, which also includes cytotoxic T-lymphocyte
44 associated antigen-4 and programmed death receptor (PD-1). The extracellular domain of CD28
45 binds to B7 proteins and initiates the co-stimulatory signal transduction [16]. CD28 signaling
46 increases the effect of T-cell and receptor antigen engagement and results in proliferation of T cells
47 at otherwise sub-mitogenic antigen concentrations [17]. Consequently, cytokine production, most
48 importantly IL-2, is significantly increased. Therefore, CD28 co-stimulation increases cell survival by
49 inducing expression of anti-apoptotic proteins such as Bcl-X_L [18]. 4-1BB, on the other hand, is a
50 member of the TNF receptor family and is expressed primarily on activated lymphocytes. It results
51 in proliferation and differentiation of CD8+ T cells, while inhibiting programmed cell death [19]. While
52 CD28:B7 co-stimulation expands naïve T-cells, 4-1BB co-stimulation expands memory T-cells,
53 resulting in enrichment of antigen-reactive T-cells upon recognition of previously primed antigens.
54 Co-stimulation with 4-1BB domain has shown enhanced *in vivo* persistence, higher expansion and
55 enhanced cytolytic ability compared to CD28 co-stimulation [19,20]. It has also been suggested that
56 combining these 2 co-stimulatory domains result in a more efficient and persistent anti-tumor activity,
57 by combining their strengths of early tumor-killing with late persistence and engraftment. This has
58 led to the concept of third-generation CAR that now include 2 co-stimulatory domains along with the
59 activation domain, resulting in ≥ 3 signaling domains in the CAR T structure [21]. To date, the
60 incorporation of more stimulatory domains did not enhance CAR T-cell function in preclinical or early
61 clinical trials. This evolution at an unprecedented pace in the world of immuno-oncology has
62 generated a tremendous enthusiasm and has led to an exciting time for developing new strategies
63 for cancer treatment.

64

65 ***T Cell isolation, expansion and generation of CAR T-cells***

66 The following steps are required to generate clinical grade CAR T-cells (Fig. 2):

67 1) T-cells are collected from patients by leukapheresis;

68 2) T-cells are then cultured in a good manufacturing process-compliant facility;

69 3) T-cells are stimulated using stimulating beads, antibodies or artificial antigen presenting cells;
70 4) T-cells are transduced with the CAR of interest. At this stage, the non-tumor specific T cells
71 acquire the ability to recognize tumor antigens;
72 5) To insert the CAR gene into T-cells, viral vectors (lentivirus or retrovirus), or non-viral
73 approaches are used (transposon, CRISPR, TALEN, RNA). While the use of viruses raises
74 concerns for insertional mutagenesis, third generation lentiviruses have been shown to be safe
75 after decades of follow-up;
76 5) T-cells are cultured for a period of 7-14 days. During that time, they expand by several folds
77 and express the CAR T construct of choice;
78 6) The final product needs to pass pre-specified release criteria (i.e. sterility, safety, efficacy)
79 and is then cryopreserved for future infusion into patients;
80 7) Patients receive low-dose lymphodepleting chemotherapy, followed by infusion of the CAR T
81 cells.

82 After infusion, CAR T-cells are stimulated through the CAR receptor after they recognize their target
83 antigen on tumor cells. This is followed by a massive *in vivo* T-cell expansion, associated with
84 cytokine release, and the release of toxic granules (Fig. 3). During this time, T-cells exhibit their
85 antitumor effect and patients are at risk of developing clinical cytokine release syndrome. Following
86 expansion, T-cells contract and, in some instances, differentiate into a memory phenotype.

87 3 Applications in Human Oncology

88 CD19 targeting CAR T-cell has been the most successful therapy to date in relapsed/refractory acute
89 lymphoblastic leukemia (ALL). In the pre-CAR T therapy era, prognosis of relapsed/refractory B-cell
90 ALL has been dismal with median overall survival reported in few weeks-months and survival at 5
91 years around 7-8% [22-24]. B-cell ALL was the first indication for which any CAR T therapy was
92 approved by the U.S FDA. Tisagenlecleucel (previously CTL019) was the first gene FDA-approved
93 therapy for the treatment of relapsed/refractory B cell ALL in patients up to 25 years of age. The initial
94 report included 2 children from the University of Pennsylvania, one of whom had an ongoing response
95 at 11 months follow-up (and we know is ongoing to date), while the other relapsed with CD19 negative
96 blast cells after an ephemeral response lasting for 2 months [25]. In the subsequent report of 30
97 patients with relapsed/refractory ALL, 27 (90%) patients achieved a complete response and 22 (73%)
98 patients had no detection of disease using sensitive multiparametric flow cytometry at 1 month after
99 infusion [26]. Interestingly, one patient had relapsed T-cell ALL post-transplantation with aberrant
100 CD19 expression and achieved a morphological response with tisagenlecleucel but with only minimal
101 residual disease. Data from clinical trials were expanded from single center experience to multi-
102 center studies with the ELIANA trial that included 92 patients; 75 (82%) of which received infusion of

103 tisagenelecleucel [5]. Remission was noted in 83% patients with overall survival rate of 90% at 6
104 months and 76% at 12 months. From the intention-to-treat analysis of 92 enrolled patients, complete
105 response (with or without complete hematological recovery) was observed in 66% patients.

106 Following the remarkable activity in ALL, trials with CART19 cell therapy were initiated in B-cell
107 lymphomas. Diffuse large B-cell lymphoma (DLBCL) is a heterogeneous group within Non-Hodgkin's
108 lymphomas (NHL) with varying molecular profiles, gene sequencing patterns and clinical responses;
109 some of which are associated with poorer outcomes and represent an area of therapeutic unmet
110 need. Clinically, patients who achieved stable or progressive disease as best response during the
111 entire course of therapy, or those who relapsed within 12 months of autologous stem cell
112 transplantation, have been shown to have a rather low overall survival rate of around 6.3 months
113 [27]. The now FDA-approved axicabtagene-ciloleucel (KTE-019) therapy was initially developed at
114 the National Cancer Institute (NCI). Preclinical work done at the NCI consisted of developing CAR-
115 transduced T-cells that could specifically recognize murine CD19 and resulted in eradication of
116 intraperitoneally injected lymphoma cells and subcutaneous lymphoma masses in a murine model
117 [28].

118 Subsequent clinical studies showed an objective positive response in 75-80% patients treated with
119 axicabtagene-ciloleucel, including some longer lasting responses [29]. This construct was further
120 pursued by Kite Pharma, as KTE-019, in the famous ZUMA-1 trial which paved the way for FDA
121 approval of this modality for DLBCL. The Phase 1 part of the ZUMA trial enrolled 7 patients with 1
122 patient experiencing a dose limiting toxicity, while grade ≥ 3 cytokine release syndrome (CRS) and
123 neurotoxicity were reported in 14% and 57% patients, respectively. In this report, 5 out of the 7 (71%)
124 patients showed an objective positive response, with 4 (57%) being complete responses. The Phase
125 2 ZUMA-1 study enrolled 111 patients, of whom 101 were able to receive the CAR T-cell infusion [4].
126 Overall positive response was reported in 82% patients with a complete response in 54% of the
127 cases. Complete response was maintained in 40% patients at a median follow-up of 15.4 months. Of
128 the 108 patients who had at least 1 year follow-up in Phase 1 and Phase 2 of the ZUMA-1 trials, an
129 overall response was seen in 82% patients, with a complete response in 58% of the cases. Of the
130 60 patients who had a partial response or a stable disease at the first assessment 1 month post CAR
131 T-cell therapy, 23 had a subsequent complete response. The progression free survival rate was
132 estimated at 49% in patients at 6 months, 44% at 12 months and 41% at 15 months, while the overall
133 survival rate was 78%, 59% and 52% at 6, 12 and 15 months, respectively. Response to treatment
134 was not affected by CD19 expression intensity, CD4-to-CD8 cell ratio, or the use of tocilizumab; but
135 was associated with a higher expansion of CAR T-cells instead. However, CAR T-cell expansion
136 within the first 28 days was noted to be higher in patients who had a positive response compared to
137 those who did not. One-year follow-up data presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Society

of Hematology and the Bone Marrow Transplantation Tandem Meetings in 2018 [30] suggested loss of CD19 expression and gain of PD-L1 expression as possible mechanisms for resistance following CAR T-cell therapy. Another product, tisagenlecleucel (CTL019), is now FDA-approved for use in patients with relapsed/refractory DLBCL (not including primary mediastinal large cell lymphoma). Approval was based on a Phase 2 study (JULIET) that enrolled 160 patients with primary analysis available on 81 patients with at least 3 month follow-up or earlier discontinuation [31]. Best overall response rate was 53.1% in these evaluable patients (39.5% complete response and 13.6% partial response). At 6 months, probability of being relapse-free was estimated at 73.5% with an overall survival of 64.5%. 95% patients in complete response at 3 months also maintained positive response at 6 months. Another case-series for the same product enrolled 38 patients with DLBCL or follicular lymphoma, of which 28 were able to receive cell infusion [32]. At 3 months, 18 of the 28 patients had a positive response (64%). Three patients with follicular lymphoma and 1 patient with DLBCL who had partial response at 3 months had a complete response by 6 months. At 6 months, 16 out of 28 (57%) patients had a complete response and these remained in remission at a median time of 29.3 months (range: 7.7 – 37.9 months). In this study, peak expansion of CAR T-cells was not different between patients who responded compared to those who did not.

