### University of New Hampshire University of New Hampshire Scholars' Repository

Doctoral Dissertations Student Scholarship

Winter 1980

# CROSS-REACTIVITY BETWEEN MAJOR HISTOCOMPATIBILITY COMPLEX ANTIGEN AND ROUS SARCOMA VIRUS-INDUCED TUMOR ANTIGEN IN CHICKENS

ERIC WARREN HEINZELMANN

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholars.unh.edu/dissertation

#### Recommended Citation

HEINZELMANN, ERIC WARREN, "CROSS-REACTIVITY BETWEEN MAJOR HISTOCOMPATIBILITY COMPLEX ANTIGEN AND ROUS SARCOMA VIRUS-INDUCED TUMOR ANTIGEN IN CHICKENS" (1980). *Doctoral Dissertations*. 1282.

https://scholars.unh.edu/dissertation/1282

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Student Scholarship at University of New Hampshire Scholars' Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in Doctoral Dissertations by an authorized administrator of University of New Hampshire Scholars' Repository. For more information, please contact nicole.hentz@unh.edu.

#### INFORMATION TO USERS

This was produced from a copy of a document sent to us for microfilming. While the most advanced technological means to photograph and reproduce this document have been used, the quality is heavily dependent upon the quality of the material submitted.

The following explanation of techniques is provided to help you understand markings or notations which may appear on this reproduction.

- 1. The sign or "target" for pages apparently lacking from the document photographed is "Missing Page(s)". If it was possible to obtain the missing page(s) or section, they are spliced into the film along with adjacent pages. This may have necessitated cutting through an image and duplicating adjacent pages to assure you of complete continuity.
- 2. When an image on the film is obliterated with a round black mark it is an indication that the film inspector noticed either blurred copy because of movement during exposure, or duplicate copy. Unless we meant to delete copyrighted materials that should not have been filmed, you will find a good image of the page in the adjacent frame. If copyrighted materials were deleted you will find a target note listing the pages in the adjacent frame.
- 3. When a map, drawing or chart, etc., is part of the material being photographed the photographer has followed a definite method in "sectioning" the material. It is customary to begin filming at the upper left hand corner of a large sheet and to continue from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. If necessary, sectioning is continued again—beginning below the first row and continuing on until complete.
- 4. For any illustrations that cannot be reproduced satisfactorily by xerography, photographic prints can be purchased at additional cost and tipped into your xerographic copy. Requests can be made to our Dissertations Customer Services Department.
- 5. Some pages in any document may have indistinct print. In all cases we have filmed the best available copy.



#### HEINZELMANN, ERIC WARREN

CROSS-REACTIVITY BETWEEN MAJOR HISTOCOMPATIBILITY COMPLEX ANTIGEN AND ROUS SARCOMA VIRUS-INDUCED TUMOR ANTIGEN IN CHICKENS

University of New Hampshire

PH.D.

1980

University
Microfilms
International 300 N. Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106

#### PLEASE NOTE:

In all cases this material has been filmed in the best possible way from the available copy. Problems encountered with this document have been identified here with a check mark  $\sqrt{\phantom{a}}$ .

| 1.  | Glossy photographs or pages  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|-----|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| 2.  | Colored illustrations, paper or print  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3.  | Photographs with dark background   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4.  | Illustrations are poor copy  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5.  | Pages with black marks, not original copy  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6.  | Print shows through as there is text on both sides of page                       |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7.  | Indistinct, broken or small print on several pages                               |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8.  | Print exceeds margin requirements  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 9.  | Tightly bound copy with print lost in spine                                      |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10. | Computer printout pages with indistinct print                                    |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 11. | Page(s) lacking when material received, and not available from school or author. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 12. | Page(s) seem to be missing in numbering only as text follows.                    |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 13. | Two pages numbered Text follows.   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 14. | Curling and wrinkled pages   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15. | Other  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

University
Microfilms
International

## CROSS-REACTIVITY BETWEEN MAJOR HISTOCCMPATIBILITY CCEPIEX ANTIGEN AND BOUS SARCOMA VIRUS-INDUCED TUMOR ANTIGEN IN CHICKENS

ΕY

ERIC W. HEINZELMANN

B. A., Colby College, 1977

#### A DISSERTATION

Submitted to the University of New Hampshire
in Partial Fulfillment of
the Requirements for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy
in
Genetics (Animal Sciences)

December, 1980

This dissertation has been examined and approved.

| W. W. Collins   |
|---|
| Dissertation director, Walter M. Collins, Professor of Animal sciences and Genetics |
| Askert M. Rugios  |
| Potert M. 2sigray, Associate Professor of Microbiology and Genetics                 |
| W. Robert Dunlap  |
| W. Rotert Dunlop, Professor of Arimal Sciences                                      |
| Sumas Distrile  |
| Thomas G. Pistcle, Associate Professor of Microbiology                              |
| Richard & Strong  |
| Richard G. Strout, Professor of Arimal Sciences                                     |
| Willard E. Woban  |
| Willard E. Urban, Associate Frofessor of Eicmetrics and Genetics                    |
| October 25, 1980  |
| Date  |

#### AWKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Special thanks to my wife Kathy for being supportive and patient during my graduate career. Thanks, to the following: Walter Collins and Robert Zsigray for their assistance in directing my research and for putting up with me; Robert Durlop, Thomas Fistole, Bichard Strout, and Willard Urhan for serving on my dissertation committee; and Kathy Clark, David Brown, and Hank Ward for aid in doing my research and for day to day entertainment.

#### TABLE OF CONTENTS

| ACK<br>LIST<br>ABS |      | 7    | AE     | L    | ES   | •             |              |     | • • | •  | • • |      | •   |    | • • |      |       |     |     |        |     | •   |     | • • |     |     |     |     | 1     | ٧ |
|--------------------|------|------|--------|------|------|---------------|--------------|-----|-----|----|-----|------|-----|----|-----|------|-------|-----|-----|--------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-------|---|
| Chapte             | er   |      |        |      |      |               |              |     |     |    |     |      |     |    |     |      |       |     |     |        |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |       |   |
| INI                | EODU | CI   | IC     | N    | •    |               | • • •        | -   | • • | -  | • • | ••   | • • |    | • • | • •  |       | •   | • • | • •    | • • | •   |     | •   | • • | •   |     |     |       | 1 |
| I. i               |      |      |        |      |      |               |              |     |     |    |     |      |     |    |     |      |       |     |     |        |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |       | 4 |
|                    | KO U |      |        |      |      |               |              |     |     |    |     |      |     |    |     |      |       |     |     |        |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |       | 4 |
|                    | HOS  |      |        |      |      |               |              |     |     |    |     |      |     |    |     |      |       |     |     |        |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |       | 5 |
|                    | IMM  |      |        |      |      |               |              |     |     |    |     |      |     |    |     |      |       |     |     |        |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     | (     | _ |
|                    | THE  |      | A.     | C    | F    | HIS           | T            | CC  | C   | !P | AT  | IE   | IJ  | LI | T3  | 7    | CC    | M   | ΡI  | E      | X   | -   |     | •   |     | -   |     |     | 1     | 1 |
|                    | MHC  | : 1  | ES     | r    | RI   | CT:           | C            | N   |     |    |     |      | -   |    |     |      |       |     |     |        |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     | 11    | 3 |
|                    | ALI  | EN   | l E    | II.  | ST   | CCC           | M            | P A | T I | ΙB | IL  | T    | Y   | A  | NO  | ΓI   | GE    | ١N. | S   | 0      | N   | T   | JM  | OI  | 3   | C   | FL  | LS  | 21    | 0 |
|                    |      |      |        |      |      |               |              |     |     |    |     |      |     |    |     |      |       |     |     |        |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |       |   |
| II.                | MAT  | E    | IA     | L    | S.   | ANI           | )            | ΜE  | T E | 0  | DS  |      |     |    |     |      |       |     | • • |        |     |     |     |     |     |     |     | ••  | 25    | 3 |
|                    | ANI  |      |        |      |      |               |              |     |     |    |     |      |     |    |     |      |       |     |     |        |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |       |   |
|                    | CEL  |      |        |      |      |               |              |     |     |    |     |      |     |    |     |      |       |     |     |        |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     | 2     |   |
|                    | BLC  |      |        |      |      |               |              |     |     |    |     |      |     |    |     |      |       |     |     |        |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     | 2     |   |
|                    | IES  |      |        |      |      |               |              |     |     |    |     |      |     |    |     |      |       |     |     |        |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     | 3(    |   |
|                    | MEA  | cn   | E      | : 14 | E XI | ייד<br>זייד   | 4 E.A        |     | E 1 |    | т - | 77.0 | •   | Ľ  | ^ 4 | . T  | <br>7 |     | •   | <br>TV | TT  | v   | ••, | CI  | , e | •   | • • |     | 32    |   |
|                    | ALL  |      |        |      |      |               |              |     |     |    |     |      |     |    |     |      |       |     |     |        |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     | 3:    |   |
|                    | ABS  |      |        |      |      |               |              |     |     |    |     |      |     |    |     |      |       |     |     |        |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     | 3.    | _ |
|                    |      |      |        |      |      |               |              |     |     |    |     |      |     |    |     |      |       |     |     |        |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |       |   |
|                    | AGG  |      |        |      |      |               |              |     |     |    |     |      |     |    |     |      |       |     |     |        |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |       |   |
|                    | FLU  |      |        |      |      |               |              |     |     |    |     |      |     |    |     |      |       |     |     |        |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     | 34    |   |
|                    | CYT  |      |        |      |      |               |              |     |     |    |     |      |     |    |     |      |       |     |     |        |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     | 3     | _ |
|                    | VIR  |      |        |      |      |               |              |     |     |    |     |      |     |    |     |      |       |     |     |        |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     | 3€    |   |
|                    | IUE  | CE   | M      | E    | ASI  | U R I         | E M I        | ΕN  | TS  |    |     | ••   | • • |    |     |      |       | • • |     |        |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |       |   |
|                    | STA  | II   | SI     | I    | CA   | L A           | N A          | L   | Y S | Ξ  | S   |      | • • |    |     |      |       |     |     | •      |     | • • |     | • • |     | • • | • • |     | 38    | 3 |
|                    |      |      |        |      |      |               |              |     |     |    |     |      |     |    |     |      |       |     |     |        |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |       |   |
| III.               |      |      |        |      |      |               |              |     |     |    |     |      |     |    |     |      |       |     |     |        |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     | 4.    | ţ |
|                    | PAR  | TI   | AL     | . '  | IC   | LEI           | A:           | I C | E   | E. | ΧP  | ER   | I   | ΞE | NI  | S    | -     |     |     |        |     |     |     |     | •   | • • |     |     | 4 '   | ١ |
|                    | CYT  | CT   | 07     | I    | CI'  | ΤY            | A            | I V | 2   | L  | LC  | AN   | T.  | IS | E   | i A  | E     | X   | P 1 | ER     | IM  | E   | ľ   | S   |     |     |     |     | 45    | 3 |
|                    | IMM  |      |        |      |      |               |              |     |     |    |     |      |     |    |     |      |       |     |     |        |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     | 5.5   | 5 |
|                    |      |      |        |      |      |               |              |     |     |    |     |      |     |    |     |      |       |     |     |        |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |       |   |
| IV.                | DIS  | CU   | SS     | I    | C N  |               |              |     |     |    | _   |      |     |    |     | _    |       |     | _   |        |     |     |     | _   |     |     |     |     | 63    | } |
| _ , ,              | PAR  |      |        |      |      |               |              |     |     |    |     |      |     |    |     |      |       |     |     |        |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     | 63    |   |
|                    | CYT  |      |        |      |      |               |              |     |     |    |     |      |     |    |     |      |       |     |     |        |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     | 67    |   |
|                    | IMM  |      |        |      |      |               |              |     |     |    |     |      |     |    |     |      |       |     |     |        |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     | 7     |   |
|                    |      |      |        |      |      |               |              |     |     |    |     |      |     |    |     |      |       |     |     |        |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |       |   |
|                    | GEN  |      |        |      |      |               |              |     |     |    |     |      |     |    |     |      |       |     |     |        |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     | 72    |   |
|                    | QUE  | 51   | TC     | . IX | 2    | KAJ           | . 51         | L   | =   | ĭ  | 1   | ijŢ  | ٤   | р  | E S | . בב | ΑЯ    | U   | 1   | •      |     | • • | •   |     | -   | • • | •   | • • | 74    | þ |
| ,                  | ाणस  | E 7  | יז יח. | Ξ.   | E 4  | ~ <b>T</b> II | 1 <b>E</b> 1 | ,   |     |    |     |      |     |    |     |      |       |     |     |        |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     | 78    | , |
|                    | r.   | B /4 |        |      | ,-   |               | r 1          |     |     |    |     |      |     | _  |     |      |       |     |     | _      |     | _   | -   |     | _   |     |     |     | , , , | 1 |

#### LIST OF TABLES

| 1.         | Skin graft results from (6-1 X 15-1) <u>B2B2</u> graft recipients receiving an incculum containing 106 viable WBC, REC, or lysed WBC from (6-1 X 15-1) <u>B5B5</u> chickens   | e<br>43 |
|------------|---|---------|
| 2.         | Mean TFI of (6-1 % 15-1) <u>E2E2</u> recipients with inocula containing various types and numbers of cells  |         |
| 3.         | Graft vs. host response to inoculations of 106 WBC or RBC from (6-1 X 15-1) <u>B535</u> or <u>E2E2</u> donors into (6-1 X 15-1) <u>B2B2</u> chickens  | 47      |
| 4_         | Mean cytotoxicity for lymphocytes from (6-1 X 15-1)F5 <u>P2B2</u> chickens with and without RSV-1induced tumors tested against each of the five target CEF types  | 50      |
| 5 🕳        | RBC agglutination titers of alloantisera absorbed with CEF  | 52      |
| ó <b>.</b> | Fluorescent antibody test of serum from (6-1 X 15-1)F5 <u>B2B2</u> chickers with RSV-1induced tumors for IqG against (6-1 X 15-1)F5 <u>B5B5</u> cells   | 54      |
| 7.         | Mean antiserum titers and TFI's cf (6-1 X 15-1)F5 <u>B2B2</u> chickens immunized subcutaneously at 21 days of age with (6-1 X 15-1)F4 <u>E5B5</u> cells followed by RSV-1inoculation at 42 days of age                  | 57      |
| 8.         | Mean antiserum titers and TPI's of (6-1 X 15-1)F5 <u>B2B2</u> chickens immunized intraperitoneally at 21 and 28 days of age with various types of (6-1 X 15-1)F4  cells followed by RSV-1—inoculation at 42 days of age | 59      |
| 9.         | Mean antiserum titers and TFI's of (6-1 X 15-1)F5  B2B2 chickens immurized intravenously at 28 and 41 days of age with various types of cells followed by  RSV-1incculation at 42 days of age                           | 61      |

#### ABSTRACT

## CROSS-REACTIVITY BETWEEN MAJOR HISTOCOMEATIBILITY COMPLEX ANTIGEN AND ROUS SARCOMA VIRUS-INDUCED TUMOR ANTIGEN IN CHICKENS

ty

Eric W. Heinzelmann
University of New Hampshire, December, 1980

Cross-reactivity between major histocompatibility complex (MHC) antique and Rous sarcoma virus (RSV)-induced tumor associated antique (TAA) in chickens was investigated. The B erythrocyte all cantiquen locus was the genetic marker for the AHC. B2B2 and B5B5 chickens from crosses of highly inbred lines 6-1 and 15-1 and B24B24 chickens from noninbred line UNH 105 were used.

B2B2 chickens rendered partially tolerant to E5 antigen through multiple intraperitoreal inoculations of either viable or lysed white blood cells (WBC) or viable red blood cells (REC) from E5E5 chickens had a significantly higher incidence of tumor progression than untreated, phosphate buffered saline treated, or E2E2 WBC inoculated B2B2 chickens. The criteria of tolerance were absence of antibody to the cell type inoculated and acceptance of skin allografts from B5B5 donors by E2E2 chickens. The higher incidence of tumor progression did not result from a

ncn-specific effect of graft versus host activity (GVH) because GVH activity was present only in chickens inoculated with <u>B5B5</u> viable WBC. E5 antigen-TAA cross-reactivity was indicated because <u>B2B2</u> chickens partially tolerant to B5 antigen were also tolerant to RSV-induced tumor, as shown by an increased incidence of tumor progression. Since WBC and REC share B-F antigens, and both were involved in producing the partial tolerance, the <u>F-F</u> region of the MHC was implicated in the cross-reactivity.

Cross-reactivity was also observed when lymphocytes from <u>B2B2</u> chickens bearing ESV-induced tumors lysed in <u>vitro</u> targets of <u>E2B2</u> and <u>B5B5</u> RSV-infected chicker embryo fibroblasts (CEF) and <u>B5B5</u> normal CEF, but did not lyse <u>B2B2</u> and <u>B24B24</u> normal CEF. Lymphocytes from normal <u>B2B2</u> chickens did not lyse any of the five types of CFF targets. Cross-reactivity was observed yet again when absorption with <u>B2B2</u> ESV-infected CEF significantly lowered the titer of <u>B2B2</u> anti-<u>E5E5</u> alloantisera. Alloantisera absorption studies also showed that both RSV-infected and uninfected CFF shared alloantigens, in particular B-F alloantigens, with syngeneic RBC's further supporting the idea that B-F antigen is involved in the cross-reactivity.