Overall, multiple CD19 targeting CAR T-cell therapy constructs are currently in development and expected to receive FDA approvals for different B cell malignancies in the next 2-3 years. One example is the B-Cell Maturation Antigen (BCMA) directed CAR T-cell therapy which is showing promising activity in multiple myeloma [33].

4 Unique Toxicities of CAR T-Cell Therapy

Due to its specific mode of action, CAR T-cell therapy is associated with various adverse effects, including the development of cytokine release syndrome, neurotoxicity and B-cell aplasia resulting in hypogammaglobulinemia.

Cytokine Release Syndrome

Cytokine release syndrome (CRS) is one of the most feared toxicities related to CAR T-cell therapy. As its name suggests, CRS is a systemic inflammatory state resulting from the excessive production of cytokine associated with CAR T-cell activation. Time-to-development of CRS is widely variable and depends on the CAR construct, the disease type and the tumor burden. Rates of CRS have ranged from 45 to 100% in various reports with serious or ≥ 3 grade in up to 50% of patients [34]. Clinical manifestations can range from mild fever to life-threatening vasodilatory shock causing hypoxia, hypotension and organ toxicity mandating management in the intensive care unit. Death related to CRS has been reported [4,14,35]. It has also been suggested that a higher burden of

tumor antigens may be associated with higher rates and severity of CRS [36]. Various biomarkers have been studied to elucidate the mechanism, of which interleukin(IL)-6/ IL-6 receptor interaction has been most consistently shown to correlate with CRS. Consistently, blockade of the IL-6 pathway has resulted in alleviation of symptoms related to CRS [37]. C-reactive protein and ferritin are clinically available laboratory tests that have been shown to be elevated in patients who develop CRS and are monitored closely at some institutions, including the Mayo Clinic Cancer Center [38,39]. Other cytokines associated with inflammation such as interferon-gamma, soluble IL-2 receptor and IL-10 have been implicated. Teachey et al. [40] at the University of Pennsylvania identified a set of 24 cytokines, including interferon-gamma, IL-6, and soluble glycoprotein-130 that are associated with severe CRS in ALL patients receiving 4-1BB/ CD3ζ CAR T-cell therapy. More recently, studies in murine models of CRS have demonstrated that the severity of CRS does not only depend on CAR T-cell derived cytokines but also on IL-1, IL-6 and nitric oxide release by host macrophages [41]. This finding can potentially open additional avenues for preventative or therapeutic measures. Currently, the mainstay of treatment for CRS remains tocilizumab since its use in the first patient treated with CART19 for ALL [25]. Subsequent data showed that the use of tocilizumab for CRS does not adversely affect the expansion of CD28/CD3ζ CAR T-cells, unlike that of high-dose steroids [38]. Another agent of potential utility for this indication is siltuximab which, in contrast to tocilizumab, directly inhibits IL-6. This direct inhibition may result in less reliance on competitive binding to IL-6 receptor and eliminate the risk of passive diffusion of unbound IL-6 into the central nervous system (CNS) resulting in neurotoxicity [42].

Neurotoxicity

The risk of neurotoxicity with CAR T-cell therapy became apparent when 5 patients died of cerebral edema in one of the early phase ROCKET trial being conducted by Juno Pharmaceuticals using JCAR015 in adult patients with B-cell ALL. Additional deaths have been reported in both B-cell ALL and NHL trials [14,39]. Non-fatal but clinically significant neurotoxicity has additionally been reported in around 40-50% patients across various clinical trials with the different CAR constructs in various malignancies [43]. Clinical presentation can vary from headache, confusion, tremor, to delirium, expressive aphasia, obtundation, myoclonus or seizure. Whether there are pre-existing risk factors in the form of CNS disease is currently unknown, as patients with active CNS disease were typically excluded from clinical trials. Various hypotheses have been put forth to explain the development of neurotoxicity, but the exact mechanism remains elusive. One hypothesis is that CAR T-cell activation results in elevated cytokine levels triggering macrophage activation and subsequent neurotoxicity. More recently, with the use of the CD28-CD3ζ therapy in lymphoma, IL-10 as well as IL-15 were noted to achieve higher peak levels in patients with grade 3 or 4

207 neurotoxicity compared to those with < grade 3 neurotoxicity [44]. Endothelial activation and
208 multifocal vascular lesions, resulting in disruption of the blood-brain-barrier were reported in patients
209 experiencing neurotoxicity within 28 days of infusion with CD19 CAR T-cells in B cell ALL, NHL and
210 CLL [45]. Humanized mice model studies have shown a role for IL-1 and IL-6 derived from host
211 monocytes in neurotoxicity which would provide a rationale for the use of anakinara (IL-1 receptor
212 antagonist) in this indication [41]. However, the mainstay of therapy to resolve CAR T-associated
213 neurotoxicity remains corticosteroids.
214
215 ***Hypogammaglobulinemia***
216 B-cell aplasia is an example of 'on-target/off-tumor' activity of CAR T-cell therapy since CD19 is
217 expressed not only on the malignant B-cells but also on normal B-lymphocytes. B-cells are assigned
218 with the task of producing immunoglobulins and hence, B-cell aplasia following CAR T-cell therapy
219 results in prolonged hypogammaglobulinemia. Hence, it is not surprising that all patients from the
220 University of Pennsylvania ALL cohort who had a positive clinical response to CAR T-cell therapy
221 also developed B-cell aplasia [5]. Hypogammaglobulinemia leads to an increased risk of infections
222 and the need for regular intravenous immunoglobulin replacement for the duration of B-cell aplasia.

223 ## 5 Applications in Veterinary Oncology

224 ***A critical need for new and innovative therapies in canine B-cell lymphoma***
225 It is estimated that more than 4.2 million dogs (5300/100,000 per population rate) in the U.S are
226 diagnosed with cancer each year [46]. The epidemiology of canine cancer is, however, not well
227 defined in the literature. Most of the available incidence data comes from a limited number of tumor
228 registries and the European Union where there is a higher percentage of insured dogs. Very little to
229 no published data is available to indicate what percentage of dogs diagnosed with cancer are then
230 treated or how they are treated in the U.S. This makes any assessment of the actual market potential
231 for veterinary oncology therapeutics extremely challenging. Clinical experience would indicate that
232 the most common canine malignant cancers diagnosed and treated include lymphoma, mast cell
233 tumor, osteosarcoma, soft tissue sarcoma, hemangiosarcoma and melanoma.
234 This clinical impression is supported by a Swiss Canine Cancer Registry study that outlined the most
235 common neoplasms diagnosed in over 120,000 dogs during a 53-year period as follows:
236 adenoma/adenocarcinoma (18.09%), mast cell tumor (6.5%), lymphoma (4.35%), melanoma
237 (3.63%), fibroma/fibrosarcoma (3.40%), hemangioma/hemangiosarcoma (2.80%), squamous cell
238 carcinoma (1.95%) and osteoma/osteosarcoma (1.24%) [47]. The high occurrence of carcinoma
239 (mammary) is related to the less frequent implementation of ovariohysterectomy at a young age
240 which is more common in the U.S.

241 Lymphoma, with an estimated incidence rate of 20-100 per 100,000 dogs [48], is one of the most
242 widely treated canine cancers given its frequent occurrence and typically robust response to
243 chemotherapeutics. Based on the current approximation of 75 million dogs in the U.S, estimates are
244 that 16,000-80,000 new cases of canine lymphoma are diagnosed each year [49]. Other estimates
245 place the number of diagnosed canine lymphoma cases at over 250,000 annually in the U.S,
246 accounting for 12-18% of annual death-related malignant cancers in dogs [46]. This makes the
247 canine lymphoma market a very appealing potential opportunity for therapeutic development.
248 There is abundant recent literature highlighting the pathologic, biologic, immunophenotypic, genetic
249 and treatment response similarities between human and canine lymphoma [49-52]. Specifically,
250 DLBCL is the most common subtype of lymphoma in both species [52], and it is the subtype most
251 studied with genomic profiling in veterinary medicine [46]. Utilizing immunohistochemistry and gene
252 expression profiling, similar profiles were noted between human and canine DLBCL, and certain
253 markers were able to separate the canine DLBCL cases into two groups with significantly different
254 clinical outcomes [53]. Provided this robust and expanding body of data supporting the parallels
255 between the most common types of human and canine lymphoma, the opportunities for therapeutic
256 development in one species to inform and progress that in the other species will only continue to
257 grow.