Cross-reactivity was not observed in the IgG from chickens tearing RSV-induced tumors. Moreover, use of three techniques of immunization of <u>E2B2</u> chickens with <u>E5B5</u> cells did not increase the incidence of tumor regression in the immunized chickens, and provided no evidence of

cross-reactivity. Although humoral immunity was observed in these two studies, cell-mediated immunity may be relatively more important in tumor regression and the focus of cross-reactivity.

Based upon these findings it is hypothesized that <u>B5B5</u> BSV-induced tumor hearing hosts respond poorly to tumor partially recause B5 antigen cross-reacts with TAA. <u>B5B5</u> individuals, therefore, may have difficulty recognizing RSV-induced tumor as foreign and this severely limits the development of an effective anti-tumor immunity. Fither TAA or a TAA-E2 antigen complex may cross-react with E5 antigen. Cross-reactivity involving cell-mediated immunity may make the difference between tumor regression and progression.

#### INTRODUCTION

The major histocompatibility complex (MHC) is a tightly linked group of cenes which in general code for cell surface antiques (Klein 1975). When the MHC was defined in the mcuse, first as a blocd group locus and later as a locus controlling tissue graft rejection (Gorer et al. 1948) the MHC's role in immunclogy was not yet imagined. With the discovery of the profound controlling effect that MHC genes have on issues responses the MHC took a much larger role in immunological thought (Eenacerraf and Katz 1975). light was shed on MHC furction when a series of experiments starting with Zinkernagel and Toherty (1974) showed that cytotoxic T cells lysed only target cells which bore the same foreign artigen and MHC antigen as the immunizing cells. This phenomenon was termed MHC restriction. Furthermore, it was found that immune cell cooperation required MHC homology (Eenacerraf and Katz 1975). It has recently beer suggested that MHC restriction is at the heart of all major MHC functions including those of immune response genes (Wettstein and Frelinger 1980).

In humans MHC harlotypes have been associated with several disease states including acute leukemia, Hodgkins disease, and trophoblastic tumors (Bodmer 1978). Immunity to tumors has been shown in many cases to be mediated by

tumor-associated anticen which elicits and acts as a target for, an immune response which leads to tumor destruction (Each 1974). In chickers all members of the Avian tumor virus group induce tumors which share common antiquence determinants (Hall et al. 1979). Furthermore, the MHC has a major influence on the fate of Rous sarcoma virus (RSV)-induced tumors in chickens (Collins et al. 1977, Schierman et al. 1977). Therefore, the chicker, through the use of RSV-induced tumors, provides an excellent model system for investigating how MHC genetics and tumor antigens interact to contribute to the immune response toward tumors.

Different types of experimental tumors in mice express anticens which cross-react with allogeneic MHC antigens and these determinants are suitable targets, for in vivo anti-tumor immunity (Parmiani et al. 1979). Since immune responses may be modulated by histocompatibility antigen-foreign antigen interactions on the cell surface and since some tumors exhibit allogeneic MHC antigens, certain tumors may survive in hosts with particular MHC haplotypes.

In this thesis I have endeavored to study, in a well defined genetic system, how cell surface antigens may interact to produce anti-tumor immune reactions. Based upon this research I hypothesize that particular MEC defined chickens which normally have progressively growing RSV-induced tumors until death, do so in part because host MEC antigen cross-reacts with tumor associated antigen. As a result of this cross-reactivity recognition of the tumor

as foreign by the host is severely limited and a weak immune response is elicited toward the tumor. My objective was to search for cross-reactivity and investigate antigen phenomena using three general approaches: a) to generate tolerance in chickens toward MHC antigen from chickens genetically predisposed to tumor progression and investigate the response of tolerant chickens to RSV-induced tumors; b) to detect cross-reactivity through the use of antisera and cytotoxic lymphocytes; c) to immunize animals with MHC antigen from chickens genetically predisposed toward tumor progression and investigate the response of the immune chickens to RSV-induced tumors.

Cross-reactivity of the type referred to here may be the reason tumors survive in many hosts. If the mechanism can be understood the extent of the phenomonon may be evaluated and a therapeutic approach developed.

#### CHAPTER I

#### REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

#### RCUS SARCOMA VIRUS (RSV)

Rous (1911) first isolated an aviar sarcoma virus from chickens and demonstrated viral eticlogy for reoplastic disease. Rous sarcoma virts (RSV) was designated a type C RNA tumor virts (Bernhard 1960) and found to contain at least three genes coding for components of the virion gene ccded (Hanafusa 1975). The for four gaq monoglycosylated internal structural proteins, pol coded for RNA-dependent INA polymerase, and env was the gere for the ervelope glycoproteins (Vogt and Hu 1977). A fourth gene, src, which coded for a phosphoprotein with protein kinase activity, was required for the initiation and maintenance of oncogenic transformation (Brugge and Erikson 1977).

Bryan and Harris strains of RSV were found to be defective in the synthesis of glycoprotein gp85 and were dependent on helper virus for the formation of infectious virus (Scheele and Hanafusa 1971). Schmidt-Ruppin, Carr-Zilker, and Prague strains of RSV were helper independent (Hanafusa 1975).

RSV along with lymphoid leukosis virus have been classified irtc subgroups based on several criteria: a) ability to infect chicken embryo cells rearing specific resistance factors for the various subgroups; t) ability to specificially inhibit secondary infection of infected cells by a second member of the same subgroup, but not by viruses of other subgroups; c) susceptibility to neutralization by antiviral serum against any member of that subgroup, but not by antiserum against members of other subgroups (Wainberg and Phillips 1976). In addition to envelope subgroup specific antigen, RSV was found to contain group specific antiquens questionally thought to be an internal component of all avian leukosis virus and not involved in virus neutralization (Wainberg and Phillips 1976).

#### HOST RESISTANCE IC RSV INFECTION

Inherited resistance to infection with specific subgroups of RSV was referred to as a first line of host defense and this resistance appeared to be effective whether the chickens were exposed to high or low doses of virus (Crittenden et al. 1967, Payne and Biggs 1970). The resistance was a block to the early stages of virus infection (Piraino 1967, Crittenden 1968). Other host genes may affect the efficiency of later steps in the viral replication cycle or the efficiency of transformation by the virus (Crittenden et al. 1972). Evidence that the host

cell may affect the nature of the viral processy has been given by Hanafusa et al. (1970).

#### IMMUNITY TO BSV-INTUCED TUMORS

Crittenden et al. (1972) referred to genetic resistance as a second line of defense. Infection was required to initiate this defense mechanism and resistance at this level was characteristic of the intact host. Host age at the time of RSV incoulation affected the regression of Rous sarcomas in chickens, with younger individuals having lower frequencies of regression (Duran-Reynals et al. 1953, Cotter et al. 1973). Strength of RSV incoulum also affects tumor regression (Gyles et al. 1967, Radzichovskaja et al. 1968).

#### Tumor Associated Surface Antiques

Tumor associated antique (TAA) has been presumed both to elicit, and to act as a target for, an innure response which leads to tumor destruction (Bach 1974). The second line of defense referred to above may involve the immune response toward transformation antigens on Rous sarcoma cells. Up to four different kinds of antigens were reported to be expressed on FSV-transformed cells (Hayni et al. 1977, Bauer et al. 1977a, Bauer et al. 1977b, Igniatovic et al. 1978): a) a subgroup-specific determinant of the virus-envelope glycoprotein gp85 expressed on the surface of

productively infected, transformed as well as untransformed cells; i) a group-specific determinant of gp85 expressed cally on the surface of virus transformed cells; c) embryonic artigens, detectable on virus and chemically transformed and on primary normal embryonic cells and; d) a RSV-induced tumor specific surface antigen, not a structural constituent of the virus, and induced in vivo by all members of the Avian tumor virus group.

#### Mechanisms of Immunity to RSV-Induced Tumors

Hall et al. (1979) have restulated that determinants of the virus ervelope antigen were more important than TSSA in provoking relevant immune responses in chickens with BSV-induced tumors; ISSA may be of greater importance when in conjunction with these VEA determinants.

Chickens rearring avian virus-induced tumors exhibited cell mediated immune responsiveness toward antigens associated with those neoplasms (Wainberg et al. 1979). Thymectomy, but not bursectomy, was stimulatory to tumor growth and abolished sensitized lymphocyte immune responsiveness suggesting that thymus mediated effector mechanisms and not artibody was involved in the immune response to RSV-induced tumors (Cotter et al. 1975, Wainberg et al. 1979). Leukocyte migration inhibition studies (Cotter et al. 1976) and lymphocytotoxicity studies (McGrail et al. 1978) in chickens bearing regressing Rous sarcomas suggested that the thymus dependent cells become

sensitized to and subsequently effect the destruction of tumor cells. Hematological studies suggested that lymphocytes may have a primary role in the immune response toward RSV-induced tumors with heterophils acting in a secondary manner (Smith et al. 1974). Serum blocking and unblocking factors in cell mediated immunity may contribute to tumor development (McGrail 1977)

#### Genetics of Innunity to RSV-Induced Tumors

A general heritable nature of regression of Rous sarcomas has been shown by Greenwood et al. (1948), Gyles et al. (1967), and Cotter et al. (1973). Furthermore, the incidence of tumor regression can be significantly modified by selection (Gyles et al. 1971, Carte et al. 1972).

A more definitive analysis of the cenetics of. RSV-induced tumor regression came with the studies of Collins et al. (1977) and Schierman et al. (1977) who associated regression with the E locus, a marker for the major histoccopatibility complex (MHC) of the chicken-Ccllins et al. (1977) showed that in F2 generation segregants of a cross of inbred lines 6-1 and 15-1 (B2B2, B2B5, and B5B5), 5, 26, and 93 percent, respectively, died of RSV-induced tumors by 70 days post-virus incculation. Neither the  $\underline{\Gamma}$  nor  $\underline{\Gamma}$  all cantigen loci nor sex had any effect on timor growth. The F2 generation studies involved ten sires, approximately 85 dams, and some 690 progery in seven hatches. Schierman et al. (1977) studied RSV-induced tumor

regression in inbred lines G-B1 and G-B2 and crosses of these lines. Their experiments involving 90 progery from a single sire indicated that RSV-induced tumor regression was controlled by a dominant gene for regression linked to the MHC, designated R-Rs-1, with the allele for progressive trmor growth in homozygous chickens designated r-Es-1. difference between the results of Collins et al. (1977) and Schierman et al. (1977), a quantitative response versus a dominant gene effect, respectively, has not been explained but may be due to the use of genetically different chickens, the greater rumber of individuals used by Collins et al-(1977) and/or to Collins et al. (1977) using Eryan high titer RSV (subgroup A) and Schierman et al. (1977) using Schmidt-Rufpin RSV (subgroup B). McBride et al. found that different RSV strains, of identical subgroup specificities, gave significantly different tumor growth patterns in the same intred line of chickens. This result may be due to the existence of fundamentally different tumor antigens from those previously described and indicates a profound influence of virus strain on the fate of RSV-induced tumors. Chickens with different MHC genotypes may respond differently to certain virus-induced tumor antigens.

Recent studies have also indicated that the <u>F</u> complex has a profound effect or RSV-induced tumor regression even ir noninbred chickens (Collins et al. 1979). Line UNH 105 was a noninbred line of New Hampshires recently derived from

a commercial line. The lowest level of regression was associated with the <u>B24</u> allele, the highest with <u>B26</u>, and <u>B23</u> gave an intermediate response. More recient studies have shown that the <u>B23B26</u> genotype gave a significantly higher incidence of RSV-induced tumor regression than <u>B23B23</u> and <u>B26B26</u> as well as the other three possible cenotypes. This provides evidence of heterosis or genetic complementation of the genes controlling tumor regression (Erown et al. unpublished).

Genes not linked to the MHC may be involved in REV-induced tumor regression. Crosses of lines 6-3 and 100 gave procesy segregating at the C, I, E, 1, and all cantigen loci (Collins unpublished). L genotype was significantly associated with the incidence of tumor regression in females, but not in males. Loci C, D, E, and I had no detectable influence on the incidence of tumor regression. The L locus was not linked to B (Briles 1964). Marks et al. (1979) using lines 6-1, 6-3, and 7-2 and F1, F2, and reciprocal tackcross progenies of these lines, irdicated that a locus (or loci) other than B or L has a rcle in RSV-induced tumor regression. Alternatively, they suggested that the issure response region of the MHC differs in lines 6 and 7 ever though the serclogical and/or graft vs. host regions have not been shown to differ. Lines 6-1, 6-3, and 7-2 were homozygous for serologically defined shared blocd group alleles  $\underline{B2}$ ,  $\underline{C5}$ ,  $\underline{L1}$ , and  $\underline{r}$ . The findings of Marks et al. (1979) were supported by those of Collins

et al. (1980) where lines 100, 7-2, 6-3, and 6-1, all homozygous E2, differed significantly in the incidence of RSV-induced tumor regression with 6.5, 45.5, 68.9, and 91.8 percent, respectively, regressed tumors.

Three recent studies shed additional light on genetics of tumor regression. Collins and Briles (1980) utilized B complex recombinants and have evidence that the <u>R-F</u> region of the MHC was involved in RSV-induced tumor regression. Watanabe et al. (1980) have shown that the F1 cross of intred lines G-B1 and G-B3, each of which normally has progressive tumors, now regresses tumors. Backcross data indicated that the B complex and a gene not linked to Bwere responsible for the gene complementation. Finally, Collins and Gilmour (unpublished) have shown that Th-1 and Ly-4 genotypes affected tumor regression in the F4 qeneration of line 6-3 crossed to line 7-2. Th-1 and Ly-4 are not linked to each other or to the MHC.

#### TEE MAJOR HISTCCOMPATIBILITY COMPLEX

The major histocompatibility complex (MHC) has been found in all mammals studied and in the chicken but is best characterized in the morse (Paul and Benacerraf 1977).

#### Mcuse

The MHC has been found to be a group of tightly linked genes first discovered in the mouse as a blood group locus and a factor in skin graft survival and designated H-2 (Gorer et al. 1948). The H-2 complex codes for cell surface antigens which differ between individuals and are recognized in graft rejection (Klein 1979). The complex is also involved in a variety of immunclogical pheromena. MHC is located in the middle of chromosome 17, sharing the chromosome with the I, t group of loci which may be a functional unit similar to H-2 but involved ir embryonic differentiation (Klein 1979). The current H-2 mar has been divided into six regions (K, I, S, G, D, and T) with the I region divided into five subregions (A, E, J, E, and C) (Klein 1979). A non-conservative map includes at least 18 lcci in the regions with a distance of 1.5 cM between the extremes of the complex (Klein 1979).

designated arbitrarily by Roman numerals I through III. Class I loci (H-2K and H-2D) code for membrane bound glycoproteins 44,000 mw which are noncovalently associated in the membrane with a 12,000 mw polypeptide designated B2-microglobulin (Cunningham 1977). Class I molecules are the H-2 molecules most involved in graft rejection and can be found on most tissues of the body (Klein 1979).

Class II cenes, located in the I region, are of types, I region associated (Ia) and innune response (Ir) genes (Klein 1979). Two Ia genes have been well defined, one in the A subregion and the other in the E/C subregions (Cullen et al. 1976). Ia genes code for membrane bound qlycoproteins consisting of two noncovalently associated rclyreptide chains ≪ (35,000 mw) and B (28,000 mw) and an urknown number of carlohydrate chains (Cullen et al 1976). In antiques have been detected primarily on T and B lymphocytes and macrophages (Delovitch and McDevitt 1975, Press et al. 1976, Schwartz et al. 1977) and have been shown to be important for the successful collaboration among immunocompetent cells (Pierce et al. 1976, Uhr et al. 1979) -Ia antigens may be the products of Ir genes (Uhr et al 1979).

H-2 linked Ir genes (mapped to the A, E, C, or E subregions) and immune suppressor (Is) genes (marred to the J subregion) were first characterized as dominant genes expressed on innuncompetent T and B cells leading to high cr low immune responses to various classes of antigen ranging from synthetic polypeptides to foreign antigens (Eenacerraf and Katz 1975). Cf particular interest was that stsceptibility to Gross leukemia virus enceqeresis was influenced by an H-2 linked gene (Rqv-1)(Lilly 1966, 1968). For certain antigens two Tennent and Snell complementing MHC linked Ir genes were required responsiveness (Benacerraf and Dorf 1976). I-region linked

complementing lcci may be involved in resistance to murine leukemia (Lonai et al. 1980). The & and E genes of Ia antiques may be the complementing genes and a gene dose effect may be responsible for differential immune responses in certain cases (Dorf et al. 1979). Most studies of Ir shown dominant inheritance cf genes ha ve high restonsiveness: however, in the H-2 controlled immune response to INF-MSA (Rathbun and Hildeman 1969) and to mouse liver F antigen (Silver and Lane 1977) high restonsiveness cculd be inherited as a recessive trait. Wicker et al. (1980) have shown that the dominance-recessive pattern of Ir genes can change as the genetic background of the H-2 haplotype varies. Berzofsky et al. (1979) have shown that genes mapping in different I subregions independently regulated antibody and T cell proliferative responses to chemically discrete regions of the same protein antigen, Sperm Whale mycglobin.