258 The majority of canine cancer treatments rely on the use of human generic chemotherapeutics. The
259 clinical responses to these therapeutics for the most common canine cancers (lymphoma,
260 osteosarcoma, hemangiosarcoma) have remained static for the past 10-20 years.
261 Focusing on canine B-cell lymphoma in particular, the standard of care for dogs with high grade
262 lymphoma over the last 35 years has ranged from single agent protocols (using prednisone or
263 doxorubicin) to combination chemotherapy regimens of variable duration. Most veterinary
264 oncologists agree that a doxorubicin-based (e.g. CHOP) combination chemotherapy protocol
265 provides the longest period of disease control and overall survival [54]. However, the response to
266 chemotherapy is often sub-optimal with recurrent or refractory disease representing a significant
267 clinical challenge. The combination of chemotherapy with half- and total-body irradiation has also
268 been evaluated in some dogs with lymphoma. The reported median survival rate in these instances
269 is no longer than that achieved with chemotherapy alone, thereby questioning the utility of this
270 adjunctive therapy [54]. Transplantation of autologous bone marrow has recently facilitated the safe
271 dose escalation of cyclophosphamide that resulted in long-term remission and prolonged patient
272 survival in dogs [55]. However, autologous bone marrow transplantation is technically and
273 logistically challenging to perform in a veterinary hospital setting which limits widespread application.
274 With only a handful of FDA-approved or USDA-licensed veterinary oncology therapeutics currently
275 available to veterinarians, there is a dire need for canine-specific treatment options (Table 1). To

276 date, there is only one therapeutic with conditional FDA approval, rabacfosadine (Tanovea®-CA1,
277 VetDC), for the treatment of canine B-cell lymphoma. Rabacfosadine is an intravenously
278 administered cytotoxic therapeutic agent which is a prodrug of the nucleotide analogue 9-(2-
279 phosphonylmethoxyethyl) guanine (PMEG). It effectively loads lymphoid cells while reducing levels
280 of PMEG in plasma and target organs of toxicity. Tanovea-CA1 received conditional approval from
281 FDA in January 2017 for the treatment of lymphoma in dogs and became available to veterinarians
282 in the spring of 2017.

283 Immuno-oncology innovations are starting to make their way to veterinary oncology but remain
284 limited with extremely sparse supporting data. Rituximab has been evaluated in dogs *ex vivo* and
285 found not to bind or deplete canine B-cell lymphocytes [56,57]. Although an anti-CD20
286 (BLONTRESS®, Aratana) and an anti-CD52 (TACTRESS®, Aratana) monoclonal antibody are both
287 fully licensed by the USDA, the company has stated that neither antibody is as specific to their
288 respective targets as expected. No peer-reviewed data is available on either of these therapeutics
289 to date and they are not commercially available. Another immunotherapeutic, Canine Lymphoma
290 Vaccine, DNA (Boehringer Ingelheim) is currently available. This is a xenogeneic murine CD20 DNA
291 therapeutic vaccine for use in dogs with B-cell lymphoma that was conditionally licensed by the
292 USDA in 2015. No peer-reviewed data is available on this therapeutic to date. With current median
293 survival times for dogs with lymphoma stagnant at less than one year, the opportunity for new,
294 advanced, specific therapeutics remains clear.
295
296 ***Preliminary data in dogs***
297 In a first ever canine study, Mason et al. [58], has reported successful mRNA electroporation of
298 primary canine cells to generate CAR T-cells. In brief, a novel expansion methodology was
299 developed that yields large numbers of canine T-cells from normal or lymphoma-diseased dogs. In
300 this study, the authors had modified previous methods to activate and expand canine T cells *ex vivo*
301 by using artificial antigen-presenting cells genetically modified to express human CD32 and canine
302 CD86. These artificial antigen-presenting cells were loaded with a canine CD3 monoclonal antibody
303 and used in combination with human IL2 and IL21 to preferentially expand $CD8^{+}$ T-cells. The mRNA
304 electroporation procedure was utilized to express a first-generation, canine CD20-specific CAR in
305 expanded T-cells as primary therapy. Treatment in 1 dog with relapsed B-cell lymphoma was well
306 tolerated and led to a modest, but transient, anti-tumor activity, suggesting that stable CAR
307 expression is required for sustained clinical remission. Other possible factors that could have
308 contributed to the partial antitumor activity include limited CAR T-cell expansion and the
309 development of canine antimouse antibodies directed against the murine scFv construct. Future
310 studies are currently underway to investigate the clinical efficacy of a stably-transduced canine CAR

311 T-cell line expressing fully canine, second-generation CAR constructs. Lymphodepleting
312 chemotherapy should also reduce the risk of inducing canine antimouse antibodies.
313 The high-cost of current human treatments, $475,000 for tisagenlecleucel and $373,000 for
314 axicabtagene ciloleucel [59] not including hospitalization and other costs, raises an important
315 potential challenge for the accessibility of this technology for use in dogs. New, non-viral genome
316 engineering tools are in development with the potential to reduce the cost of goods through obviating
317 the need for the generation of an infective engineered virus. For example, the *Sleeping Beauty* [60]
318 and *piggyBac* [61] transposons are in ongoing CAR T-cell clinical trials. In addition, gene editing
319 approaches for targeted knock-in using electroporation and ssDNA as donor [62] and new
320 approaches using enhanced dsDNA as donors for efficient targeted gene knock-in at diverse loci
321 [63] hold the potential for additional and more accessible, non-viral methods for CAR T-cell
322 generation.

323 6 Comparative Oncology: An Opportunity to Accelerate Parallel Drug Development

324 According to a recent report from the National Academy of Medicine [64], only 1 out of 10 oncology
325 candidates that appear promising in preclinical mouse models are in fact effective and safe in human
326 clinical trials. This overtly high attrition rate highlights the need for alternative models at the early
327 stage of the Drug Research and Development lifecycle [65], as shown in other therapeutic areas [66-
328 71]. Although murine models have been extremely useful for studying the biology of cancer initiation,
329 promotion and progression, mice typically do not faithfully represent many of the features constitutive
330 of human cancer, including genomic instability, tumor heterogeneity and long periods of latency [72].
331 Additionally, study mice are often immunocompromised and bred in sterile laboratories, unlike
332 domesticated dogs that share the same habitat and are exposed to same environmental carcinogens
333 (e.g. UV light, pollution and food contaminants) as humans.
334 Importantly, cancers develop spontaneously in dogs (i.e. without genetic manipulation) and in the
335 context of an intact immunity with a syngeneic host and tumor microenvironment. Canine tumors
336 typically have similar features to human malignancies, such as histological appearance, cytogenic
337 abnormalities, therapeutic response, acquired resistance and background genetics [72]. Indeed, as
338 the dog genome became available, multiple comparative genomics studies have shown significant
339 homologies between canine and human cancer-associated genes, including MET, mTOR, KIT and
340 TRAF3 [73]. Given the large number of breeds and their shared ancestry [74], inheritable germline
341 mutations associated with cancer are easier to identify in purebred dogs than in human populations
342 [75]. The outbred nature of dogs (relative to most murine models) contributes to their biological
343 relevance for studying new cancer therapies. At the same time, the rapid progression of cancer

344 associated with the shorter lifespan of dogs provides an opportunity to study the efficacy and safety
345 of candidate therapeutic drugs in a much faster timeframe than clinical trials in human patients [76].
346 Biological similarities between canine and human cancer provide an impetus for the study of novel
347 therapeutics in dog clinical trials (Fig. 4). In fact, the evaluation of oncology drugs in dogs with
348 naturally occurring cancers is not new, with a few descriptions already available in the early 1970s
349 [77-79]. Over the last decade, multiple reports have demonstrated the relevance of the dog model to
350 bridge the knowledge gap between murine experiments and human clinical trials, and exemplify the
351 value of a comparative oncology approach to drug development [80-81].

352 For instance, both canine and human DLBCL patients share similar constitutive NF-κB activity that
353 drives overexpression of anti-apoptotic NF-κB target genes which promote lymphocyte proliferation
354 [82-83]. Studies indicate that administration of a targeted inhibitor of constitutive NF-κB activity,
355 NEMO Binding Domain (NBD), induces apoptosis of canine malignant B cells in vitro. Moreover, pilot
356 trials have demonstrated intranodal administration of NBD peptide to dogs with relapsed B-cell
357 lymphoma inhibits the expression of NF-κB target genes leading to reduced tumor burden [84]. In a
358 separate Phase 1 clinical trial, these same investigators showed that NBD peptide administered
359 intravenously is safe and effective at inhibiting constitutive NF-κB activity in a subset of dogs with
360 lymphoma [85]. Additionally, the use of established canine tumor cell lines has proven beneficial in
361 studying tumor biology and pre-clinical therapeutics. A CD40 ligand-dependent culture system for
362 canine malignant B-cells has been recently designed to test compounds for treatment in primary
363 tumor samples from dogs and humans [86]. The tumor cells retain their original phenotype, clonality,
364 and known karyotypic abnormalities after expansion and culture. This canine cell culture system is
365 reported to be potentially robust to perform in vitro preclinical cytotoxic assays with primary B-cell
366 malignancies.

367 The opportunity to synergize quantitative information available from humans and animals sharing
368 clinical analogs to develop improved therapies for both species is known as ‘Reverse Translation’
369 [65]. A significant component of the success of comparative oncology in drug development is the
370 creation of consortia that link drug development stakeholders to veterinary clinicians with access to
371 tumor-bearing pet animals. This supports the implementation of clinical trials carried out in pets and
372 the collection of high-quality clinical data and biologic specimens that are critical to defining PK/PD,
373 tolerability and efficacy of novel therapeutic approaches destined for human use. To this end, the
374 Comparative Oncology Program of the NCI has established a multi-center collaborative network of
375 24 veterinary academic partners known as the Comparative Oncology Trials Consortium [72,87]. The
376 mission of the COTC is to answer biological questions geared to inform the development path of
377 chemotherapeutics for future use in human cancer patients. The COTC operates as a platform for

378 collaborative work between the NCI and extramural academic comparative oncology centers to
379 design and execute clinical studies in dogs with cancer. Support for the oversight and management
380 of the COTC comes from the NCI. Trial sponsors, most often pharmaceutical companies, support the
381 costs associated with clinical studies in dogs in established COTC academic centers.

382 Several published examples of COTC trials exemplify the functionality and impact of such studies
383 [87-89]. COTC trials do not focus exclusively on small molecules or biologic agents; instead they can
384 be designed and implemented to answer a range of drug development questions that are key to the
385 forward progress of an agent or group of candidate molecules, medical devices, or molecular profiling
386 platforms. One such example illustrating the value of the dog model pertains to the development of
387 the inflammatory cytokine IL-12 for the treatment of human malignant melanoma. The use of
388 cytokines to enhance antitumor immunity has been recognized as an important immunomodulatory
389 approach in cancer management. Yet, historically, the high risk for systemic toxicity presented by IL-
390 12 dosing had prevented development of this cytokine into a therapeutic drug. A strong genetic
391 similarity exists between canine and human IL-12 (i.e. 84% homology for the ligand and 68%
392 homology for the receptor), which motivated studies on the characterization of IL-12 PK/PD, efficacy,
393 and toxicity in dogs with naturally occurring malignant melanoma [90]. Results showed that a fully
394 human necrosis-targeted immunocytokine NHS-IL-12 could be safely administered subcutaneously
395 to patients with malignant melanoma, while maintaining both systemic immunological and clinical
396 activity. This was demonstrated by measuring serum IL-12 and other representative biomarkers (e.g.
397 IL-10 and IFN-gamma) over time, and establishing PK/PD models of IL-12. These findings in dogs
398 were key to guide the sponsor's decision to move forward with a Phase I clinical trial of this agent in
399 humans. In turn, preliminary studies focusing on IL-12 gene electrotransfer in dog patients with
400 melanoma have shown promising results for the treatment of spontaneous canine tumors [91-92].
401 With respect to CAR T-cell therapy research and development, the COTC infrastructure stands ready
402 to support the implementation of cell-based trials for pivotal go/no-go decision-making prior to clinical
403 testing in humans. Through strategic partnerships with study sponsors whom can provide the
404 necessary cell manufacturing, quality control/assurance, and distribution support for such trials, the
405 COTC can provide the requisite scientific input and execution for such trials to be carried out in the
406 veterinary academic setting. Similarly, the COTC Pharmacodynamic Core laboratory can provide
407 access to providers of canine-specific assay support for critical immunological assays such as flow
408 cytometric assessment of immune cell subsets, gene expression profiling, histopathology,
409 immunohistochemistry, proteomics, multiplex cytokine analysis, and the like [93].
410

7 Conclusions

CAR T-cells are one of the most promising development for the treatment of hematological malignancies. Specifically, CART19 cells have demonstrated unprecedented clinical results in human B-cell malignancies with two constructs being approved by the U.S FDA in 2017.
Yet, the technology is still in its early phase and significant challenges need to be resolved before it can be used for large scale clinical trials. Obvious limitations include the complexity and costs (direct: related to the manufacturing, and indirect: related to hospital costs and patient care) of CAR T-cell therapy. The requirement for GMP materials and the individualized nature of the therapy are the main causes that drive-up the cost. The possibility to generate allogeneic off-the-shelf universal CAR T-cells [94] would lead to easier and more cost-effective manufacturing, reduced time to CAR T-cell infusion, improved CAR T health and faster translation of novel combination strategies with CAR T-cells in early phase clinical trials. In addition, the management of toxicities after CAR T-cell therapy requires specialized expertise and care level, making it available only in specialized tertiary centers. Strategies to modulate cytokine production after CAR T-cell therapy are being developed and could represent a new paradigm in the management of CAR-T cell-related side effects.

Importantly, there is currently a lack of robust preclinical models to recapitulate the microenvironment and toxicities following CAR T-cell therapy. Canine models have long been used in development of human cell therapies and allogeneic transplantation procedures and represent an attractive model to further investigate novel CAR T-cell strategies in liquid and solid tumors, as well as to develop novel off-the-shelf approaches. Preliminary data in dogs using a canine CD 20-specific CAR in expanded T-cells showed promising, but transient results. However, these preliminary findings lay the foundation for future studies in dogs where both tumor biology and the microenvironment more faithfully recapitulate that of humans.

Multiple studies are currently evaluating the effect of CAR T-cell therapy for the treatment of solid tumors, with modest results thus far [95]. Potential strategies to increase the efficacy of CAR T in this context include combinations with immune stimulants, secondary modifications of CAR T-cells, re-engineering of the T cell, and specific targeting of the tumor microenvironment. Lastly, efforts are on the way to harness the immunosuppressive property of CAR T-cell for the treatment of autoimmune diseases, such as Inflammatory Bowel Disease (IBD) [96], thereby opening new avenues for comparative medicine and parallel drug development as the dog is a spontaneous animal disease model for IBD as well [97].

8 Funding

None.

9 Conflict of Interest

JPM, SE, CJ, AJ, KA, WW and SSK are founders of LifEngine Animal Health Laboratories, Inc. SSK is inventor on patents in the CAR T-cell therapy field that are licensed to Novartis.
This work was partially supported (AKL) by the Intramural Program of the National Cancer Institute, NIH (Z01-BC006161). The content of this publication does not necessarily reflect the views or policies of the Department of Health and Human Services, nor does mention of trade names, commercial products, or organizations imply endorsement by the U.S. Government.

10 Author Contributions

All authors (JPM, SE, CJ, AJ, KA, ABM, MK, SB WW, AKL, SSK) have contributed to the writing of the manuscript. JPM was responsible for the final production of the Commentary. All authors have read and approved the final manuscript.

456 ## References

457 1. Kaiser J, Couzin-Frankel J. Cancer immunotherapy sweeps Nobel for medicine. Science.
458 2018;362(6410):13.
459 2. Kenderian SS, Ruella M, Gill S, Kalos M. Chimeric antigen receptor T-cell therapy to target
460 hematologic malignancies. Cancer Res. 2014;74(22):6383-9.
461 3. Yoon DH, Osborn MJ, Tolar J, Kim CJ. Incorporation of Immune Checkpoint Blockade into
462 Chimeric Antigen Receptor T Cells (CAR-Ts): Combination or Built-In CAR-T. Int J Mol Sci.
463 2018;19(2). pii: E340.
464 4. Neelapu SS, Locke FL, Bartlett NL, Lekakis LJ, Miklos DB, Jacobson CA, Braunschweig I,
465 Oluwole OO, Siddiqi T, Lin Y, Timmerman JM, Stiff PJ, Friedberg JW, Flinn IW, Goy A, Hill
466 BT, Smith MR, Deol A, Farooq U, McSweeney P, Munoz J, Avivi I, Castro JE, Westin JR,
467 Chavez JC, Ghobadi A, Komanduri KV, Levy R, Jacobsen ED, Witzig TE, Reagan P, Bot A,
468 Rossi J, Navale L, Jiang Y, Aycock J, Elias M, Chang D, Wiezorek J, Go WY. Axicabtagene
469 Ciloleucel CAR T-Cell Therapy in Refractory Large B-Cell Lymphoma. N Engl J Med.
470 2017;377(26):2531-2544.
471 5. Maude SL, Laetsch TW, Buechner J, Rives S, Boyer M, Bittencourt H, Bader P, Verneris MR,
472 Stefanski HE, Myers GD, Qayed M, De Moerloose B, Hiramatsu H, Schlis K, Davis KL, Martin
473 PL, Nemecek ER, Yanik GA, Peters C, Baruchel A, Boissel N, Mechinaud F, Balduzzi A,
474 Krueger J, June CH, Levine BL, Wood P, Taran T, Leung M, Mueller KT, Zhang Y, Sen K,
475 Lebwohl D, Pulsipher MA, Grupp SA. Tisagenlecleucel in Children and Young Adults with B-
476 Cell Lymphoblastic Leukemia. N Engl J Med. 2018;378(5):439-448.
477 6. Collins FS, Gottlieb S. The Next Phase of Human Gene-Therapy Oversight. N Engl J Med.
478 2018;379(15):1393-1395.
479 7. Seelig DM, Avery AC, Ehrhart EJ, Linden MA. The Comparative Diagnostic Features of Canine
480 and Human Lymphoma. Vet Sci. 2016;3(2). pii: 11.
481 8. Bromberek JL, Rout ED, Agnew MR, Yoshimoto J, Morley PS, Avery AC. Breed Distribution
482 and Clinical Characteristics of B Cell Chronic Lymphocytic Leukemia in Dogs. J Vet Intern
483 Med. 2016;30(1):215-22.
484 9. Pule MA, Savoldo B, Myers GD, Rossig C, Russell HV, Dotti G, Huls MH, Liu E, Gee AP, Mei
485 Z, Yvon E, Weiss HL, Liu H, Rooney CM, Heslop HE, Brenner MK. Virus-specific T cells
486 engineered to coexpress tumor-specific receptors: persistence and antitumor activity in
487 individuals with neuroblastoma. Nat Med. 2008;14(11):1264-70.
488 10. Till BG, Jensen MC, Wang J, Chen EY, Wood BL, Greisman HA, Qian X, James SE,
489 Raubitschek A, Forman SJ, Gopal AK, Pagel JM, Lindgren CG, Greenberg PD, Riddell SR,
490 Press OW. Adoptive immunotherapy for indolent non-Hodgkin lymphoma and mantle cell