Class III genes, located in the S region, have been found to code for serum proteins Ss and Slp, both 200,000 mw and consisting of three occulently linked polypeptide chains (Shreffler 1976). These molecules were found to be the C4 component of the classical complement pathway. Moreover, Dasilva et al. (1978) have associated the C3 component of the classical complement pathway with the H-2 component of

The G region codes for the agreemence of an antigen on erythrocytes (Klein 1979).

It is interesting to note that the H-2 complex genes exhibit a very high degree of genetic polymorphism compared to other mouse genes (Klein 1979). The relationship of the polymorphism to function is unknown. Also, certain H-2 haplotypes have been found to be more frequently associated with other genes on chromosome 17 than would be expected on the basis of gene frequencies and the frequency of recombination between genes; this has been referred to as linkage disequilibrum (Hammerberg and Klein 1975).

#### Human

The MHC in man (HIA complex) has been found to be very similar to that of the mouse (Albert and Gotze 1977). Class I genes are in the A, B, and C regions, class II genes in the D and Dr regions and class III genes map between the B and D regions. Strong linkage disequilibrium has been observed within the HIA complex (Albert and Gotze 1977). HIA has been associated with many disease states in man including, rheumatoid arthritis, multiple sclerosis and acute leukaemia (Fodmer 1978). HIA is most closely associated with the disease ankylosing spondylitis where 90 percent of the diseased individuals carry the B27 HIA allele compared to seven percent of healthy individuals (Ivanyi 1980).

#### Chicken

The structure of the MHC (E complex) in the chicken has not been as well established as that of the mouse or man. The B blood group system was discovered by Briles et al. (1950) and shown to be a marker for the MHC by Schierman and Nordskog (1961). The E complex has been located or one of the medium sized microchronosomes (15-18) (Bloom and Cole 1978) and there has been evidence for recombination of genes within the chicken MHC (Schierman and McBride 1969, Hala et al. 1976, Briles and Briles 1977, Hala et al. 1977, Pink et al. 1977, Schierman et al. 1977, and Pevzner et al. 1978).

Hala et al. (1977) proposed that the B complex be divided into at least three regions: B-F, E-I, and B-G. The E-F and E-I regions coded for surface antiqens on white thood cells (WBC) and the E-F and B-G regions for surface antiques on red blood cells (EBC). The B-F gene products were associated with B2-micrcglcbulin--like molecules making the E-F antiqens similar to K and D molecules in mice (Ziegler and Fink 1978). B-F antigens on RBC were 20% as numerous as these found on WBC (Ziegler and Pink 1978). E-L region antigens appeared to be identical to Ia antigens in the mouse (Ziegler and Fink 1976, Hala et al. 1977, Ewert and Cooper 1978, and Ewert et al. 1980). E-F and E-L region antigens were involved in histocompatibility reactions, but the E-G region appeared to have no effect on these reactions (Hala et al. 1976, Hala et al. 1977, Pink

et al. 1977, and Simonsen et al. 1977). Immunological telerance to WBC surface antigens, but not REC surface antigens, mediated allogeneic skin graft acceptance (Eillingham et al. 1956, Schierman and Nordskog 1964).

Serum hemolytic complement level has been found to be controlled by a dominant gene associated with the <u>B</u> complex (Chanh et al. 1976).

Pevzner et al. (1978) showed recombination between genes coding for innune response and the serologically defined regions of the B complex. Antibody response of chickens to (I,G)-A-I (Gunther <u>et al</u>. 1974), GAT10 and GA (Fenedict et al. 1975) and DNF (Ealcardva et al. 1974) was associated with certain B harlotypes, suggesting possible close linkage with immune response genes. Control of immune responsiveness to Salmonella pullorum, (Pevzner et al. 1978), spentaneous autoimmune thyroiditis (Eacen et al. 1974, Wick et al. 1974), and erythroflastosis (Bacch et al. 1979) was linked to the MHC of the chicken. Susceptibility tc Marek's disease, which has a Herpes virus as an eticlogical agent, was litked to the MHC (Hanson et al. 1967, Brewer et al. 1969, Pazderka et al. 1975). The B complex has a profound effect on the fate of RSV-induced (discussed previously) (Collins et al. tumors Schierman et al. 1977). Gebriel et al. (1979) has shown genetic linkage between the immune response to GAT and the fate of RSV-induced tumors in a particular subpopulation of S1 inbred leghorns.

Recently, Simonsen et al. (1980) suggested that linkage disequilibrium of E-F and E-G genes in outbred chicken populations may be relatively stronger than linkage disequilibrium in man.

#### MHC RESIDICTION

Studies in the mouse have given the strongest clue to the function of the MEC; that of H-2 restriction or associative recognition of antigens (Klein 1979). Cytotoxic I cells primed to virus-infected cells (Zinkernagel and Echerty 1974), hapten-modified cells (Shearer et al. or minor histcompatibility antigens (Bevan 1975) were capable of lysing only target cells which hore the same foreign antiqen and MHC antiqer as the immunizing cells. The proliferative response of T cells to antigen presented on the macrophage surface required histocompatibility at the H-2I region of the two cell types (Shevach and Rosenthal 1973). Also, cooperation between helper I cells and B cells exhibited H-2 restriction (Katz and Benacerraf 1975). series of experiments 2inkernagel et al. (1977, demonstrated that the thymus epithelium dictated the H-2 context of artigen recognition by lymphocytes. chicken, cytctcxic splerocytes primed against FSV-induced trmors showed significantly greater killing of autochthonous RSV-induced tuncr cell targets than of allogeneic ESV-induced tumor cell targets (Wainberg et al.

Trivanen and Trivanen (1977) have shown that an interaction of histocompatible or semi-allogeneic B and T cells was necessary for the formation of germinal centers in chickens.

To explain H-2 restriction two general types hypotheses have been proposed; dual recognition and altered self hypotheses (Doherty 1976). The dual recognition hypothesis states that T cells exhibit two separate receptors on their surfaces, one with specificity for H-2 antigen and the other with specificity for non--H-2 antiquens. The altered self hypothesis suggests that T cells tear a single receptor capable of recognizing antigens in association with H-2. Hale (1980) showed that a close spatial relationship exists between a serologically defined portion of the G protein of Vesicular stomatitis virus (VSV), the H-2K(k) mclecules and those antigens (virus and cell specific) recognized by anti-VSV cytctoxic Ί lymphocytes, suggesting that MHC antigens and foreign antigens closely associate on the cell surface.

It has been postulated that Ia molecules, through the phenomenon of associative recognition, regulate the interaction of I cells with macrophages and B cells and lead to Ir gene responses (Benacerraf and Germain 1978). If I and H-2K/D artigens perform similar functions (i.e. associative recognition) then Ir genes which regulate specifically the ability of cells to present artigens to anticen-specific I cells should map to both I and K/C regions (Wettstein and Frelinger 1980). Wettstein and

Frelinger (1980) showed that H-2K/D region genes specifically regulate the immunogenicity of a panel of non-H-2 histocompatibility antiques. This study suggested that the MEC linked immune response phenomenon was due to an associative recognition, perhaps, because different foreign antiques having variable affinities for particular MHC antiques.

#### ALIEN HISTOCOMPATIBILITY ANTIGENS ON TUMOR CELLS

#### <u>Transplantation Studies</u>

Immunity to DEA/2 (H-2(d)) or C3Hf (H-2(k)), but not to AKE (H-2(k)) tissue induced a resistance against the challenge of the syngeneic ST2 sarcoma in BALB/c (H-2(d)) mice (Invernizzi and Parmiani 1975, Farmiani and Invernizzi 1975, Invernizzi et al. 1977b). The inmunity was resistant to 400R and could be passively transferred by lymphoid cells to syngeneic mice. Martin et al. (1976, 1977) found that immunization of C3Hf, but not (C3Hf X A) F1 mice with normal E10. A or A tissues induced transplantation innunity to subsequent challerges of C3Hf lung tumors expressing H-2(a)-like determinants. The extra-H-2 antiques on the tumors were marred into the K region of H-2(a) which seems to be different than the K region of C3Hf mice (Gipson et al. 1978, Martin et al. 1976). The transplantation studies indicated that different types of experimental tumors may express antiqens cross-reacting with allogeneic

H-2 antiques and that these determinants were suitable tarqets for an efficient in vivo anti-tumor immunity (Parmiani et al. 1979).

#### <u>Serclogical Studies</u>

Using the C-1 fibrosarcoma of FALB/c strair (H-2(d)) Meschini et al. (1977), Irvernizzi et al. (1977a), and Carrone et al. (1978) showed with antisera absorption studies that the tunor contained the H-2(k) alier antigen. Operationally monospecific anti--H-2 alloantiserum contained complement-dependent cytotoxic activity to apparently H-2 unrelated murine leukemia targets (Garrido et al. 1976, 1977). Roman and Borivida (1979) showed that SJI (H-2(s)) reticulum cell sarcomas expressed extra--H-2(d) and H-2(b) artiques detectable by complement dependent cytotoxicity of anti-H-2 alloantisera on tumor cells; this activity could be absorbed by normal H-2(d) and E-2(h) cells. Fellegring et al. (1976) showed the presence of extra HLA antigens on SV40 transformed human fibrochlasts.

#### Cytotoxic Lymphocyte Studies

Parmiani et al. (1979) showed that cell mediated lympholysis defined determinants cross-reacting with H-2(k) existed on BALE/c sarcoma C-1, although they were less immurogenic than the H-2(d) original determinants. Normal SJL (H-2(s)) lymphocytes sensitized in vitro to syngeneic reticulum cell sarcomas generated effectors capable of

lysing not only syndeneic SJL tumors but also H-2(d) or H-2(b) alloqueic lymphoblasts induced by concanavalin A stimulation or neoplastic cells (Foman and Bonavida 1979). Ecreover, SJI lymphocytes sensitized to H-2(b) or H-2(d) cells efficiently lysed neoplastic SJL cells in vitro-Russell et al. (1979) showed in EALB/c mice that cytotoxic I lymphocytes to the EALB/c myeloma tumor MOPC-167 caused essentially no lysis of eight other BALB/c tumors, including three myeloma tumors, but extensively lysed six cut of nine tumors of DEA/2 mice. Their observations suggested that MCFC-167 expressed an alloantigen normally absent in BALB/c mice but present in DEA/2 mice and in many DBA/2 tumors.

Prat et al. (1978) and Robinson and Schirmacher (1979) showed that amplification of previously undetected rublic H-2 antigens on tumor cells took place on lymphomas of SJL (H-2(s)) and DEA/2 strains of mice. Therefore, shared public antigens may be the cause of some cross-reactivity.

#### Nature of Cross-Reacting Antiqens

Invernizzi and Parmiani (1975) and Parmiani and Invernizzi (1975) concluded that cross-reactivity of tumor antiques with alloqueeic MEC antiques was due to either modification of existing histocompatibility antiques or products of derepressed silent histocompatibility quees. Perry and Greene (1980) provided an alternative explanation for cross-reactivity between tumor specific transplantation

antiquens. They suggested that specificity of T cell recognition with regard to tumor antigen and alloantiquen reflects the differential associative context in which these determinants are recognized. They concluded that interaction of tumor antigen and host macrophage I-A determinants may create a complex antigenic structure which resembles anticens coded by the K or I-A subregions of the foreign H-2 haplotype, at the level of T cell recognition.

H-2-restricted cytctcxic lymphocytes specific for minor histccompatibility antiques (Beyan 1977), Sendai virus (Finberg et al. 1978), H-Y antigen (Von Boehmer et al. 1979), and Herpes simplex virus (Pfizermaier et al. 1980), selectively cross-react with allogeneic MHC determinants. Pfizenmaier et al. (1980) concluded that H-2D(k) plus Herres simplex virus antigenic determinants may evoke new determinants similar to those expressed by allelic variants of MHC products, or that cross-reactivity may be due to cross-reaction of the arti-foreign receptor on the cytotoxic I lymphocyte. Ivanyi et al. (1980) showed that in BALB/c mice syngeneic immunization with normal lymphoid cells induced alloreactive antibodies of high cytotoxic titer. They hypothesized that virus modified H-2(d) antigenic determinants had triggered alloreactive B-cell clones to produce anti--H-2 antibodies.

Simonsen (1955) showed that tolerance to chicken erythrocytes in the turkey led to increased susceptibility of the normally resistant nature turkey to RSV. Subsequent studies have revealed that human group A erythrocytes, sheep erythrocytes, and chicker tissue extracts all have the property of altering the susceptibility of turkeys. All have in common a Forssman-like heterophile antigen (Harris and Simons 1958). In these studies the phenomenon being observed may have been a host-tumor antigen cross-reactivity.

Evidence has been presented which indicates that cell surface antiquens are important to the immune response both as targets and regulators. Furthermore, tumor cells present altered MEC antiques. Whether or not these charges affect the outcome of any non-experimental necolasms is unknown.

#### CEAPTEF II

#### MATERIALS AND METHODS

#### ANIMALS

F2, F3, F4, and F5 generation crosses of lines 6 subline 1 (6-1) and line 15 subline 1 (15-1), designated  $(6-1 \times 15-1)$ , two highly inbred (F > 0.99) Single Comb White Leghorn lines developed and maintained at the Regional Fcultry Research Laboratory (RFRL) of the United States Department of Agriculture, East Lansing, Michigan, were used this research. Line 6-1 was homczyccus susceptibility to subgroup A lymphoid leukosis (LL) virus and resistant to Marek's disease (MD). Line 15-1 was segregating for cellular susceptibility to subgroup A II virus and was susceptible to MD (Stone 1975 and personal communication, Sommes 1975). Farental and F2 generation chickens were blood typed in the laboratory of W. F. Briles (Department cf Biclcgical Sciences, Northern Illinois University) and F2 proceny were known to be segrecating for genes at the B, D, and I all cantiger loci. Parents of the F3, F4, and F5 generations and all offspring except those from homozygous matings were typed for B system antigens, the marker for the MHC. F3 through F5 generation progeny

were not blocd typed for the D and I antigens because neither D nor I genotype, nor sex, significantly affected tumor growth (Collins et al. 1977). Line 6-1 was homozygous E2 and line 15-1 homozygous E5. Line 100 (F > 0.78), a Single Comb White Leghorn line developed and maintained at the RFRI, homozygous E2 (parents blood typed by W. E. Briles), was used as a blood source in one immunization experiment. Nonimbred line UNH 105 E24E24 chickens from homozygous E24B24 parents (parents blood typed by W. E. Briles) served as a source of a third MHC haplotype for the cytotoxicity and alloantisera experiments and as a negative control in the skin graft experiments.

Animals used as ilcod donors were either homozygous B5 or B2 and at least 16 weeks of age. In partial tolerance experiments (6-1 X 15-1) F3, F4, and F5 generation chickens were used as experimental animals and blood sources for each experiment were chickens from the previous generation. Animals within an experiment were always of the same generation, but animals in different experiments of the same type may have come from more than one generation. In immunization experiments (6-1 X 15-1) F5 generation chickens were used as experimental animals and F4 and line 100 chickens served as blood donors. In cytotoxicity and alloantisera experiments (6-1 x 15-1) F4 generation chickens were used in allcantisera production while F5 chickens were used as the source of effector cells and most target cells. Up to five different sires were represented in each

experiment but progeny of a given sire were randomized in approximately equal numbers to each treatment group.

Chickens were vaccinated at hatching with Marek's disease vaccine (live turkey Herpesvirus, chicken tissue culture origin, cell-free, Sterwin Laboratories Millsboro, Delaware) and at ten days of age with Newcastle-tronchitis vaccine (live virus, chicken embryo orgin, Sterwin Laboratories Inc., Millsboro, Delaware). In the cytotexicity, all cantisera, and immurization experiments each chicker also received 0.2 mg gentimicin sulfate (Garasol, American Scientific Laboratories, Madiscn. Wisconsin) mixed with the Marek's disease vaccine in a 0.2 ml dose subcutanectaly at hatching to decrease chick mcrtality due to a recurrent respiratory problem at the University of New Harrshire (UNH) Poultry Research Farm.

Chickens were brooded from hatching to four to six weeks of age in convertional, electrically-heated brooding tatteries located in windowless houses at the UNH Poultry Research Farm. Chickens were moved to semi-isolated facilities for virus inoculation and were maintained in conventional holding tatteries until the end of the experiment. Chickens used as blood sources and for all cantisera production were kept in separate semi-isolated facilities.

All chickens were fed, ad <u>libitum</u>, commercially prepared, all mash, medicated (0.004% amprolium and lacitracin methylene disalicylate to aid in the development

of immunity to coccidics is under conditions of slight exposure) chick starter feed.

### CELLS

Blood was drawn aseptically via either cardiac puncture or the brachial vein in the wing into heparinized (50 units/ml whole blood) syringes. Peripheral white blood cells (WBC) were separated from red blood cells (RBC) on a ficoll-hypaque gradient (Archambault et al. 1976). Cells were counted, checked for viability using a trypar blue dye exclusion test (Hudson and Hay 1976) and suspended in phosphate buffered saline (PBS) to the proper dilution. WBC were lysed completely (assayed by the trypan blue dye exclusion test) by suspending the cells in sterile double-distilled water for 30 minutes at room temperature. WEC preparations contained from zero to five percent RBC and REC preparations contained from zero to one percent WEC.