491 lymphoma using genetically modified autologous CD20-specific T cells. Blood.
492 2008;112(6):2261-71.
493 11. Kershaw MH, Westwood JA, Parker LL, Wang G, Eshhar Z, Mavroukakis SA, White DE,
494 Wunderlich JR, Canevari S, Rogers-Freezer L, Chen CC, Yang JC, Rosenberg SA, Hwu P. A
495 phase I study on adoptive immunotherapy using gene-modified T cells for ovarian cancer. Clin
496 Cancer Res. 2006;12(20 Pt 1):6106-15.
497 12. Savoldo B, Ramos CA, Liu E, Mims MP, Keating MJ, Carrum G, Kamble RT, Bollard CM, Gee
498 AP, Mei Z, Liu H, Grilley B, Rooney CM, Heslop HE, Brenner MK, Dotti G. CD28 costimulation
499 improves expansion and persistence of chimeric antigen receptor-modified T cells in
500 lymphoma patients. J Clin Invest. 2011;121(5):1822-6.
501 13. van der Stegen SJ, Hamieh M, Sadelain M. The pharmacology of second-generation chimeric
502 antigen receptors. Nat Rev Drug Discov. 2015;14(7):499-509.
503 14. Turtle CJ, Hanafi LA, Berger C, Hudecek M, Pender B, Robinson E, Hawkins R, Chaney C,
504 Cherian S, Chen X, Soma L, Wood B, Li D, Heimfeld S, Riddell SR, Maloney DG.
505 Immunotherapy of non-Hodgkin's lymphoma with a defined ratio of CD8+ and CD4+ CD19-
506 specific chimeric antigen receptor-modified T cells. Sci Transl Med. 2016;8(355):355ra116.
507 15. Lee DW, Kochenderfer JN, Stetler-Stevenson M, Cui YK, Delbrook C, Feldman SA, Fry TJ,
508 Orentas R, Sabatino M, Shah NN, Steinberg SM, Stroncek D, Tschernia N, Yuan C, Zhang H,
509 Zhang L, Rosenberg SA, Wayne AS, Mackall CL. T cells expressing CD19 chimeric antigen
510 receptors for acute lymphoblastic leukaemia in children and young adults: a phase 1 dose-
511 escalation trial. Lancet. 2015;385(9967):517-528.
512 16. Rudd CE, Schneider H. Unifying concepts in CD28, ICOS and CTLA4 co-receptor signalling.
513 Nat Rev Immunol. 2003;3(7):544-56.
514 17. Boomer JS, Green JM. An enigmatic tail of CD28 signaling. Cold Spring Harb Perspect Biol.
515 2010;2(8):a002436.
516 18. Sperling AI, Auger JA, Ehst BD, Rulifson IC, Thompson CB, Bluestone JA. CD28/B7
517 interactions deliver a unique signal to naive T cells that regulates cell survival but not early
518 proliferation. J Immunol. 1996;157(9):3909-17.
519 19. Zhang H, Snyder KM, Suhoski MM, Maus MV, Kapoor V, June CH, Mackall CL. 4-1BB is
520 superior to CD28 costimulation for generating CD8+ cytotoxic lymphocytes for adoptive
521 immunotherapy. J Immunol. 2007;179(7):4910-8.
522 20. Carpenito C, Milone MC, Hassan R, Simonet JC, Lakhal M, Suhoski MM, Varela-Rohena A,
523 Haines KM, Heitjan DF, Albelda SM, Carroll RG, Riley JL, Pastan I, June CH. Control of large,
524 established tumor xenografts with genetically retargeted human T cells containing CD28 and
525 CD137 domains. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A. 2009;106(9):3360-5.

526 21. Zhong XS, Matsushita M, Plotkin J, Riviere I, Sadelain M. Chimeric antigen receptors
527 combining 4-1BB and CD28 signaling domains augment PI3kinase/AKT/Bcl-XL activation and
528 CD8+ T cell-mediated tumor eradication. Mol Ther. 2010;18(2):413-20.
529 22. Fielding AK, Richards SM, Chopra R, Lazarus HM, Litzow MR, Buck G, Durrant IJ, Luger SM,
530 Marks DI, Franklin IM, McMillan AK, Tallman MS, Rowe JM, Goldstone AH; Medical Research
531 Council of the United Kingdom Adult ALL Working Party; Eastern Cooperative Oncology
532 Group. Outcome of 609 adults after relapse of acute lymphoblastic leukemia (ALL); an MRC
533 UKALL12/ECOG 2993 study. Blood. 2007;109(3):944-50.
534 23. Tavernier E, Boiron JM, Huguet F, Bradstock K, Vey N, Kovacsovics T, Delannoy A, Fegueux
535 N, Fenaux P, Stamatoullas A, Tournilhac O, Buzyn A, Reman O, Charrin C, Boucheix C,
536 Gabert J, Lhéritier V, Vernant JP, Dombret H, Thomas X; GET-LALA Group; Swiss Group for
537 Clinical Cancer Research SAKK; Australasian Leukaemia and Lymphoma Group. Outcome of
538 treatment after first relapse in adults with acute lymphoblastic leukemia initially treated by the
539 LALA-94 trial. Leukemia. 2007;21(9):1907-14.
540 24. Gökbuget N, Stanze D, Beck J, Diedrich H, Horst HA, Hüttmann A, Kobbe G, Kreuzer KA,
541 Leimer L, Reichle A, Schaich M, Schwartz S, Serve H, Starck M, Stelljes M, Stuhlmann R,
542 Viardot A, Wendelin K, Freund M, Hoelzer D; German Multicenter Study Group for Adult Acute
543 Lymphoblastic Leukemia. Outcome of relapsed adult lymphoblastic leukemia depends on
544 response to salvage chemotherapy, prognostic factors, and performance of stem cell
545 transplantation. Blood. 2012;120(10):2032-41.
546 25. Grupp SA, Kalos M, Barrett D, Aplenc R, Porter DL, Rheingold SR, Teachey DT, Chew A,
547 Hauck B, Wright JF, Milone MC, Levine BL, June CH. Chimeric antigen receptor-modified T
548 cells for acute lymphoid leukemia. N Engl J Med. 2013 Apr 18;368(16):1509-1518.
549 26. Maude SL, Frey N, Shaw PA, Aplenc R, Barrett DM, Bunin NJ, Chew A, Gonzalez VE, Zheng
550 Z, Lacey SF, Mahnke YD, Melenhorst JJ, Rheingold SR, Shen A, Teachey DT, Levine BL,
551 June CH, Porter DL, Grupp SA. Chimeric antigen receptor T cells for sustained remissions in
552 leukemia. N Engl J Med. 2014;371(16):1507-17.
553 27. Crump M, Neelapu SS, Farooq U, Van Den Neste E, Kuruvilla J, Westin J, Link BK, Hay A,
554 Cerhan JR, Zhu L, Boussetta S, Feng L, Maurer MJ, Navale L, Wiezorek J, Go WY,
555 Gisselbrecht C. Outcomes in refractory diffuse large B-cell lymphoma: results from the
556 international SCHOLAR-1 study. Blood. 2017;130(16):1800-1808.
557 28. Kochenderfer JN, Yu Z, Frasheri D, Restifo NP, Rosenberg SA. Adoptive transfer of syngeneic
558 T cells transduced with a chimeric antigen receptor that recognizes murine CD19 can eradicate
559 lymphoma and normal B cells. Blood. 2010 Nov;116(19):3875-86.
560 29. Roberts ZJ, Better M, Bot A, Roberts MR, Ribas A. Axicabtagene ciloleucel, a first-in-class
561 CAR T cell therapy for aggressive NHL. Leuk Lymphoma. 2018;59(8):1785-1796.