Secondary cultures of chicken embryc fibroblasts (CEF) (two to three days in culture) were derived from 10 to 11 day old embryos of line 105 and the F5 generation of (6-1 x 15-1) (procedure from Vcgt 1965). CEF were cultured in Falcon 3013, 25 square centimeter tissue culture flasks with BFMI 1640 medium surplemented with 5% fetal calf serum, 100 units/fil renicillin, 100 ug/ml streptomycin and freshly added L-qlutarine (2mm) at 370 in a 5% carlon-dioxide atmosphere. The total redium was designated as RFMI 1640+.

Spleens were removed aseptically and placed in RPMI 1640+ medium. Splenocyte suspensions were prepared by chopping the spleen into small pieces, drawing the pieces into a syringe (18-gauge needle) and gently expressing them to disaggregate the spleen. Large spleen fragments were allowed to settle and the supernate was centrifuged at 400 x q for two minutes. The supernate was collected, centrifuged at 400 x q for five minutes and the pelleted cells washed twice in FES. The splenocytes were resuspended in APMI 1640+ medium and used immediately in the cytotoxicity assay. Cell viability was tested by the ability of the cells to exclude trypan blue dye.

Tumors were removed asertically, necretic tissue discarded and healthy tissue placed in RPMI 164C+ medium. Tumor cell suspensions were prepared in the manner of spleen stapensions and used immediately in the fluorescent antibody assay.

## FLOOR AND CELL INCCULATIONS

### Partial Tolerance Experiments

Recipient (6-1 X 15-1) <u>B2B2</u> chickens in blood inoculation experiments were inoculated intraperitoneally (IP) with either 0.5 ml blood from (6-1 X 15-1) <u>B5B5</u> chickens or PBS on days zero (hatching) and two and with 0.3 ml on days eight, 14, 20, and 23. In all other experiments inoculation IP with 0.3 ml of the appropriate

dilution of viable WBC or FEC (100 million, 1 million, or 1 hundred thousand cells) from  $(6-1 \times 15-1)$  <u>B5B5</u> chickers, 1 million lysed WBC from <u>B5B5</u> chickens, or 1 million viable WBC from  $(6-1 \times 15-1)$  <u>B2B2</u> chickens was made on days zero, two, seven, 14, and 21.

### Immunization Experiments

Recipient (6-1 X 15-1) B2B2 chickens were inoculated either subcutaneously, IP, or intravenously (IV) with either viable WEC or REC from (6-1 X 15-1) B5B5 chickens, (6-1 X 15-1) B2B2 chickens, cr line 100 B2B2 chickens. Subcutaneous inoculations were made in the dorsal neck surface and the ventral surface beside the breast hone at 21 days of age. The subcutaneous inoculum consisted of 1 million cells in 0.3 ml of an emulsion of PBS and Freunds complete adjuvant (Herbert 1978). IP inoculations were made with 5 million cells in 0.2 ml FBS at 21 and 28 days of age. IV inoculations were made in the brachial vein of the left wing with 5 million cells in 0.1 ml PBS at 28 and 41 days of age.

### TESTS FCR TCLERANCE

Chickens in experiments involving inoculation of whole blocd and in those involving inoculations of 100 million and 1 million WBC and RBC from (6-1 X 15-1) <u>B5B5</u> chickens were tested on day 27 for antibody toward cells from <u>B5B5</u>

chickens using slide hemagglutination tests (Hudson and 1976). Sera were channed from blood drawn from the trachial vein. Test cells were syspended at two percent in The positive control consisted of a known antisera to FES. cells from B5B5 chickens. A Cocmbs test (modification of Ccombs et al. 1945) was used to test for incomplete antibody in the serum samples from chickens inoculated with 100 million and 1 million FEC from <u>P5E5</u> chickers. Serum samples had been frozen at -220 for approximately six months. Che tenth milliliter of two percent RBC in PBS was mixed with 0.1 ml test serum and incubated at 37C for one RBC's were washed three times in PES and 0.1 ml rabbit anti-chicken IqG (Miles Laboratories Inc., Elkhart Indiana) added. Activity of the rabbit anti-chicken IgG was confirmed by its ability to block the binding fluorescin-conjugated rabbit anti-chicken IgG (Miles Laboratories Inc., Elkhart Indiana) on the surface of WBC. The mixture was inculated for ten minutes, centrifuged for two minutes at 400 x q, and observed for clumped cells. Washed, untreated RBC were mixed with rabbit anti-chicken IgG and showed no agglutination.

Alloquaft tolerance was tested by observing the fate of dorsal skin grafts on (6-1 X 15-1) <u>B2B2</u> recipients. Skin donor chickens were killed and portions of dorsal skin approximately three centimeters square immediately removed and floated on FFMI 1640 medium. Graft recipients, 4-weeks cld, were plucked of dorsal feathers, swabbed with tincture

of iodine, and anesthetized with 17mg/100gm body weight of ketamine intramuscularly in the thigh. Two graft beds, approximately C.5 centimeters scuare were prepared on each recipient. Skin from (6-1 x 15-1) E5B5 donors was placed in one graft bed and skin from either (6-1 x 15-1) E2E2 or line 105 B24B24 donors fitted into the second bed. Each graft was covered with sterile gauze and taped securely. Recipient chickens were individually caged and moritored for acute graft rejection on days five, seven, nine and 14 after grafting. A dry, brittle, black graft was interpreted as a positive indication of rejection (Polley et al. 1960).

# MEASUREMENT OF GRAFT VS. HOST (GVH) ACTIVITY

A spleen weight assay was used to assess GVE activity resulting from cell incculation. Samples of control and cell recipient chickens were sacrificed on day zero, eight, 15, 22, and 28, body weight recorded and the spleen removed and weighed immediately. GVE response was calculated according to the following spleen index (Ford 1978):

At index of 1.3 or greater was considered significant (Ford 1978).

## ALLCANTISERA PRODUCTION

Adult half-sib <u>3232</u> and <u>B525</u> (6-1 x 15-1) chickens were given 1V inoculations in the trachial vein of cre rl of 500 million cells/ml, Ficcll-Hypaque separated WBC from the reciprocal genetype. After two weeks they were re-immunized with cells from the same source used in the primary immunization. Six days after the second immunization serum was collected and tested for agglutination of both syngeneic and donor WBC and RBC. Blood was drawn aseptically via the brachial vein.

## ABSORPTION OF ALICANTISEBA

All cantisers diluted 1:10 in PES were specifically absorbed by secondary culture nonclayers (approximately 3-4 million cells/monolayer) of (6-1 x 15-1) <u>B2B2</u>, <u>B5B5</u>, and line 105 <u>E24E24</u> CEF, including both Rous sarcoma virus (ESV)-infected and uninfected cultures. The cell-alloantisers mixture was incubated at 37C for one hour with gentle shaking. Absorption was repeated three times.

#### AGGIUTINATICN ASSAY

The alloantisera were tested for ability to specifically applutinate (6-1  $\times$  15-1) F5 generation <u>B2B2</u> and <u>E5E5</u> RBC (2% in PES). Sera from chickens in immunization

experiments were tested for agglutinating antilcdy toward the cell type inoculated. Control chickens were tested for agglutinating antibody toward <u>B5E5</u> FEC except in the line 100 experiments where line 100 WBC were used. The sera were tested in a doubling dilution series starting with a 1:2 dilution. Controls of cells in PBS were used throughout.

## FLUORISCENT ANTIBORY ASSAY

One tenth milliliter of a 1% cell suspension was mixed with 0.1 ml of 1:16 PBS diluted rabbit arti-chicken IgG (Miles Laterateries Irc., Elkhart Indiana) and shaken gently at 37C for ten minutes. Cells were washed in PES and resuspended in 0.1 ml FES, 0.1 ml test serum added and shaken gently at 37C for ten minutes. Cells were washed twice in FES and resuspended in 0.1 ml PBS, 0.1 ml FITC conjugated rabbit anti-chicken IgG (Miles Laboratories Inc., Elkhart Irdiana) added and shaken gently at 37C for ten minutes. Cells were washed three times in PBS and resuspended in 0.1 ml PBS, a wet mount prepared and cells chserved for fluorescence with a Reichert fluorescence microscope (exciting filter #KG-2/BG-12, barrier filter #1.5/OG1 1/GG-9). One hundred cells were counted.

### CYTOTCXICITY ASSAY

lymphocyte cytotoxicity was tested using a modification of the 51Cr uptake microcytotoxicity assay (More et al. 1975, McGrail et al. 1978). Effector cells were splenocytes from six week cld chickers with RSV-induced tumors (tumor scores of three or four at time of spleen harvest) and from chickens uninoculated with RSV. Target cells were (6-1 x 15-1) F5 generation <u>E2E2</u>, <u>B5B5</u>, and line 105 <u>B24B24</u> CEF including BSV-infected <u>B2B2</u> and <u>B5B5</u> CEF. Aliquots of ter thousand target CFF, suspended in 0.1 ml RFMI 1640+ medium were seeded into appropriate wells of a Falcon 3040 microtest II tissue culture microtiter plate. RSV-infected CEF were in segarate plates from uninfected CEF. After 48 hours inculation at 37C, the medium was discarded and 0.1 ml RFMI 1640+ containing cre million lymphocy tes a₫₫€₫ tc appropriate wells. Each effector-target cell combination was repeated in five wells. Two sets of target cells (five wells of each of the five CEF types per set), inculated in medium cnly, were used as controls. The microtiter plates were incubated at 37c for 48 hours, the medium with dead cells discarded and the wells washed thoroughly with PBS. Na2(51)CrC4 (sodium chromate, specific activity = 50-400 mCi/mqCr) was added to each well at a concentration of C.5 wCi in O.1 ml RFMI 1640+ medium. The plates were incutated three hours at 37C, the medium discarded and the plates washed three times with PBS. The

remaining target cells were trypsinized, transferred to individual BFFM capsules and counted for one mirute in a Packard tri-carb liquid scirtillation counter (Model 3320) with an attached autogamma spectrometer.

The percent cytctcxicity for each effector-target cell combination was calculated as follows:

Mean 51Cr c.p.m. ccntrcl - Mean 51Cr c.p.m. test sample

Mean 51Cr c.p.m. ccntrol

Negative cytctcxicity values were interpreted as complete absence of target cell lysis.

## VIRUS AND VIRUS INCCULATION

A highly purified pseudotype of Bryan High-titer Rous sarcoma virts, subgroup A, designated BH FSV (RAV-1) abbreviated FSV-1, supplied by L. E. Crittenden of the RPRL, and stored in liquid Nitrogen, was used in this research. The stock virus was diluted in Harks balanced salts solution containing 5% fetal calf serum, 100 units/ml pericillin, 100 ug/ml streptomycin, and 100 ug/ml hyalauronidase. Virus inoculated chickens received 0.05 ml of a 1: 1000 dilution of stock virus (approximately 10 pock-forming units on the chorioallantoic membranes of susceptible embryos) intradermally, in the left wingweb at four weeks of age in partial tolerance, cytotoxicity and alloantisera experiments and six weeks of age in immunization experiments.

RSV-1--infected CFF were attained by using a modification of the technique of Hanafusa (1969). Approximately 50% confluent monoclayers were overlayed with 0.1 ml of DEAE-dextran in RFMI 1640+ (240 ug/ml) and 0.5 ml of RSV-1 at a 1: 1000 final dilution in RPMI 1640+. After absorption of virus for one hour at 370 the cultures were washed and re-incubated in RPMI 1640+ for 48 hours prior to use in the alloantiserum or cytotoxicity assays. Virus infected and uninfected cultures were handled at separate times and in separate facilities prior to cytotoxic assays.

### TUMOR MEASUREMENT

Tumors appeared on the site of virus inoculation at approximately ten days post inoculation (PI) and were subjectively secred for size at weekly intervals between 14 and 70 days FI. Tumor scores were based upon the following criteria (Collins et al. 1977).

| Score | Critericn                             |
|-------|---------------------------------------|
| 0     | No palpable tumor                     |
| 1     | Tumor > 0 and ≤ 0.5 cm diameter       |
| 2     | Tumor > 0.5 or and ≤ 1.2 or diameter  |
| 3     | Tumor > 1.2 om and ≤ 1/2 wingweb area |
| 4     | Tumcr > 1/2 btt ≤ total wingweb area  |
| 5     | Tumor fills wingweb                   |
| 6     | Tumor extends beyond wingweb          |

Eased upon the criteria below a tumor profile index (TPI) was assigned (Collins et al. 1977).

# 

A necropsy was performed upon chickens which died during an experiment.

## STATISTICAL ANALYSES

Analysis of variance was used to statistically examine the data with statistical significance determined at  $P \leq 0.05$  (Snedecor and Cochran 1967). A mean separation

test appropriate to equal and unequal subclass numbers, was used (Dixon and Duncan 1975).

## Partial Tclerance Experiments

Tumor experiments were arranged in a completely randomized design with the dependent variable being TPI and the independent variable being type of inoculum. Error mean squares of experiments within the same experiment type were tested for homogeneity of variance and in all cases the error mean squares proved to be homogenous allowing pooling of experiments. The socied experiments were arranged in a randomized block design with experiments treated as blocks. The dependent variable was TPI and the independent variable was type of inoculum.

### Cytotoxicity and Alloantisera Experiments

Percent cytotoxicity and percent fluorescing cells were analysed in the same way. Percentages were converted to an angle (angle = arcsin\( \sqrt{percent} \)) and in the case of percent cytotoxicity were coded to a positive value prior to the analysis of variance (Snedecor and Cochran 1967). The experiments were arranged in a completely randomized design. In the cytotoxicity experiment the dependent variable was the transformed percent cytotoxicity and the independent variable was the type of target cell. Data concerning lymphocytes from round chickens were analysed separately from that of tumor hearing chickens. In the fluorescence

experiment the dependent variable was the transformed percent flucrescing cells and the independent variable was days postincculation. Data on each of the four target cell types were analysed separately.

In all cantisers experiments titers of <2 were taken as

1 in the analysis. Titers were transformed by taking

1 cq(titer) before analysis of variance (Lutz 1978). The

experiments were arranced in a completely randomized design.

The dependent variable was the transformed titer value and

the independent variable was the type of absorbing CEF

combined with one of the BBC targets. Data were not

analysed between all cantisers types.

## Immunization Experiments

Tumor experiments were arranged in a completely randomized design with the dependent variable being TFI and the independent variable being the type of inocults.

#### CHAPTER III

#### RESULIS

This research may be divided into three segments:

a) Partial telerance experiments; b) Cytotoxicity and alloantisera experiments; and c) Immunization experiments. All of the studies were designed to test the hypothesis that (6-1 x 15-1) <u>ESB5</u> chickens have RSV-1--induced temors that grow progressively to death, in part because host MHC antigen cross-reacts with tumor associated antiger.

## PARTIAL TOLERANCE EXFERIPENTS

(6-1 X 15-1) <u>P2B2</u> and <u>F5B5</u> chickers were used in these studies. <u>B2B2</u> chickers were always the host chickers in which partial telerance to B5 antiqen was elicited. Line UNH 105 <u>B24B24</u> chickers were used as a negative centrol in the skin graft experiments.

The mechanism of the partial tolerance was not important to these experiments. What was important was to observe whether or not cells from <u>E5B5</u> individuals elicited a state of specific immune paralysis which in turn would affect RSV-1--induced tymor growth.

The criteria \*of partial tclerance were alsence of complete and incomplete antibody toward the cell type used to induce partial tolerance and acceptance of allografts from <u>B5B5</u> denors by <u>B2B2</u> chickens. Antibody against the cellular types was not detected in any tested chickens at 27 days of age. Dorsal skin graft results are given in Table 1. In uninoculated <u>B2B2</u> chickens 30 percent of 15 grafts from F2F2 donors were still healthy on day 14, whereas all 15 grafts from B5B5 denors were rejected by day seven. Where WEC or REC from <u>B5B5</u> chickens were ircculated, grafts from <u>E2E2</u> donors served as graft acceptance controls and grafts from <u>B24B24</u> donors as graft rejection controls. Thenty-six to 81 percent of the grafts of E2B2 denors were healthy on day 14. For grafts of E24B24 donors from zero to 13 percent were healthy on day seven but all were rejected by day nine. With inoculations of viable WBC, RBC, and lysed WBC, from B5B5 chickens, 41, 34, and 35 percent, respectively, of grafts from **B5B5** donors were healthy on day seven compared to zero percent for those receiving no cell inoculations. On day 14, 28 and 21 percent of grafts from 8585 donors on chickers incoulated with viable and lysed WBC from B5B5 individuals, respectively, were healthy compared to zero percent for the grafts from B5B5 donors on chickens inoculated with <u>B5E5</u> REC and on uninoculated chickers. These results indicated a partial state of tolerance toward B5 cell surface antiqens existed in treated B2B2 chickens 14 days after skin grafting. Furthermore, partial tclerance

Table 1. Skin graft results from (6-1  $\times$  15-1)  $\underline{\text{B2B2}}$  graft recipients receiving an inoculum containing  $10^6$  viable WBC, RBC, or lysed WBC from (6-1  $\times$  15-1)  $\underline{\text{B5B5}}$  chickens.

| Type of cell inoculum | Number of grafts <sup>a</sup> | B genotype of graft donor | Healthy<br>5 | skin<br>7 | grafts (%) | on day:   |
|-----------------------|-------------------------------|---------------------------|--------------|-----------|------------|-----------|
| Uninoculated          | 15                            | 5/5                       | 30           | 0         | 0          | 0         |
|                       | 15                            | 2/2                       | 47           | 40        | 30         | 30        |
| Viable WBC            | 32                            | 5/5                       | 68           | 41        | 31         | 28        |
|                       | 16                            | 2/2                       | 81           | 81        | 81         | 81        |
|                       | 16                            | 24/24                     | 38           | 13        | 0          | 0         |
| Viable RBC            | 35                            | 5/5                       | 43           | 34        | 0          | 0         |
|                       | 17                            | 2/2                       | 82           | 71        | <b>47</b>  | <b>41</b> |
|                       | 18                            | 24/24                     | 22           | 1         | 0          | 0         |
| Lysed WBC             | 34                            | 5/5                       | 44           | 35        | 21         | 21        |
|                       | 19                            | 2/2                       | 37           | 32        | 26         | 26        |
|                       | 15                            | 24/24                     | 20           | 0         | 0          | 0         |

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>a</sup>Two grafts per chicken.

was specific to 35 antiquen since grafts from <u>B525</u> chickens were frequently accepted but grafts from <u>B24E24</u> chickens never were.