562 30. Advances in aggressive lymphoma from the 2017 American Society of Hematology Annual
563 Meeting and Exposition. Clin Adv Hematol Oncol. 2018;16 Suppl 5(2):1-24.
564 31. News in Brief. Value in Using CAR T Cells for DLBCL. Cancer Discov. 2018;8(2):131-132.
565 32. Schuster SJ, Svoboda J, Chong EA, Nasta SD, Mato AR, Anak Ö, Brogdon JL, Pruteanu-
566 Malinici I, Bhoj V, Landsburg D, Wasik M, Levine BL, Lacey SF, Melenhorst JJ, Porter DL,
567 June CH. Chimeric Antigen Receptor T Cells in Refractory B-Cell Lymphomas. N Engl J Med.
568 2017;377(26):2545-2554.
569 33. Rasche L, Weinhold N, Morgan GJ, van Rhee F, Davies FE. Immunologic approaches for the
570 treatment of multiple myeloma. Cancer Treat Rev. 2017;55:190-199.
571 34. Jin Z, Xiang R, Qing K, Li X, Zhang Y, Wang L, Zhu H, Mao Y, Xu Z, Li J. The severe cytokine
572 release syndrome in phase I trials of CD19-CAR-T cell therapy: a systematic review. Ann
573 Hematol. 2018. doi: 10.1007/s00277-018-3368-8.
574 35. Park JH, Rivière I, Gonen M, Wang X, Sénéchal B, Curran KJ, Sauter C, Wang Y, Santomasso
575 B, Mead E, Roshal M, Maslak P, Davila M, Brentjens RJ, Sadelain M. Long-Term Follow-up
576 of CD19 CAR Therapy in Acute Lymphoblastic Leukemia. N Engl J Med. 2018;378(5):449-
577 459.
578 36. Lee DW, Kochenderfer JN, Stetler-Stevenson M, Cui YK, Delbrook C, Feldman SA, Fry TJ,
579 Orentas R, Sabatino M, Shah NN, Steinberg SM, Stroncek D, Tschernia N, Yuan C, Zhang H,
580 Zhang L, Rosenberg SA, Wayne AS, Mackall CL. T cells expressing CD19 chimeric antigen
581 receptors for acute lymphoblastic leukaemia in children and young adults: a phase 1 dose-
582 escalation trial. Lancet. 2015;385(9967):517-528.
583 37. Liu D, Zhao J. Cytokine release syndrome: grading, modeling, and new therapy. J Hematol
584 Oncol. 2018;11(1):121.
585 38. Davila ML, Riviere I, Wang X, Bartido S, Park J, Curran K, Chung SS, Stefanski J, Borquez-
586 Ojeda O, Olszewska M, Qu J, Wasielewska T, He Q, Fink M, Shinglot H, Youssif M, Satter M,
587 Wang Y, Hosey J, Quintanilla H, Halton E, Bernal Y, Bouhassira DC, Arcila ME, Gonen M,
588 Roboz GJ, Maslak P, Douer D, Frattini MG, Giralt S, Sadelain M, Brentjens R. Efficacy and
589 toxicity management of 19-28z CAR T cell therapy in B cell acute lymphoblastic leukemia. Sci
590 Transl Med. 2014;6(224):224ra25.
591 39. Turtle CJ, Hanafi LA, Berger C, Gooley TA, Cherian S, Hudecek M, Sommermeyer D, Melville
592 K, Pender B, Budiarto TM, Robinson E, Steevens NN, Chaney C, Soma L, Chen X, Yeung C,
593 Wood B, Li D, Cao J, Heimfeld S, Jensen MC, Riddell SR, Maloney DG. CD19 CAR-T cells of
594 defined CD4+:CD8+ composition in adult B cell ALL patients. J Clin Invest. 2016;126(6):2123-
595 38.
596 40. Teachey DT, Lacey SF, Shaw PA, Melenhorst JJ, Maude SL, Frey N, Pequignot E, Gonzalez
597 VE, Chen F, Finklestein J, Barrett DM, Weiss SL, Fitzgerald JC, Berg RA, Aplenc R, Callahan

598 C, Rheingold SR, Zheng Z, Rose-John S, White JC, Nazimuddin F, Wertheim G, Levine BL,
599 June CH, Porter DL, Grupp SA. Identification of Predictive Biomarkers for Cytokine Release
600 Syndrome after Chimeric Antigen Receptor T-cell Therapy for Acute Lymphoblastic Leukemia.
601 Cancer Discov. 2016;6(6):664-79.
602 41. Giavridis T, van der Stegen SJC, Eyquem J, Hamieh M, Piersigilli A, Sadelain M. CAR T cell-
603 induced cytokine release syndrome is mediated by macrophages and abated by IL-1 blockade.
604 Nat Med. 2018;24(6):731-738.
605 42. Neelapu SS, Tummala S, Kebriaei P, Wierda W, Gutierrez C, Locke FL, Komanduri KV, Lin Y,
606 Jain N, Daver N, Westin J, Gulbis AM, Loghin ME, de Groot JF, Adkins S, Davis SE, Rezvani
607 K, Hwu P, Shpall EJ. Chimeric antigen receptor T-cell therapy - assessment and management
608 of toxicities. Nat Rev Clin Oncol. 2018;15(1):47-62.
609 43. Santomasso BD, Park JH, Salloum D, Riviere I, Flynn J, Mead E, Halton E, Wang X, Senechal
610 B, Purdon T, Cross JR, Liu H, Vachha B, Chen X, DeAngelis LM, Li D, Bernal Y, Gonen M,
611 Wendel HG, Sadelain M, Brentjens RJ. Clinical and Biological Correlates of Neurotoxicity
612 Associated with CAR T-cell Therapy in Patients with B-cell Acute Lymphoblastic Leukemia.
613 Cancer Discov. 2018;8(8):958-971.
614 44. Kochenderfer JN, Dudley ME, Kassim SH, Somerville RP, Carpenter RO, Stetler-Stevenson
615 M, Yang JC, Phan GQ, Hughes MS, Sherry RM, Raffeld M, Feldman S, Lu L, Li YF, Ngo LT,
616 Goy A, Feldman T, Spaner DE, Wang ML, Chen CC, Kranick SM, Nath A, Nathan DA, Morton
617 KE, Toomey MA, Rosenberg SA. Chemotherapy-refractory diffuse large B-cell lymphoma and
618 indolent B-cell malignancies can be effectively treated with autologous T cells expressing an
619 anti-CD19 chimeric antigen receptor. J Clin Oncol. 2015;33(6):540-9.
620 45. Gust J, Hay KA, Hanafi LA, Li D, Myerson D, Gonzalez-Cuyar LF, Yeung C, Liles WC, Wurfel
621 M, Lopez JA, Chen J, Chung D, Harju-Baker S, Özpolat T, Fink KR, Riddell SR, Maloney DG,
622 Turtle CJ. Endothelial Activation and Blood-Brain Barrier Disruption in Neurotoxicity after
623 Adoptive Immunotherapy with CD19 CAR-T Cells. Cancer Discov. 2017;7(12):1404-1419.
624 46. Schiffman JD, Breen M. Comparative oncology: what dogs and other species can teach us
625 about humans with cancer. Philos Trans R Soc Lond B Biol Sci. 2015;370(1673). pii:
626 20140231.
627 47. Gruntzig K, Graf R, Boo G, et al. Swiss Canine Cancer Registry 1955-2008: Occurrence of the
628 most common tumour diagnoses and influence of age, breed, body size, sex and neutering
629 status on tumour development. J Comp Pathol. 2016;155(2-3):156-170.
630 48. Dobson JM, Samuel S, Milstein H, et al. Canine neoplasia in the UK: estimates of incidence
631 rates from a population of insured dogs. J Small Anim Pract. 2002;43(6):240-6.
632 49. Richards KL and Suter SE. Man's best friend: what can pet dogs teach us about non-Hodgkin
633 lymphoma? Immunol Rev. 2015;263(1):173-191.