Table 2 gives the response of partially tolerant and control chickens to FSV-1—induced tumors presented in two ways: 1) as mean TPI and; 2) as the percent distribution of animals according to TPI. <u>E2E2</u> chickens were inoculated with B5 antiqen in the manner shown in the previous set of experiments to produce partial tolerance to B5 antiqen.

With respect to mean TFI, particulate control inoculations of <u>E2E2</u> WEC or RBC into <u>B2B2</u> hosts gave mean TFI's of 3.0 and 2.8, respectively, and each was not significantly different from the mean TPI of 3.1 for the uninoculated B2B2 chickens. B2B2 chickens inoculated with BEB5 blood had a mean TPI of 3.7 which was significantly higher than the mean TPI's of 2.8 and 3.1 for PES treated and uninoculated <u>E2E2</u> chickens, respectively. <u>E2E2</u> chickens inoculated with 100 million B5E5 viable WBC had a mean TFI of 3.9 which was significantly higher than the mean TPI of 3.1 for unincculated <u>F2B2</u> chickens. <u>B2B2</u> chickens incculated with 100 million BSE5 viable RBC, however, had a mean TPI of 3.4 which was not significantly different from that of 3.9 for B2B2 chickers incculated with 100 million B5B5 viable WEC and that of 3.1 for uninoculated B2B2 chickens. B2B2 chickens inoculated with 1 million B5B5 viable WBC or RBC had mean IPI's of 4.3 and 3.8. respectively, which were not significantly different from

Table 2. Mean TPI<sup>a</sup> of (6-1 X 15-1) <u>B2B2</u> recipients with inocula containing various types and numbers of cells.

| B Genotype of cell donor | Type of cell inoculum | No. of cells inoculated | No. of experiments | No. of animals | P<br>an | Mean<br>TpI <sup>C</sup> |             |    |    |                  |
|--------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------|--------------------|----------------|---------|--------------------------|-------------|----|----|------------------|
|                          | 11100010111           | Ziloculucca             | CAPCE EMCITED      | animarb        | 1       | 2                        | accord<br>3 | 4  | 5  | ***              |
| 2/2                      | Viable WBC            |                         |                    | 22             | 14      | 27                       | 23          | 23 | 14 | 3.0A             |
|                          | Viable RBC            | 106                     | 2                  | 19             | 5       | 21                       | 42          | 11 | 21 | 2.8A             |
|                          | Uninoculated          |                         |                    | 29             | 7       | 28                       | 24          | 34 | 7  | 3.1A             |
| 5/5                      | Blood                 |                         |                    | 36             | 6       | 6                        | 25          | 44 | 19 | 3.7A             |
|                          | PBS                   | b                       | 2                  | 28             | 14      | 36                       | 21          | 18 | 11 | 2.8B             |
| ı                        | Uninoculated          |                         |                    | 29             | 7       | 28                       | 34          | 14 | 17 | 3.1B             |
| 5/5                      | Viable WBC            |                         |                    | 28             | 0       | 7                        | 32          | 22 | 39 | 3.9A             |
|                          | Viable RBC            | 108                     | 3                  | 37             | 3       | 19                       | 35          | 22 | 22 | 3.4AB            |
|                          | Uninoculated          |                         |                    | 41             | 7       | 17                       | 42          | 29 | 5  | 3.1B             |
| 5/5                      | Viable WBC            |                         |                    | 26             | 0       | 0                        | 19          | 31 | 50 | 4.3 <sup>A</sup> |
|                          | Viable RBC            | 10 <sup>6</sup>         | 3                  | 24             | 0       | 17                       | 13          | 42 | 29 | 3.8A             |
|                          | Uninoculated          |                         |                    | 28             | 7       | 25                       | 32          | 36 | 0  | 3.0B             |
| 5/5                      | Viable WBC            |                         |                    | 23             | 0       | 9                        | 17          | 31 | 43 | 4.1 <sup>A</sup> |
|                          | Viable RBC            | 10 <sup>5</sup>         | 3                  | 24             | 0       | 8                        | 25          | 17 | 50 | 4.1A             |
|                          | Uninoculated          |                         |                    | 27             | 11      | 37                       | 22          | 19 | 11 | 2.8B             |
| 5/5                      | Lysed WBC             | 106                     | 3                  | 27             | 0       | 11                       | 22          | 30 | 37 | 3.9 <sup>A</sup> |
|                          | Uninoculated          |                         |                    | 31             | 10      | 42                       | 19          | 26 | 3  | 2.7B             |

a Tumor profile index of RSV-induced tumors

b See Materials and Methods

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>C</sup> Means within a given experiment type having no superscripts in common are significantly different,  $P \leq 0.05$ .

each other but each of which was significantly different from the mean TPI of 3.0 for uninoculated B2B2 chickens. E2E2 chickers inoculated with 100 thousand B5B5 viable WBC or RBC had mean TFI's of 4.1, each, and each was significantly different from the mean TPI of 2.8 for uninoculated E2B2 chickens. E2E2 chickens inoculated with 1 million lysed WBC had a mean TPI of 3.9 which was significantly higher than the mean TPI of 2.7 for uninoculated E2B2 chickens.

With respect to percent distribution of animals according to TPI it was shown that the increase ir mean TPI exhibited by <u>E2B2</u> chickens partially tolerant to E5 antigen was due to a decrease in the number of chickens with TPI's of 1 and 2 (completely regressing categories) and an increase in the number of chickens with TPI's of 4 and 5 (progressing categories), wher compared to uninoculated control <u>B2B2</u> chickens. For example, <u>P2B2</u> chickens inoculated with 1 million <u>B5B5</u> viable WBC showed zero percent of the chickens in TPI categories of 1 and 2 while 50 percent were in TPI category 5 compared to 7 and 25 percent of uninoculated <u>B2B2</u> chickens in TPI categories 1 and 2, respectively, and zero percent in category 5.

To determine whether crinct a severe GVH response was occurring in the test chickens during antigenic exposure a GVH (spleen weight) assay was utilized. In this assay a mean spleen index  $\geq$  1.3 was interpreted as a significant spleen enlargement over spleens of uninoculated control

Table 3. Graft vs. host response to inoculations of 10<sup>6</sup> WBC or RBC from (6-1 X 15-1) <u>B5B5</u> or <u>B2B2</u> donors into (6-1 X 15-1) <u>B2B2</u> chickens.

| B Genotype of | Type of cell | Mean spleen index (days) |      |      |      |      |      |             |
|---------------|--------------|--------------------------|------|------|------|------|------|-------------|
| cell donor    | inoculum     | sacrificed each day      | 0    | 8    | 15   | 22   | 28   | <del></del> |
| 5/5           | Viable RBC   | 10                       | 0.99 | 1.22 | 1.05 | 1.13 | 1.09 |             |
| 5/5           | Lysed WBC    | 10                       | 1.07 | 1.27 | 1.22 | 1.17 | 1.27 |             |
| 2/2           | Viable WBC   | 10                       | 1.01 | 1.20 | 1.16 | 1.10 | 1.22 |             |
| 5/5           | Viable WBC   | 10                       | 1.06 | 1.27 | 1.51 | 1.24 | 1.82 |             |
|               | •            |                          |      |      |      |      |      |             |

a Mean spleen index ≥ 1.3 was interpreted as a significant spleen enlargement over spleens of uninoculated control chickens (Ford 1978).

chickens (Fcrd 1978). Table 3 gives the GVH response of E2B2 chickens to incculation with 1 million cells. Neither REC or lysed WBC from B535 chickens, nor WBC from B2B2 chickens gave significant spleen enlargement over unincculated E2E2 chickens. Incculations of viable WBC from E5B5 chickens, however, gave significant spleen enlargement over unincculated chickens on days 15 and 28, indicating a GVH response.

In summary, these experiments showed that crosses of lines 6-1 and 15-1 having a <u>B2B2</u> MHC genotype when made partially tolerant to viable WBC, REC, or lysed WBC from corresponding chickers of <u>B5E5</u> MHC genotype, exibited a greater frequency of progressing RSV-1--induced traces than untreated <u>B2E2</u> chickens. Cell inocula consisting of 100 million, 1 million, or 100 thorsand cells gave similar results. <u>B2B2</u> control chickers incoulated with FES, or with cells from <u>B2B2</u> chickens, gave results not significantly different from unincoulated <u>B2B2</u> chickens indicating that increased tumor growth did not result from a non-specific effect resulting from the cell inoculations.

A non-specific effect of chronic GVH on tumor growth would not appear to be the explanation for the results because: a) Lysed WBC and viable RBC contributed to increased tumor growth but not to GVH; b) differential skin graft results were observed indicating specificity in the partial tolerance; c) tumor growth patterns were changed significantly and in a manner that would not appear to be

attributable to a mild effect of GVH.

## CYTCTCKICITY AND ALLCANTISERA EXPERIMENTS

These experiments were designed to detect cross-reactivity between <u>B5B5</u> antiqen and RSV-1--induced tumor associated antiqen. <u>E2E2</u> and <u>B5B5</u> chickens were from the F4 and F5 generations of a cross of lines 6-1 and 15-1.

<u>B24B24</u> chickens were from line UNH 105.

Twenty six-week cld <u>E2B2</u> chickens, ten urinoculated with RSV-1 and ten hearing RSV-1-induced sarcomas (two weeks post-RSV-1--inoculation), were tested for cytolytic lymphocytes (CL) against <u>B2B2</u> and <u>B5B5</u> chicken embryc fibroblast (CEF) targets, both uninfected and infected with RSV-1. Six of the <u>E2E2</u> FSV-1--inoculated chickers and six of the unincoculated chickens were also tested for CL against <u>E24B24</u> CEF targets.

Table 4 gives mean cytotoxicity percentages for the effector-target cell combinations. Lymphocytes from chickens unincoulated with RSV-1 (normal chickens) gave mean cytotoxicity percentages toward the five target CEF types ranging from -1.4 to 0.0; none significantly different. Lymphocytes from chickens with RSV-1--induced tumors gave mean cytotoxicity percentages of 49.0, 28.3, and 37.8 for targets of B2B2 and B5E5 RSV-1--infected and B5B5 uninfected CFF, respectively, all three significantly different from the cytotoxicity percentages of -9.0 and -8.8 for targets of

Table 4. Mean cytotoxicity for lymphocytes from (6-1 X 15-1)F5 <u>B2B2</u> chickens with and without RSV-1--induced tumors tested against each of the five target CEF<sup>a</sup> types.

| *========== | :::::::::::::::::::::::::::::::::::::: |                   |                     |
|-------------|--|-------------------|---------------------|
| Targe       | et CEF                                 | Mean cytoto       | xicity (percent) bc |
| B Genotype  | RSV-1 status                           |                   | tumorous chickens   |
| 2/2         | not infected                           | -0.4A             | -9.0 <sup>A</sup>   |
| 5/5         | not infected                           | 0.0 <sup>A</sup>  | 31.8 <sup>B</sup>   |
| 24/24       | not infected                           | -0.8A             | -8.8 <sup>A</sup>   |
| 2/2         | infected                               | -0.5 <sup>A</sup> | 49.0 <sup>B</sup>   |
| 5/5         | infected                               | -1.4 <sup>A</sup> | 28.3 <sup>B</sup>   |

a Chicken embryo fibroblasts.

b Splenocyte preparations from 20 <u>B2B2</u> chickens, ten with tumors and ten without, were tested for cytotoxicity against each of the five target CEF types except for targets of <u>B24B24</u> CEF where only six chickens from each group were used.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>c</sup> Means within one column having no superscripts in common were significantly different,  $P \le 0.05$ .

ncn-RSV-1--infected <u>B2B2</u> and <u>B2B24</u> CEF, respectively.

Negative and zero percent cytotoxicities indicated no
lymphocyte-rediated lysis of target cells. Positive percent
cytotoxicities indicated target cell lysis by lymphocytes.

Table 5 gives RBC agglutination titers of CEF absorbed alloantisera. Specific B5B5 anti-B2B2 and B2B2 anti-B5B5 all cantisera were produced and tested prior to the start of the experiment (see Materials and Methods, Allcantisera Production, page 33). Samples of allcantisera were absorbed with CEF and the resulting absorbed alloantisera tested for the ability to agglutinate <u>B2B2</u> or <u>B5B5</u> RBC. Three separate allcantisera absorptions with subsequent tests agglutination were used to calculate mean titers. allcantisera produced in <u>B2B2</u> chickens, agglutinated <u>B5B5</u> REC, with mean titers from 10.0 to 21.3, but not E2B2 RBC, with mean titers all < 2. Likewise, anti-B2B2 alloantisera produced in B5B5 chickers, agglutinated E2B2 RBC, with mean titers from 26.7 to 42.7, but not ESE5 REC, with mean titers all < 2. Abscrption of anti-B5B5 alloantisera RSV-1--infected cr uninfected B5B5 CFF removed all agglutination activity from the alloantisera giving mean titers of < 2, each, and each was significantly different from the mean titer of 21.3 for unabsorbed anti-B5B5 all cantisera, when tested against **E5E5** RBC. Abscrption of anti-B2B2 all cantisera with RSV-1--infected or uninfected CEF removed all agglutination activity from the <u>E2B2</u> alloantisera giving mean titers of < 2, each, and each

Table 5. RBC agglutination titers of alloantisera absorbed with CEF<sup>a</sup>.

Mean titer for agglutination of RBC of genotype:bc Absorbing CEF Alloantisera RSV-1 status B5B5 B Genotype <2<sup>A</sup> 21.3<sup>B</sup> B2B2 anti-B5B5 not infected ` 2/2 <2 A **<**2<sup>A</sup> not infected 5/5 <2<sup>A</sup> 16.0BC 24/24 not infected **C2**<sup>A</sup> 10.0C 2/2 infected **∢**2<sup>A</sup> **∠**2 A 5/5 infected (2A 21.3B No absorption <2<sup>A</sup> <2 A B5B5 anti-B2B2 2/2 not infected 26.7B <2<sup>A</sup> 5/5 not infected 42.7B <2<sup>A</sup> 24/24 not infected **∠**2 A <2<sup>A</sup> 2/2 infected <2<sup>A</sup> 5/5 infected 32.0B **∠**2A 32.0B No absorption

a Chicken embryo fibroblasts.

b Mean titers based upon three observations.

 $<sup>^{\</sup>rm C}$  Mean titers within the same alloantisera category having no superscripts in common are significantly different, P  $\leq$  0.05.

significantly different from the mean titer of 32.0 for the unabsorbed anti-<u>E2E2</u> alloantisers, when tested against <u>E2E2</u> REC. Wone of the other CEF-alloantisers continuations resulted in significantly reduced agglutination titers when tested against their specific FBC except that absorption of anti-<u>B5B5</u> alloantisers with RSV-1--infected <u>B2B2</u> CEF gave a mean titer of 10.0 which was significantly lower than the 21.3 mean titer of unabsorbed anti-<u>E5B5</u> alloantisers, when tested against <u>B5B5</u> RBC. The latter result indicates cross-reactivity between ESV-1--infected <u>B2B2</u> CEF and B5 antigen.

Antisera from B2B2 chickens with RSV-1--induced tumors were tested for cross-reactivity with B5B5 cells using a fluorescent antibody test. Table 6 gives the fluorescent antibody test of serum from B2B2 chickers RSV-1--induced tumors for IqG against <u>B5B5</u> cells. Ten-week cld unincculated B2B2 chickers served as negative controls and gave low mean percent fluorescing cells; 0.4, 0.8, 1.2, and 1.8 for sarcoma cells, WBC, FBC and CEF, respectively. At all days FI tested, <u>B2B2</u> FSV-1--induced turcr bearing chickens contained IgG that bound to B5B5 RSV-1-induced sarcoma cells with mean percent flucrescing cells ranging from 60 to 78 percent and with no significant differences Letween age croups, but all significantly different from the mean percent fluorescing cells (0.4) found when serum from chickers unincoulated with RSV-1 was added to sarcoma cells. The fluorescence in sarcona cells served as positive

Table 6. Fluorescent antibody test of serum from  $(6-1 \times 15-1)$ F5 B2B2 chickens with RSV-l--induced tumors for IgG against  $(6-1 \times 15-1)$ F5 B5B5 cells.

| Day PI <sup>a</sup> | Number of serum samples | Mean percent fl  |                  |                  | cells <sup>d</sup> |
|---------------------|-------------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|--------------------|
|                     |                         | sarcoma cells    | WBC              | RBC              | CEFC               |
| Uninoculatedb       | 5                       | 0.4 <sup>A</sup> | 0.8 <sup>A</sup> | 1.2 <sup>A</sup> | 1.8 <sup>A</sup>   |
| 14                  | 5                       | 70 <sup>B</sup>  | 1.4 <sup>A</sup> | 0.2 <sup>A</sup> | 1.6 <sup>A</sup>   |
| 28                  | 5                       | 77 <sup>B</sup>  | 0.8 <sup>A</sup> | 2.6A             | 1.4 <sup>A</sup>   |
| 42                  | 5                       | 60 <sup>B</sup>  | 2.4 <sup>A</sup> | 0.4 <sup>A</sup> | 0.8 <sup>A</sup>   |
| 56                  | 5                       | 78 <sup>B</sup>  | 2.4 <sup>A</sup> | 1.8 <sup>A</sup> | 1.8 <sup>A</sup>   |
| 70                  | 5                       | 63B              | 1.0 <sup>A</sup> | 1.6 <sup>A</sup> | 0.6 <sup>A</sup>   |

a Post-RSV-1--inoculation.

b 10 weeks old.

c chicken embryo fibroblasts.

 $<sup>^{\</sup>rm d}$  Means within the same cell type having no superscripts in common are significantly different, P  $\leq$  0.05.

controls because the same serum samples were always tested for IqG binding to each of the four target cell types. Binding of IqG to B5E5 WBC, REC, or CFF was not observed. All samples from 14 to 70 days PI gave mean percent of fluorescing cells not significantly different than those associated with the serum samples from uninoculated chickens. The data indicated that the IqG was binding to the sarcoma cells because of affinity for tumor associated antiqen and not affinity for B5 antigen.

In summary, the alloantisera absorption studies showed that the RSV-1--infected and uninfected CEF shared antigen with syngeneic REC. Absorption with RSV-1--infected B2B2 CEF significantly lowered the <u>B5E5</u> REC agglutination titer of <u>B2B2</u> anti-<u>E5E5</u> all cantisera suggesting crcss-reactivity between RSV-1--infected cells and <u>B5B5</u> REC. <u>B2B2</u> cytotoxic lymphocytes primed against RSV-1--induced tuncr cells specifically lysed FSV-1--infected B2B2 CEF and both RSV-1--infected and uninfected B5B5 CFF; again cross-reactivity indicated. was However, no cross-reactivity was observed in IgG from chickers bearing RSV-1--induced tumors.

#### IMMUNIZATION EXPERIMENTS

If B5 antigen cross-reacts with RSV-1--induced tumor associated antigen it was hypothesized that it should be ressible to immunize a chicken against B5 antigen and that

this should enhance the innune response toward an FSV-1--induced tumor. The following experiments were designed to test this hypothesis. In all cases the chickens immurized were (6-1 x 15-1) F5 generation <u>B2B2</u> chickens. The immunizing cells were (6-1 x 15-1) F4 generation <u>B5B5</u> WBC and REC, <u>F2E2</u> WBC (as an incoulation control) and line 100 WBC and REC. Line 100 chickens have a <u>B2B2</u> genotype but their RSV-1--induced tumors grow progressively in a manner similar to those of (6-1 x 15-1) <u>B5B5</u> chickers (Collins et al. 1980).

A subcutaneous innunization technique with the cells emulsified with Freund's adjuvant was tried initially. Two similar experiments were conducted. The chickens were innunized once at 21 days of age, alloantisers titers were obtained at 42 days of age and FSV-1--inoculation made at 42 days of age. The titers were used to give an indication of the effectiveness of innunization. It was hoped that the three week interval between immunization and RSV-1--inoculation would allow a strong secondary immune response to develop toward the tumor if cross-reactivity was present.

Table 7 gives the results following sticutaneous immunization. In both experiments 1 and 2 antisera titers resulted from immunization. In experiment 1, however, the mean titer values were 69 and 90 for <u>B5B5</u> WEC and RBC, respectively, while ir experiment 2 the corresponding mean titers were only 26 and 30. In experiment 1 mean TPI's for

Table 7. Mean antisera titers and TPI'sa of (6-1 X 15-1)F5 B2B2 chickens immunized subcutaneously at 21 days of age with (6-1 X 15-1)F4 B5B5 cells followed by RSV-1--inoculation at 42 days of age.

| Experiment | Immunizing cell                        | Number of animals | Mean titer <sup>bcd</sup><br>of antisera |          | ercent<br>imals |    | Mean<br><sub>TPI</sub> d |    |                  |  |
|------------|--|-------------------|--|----------|-----------------|----|--------------------------|----|------------------|--|
|            | ······································ |                   | · —                                      | <u> </u> | 2               | 3  | 4                        | 5  |                  |  |
| 1          | Viable WBC                             | 6                 | 69 <sup>A</sup>                          | 0        | 67              | 17 | 17                       | 0  | 2.5 <sup>A</sup> |  |
|            | Viable RBC                             | 5                 | 90 <sup>A</sup>                          | 20       | 40              | 20 | 0                        | 20 | 2.6 <sup>A</sup> |  |
|            | .Uninoculated                          | 5                 | <2 <sup>B</sup>                          | 0        | 20              | 0  | 80                       | 0  | 3.6 <sup>A</sup> |  |
| 2          | Viable WBC                             | 12                | 26 <sup>A</sup>                          | 17       | 17              | 8  | 50                       | 8  | 3.2 <sup>A</sup> |  |
| ·          | Viable RBC                             | 12                | 30 <sup>A</sup>                          | 17       | 25              | 8  | 25                       | 25 | 3.2 <sup>A</sup> |  |
| •          | Uninoculated                           | 12                | <2 <sup>B</sup>                          | 8        | 50              | 17 | 17                       | 8  | 2.6A             |  |

a Tumor profile index

b Antisera collected at 42 days of age

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>C</sup> Antisera were titered for activity toward the immunizing cell type; samples from uninoculated controls were titered for activity toward (6-1 x 15-1)F4 B5B5 RBC's.

d Means within the same experiment with no superscripts in common are significantly different, P < 0.05.

chickens innunized with B5B5 WBC, RBC, or uninoculated were 2.5, 2.6, and 3.6, respectively. Although the mean TPI's of the innunizing cell types did not differ significantly from each other there was some indication that the immunization was successful because the mean TPI's of inoculated groups were approximately two-thirds that of the unincoulated group. On the other hand, the mean TFI of the uninoculated group (3.6) was higher than would be expected in untreated (6-1 x 15-1) B2B2 chickens (see partial Morecver, the sample size was tclerance experiments). small. In Experiment 2 results appeared to be opposite to those of experiment 1. The mean TPI's of <u>B585</u> WBC and RBC immunized groups (3.2) were higher than the mean TFI of the uninoculated group (2.6), although the differences were not significant. The differences in mean TPI's in experiment 1 may have been influenced by sample size. But antisera titers in experiment 1 were higher than those in experiment 2 and this could have contributed to the different results in the two experiments.

To attempt to improve the immunization results intraperitoneal inoculations were tried. Furthermore, two inoculations, one at 21 days and an other at 28 days were utilized in an attempt to develop a stronger immure response toward the tumor than that which resulted from subcutaneous immunizations. RSV-1—inoculation was at 42 days of age.

Table 8. Mean antisera titers and TPI'sa of (6-1 x 15-1)F5 B2B2 chickens immunized intraperitoneally at 21 and 28 days of age with various types of (6-1 x 15-1)F4 cells followed by RSV-1--inoculation at 42 days of age.

| Immunizing cell | Number of animals | Mean titer <sup>bcd</sup><br>of antisera | _  | ercent<br>imals | Mean<br>TPId |    |    |                  |  |
|-----------------|-------------------|--|----|-----------------|--------------|----|----|------------------|--|
|                 |                   |  | 1  | 2               | 3            | 4  | 5  |                  |  |
| B5B5 Viable WBC | 16                | 7 <sup>A</sup>                           | 31 | 13              | 31           | 13 | 13 | 2.6 <sup>A</sup> |  |
| B5B5 Viable RBC | 11                | 9 <sup>A</sup>                           | 55 | 18              | 9            | 0  | 18 | 2.1 <sup>A</sup> |  |
| B2B2 Viable WBC | 16                | <2 <sup>B</sup>                          | 38 | 19              | 19           | 6  | 19 | 2.5A             |  |
| Uninoculated    | 13                | < 2 <sup>B</sup>                         | 23 | 31              | 23           | 8  | 8  | 2.6 <sup>A</sup> |  |

a Tumor profile index

b Antisera collected at 42 days of age.

C Antisera were titered for activity toward the immunizing cell type; samples from uninoculated controls were titered for activity toward (6-1 X 15-1)F4 B5B5 RBC's.

d Means with no superscripts in common are significantly different, P  $\leq$  0.05.

Table 8 gives the results a£ intraperitoneal immurization. The antiserum titers, tested at 42 days of age, showed that anti-ESB5 antibody had been formed giving mean titers of 7 and 9 for F2F2 chickens incoulated with E5E5 viable WBC and RBC, respectively. Fach was significantly different from the titers of < 2 for B2B2chickers incculated with viable B2B2 WBC or uninoculated chickens. None of the differences among the mean TPI's as a result af using different insurizing cells were statistically significant. All groups were at the level of tumor response expected for untreated chickens.

In the third immunization technique intravencus inoculations were tried because subcutaneous and IP inoculations did not lead to altered tumor growth. Immunizations were made at 28 and 41 days of age and RSV-1--inoculation at 42 days of age. The inoculation at 28 days was intended to elicit a primary immune response and the one at 41 days to produce a secondary immune response. It was hypothesized that a strong secondary immune response would develop before tumor formation and that this would alter tumor growth. The antisera was titered at 49 days of age to check the immune response after RSV-1--inoculation.

Table 9 gives the results of the intravencus immunizations. The mean titers showed a strong immune response to the cells after RSV-1--inoculation. However, the mean TPI's showed that tumor growth in the immunized individuals was not different from that of uninoculated

Table 9. Mean antisera titers and TPI'sa of (6-1 X 15-1)F5 B2B2 chickens immunized intravenously at 28 and 41 days of age with various types of cells followed by RSV-1--inoculation at 42 days of age.

| xperiment | Immunizing cell <sup>b</sup> | Number of animals | Mean titer <sup>cdf</sup><br>of antisera | Percent distribution of animals according to TPI: |            |    |    |    | $_{\mathtt{TPI}}^{\mathtt{Mean}}$ |
|-----------|------------------------------|-------------------|--|---|------------|----|----|----|-----------------------------------|
|           |                              |                   |  | 1   | 2 ·        | 3  | 4  | 5  |                                   |
| 1         | B5B5 Viable WBC              | 13                | 315 <sup>A</sup>                         | 23  | 23         | 39 | 15 | 0  | 2.5A                              |
|           | B5B5 Viable RBC              | 14                | 363 <sup>A</sup>                         | 36  | 21         | 36 | 0  | 7  | 2.2 <sup>A</sup>                  |
|           | B2B2 Viable WBC              | 11                | <2 <sup>B</sup>                          | 18  | 18         | 36 | 9  | 18 | 2.9 <sup>A</sup>                  |
|           | Uninoculated                 | 10                | <2 <sup>B</sup>                          | 20  | 20         | 40 | 10 | 10 | 2.7A                              |
| 2 ,       | B5B5 Viable WBC              | 10                | 416 <sup>A</sup>                         | 30  | 20         | 30 | 10 | 10 | 2.5 <sup>A</sup>                  |
|           | Uninoculated                 | 7                 | <2 <sup>B</sup>                          | 0   | 5 <b>7</b> | 29 | 14 | 0  | 2.6A                              |
| 3         | B5B5 Viable WBC              | 11                | 548 <sup>A</sup>                         | 18  | 36         | 46 | 0  | 0  | 2.3 <sup>A</sup>                  |
|           | B5B5 Viable RBC              | 7                 | 411A                                     | 0   | 29         | 71 | Ō  | Ō  | 2.7A                              |
|           | B2B2 Viable WBC              | 8                 | <2 <sup>B</sup>                          | 0   | 25         | 50 | 25 | 0  | 3.0 <sup>A</sup>                  |
|           | Uninoculated                 | 7                 | <2 <sup>B</sup>                          | 14  | 44         | 14 | 14 | 14 | 2.7 <sup>A</sup>                  |
| 4         | Line 100 Viable WBC          | 2 11              | 32 <sup>A</sup>                          | 45  | 9          | 18 | 18 | 9  | 2.4A                              |
|           | Line 100 Viable RBC          |                   | 20 <sup>A</sup>                          | 33  | 13         | 33 | 13 | 7  | 2.4A                              |
|           | Uninoculated                 | 15                | <2 <sup>B</sup>                          | 47  | 7          | 13 | 20 | 13 | 2.5A                              |

a Tumor profile index

b All (6-1 x 15-1)F4 cells except in experiment 4 where Line 100 cells were used.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>C</sup> Antisera collected at 49 days of age.

d Antiserawere titered for activity toward the immunizing cell type; samples from uninoculated controls were titered for activity toward (6-1 x 15-1)F4 B5B5 RBC except in experiment 4 where Line 100 RBC were used.

f Means within the same experiment with no superscripts in common are significantly different, P  $\leq$  0.05.

chickens. Experiments 1, 2, and 3 gave mean TPI's ranging from 2.2 to 3.0. Experiment 4 was designed to investigate whether line 100 cells would act similarly to (6-1 x 15-1) \$\frac{85E5}{85E5}\$ cells and produce cross-reactivity between host and tumor. Line 100, which is \$\frac{82E2}{85E5}\$, normally has a high incidence of progressing tumors as do \$\frac{85B5}{85E5}\$ chickens (Collins et al. 1980). However, the effect of immunization was no different in experiment four than in the previous three experiments.

In summary, three different techniques of innunization of (6-1 x 15-1) F4 generation <u>E2B2</u> chickens with <u>E5B5</u> cells were used to attempt to improve the immune response toward RSV-1--induced tumors. In no case, however, was tumor growth significantly altered. The first subcutaneous immunization experiment suggested that immunization might assist in eliminating the tumor, but the second subcutaneous immunization experiment, the intraperitoneal immunization experiments and the intravenous immunization experiments did not support this result. Immunization with line 100 cells, also, did not alter tumor growth.

#### CHAPTER IV

#### DISCUSSION

## PARTIAL TOLEFANCE EXPERIMENTS

(6-1 X 15-1) <u>B2F2</u> chickens partially tolerart to B5 antiqen had a significantly higher incidence of RSV-1--induced tumor progression than untreated <u>E2B2</u> chickens. It appears likely that E5 antigen cross-reacted with tumor associated antigen and thereby severely limited <u>E2B2</u> host recognition of the tumor as foreign.

Partial telerance may involve blocking factors and/or suppressor cells (Brent et al. 1976). The absence of both complete and incomplete antibody at four weeks of age toward the cells inoculated indicated that antibody did not mediate the partial telerance elserved. The partial telerance produced was specific because partially telerant B2B2 chickens frequently accepted E5F5 skin grafts but always rejected E24E24 grafts.

The <u>F</u> genotype has a major influence on the ability of the chicken to regress RSV-induced tumors (Collins et al. 1977, Schierman et al. 1977). <u>F2F2</u>, <u>F2B5</u>, and <u>B5F5</u> chickens from an F2 generation cross of lines 6-1 and 15-1 had mean TPI's of 2.9, 3.8, and 4.8, respectively (Collins

et al. 1977). The data presented here indicated a close association between B5 cell surface antigen and progression of R3V-1--induced tumors. Mortality from RSV-1--induced tumors was higher in 32E2 chickens partially tolerant to B5B5 cells than in normal 32B2 chickens. The E-E region antiqen(s) was the only MHC antiqen found on both WBC and REC (Hala et al. 1977). The involvement of both WBC and REC antiqens in tumor growth suggests, therefore, that the class of molecules coded for by the B-E region may have contributed to increased tumor growth.

Not all <u>F2F2</u> chickens made partially telerant to antiquen showed the same high degree of tumor progression as chserved in <u>F5F5</u> chickens by Collins et al. (1977). A few <u>P2B2</u> chickens incculated with cells from <u>B5B5</u> individuals had low TPI's (i.e. 1 cr 2) which lowered the mean TPI. Partial tcl∈rance may be stronger in some individuals than in others. None of the treated chickens tested had detectable artibody toward the B5 cell surface antigens. Skin grafts from <u>B5B5</u> donors were rejected, however, by 72 and 79 percent of the partially telerant chickens inoculated with viable and lysed WEC, respectively, from B5B5 chickens. Variation in the degree of partial tolerance would be expected to increase the variation among Firthermore, telerance may have been present at 4 to 5 weeks of age but may have disappeared prior to the end of the experiment (14 weeks of age) allowing some of the B2B2 hosts to recognize the tumor as foreign and belatedly to mount an

effective anti-tumor immune response. B2B2 hosts having progressive tumors may have a strong state of tolerance to antigen which, if present for only a short period of time, might permit establishment of the tumor and prevent its ultimate rejection. In the mouse strong meanatally induced transplantation tolerance is much more difficult to establish when denot and recipient differ at the K region of the MHC than when they differ at the D and/or I regions (Folan et al. 1978). In the chicken the total subregion structure of the B2 and E5 harletypes is ret known. Therefore, these two harlotypes could be similar in regions otherwise rrcmcte tolerance. would strong Alternatively, the gene coding for the cross-reacting antigen may be located in a region of the MHC which does not promote strong tolerance.