634 50. Marconato L, Gelain ME, Comazzi S. The dog as a possible animal model for human non-
635 Hodgkin lymphoma: a review. Hematol Oncol. 2013;31(1):1-9.
636 51. Ito D, Frantz AM, Modiano JF. Canine lymphoma as a comparative model for human non-
637 Hodgkin lymphoma: recent progress and applications. Vet Immunol Immunopathol.
638 2014;159(3-4):192-201.
639 52. Seelig DM, Avery AC, Ehrhart EJ, Linden MA. The comparative diagnostic features of canine
640 and human lymphoma. Vet Sci. 2016;3(2):11.
641 53. Richards KL, Motsinger-Reif AA, Chen HW, et al. Gene profiling of canine B-cell lymphoma
642 reveals germinal center and post-germinal center subtypes with different survival times,
643 modeling human DLBCL. Cancer Res. 2013;73(16):5029-39.
644 54. Chun R. Lymphoma: which chemotherapy protocol and why? Top Companion Anim Med.
645 2009;24(3):157-62.
646 55. Frimberger AE, Moore AS, Rassnick KM, Cotter SM, O'Sullivan JL, Quesenberry PJ. A
647 combination chemotherapy protocol with dose intensification and autologous bone marrow
648 transplant (VELCAP-HDC) for canine lymphoma. J Vet Intern Med. 2006;20(2):355-64.
649 56. Jubala CM, Wojcieszyn JW, Valli VE, et al. CD20 expression in normal canine B cells and in
650 canine non-Hodgkin lymphoma. Vet Pathol. 2005;42(4):488-76.
651 57. Impellizeri JA, Howell K, McKeever KP and Crow SE. The role of rituximab in the treatment of
652 canine lymphoma: an ex vivo evaluation. Vet J. 2006;171(3):556-8.
653 58. Panjwani MK, Smith JB, Schutsky K, Gnanandarajah J, O'Connor CM, Powell DJ Jr, Mason
654 NJ. Feasibility and Safety of RNA-transfected CD20-specific Chimeric Antigen Receptor T
655 Cells in Dogs with Spontaneous B Cell Lymphoma. Mol Ther. 2016;24(9):1602-14.
656 59. Sharma P, King GT, Shinde SS, Purev E, Jimeno A. Axicabtagene ciloleucel for the treatment
657 of relapsed/refractory B-cell non-Hodgkin's lymphomas. Drugs Today (Barc). 2018;54(3):187-
658 198.
659 60. Kebriaei P, Singh H, Huls MH, Figliola MJ, Bassett R, Olivares S, Jena B, Dawson MJ,
660 Kumaresan PR, Su S, Maiti S, Dai J, Moriarity B, Forget MA, Senyukov V, Orozco A, Liu T,
661 McCarty J, Jackson RN, Moyes JS, Rondon G, Qazilbash M, Ciurea S, Alousi A, Nieto Y,
662 Rezvani K, Marin D, Popat U, Hosing C, Shpall EJ, Kantarjian H, Keating M, Wierda W, Do
663 KA, Largaespada DA, Lee DA, Hackett PB, Champlin RE, Cooper LJ. Phase I trials using
664 Sleeping Beauty to generate CD19-specific CAR T cells. J Clin Invest. 2016;126(9):3363-76.
665 61. Ramanayake S, Bilmon I, Bishop D, Dubosq MC, Blyth E, Clancy L, Gottlieb D, Micklethwaite
666 K. Low-cost generation of Good Manufacturing Practice-grade CD19-specific chimeric antigen
667 receptor-expressing T cells using piggyBac gene transfer and patient-derived materials.
668 Cytotherapy. 2015;17(9):1251-67.

669 62. Roth TL, Puig-Saus C, Yu R, Shifrut E, Carnevale J, Li PJ, Hiatt J, Saco J, Krystofinski P, Li
670 H, Tobin V, Nguyen DN, Lee MR, Putnam AL, Ferris AL, Chen JW, Schickel JN, Pellerin L,
671 Carmody D, Alkorta-Aranburu G, Del Gaudio D, Matsumoto H, Morell M, Mao Y, Cho M,
672 Quadros RM, Gurumurthy CB, Smith B, Haugwitz M, Hughes SH, Weissman JS, Schumann
673 K, Esensten JH, May AP, Ashworth A, Kupfer GM, Greeley SAW, Bacchetta R, Meffre E,
674 Roncarolo MG, Romberg N, Herold KC, Ribas A, Leonetti MD, Marson A. Reprogramming
675 human T cell function and specificity with non-viral genome targeting. Nature.
676 2018;559(7714):405-409.
677 63. Wierson WA, Welker JM, Almeida MP, Mann CM, Webster DA, Weiss TJ, Torrie ME,
678 Vollbrecht MK, Lan M, McKeighan KC, Ming Z, Wehmeier A, Mikelson CS, Haltom JA, Kwan,
679 KM, Chien CB, Balciunas D, Ekker SC, Clark KJ, Webber BR, Moriarity B, Solin SL, Carlson
680 DF, Dobbs DL, McGrail M, Essner JJ. GeneWeld: a method for efficient targeted integration
681 directed by short homology. http://biorxiv.org/content/early/2018/10/03/431627.
682 64. National Cancer Policy Forum, Board on Health Care Services, Institute of Medicine, National
683 Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine. The Role of Clinical Studies for Pets with
684 Naturally Occurring Tumors in Translational Cancer Research: Workshop Summary.
685 Washington (DC): National Academies Press (US); 2015.
686 65. Schneider B, Balbas-Martinez V, Jergens AE, Troconiz IF, Allenspach K, Mochel JP. Model-
687 Based Reverse Translation Between Veterinary and Human Medicine: The One Health
688 Initiative. CPT Pharmacometrics Syst Pharmacol. 2018;7(2):65-68.
689 66. Mochel JP, Gabrielsson J, Collard W, Fink M, Gehring R, Laffont C, Liu Y, Martin-Jimenez T,
690 Pelligand L, Steimer JL, Toutain PL, Whittem T, Riviere J. Animal Health Modeling &
691 Simulation Society: a new society promoting model-based approaches in veterinary
692 pharmacology. J Vet Pharmacol Ther. 2013 May 29. doi: 10.1111/jvp.12060.
693 67. Mochel JP, Fink M, Peyrou M, Soubret A, Giraudel JM, Danhof M.
694 Pharmacokinetic/Pharmacodynamic Modeling of Renin-Angiotensin Aldosterone Biomarkers
695 Following Angiotensin-Converting Enzyme (ACE) Inhibition Therapy with Benazepril in Dogs.
696 Pharm Res. 2015;32(6):1931-46.
697 68. Mochel JP, Danhof M. Chronobiology and Pharmacologic Modulation of the Renin-
698 Angiotensin-Aldosterone System in Dogs: What Have We Learned? Rev Physiol Biochem
699 Pharmacol. 2015;169:43-69.
700 69. Riviere JE, Gabrielsson J, Fink M, Mochel J. Mathematical modeling and simulation in animal
701 health. Part I: Moving beyond pharmacokinetics. J Vet Pharmacol Ther. 2016;39(3):213-23.
702 70. Bon C, Toutain PL, Concordet D, Gehring R, Martin-Jimenez T, Smith J, Pelligand L, Martinez
703 M, Whittem T, Riviere JE, Mochel JP. Mathematical modeling and simulation in animal health.

704 Part III: Using nonlinear mixed-effects to characterize and quantify variability in drug
705 pharmacokinetics. J Vet Pharmacol Ther. 2018;41(2):171-183.
706 71. Berger EP, Johannes CM, Jergens AE, Allenspach K, Powers BE, Du Y, Mochel JP, Fox LE,
707 Musser ML. Retrospective evaluation of toceranib phosphate (Palladia®) use in the treatment
708 of gastrointestinal stromal tumors of dogs. J Vet Intern Med. 2018 Oct 11. doi:
709 10.1111/jvim.15335.
710 72. Gordon I, Paoloni M, Mazcko C, Khanna C. The Comparative Oncology Trials Consortium:
711 using spontaneously occurring cancers in dogs to inform the cancer drug development
712 pathway. PLoS Med. 2009;6(10):e1000161.
713 73. Paoloni M, Khanna C. Translation of new cancer treatments from pet dogs to humans. Nat
714 Rev Cancer. 2008;8(2):147-56.
715 74. Breen M, Modiano JF. Evolutionarily conserved cytogenetic changes in hematological
716 malignancies of dogs and humans--man and his best friend share more than companionship.
717 Chromosome Res. 2008;16(1):145-54.
718 75. Jacob JA. Researchers Turn to Canine Clinical Trials to Advance Cancer Therapies. JAMA.
719 2016;315(15):1550-2.
720 76. Khanna C, London C, Vail D, Mazcko C, Hirschfeld S. Guiding the optimal translation of new
721 cancer treatments from canine to human cancer patients. Clin Cancer Res. 2009;15(18):5671-
722 7.
723 77. Tsoi MS, Weiden PL, Storb R. Lymphocyte reactivity to autochthonous tumor cells in dogs with
724 spontaneous malignancies. Cell Immunol. 1974 Sep;13(3):431-9.
725 78. Weiden PL, Storb R, Lerner KG, Kao GF, Graham TC, Thomas ED. Treatment of canine
726 malignancies by 1200 R total body irradiation and autologous marrow grafts. Exp Hematol.
727 1975;3(2):124-34.
728 79. Benjamini E, Theilen GH, Torten M, Fong S, Crow S, Henness AM. Tumor vaccines for
729 immunotherapy of canine lymphosarcoma. Ann N Y Acad Sci. 1976;277(00):305-12.
730 80. Paoloni MC, Tandle A, Mazcko C, Hanna E, Kachala S, Leblanc A, Newman S, Vail D, Henry
731 C, Thamm D, Sorenmo K, Hajitou A, Pasqualini R, Arap W, Khanna C, Libutti SK. Launching
732 a novel preclinical infrastructure: comparative oncology trials consortium directed therapeutic
733 targeting of TNFalpha to cancer vasculature. PLoS One. 2009;4(3):e4972.
734 81. Burton JH, Mazcko C, LeBlanc A, Covey JM, Ji J, Kinders RJ, Parchment RE, Khanna C,
735 Paoloni M, Lana S, Weishaar K, London C, Kisseberth W, Krick E, Vail D, Childress M, Bryan
736 JN, Barber L, Ehrhart EJ, Kent M, Fan T, Kow K, Northup N, Wilson-Robles H, Tomaszewski
737 J, Holleran JL, Muzzio M, Eiseman J, Beumer JH, Doroshow JH, Pommier Y. NCI Comparative
738 Oncology Program Testing of Non-Camptothecin Indenoisoquinoline Topoisomerase I