Both RBC and WBC cell surface antigens contributed to altered tumor growth in partially tolerant <u>B2F2</u> tumorous hosts, but tolerance to REC antigens had no effect or acceptance of skin grafts. Possibly this difference between the tumor and skin graft results may be explained by the difference between the density of the <u>B-F</u> antigens on the REC versus the WEC. F-F antigens on the RBC are only 20 percent as numerous as those on the WBC (Ziegler and Pink 1978). The lower artigenic dose on the REC may be insufficient for skin graft acceptance but adequate to inhibit the innure system during growth of an ESV-induced tumor.

Simcrsen (1955) showed that tolerance to chicken RBC in the turkey led to increased susceptibility of the normally resistant mature turkey to RSV. Subsequent studies showed that human group A erythrocytes, sheep erythrocytes, and chicken tissue extracts each have the property of altering the susceptibility of turkeys to RSV. All have in common a forssman-like heterophile antiqen (Harris and Simons 1958). The B5 antiqen-RSV-induced turor relationship may be a similar example which, in the B535 chicken leads to tumor progression.

General artigen competition or a non-specific effect of chronic GVH does not appear to provide an explanation for the partial tolerance observed because: a) Tolerant B2B2 chickens rapidly rejected skin grafts from B24B24 chickens, while accepting skin grafts from E5B5 chickens indicating specificity in the partial tolerance; b) The response to the second antigen (i.e. RSV-1--induced tumor) persisted for ten weeks, a situation not common with antigenic competition (Pross and Erdinger 1974); c) Lysed WBC and viable RBC contributed to increased tumor growth but not to GVH; and d) Tumor growth patterns were significantly changed; whereas ir rormal B2B2 chickens many completely regressed their tumors, under partial tolerance many chickens died with tumors.

as antiqen may cross-react with antiqenic determinants on tumor associated antiqen, thereby severely limiting recognition or FSV-1--induced tumor as foreign. Rapid tumor

growth could overcome a small immure response to the tumor and lead to the death of the host. B282 individuals regress RSV-1--induced tumers presumably due, in part, to a strong recognition of the tumor as foreign. (6-1 x 15-1) F2 generation <u>E5B5</u> chickens had a significantly higher incidence of turcr progression than B2B2 chickens (Collins 1977). Since tumors in both B2E2 and E5E5et al. individuals were induced by the same subgroup (A) and quantity of virus, these tumors share common subgroup specific and croup specific determinants as well as the ren-virion tumor specific surface antigen. If B5 antigen cross-reacts with any of these common antigenic determinants, E2B2 individuals tolerant to the B5 antiqen should show increased tumor progression. The rechanism of the partial telerance is not important to this hypothesis. Required is that cells from <u>B585</u> chickens elicit a state of srecific immune paralysis which in turn affects RSV-1--induced tumor growth.

## CYTOTCKICITY AND ALLCANTISERA EXPERIMENTS

The MBC of the chicken has been shown to code for at least three artigens, the E-G found on REC, the E-I found on WBC, and the E-F found on both REC and WBC (Fala et al 1977). The alloantisera used in the present experiments were raised against, and agglutinated, WBC and presumably contained both anti-B-F and anti-E-L antibodies. By

testing these antisera against REC, which have no B-L determinants, agglutination was a result of the anti--E-F antibodies. The E-F antigen is associated with B2-microglobulin--like molecules making B-F gene products similar to K and D molecules in mice (Ziegler and Pink 1978). The alloantisera absorption studies showed that the RSV-1--infected and uninfected CEF shared alloantigens, in particular B-F region anticens, with syngeneic RBC.

Since B2B2 cytctcxic lymphccytes (CL) primed against FSV-1--induced tumor specifically lysed RSV-1--infected <u>B2B2</u> CEF and both RSV-1--infected and uninfected E5B5 CEF, cross-reactivity between B5 antigen and tumor associated antiqen (TAA) was indicated. Cell-mediated lympholysis (CML) assays have been used to show cross-reactivity between H-2 antiqens and tumor associated antiqer in the mouse. Parmiani et al. (1979) showed that CML-defined antigenic determinants which cross-reacted with H-2(k) were present on EALB/c sarccma C-1, although they were less immunogenic than the H-2(d) original determinants. Normal SJI (H-2(s)) lymphocytes sensitized in vitro to syngeneic reticulum sarcomas generated effectors capable of lysing not only syngeneic SJI tumors but also H-2(d) or H-2(t) allogeneic Con A clasts or neoplastic cells (Roman and Bonavida 1979). Mcreover, SJL lymphocytes sensitized to H-2(b) or H-2(d) cells efficiently lysed neoplastic SJL cells in vitro. Russell et al. (1979) showed in FALE/c mice that cytotoxic I lymphocytes (CTL) to the BALE/C myelcma tumor MCFC-167 caused essertially no lysis of eight other BALE/c tumors, including three myeloma tumors, but extensively lysed six out of nine tumors of DBA/2 mice. Their observations successed that MOPC-167 expressed an alloantigen normally absent in EALE/c mice but present in DEA/2 mice and in many IEA/2 tumors.

The lysis of <u>B5B5</u> CEF by <u>B2B2</u> CL primed toward <u>B2B2</u> RSV-1--induced tumor was due to cross-reactivity between B5 antique and tumor associated antique not to a common B5-B2 antiqen specificity. Prat et al. (1978) and Robinson and Schirrmacher (1979) showed that amplification of previously undetected public H-2 antigens on tumor cells tock place on lymphomas of SJL (9-2(s)) and IEA/2 strains. Furthermore, cross-reactivity which cytctoxic T cells display on different H-2 haplotypes may be attributable to clones against shared determinants and not to low affinity binding of cytotoxic T cells activated by private H-2 antigen (Schnagl and Boyl 1980). Therefore, shared public antigens may be the cause of some cross-reactivity. Although in the chicken B2 and B5 antigens may share public MHC specificities, priming the <u>E2B2</u> CL against autologous RSV-1--induced tumor prevented immunity against shared rublic specificities.

Alloantisera absorption studies, also, indicated B5-TAA cross-reactivity. The data showed that absorption with BSV-1--infected B2B2 CFF significantly lowered the B5B5 RBC applutination titer of B2B2 anti-B5B5 antisera suggesting

cross-reactivity between RSV-1--infected cells and B5B5 RBC. for cross-reactivity was sought by €vič∈nce investigating the possibility that IgG in serum from <u>B2B2</u> chickens with regressing FSV-1--induced tumors, detected by fluorescent artibody technique to bind to B5B5 RSV-1--induced sarcoma cells, may also bind to E5E5 RBC, WBC or CEF. If B2B2 anti-TAA IGG would bind to E5B5 cells without TAA being expressed on the cells then B5-TAA cross-reactivity would be indicated. Serum samples were ccllected at two week intervals until 70 days rcst--RSV-1 inoculation, but in no case was cross-reactivity detected. Thus, two different approaches to serclogical detection of cross-reactivity gave different results possibly due to antiseras reacting to different antigenic determinants. Evidence from studies on mutants in mice suggested that defined determinants and CI defined serologically determinants were two distinct epitopes on the same molecule (Nathenson et al. 1977). It may not be unusual, therefore, that in the chicken strong cross-reactivity was observed with CL technique but not with serclogical methods. Although it has been frequently observed that animals bearing ESV-induced tumors mount both cellular and humoral anti-tumor insure responses there is good reason to believe that the cellular immune system may play the mcre effective rcle (Wainberg and Phillips 1976, Israel and Wainberg 1977, 1979). Cross-reactivity Hall involving et al. cell-mediated immunity may make the difference between tumor

regression or progression.

### IMMUNIZATION EXPERIMENTS

<u>B2B2</u> chickens partially tolerant to B5. antigen demonstrated increased growth of RSV-1--induced tumors, but immunization of <u>B2B2</u> chickens with B5 antigen, although giving antibody titers toward the E5 antigen, did not result in decreased crowth of tumors. Therefore, the immunization experiments did not support the evidence from the partial tclerance, cytctcxicity, and allcantisera experiments; that antigen cross-reacts with TAA. Transplantation techniques have been used successfully in mice to immunize Immunity to DEA/2 (H-2(d)) or C3Hf against tumors. (H-2(k)), but not to AKE (H-2(k)) tissue, induced in BAL3/c (8-2(d)) mice a resistance against challenge of syngeneic ST2 sarcoma (Invernizzi and Parmiani 1975, Parmiani and Invernizzi 1975, Invernizzi et al. 1977b). Immunization of C3Hf, but not (C3Hf X A)F1 mice with normal B1G-A or A tissue, induced transplantion immunity to subsequent challenge of C3Hf lung tumor expressing E-2(a)-like determinants (Martin et al. 1976, Martin et al. 1977).

The innumizations may have failed to influence tumor growth because they did not elicit an adequate immune response. A strong humoral immune response, but an iradequate cell-mediated immune response, may have been present. Transplantation of skin grafts and subsequent

graft rejection may be required to obtain a strong cell-mediated immunity that would effect the tumor and therefore, indicate 35-TAA cross-reactivity.

## GENERAL DISCUSSION

Invernizzi and Parmiani (1975) and Parmiani an d Invernizzi (1975) concluded that crcss-reactivity of tumor antiques with alloquecic MHC antiques was due to either mcdification of existing histocompatibility anticens or to products of deregressed silent histocompatibility genes. Perry and Greene (1980) suggested that specificity of T cell recognition with regard to tumor anticer and alloantigen reflects the different associative context in which these determinants are recognized. They concluded interaction of tumor antique and host macrophage I-A determinants may create a complex antiquenic structure which resembles artigen encoded by the  $\underline{K}$  or  $\underline{\mathbf{I}}-\underline{\mathbf{A}}$  subregions of the foreign H-2 harlotype, at the level of T cell recognition.

H-2 restricted cytotoxic lymphocytes specific for minor histocompatibility antigens (Bevan 1977), Sendai virus (Finberg et al. 1978), H-Y antigen (von Boehmer et al. 1979), and Herpes simplex virus (Pfizenmaier et al. 1980), selectively cross-reacted with allogeneic MHC determinants. Pfizenmaier et al. (1980) concluded that H-2F(k) plus Herpes simplex virus antiqenic determinants may evoke new antiqenic determinants similar to those expressed by allelic

variants of MHC products, or that cross-reactivity may be due to cross-reaction of the anti-foreign receptor on the CTL. Ivanyi et al. (1980) showed that in EMIE/c mice syngeneic immurization with rormal lymphoid cells induced alloreactive artibodies with high cytotoxic titer. They hypothesized that virus-modified H-2(d) antigeric determinants had triggered alloreactive B-cell clones to produce anti-H-2 antibodies. Hale (1980) demonstrated the existence of a close spatial relationship between a serologically defined portion of the G protein of vesicular stomatitis virus (VSV), the H-2K(k) molecules and those antigens (virus and cell specific) recognized by anti-VSV CTL's.

If cross-reactivity between B5 antigen and specific anticen was direct this would explain the high degree of tumor progression chserved in B5B5 chickers. Direct crcss-reactivity would make it difficult for <u>E5B5</u> chickens to recognize FSV-1--induced tumor as foreign and would severly limit the development of an effective anti-tumor ismunity. hand. On the other the cross-reactivity observed may have been due to a B2--RSV-1 antigen complex which cross-reacted with a B5 antigen. this case cross-reactivity would be observed only in the context of the E2 haplotype. Thus, in the B5B5 lost there may be a cell surface antiqen which, acting in the manner of the B2 antiger, would react with the tumor antigen to form a ccmplex. This complex in turn, would cross-react with a B5 MHC antigen and lead to non-recognition of the tumor as foreign and subsequent tumor progression.

If cross-reactivity of B5 antigen with RSV-1--induced tumor antigen constitutes a cornon mechanism of tumor progression this phenomenon would go far toward explaining the variety of host responses to RSV-1--induced tumors of the variety of host responses to RSV-1--induced tumors of the avian tumor virus group induce tumors with common antigenic determinants (Hall et al. 1979), the response of chickens to avian leukosis virus may also be mediated by a similar mechanism.

To determine more clearly the relationship of the chserved cross-reactivity to tumor progression in <u>B5B5</u> chickens, immunochemical studies of the exact nature of B2, B5, and the cross-reacting antique are required.

### CUESTIONS FAISED BY THIS RESEARCH

1. What is the nature of the cross-reacting antigens? Biochemical definition of the anticens is required and monocolonal antibody would be useful in the isolation procedure. Knowing the chemical structures of the molecules involved would help to determine whether or not the cross-reactivity was direct or due to a B2--RSV-1 antiqen complex. If an antigen complex is involved it is important to determine if a similar complex can form in the B5E5 host. If a complex cannot form then

cross-reactivity is an artifact of the system being studied and has no role in tumor progression in normal <u>E5B5</u> chickens. Information on the relationship between tumor associated artigen and MEC antigen would be gained in any case.

- 2. Would long-term (> 90 days) transplantion tolerance to B5 antiqen in (6-1 x 15-1) B2B2 chickens lead to complete RSV-1--induced tumor progression? Repeated IV inoculations have been shown to elicit long-term tolerance in chickens (Schierman and Nordskog 1964). Anti-tumor immunity may not develop before the tumor kills the host in chickens long-term tolerant to B5 antiqen. Long-term tolerance of B2B2 chickens to B5 antiqen may show all tolerant chickens dying of BSV-1--induced tumor. This result would eliminate variation amoung TPI's and give strong evidence for B5-TAA cross-reactivity.
- 3. Would immurization of (6-1 x 15-1) <u>E2E2</u> chickens with <u>E5B5</u> skin grafts enhance the cell-mediated immune response against RSV-1--induced tumors? Cell-mediated immunity may be more important than humonal immunity in RSV-1--induced tumor regression (Fall <u>et al</u>. 1978). Graft rejection is considered to be mediated, primarily, by cellular effector mechanisms (Klein 1979). Immunization with B5 grafts, leading to a strong cell-mediated immunity, therefore, may affect tumor growth and indicate B5-TAA cross-reactivity.

- 4. How strong is MHC restriction in the chicken? According to the theory of MHC restriction <u>B2E2</u> cytolytic lymphocytes should only kill <u>F2E2</u> RSV-1--infected cells and not <u>F5E5</u> RSV-1--infected cells. In this thesis <u>E2E2</u> cytolytic lymphocytes were observed to kill both of the above mentioned cells and this was used as evidence in support of cross-reactivity. However, if MHC restriction is weak in the chicken then such killing would not be an uncommon situation and would do little to support the hypothesis of B5-TAA cross-reactivity. In any case, the fact that <u>B2B2</u> cytolytic lymphocytes primed to RSV-1--induced tumor will kill normal <u>B5B5</u> cells was the strongest evidence of cross-reactivity.
- 5. Do the MHC regions contain multiple lcci and would this complicate cross-reactivity detection? Multiple lcci in syngeneic individuals with different patterns of gene expression may lead to variable results.
- 6. Would cross-reactivity patterns change with the use of a different RSV subgroup or clone? McBride et al. (1980) observed significant variation in the incidence of tumor regression between chickens from the same highly inbred line inoculated with different RSV subgroups and clones; no significant variation within RSV type was observed. In this case different antiqens may be expressed on tumor cells depending on the virus type.

7. If cross-reactivity is a mechanism of tumor progression in nature is it ceneral or limited to a few specific cases? The E5 and E2 MHC antique system may present a unique case in which cross-reactivity with FSV-1 tumor associated antique is present. On the other hand if tumor associated antique chemical structure is closely related to general MHC antique chemical structure and/or if TAA-MHC antique complexes are necessary for anti-tumor immunity to develop, then TAA-MHC antique cross-reactivity may be a general phenomenon.

#### LITERATURE CITED

- Albert, E. and Gotze, D.: The major histocompatibility system in man. In: The major histocompatibility system of man and animals. Gotze, D. (ed.) pp. 7-77, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1977.
- Archarkault, I. P., Dunler, W. R., Cucchiara, F. P., Collins, W. M., and Corkett, A. C.: A simplified technique for chaining purified peripheral lymphocytes from chickens. <u>Poultry Sci.</u> 55:1972-1973, 1976.
- Each, F. H.: Normal histocompatibility antigens as a model for tumors. Amer. J. Clin. Path. 62:173-183, 1974.
- Eacon, L. D., Fadly, A. M., Mctta, J. V., and Crittenden, L. B.: E-haplotype influence on erythroblastosis in chickens. <u>Fed. Froc.</u> 38:1164, 1979.
- Eacon, L. D., Kite, J. H., and Fose, N. R.: A relationship between the major histocompatibility (E) locus and autoimmune thyroiditis in obese chickers. <u>Science</u> 186: 274-275, 1974.
- Ealcarova, J., Eerka, J., Eala, K., and Brata, I.: Genetic control of innure response to the dinitrophenol group in lines of chickers. Folia Fiol. 20:346-349, 1974.
- Bauer, H., Hayami, M., Eecker, D., and Friis, R, R.:
  Biological and hiochemical changes in the plasma
  membrane of RNA tumor virts-transformed cells. <u>In:</u>
  Structural and kinetic approach to plasma membrane
  functions. Nicolaui, C. and Faref, A. (ed.), pp.
  104-113, Springer-Verlag, Ferlin, 1977a.
- Eauer, H., Iqnjatovic, J., Ruksamen, H., and Hayami, M.: Transfermation-associated surface antigens in virus and chemically transfermed avian cells. Med. Microbiol. Immuncl. 164: 197-205, 1977b.
- Esnacerrai, B. and Dorf, M. E.: Genetic control of the immure response by I region genes. <u>Cold Spring Harbor Symp. Quant.</u> <u>Biol.</u> 41:465, 1976.
- Benacerraf, E. and Germain, R. N.: The immune response genes of the major histocompatibility complex.