739 Inhibitors in Naturally Occurring Canine Lymphoma. Clin Cancer Res. 2018 Jul 30. doi:
740 10.1158/1078-0432.CCR-18-1498.
741 82. Davis RE, Brown KD, Siebenlist U, Staudt LM. Constitutive nuclear factor kappaB activity is
742 required for survival of activated B cell-like diffuse large B cell lymphoma cells. J Exp Med.
743 2001;194(12):1861-74.
744 83. Karin M, Lin A. NF-kappaB at the crossroads of life and death. Nat Immunol. 2002;3(3):221-7.
745 84. Gaurnier-Hausser A, Patel R, Baldwin AS, May MJ, Mason NJ. NEMO-binding domain peptide
746 inhibits constitutive NF-κB activity and reduces tumor burden in a canine model of relapsed,
747 refractory diffuse large B-cell lymphoma. Clin Cancer Res. 2011;17(14):4661-71.
748 85. Habineza Ndikuyeze G, Gaurnier-Hausser A, Patel R, Baldwin AS, May MJ, Flood P, Krick E,
749 Propert KJ, Mason NJ. A phase I clinical trial of systemically delivered NEMO binding domain
750 peptide in dogs with spontaneous activated B-cell like diffuse large B-cell lymphoma. PLoS
751 One. 2014;9(5):e95404.
752 86. Ito D, Frantz AM, Williams C, Thomas R, Burnett RC, Avery AC, Breen M, Mason NJ, O'Brien
753 TD, Modiano JF. CD40 ligand is necessary and sufficient to support primary diffuse large B-
754 cell lymphoma cells in culture: a tool for in vitro preclinical studies with primary B-cell
755 malignancies. Leuk Lymphoma. 2012;53(7):1390-8.
756 87. LeBlanc AK, Breen M, Choyke P, Dewhirst M, Fan TM, Gustafson DL, Helman LJ, Kastan MB,
757 Knapp DW, Levin WJ, London C, Mason N, Mazcko C, Olson PN, Page R, Teicher BA, Thamm
758 DH, Trent JM, Vail DM, Khanna C. Perspectives from man's best friend: National Academy of
759 Medicine's Workshop on Comparative Oncology. Sci Transl Med. 2016;8(324):324ps5.
760 88. LeBlanc AK, Mazcko CN, Khanna C. Defining the Value of a Comparative Approach to Cancer
761 Drug Development. Clin Cancer Res. 2016;22(9):2133-8.
762 89. Paoloni MC, Tandle A, Mazcko C, Hanna E, Kachala S, Leblanc A, Newman S, Vail D, Henry
763 C, Thamm D, Sorenmo K, Hajitou A, Pasqualini R, Arap W, Khanna C,Libutti SK. Launching
764 a novel preclinical infrastructure: comparative oncologytrials consortium directed therapeutic
765 targeting of TNFalpha to cancer vasculature. PLoS One. 2009;4(3):e4972.
766 90. Paoloni M, Mazcko C, Selting K, Lana S, Barber L, Phillips J, Skorupski K, Vail D, Wilson H,
767 Biller B, Avery A, Kiupel M, LeBlanc A, Bernhardt A, Brunkhorst B, Tighe R, Khanna C.
768 Defining the Pharmacodynamic Profile and Therapeutic Index of NHS-IL12 Immunocytokine
769 in Dogs with Malignant Melanoma. PLoS One. 2015;10(6):e0129954.
770 91. Lampreht U, Kamensek U, Stimac M, Sersa G, Tozon N, Bosnjak M, Brozic A, de Sá Oliveira
771 GG, Nakagawa T, Saeki K, Cemazar M. Gene Electrotransfer of Canine Interleukin 12 into
772 Canine Melanoma Cell Lines. J Membr Biol. 2015;248(5):909-17.

773 92. Lampreht Tratar U, Kos S, Kamensek U, Ota M, Tozon N, Sersa G, Cemazar M. Antitumor
774 effect of antibiotic resistance gene-free plasmids encoding interleukin-12 in canine melanoma
775 model. Cancer Gene Ther. 2018;25(9-10):260-273.
776 93. Paoloni M, Lana S, Thamm D, Mazcko C, Withrow S. The creation of the Comparative
777 Oncology Trials Consortium Pharmacodynamic Core: Infrastructure for a virtual laboratory. Vet
778 J. 2010;185(1):88-9.
779 94. Ruella M, Kenderian SS. Next-Generation Chimeric Antigen Receptor T-Cell Therapy: Going
780 off the Shelf. BioDrugs. 2017;31(6):473-481.
781 95. Jaspers JE, Brentjens RJ. Development of CAR T cells designed to improve antitumor efficacy
782 and safety. Pharmacol Ther. 2017;178:83-91.
783 96. Shin B, Kress RL, Kramer PA, Darley-Usmar VM, Bellis SL, Harrington LE. Effector CD4 T
784 cells with progenitor potential mediate chronic intestinal inflammation. J Exp Med.
785 2018;215(7):1803-1812.
786 97. Otoni CC, Heilmann RM, García-Sancho M, Sainz A, Ackermann MR, Suchodolski JS, Steiner
787 JM, Jergens AE. Serologic and fecal markers to predict response to induction therapy in dogs
788 with idiopathic inflammatory bowel disease. J Vet Intern Med. 2018;32(3):999-1008.
789 98. Zhao Z, Chen Y, Francisco NM, Zhang Y, Wu M. The application of CAR-T cell therapy in
790 hematological malignancies: advantages and challenges. Acta Pharm Sin B. 2018;8(4):539-
791 551.

Tables

Table 1. Approved or Licensed Veterinary Oncology Therapeutics (U.S.)

Trade Name	Compound Name	Company	Indication	Regulatory Status, U.S. (Year)	Species	Commercial Availability
Blontress®	Canine lymphoma MAb, B-cell	Aratana	B-cell lymphoma	USDA Licensed (2015)	Canine	No
NA	Canine lymphoma vaccine, DNA	Merial/BI	B-cell lymphoma	USDA Conditional License (2015)	Canine	Yes
NA	Canine osteosarcoma vaccine, live listeria vector	Aratana	Osteosarcoma	USDA Conditional License (2017)	Canine	Yes
NA	Feline interleukin-2 immunomodulator	Merial/BI	Primary stage I fibrosarcoma	USDA Conditional License (2015)	Feline	Yes
Immunocidin ®	Mycobacterium cell wall fraction	NovaVive	Mammary tumors	USDA Licensed (2009)	Canine	Yes
Oncept®	Canine melanoma vaccine, DNA	Merial/BI	Melanoma	USDA Licensed (2010)	Canine	Yes
Palladia®	Toceranib phosphate	Zoetis	Grade II/III mast cell tumor	FDA Approved (2009)	Canine	Yes
Tactress®	Canine lymphoma MAb, T-cell	Aratana	T-cell lymphoma	USDA Licensed (2016)	Canine	No
Tanovea®-CA1	Rabacfosadine for injection	VetDC	Lymphoma	FDA Conditional Approval (2017)	Canine	Yes

Figure Captions

Figure 1. Evolution of the Chimeric Antigen Receptor (CAR). The 1st CAR generation consists of a receptor fused to a signaling domain composed of CD3ζ. The 2nd generation includes an antigen-binding domain, usually derived from a single chain variable fragment (scFv) or a protein receptor, a hinge that connects the scFv to a transmembrane domain, a co-stimulatory domain (typically CD28) and a CD3ζ signaling domain. The 3rd generation CAR includes 2 co-stimulatory domains along with the activation domain, resulting in ≥ 3 signaling domains in the CAR structure. Adapted from Zhao et al. [98].

Figure 2. An overview of the basic steps of CAR T-Cell therapy production: (1) A patient (human, dog) or donor is undergoing leukapheresis to isolate T cells; (2) T cells are then genetically engineered to express CAR by gene transfection; (3) CAR-expressing T cells are expanded to a significant population size *in vitro*; (4) CAR T-cells are then introduced back into the patient.

Figure 3. In Chimeric Antigen Receptor (CAR) therapy, a patient's T cells are reprogrammed to specifically to seek-out and target cells expressing a particular antigen found on specific cancer cell types (Kenderian, 2014). Activation of T cells leads to direct killing of tumor cells through the release of cytolytic proteins, such as granzyme and perforin. Consult Figure 2 for additional technical details on CAR T-cell production.

Figure 4. Common cancers that have clinical analogues in humans and dogs. Approximately 4.2 million dogs (vs. 1.7 million human patients) get diagnosed with cancer each year, representing ca. 5,300 new canine cases for a standard 100,000 population size [46].

Figure 1



Figure 2



Figure 3



Figure 4