  Immunogenetics 38:70-119, 1978.

- Eenacerraf, B. and Katz, D. E.: The nature and function of histocompatibility-linked immune response cenes. <u>In: Immunogenetics and immuno-deficiency</u>. Benacerraf, B. (ed.), pp. 117-177, MFT, St. Lenords House Lancaster, England, 1975.
- Ecnedict, A. A., Pollard, L. W., Morrow, R. R., Applanalp, H., Maurer, R. H., and Eriles, W. E.: Genetic control of innune responses in chickens. <u>Immunogenetics</u> 2:313-324, 1975.
- Berzofsky, J. A., Richman, I. K., and Killicn, E.: Distinct H-2-linked <u>Ir</u> genes control both antibody and T cell responses to different determinants on the same antigen, mycglobin. <u>Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.</u> 76:4046-4050, 1979.
- Earnhard, W.: The detection and study of human viruses with the electron microscope. <u>Cancer Res.</u> 20:712, 1960.
- Bevan, M. J.: Killer cells reactive to altered-self antiques can also be allo-reactive. <u>Prcc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.</u> 74:2094-2098, 1977.
- Bevan, M. J.: The major histocompatibility complex determines susceptibility to cytotoxic T cells directed against minor histocompatibility antigen. J. Exp. Med. 142:1349-1364, 1975.
- Eillingham, R. E., Brent, I., and Medawar, P. G.: Quantitative studies on tissue transplatation immunity. III. Actively acquired tolerance. Phil. Trans. Roy. Soc. (London Ser.) B239:357, 1956.
- Elect, S. E. and Cole, R. K.: Chromosomal location of the major histocompatibility (B) locus in the chicken.

  Poultry Sci. 57:1119, 1978.
- Ecdmer, W. E. (ed.): The HLA system. <u>Erit. Med. Eull.</u> 34, 1978.
- Brent, L., Ercks, L. G., Mederar, P. E., and Singson, E.: Transplantation telerance. <u>Brit. Med. Eull.</u> 32(2): 101-106, 1976.
- Brewer, R. N., Moore, C. H., and Johnson, L. W.: Effects of blood group antigens on resistance to Marek's disease.

  <u>Poultry Sci.</u> 48:1970, 1969.
- Briles, W. F.: Current status of blood groups in domestic birds. Zschr. Tierzuchtung und Zuchturgsbiclogie 79:371-391, 1964.

- Eriles, W. E. and Briles, B. W.: Some recent recombinants at the B locus. <u>In: Avian Immunology.</u> Fenedict, A. A. (ed.), pp. 221-225, Flenum Fress, New York, 1977.
- Briles, W. E., McGibbon, W. H., and Irwin, M. R.: Cn multiple alleles effecting cellular anticens in the chicken. <u>Genetics</u> 35:633-652, 1950.
- Brugge, J. S. and Erikson, B. L.: Identification of a transformation-specific antiqen induced by an avian sarcoma virus. Nature 269:346, 1977.
- Carbone, G., Invernizzi, G., Meschini, A., and Farmiani, G.:

  In vitro and in vivo expression of original and foreign H-2 anticens and of the tumor-associated transplantation artigen of a murine fibrosarcoma. Int.

  J. Cancer 21: 85-93, 1978.
- Carte, I. F., Smith, J. H., Weston, C. R., and Savage, T. F.: Immunogenetics and regression of FSV (RAV-1) wing-web tumors in chickens. <u>Poultry Sci.</u> 51: 1792, 1972.
- Chanh, T. C., Fenedict, A. A., Abplanalp, H.: Association of serum hemolytic complement levels with the major histocompatibility complex in chickens. J. Exp. Med. 144:555-561, 1976.
- Collins, W. M. and Eriles, W. E.: Response of two B (MHC) recombinants to Rots salcoma virus-induced tumors. Paper presented at the 17th conference on Animal Blood Groups and Bicchemical Polymorphism; Wageningen, The Netherlands, July 28 to August 2, 1980.
- Collins, W. M., Briles, W. E., Corbett, A. C., Clark, K. K., Zsigray, R. M., and Dunlop, W. R.: E locus (MHC) effect upon regression of RSV-induced tumors in non-inbred chickens. Immurogenetics 9:97-100, 1979.
- Ccllins, W. M., Briles, W. E., Zsigray, R. M., Dunlop, W. R., Corbett, A. C., Clark, K. K., Marks, J. L., and McGrail, T. P.: The E locus (MHC) in the chicken: Association with the fate of RSV-induced tumors.

  Immunogenetics 5:333-343, 1977.
- Collins, W. M., Heinzelmann, E. W., Corbett, A. C., Zsigray, R. M., and Dunlop, W. R.: Rous sarcoma recression in seven highly inbied lines of white leghorns. <u>Poultry Sci.</u> 59: 1172-1177, 1980.
- Cctter, P. F., Collins, W. M., Corbett, A. C., and Dunler, W. R.: Regression of Rous sarcomas in two lines of chickens. <u>Foultry Sci.</u> 52:799-800, 1973.

- Cctter, P. F., Collins, W. M., Eunlop, W. R., and Corbett, A. C.: Detection of cellular immurity to Bous tumors of chickers by the leukcoyte migration inhibition reaction. <u>Poultry Sci.</u> 55:1008-1011, 1976a.
- Cotter, P. F., Collins, N. M., Eunlop, W. R., and Corbett, A. C.: The influence of thymeotomy on Rous sarcoma regression. Avian Diseases 20:75-78, 1975.
- Cctter, P. F., Collins, W. M., Eunlop, W. R., and Corbett, A. C.: Host age dependency of regression of Rous sarcomas of chickens. <u>Cancer Res.</u> 33:3310-3311, 1973.
- Crittenden, I. B.: Chservations on the nature of a genetic cellular resistance to avian tumor viruses. <u>J. Nat. Cancer Irst.</u> 41:145-153, 1968.
- Crittenden, L. E., Furchase, H. G., Sclomon, J. J., Okazaki, W., and Burnester, B. R.: Genetic control of susceptibility to the avian leukosis complex. <u>Poultry Sci.</u> 51:242-261, 1972.
- Crittenden, L. B., Stone, H. A., Reamer, B. H., and Ckazaki, W.: Two loci controlling genetic cellular resistance to avian leukcsis-sarcoma viruses. J. <u>Virology</u> 1:898-904, 1967.
- Cullen, S. E., Freed, J. H., and Nathenson, S. G.: Structure and serological properties of nurine Ia allcantigen. <u>Transplant</u>. <u>Rev.</u> 30:236, 1976.
- Cunningham, B. A.: The structure and function of histocompatibility antiques. <u>Sci. Amer.</u> 237:96-107, 1977.
- DaSilva, F. F., Hoecker, G. F., Day, N. K., Vienne, P., and Rubinstein, P.: Murine complement component 3: Genetic variation and linkage to H-2. <u>Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.</u> 75:963-965, 1978.
- Delovitch, T. C. and McDevitt, H. D.: Isolation and characterization of murine Ia antigens. <u>Immurogenetics</u> 2:39, 1975.
- Lixon, D. C. and Durcan, I. E.: Minimum tayes risk
  t-intervals for multiple comparisons. J. Am. Stat.
  Assoc. 70:822-831, 1975.
- Cherty, F. C.: Models for recognition of virally modified cells by innune thymus-derived lymphocytes.

  Immunogenetics 3:517-524, 1976.
- Corf. M. E., Stimpfling, J. H., and Benacerraf, E.: Gene dose effects in Ir gene-controlled systems. <u>J. of Immunclecy</u> 123:269-271, 1979.

- Erran-Reynals, F. and Freine, F. M.: The ace of the tumor-bearing hosts as a factor conditioning the transmissibility of the Rous sarcoma by filtrates and cells. <u>Cancer Res.</u> 13:376-382, 1953.
- Exert, D. C., and Cooper, M. D.: Ia-like allcantigens in the chicken: Serologic characterization and ontogeny of cellular expression. <u>Immunogenetics</u> 7:521-535, 1978.
- Ewert, D. C., Gilmour, L. G., Eriles, W. E., and Ccoper, M. D.: Genetics of Ia-like alloantiques in chickens and linkage with E major histocompatibility complex.

  Immunocenetics 10: 169-174, 1980.
- Finberg, F., Furakoff, S., Canter, E., and Benacerraf, B.:
  Biological significance of alloreactivity: T cells
  stimulated by Sendai virus-coated syngeneic spleen
  cells specifically lyse allogenic target cells. Froc.
  Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A. 75:5145-5149, 1978.
- Ford, W. C.: Measurement of graft-versus-host activity.

  In. Handtook of experimental immunology, 3rd edition, weir, L. M. (ed.), pp. 30-1-30-12, Blackwell scientific publication, Oxford, London, Edinburgh, Melbourne, 1978.
- Garrido, F., Festenstein, H., and Schirrmacher, V.: Purther evidence for derepression of H-2 and Ia-like specificities of foreign haplotypes in mouse tumor cell lines, Nature 261:704-706, 1976.
- Garrido, F., Schirrmacher, V., and Festenstein, H.: Studies on H-2 specificities on mouse tumor cells by a new microradic assay. J. Impuncemet. 4:15-27, 1977.
- Gebriel, G. M., Pevzner, I. Y., and Nordskog, A. W.: Genetic linkage betweer innure response to GAT and the fate of FSV-induced tumors in chickens. <u>Innurogenetics</u> 9:327-334, 1979.
- Gipson, T. G., Imamura, M., Ccrliffe, M. A., and Martin, W. J.: Lung tumer-associated derepressed alloantigen coded for by the K region of the H-2 major histocompatibility complex. J. Exp. Med. 197: 1363-1373, 1978.
- Gorer, P. A., Lyman, S., and Snell, G. L.: Studies on the genetic and antigenic basis of tumor transplantation:
  Linkage between a bistcocupatibility gene and fused in mice. Proc. R. Soc. London Ser. B 135:499, 1948.

- Greenwood, A. W., Blyth, J. S. S., and Carr, J. G.:
  Indications of the heritable nature of
  nonsusceptibility to Rous sarcoma in fowls. <u>Erit.</u> <u>J.</u>
  <u>Cancer</u> 2:135-143, 1948.
- Gunther, F., Hala, K., Fude, F., and Eraka, T.: Evidence for an association between immune responsiveness of chickens to (T,G)-A-L and the major histocompatibility system. <u>Eur.</u> J. <u>Immuncl.</u> 4:548-553, 1971.
- Gyles, N. B. and Brown, C. J.: Selection in chickens for retroregression of tumors caused by Rous sarcoma virus.

  <u>Poultry Sci.</u> 50:901-905, 1971.
- Gyles, N. B., Filey, J. L., and Brown, C. J.: The response of resistart and susceptible strains of chickens and their F1 and F2 crosses to subcutaneous incculation with Rous sarcona virus. <u>Foultry Sci.</u> 46:465-472, 1967.
- Gyles, N. R., Stewart, E. R., and Ercwn, C. J.: Mechanisms of genetic resistance in the chicken to Rcus sarcoma virus. Pcultry Sci. 47:430-450, 1968.
- Hala, K., Vilhelmova, M., and Hartmanova, J.: The structure of the major histocompatibility complex of the chicken.

  In: Avian immuncleqy. Benedict, A. A. (ed.), pp. 227-232, Plenum Fress, New York, 1977.
- Hala, K., Vilhelmova, M., and Hartmanova, J.: Probable crossing over in the <u>B</u> blood group system of chickens. <u>Immunogenetics</u> 3:57-103, 1976.
- Hale, A. H.: The spatial relationship of the viral and H-2 antiqens recognized by anti-viral CTL's. <u>Immunoqenetics</u> 10:469-479, 1980.
- Hall, M. R., Qualtiere, L. F., and Meyers, P.: Cellular and humoral immune reactivity to tumor-associated antigens in chickers infected with Rous sarcoma virus. J. Immunclecy 123:1097-1105, 1979.
- Hammerberg, C. and Klein, J.: Linkage disequilibrium between H-2 and t complexes in chromosome 17 of the mouse. Nature 258:296-299, 1975.
- Hanafusa, H.: Avian FNA tumor viruses. <u>In: Cancer 2.</u> Becker, F. F. (ed.), pp. 49-82, Plenum Press, New York, 1975.
- Hanaiusa, H.: Fapid transformation of cells by Rous sarcoma virus. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A. 63:318-325, 1969.

- Hanafusa, H., Miyamoto, T., and Hanafusa, T.: A cell-associated factor essential for the formation of an infectious form of Rous sarcoma virus. Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. U.S.A. 66:314-321, 1970.
- Hanson, E. F., VanZandt, J. N., and Law, G. R. J.:
  Differences in sysceptibility to Marek's disease in chickens carrying two different B locus blood group alleles. Poultry Sci. 46:1268, 1961.
- Harris, R. J. C. and Simons, F. S.: Nature of the antigens responsible for the acquired tolerance of turkeys to Rous sarcoma agent. Nature 181:1485-1486, 1958.
- Hayami, M., Iqnjatovic, J., and Eauer, H.: Avian retrovirus-induced surface antiqens and their cross-reactivity with chemically-transformed cells and primary embryonic cells of Japanese quails. <u>Int. J. Cancer</u> 20:729-737, 1977.
- Herkert, W. J.: Mineral-cil adjuvants and the innunization of lateratory animals. In. Handbook of experimental immurcledy. 3rd edition, Weir, D. M. (ed.), pp. a3.1-a3.15, Blackwell scientific publication, Oxford London, Edinburgh, Melbourne, 1978.
- Holan, V., Chutra, J., and Hasek, M.: Participation of H-2 regions in nechatally induced transplantion tolerance.

  Immunogenetics 6:397-401, 1978.
- Hudson, L. and Hay, F. L.: Practical immunology.

  Blackwell scientific publications, Osney, Meac, Oxford,
  1976.
- Iqnjatovic, J., Rubsamen, F., Bayami, M., and Fauer, H.:
  Rous sarccra virus-transformed avian cells express four
  different cell surface antigens that are
  distinguishable by a cell-mediated cytotoxicity test.
  J. Immunclogy 120:1663-1668, 1978.
- Invernizzi, G. and Farmiani, G.: Tumor associated transplantion artigens of chemically induced sarcomata cross-reacting with allogeneic histocompatibility antigens. Nature 254:713-714, 1975.
- Invernizzi, G., Carkone, G., and Farmiani, G.: Alien histocompatibility determinants on the cell surface of sarcomas induced by methylchclanthrene. II. In vitro serological studies. Tumor 63: 181-194, 1977a.
- Invernizzi, G., Carbone, G., Meschini, A., and Parmiani, G.:
  Multiple foreign ron-H-2 determinants on the surface of
  a chemically-induced murine sarcoma. J. Immunogenet.
  4:97-106, 1977b.

- Ivanyi, P.: ELA and disease association. Paper presented at the 17th conference on Animal Blood Groups and Biochegical Polymorphism: Wageningen, The Netherlands, July 28 to August 2, 1980.
- Ivanyi, P., van Movrik, P., Breuning, M., and Melief, C. J. M.: Anti-H-2 antibodies induced by syngeneic immunization. <u>Innunogenetics</u> 10:319-332, 1980.
- Katz, D. H. and Benacerraf, B.: The function and interrelationships of T-cell receptors, Ir genes and other histocompatible I and B lymphocytes.

  Transplantation Rev. 22:175-195, 1975.
- Klein, J.: The major histocompatibility complex of the mouse. Science 203:516-521, 1979.
- Klein, J.: <u>Biclogy of the mouse histocompatibility-2</u> complex. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1976.
- Lilly, F.: The inheritance of susceptibility to the Gross leukemia virus in mice. Genetics 53:529-539, 1966.
- Lonai, P., Katz, E., and Haran-Ghera, N.: I-region linked complementing leukemogenesis in the mouse.

  <u>Immunogenetics</u> 10:535-543, 1980.
- Lutz, W.: Statistical methods as applied to immunological data. Ir. Harchcok of experimental immunology. 3rd edition, Weir, D. M. (ed.), pp. a2.1-2.29, Elackwell scientific publication, Oxford, London, Edinburgh, Melbourne, 1978.
- Marks, J. L., Collins, W. M., Corbett, A. C., Zsigray, R. M., and Dunlop, W. R.: Genetic nature of regression of Rous sarcoma virts-induced tumors in crosses of Regional Foultry Research Laboratory lines 6 and 7-2.

  Poultry Sci. 58:502-508, 1979.
- Martin, W. J., Gipson, T. G., and Rice, J. M.: H-2(a) associated all cantigen expressed by several transplancentally induced lung tumors of C3Hf mice.
  Nature 265:738-739, 1977.
- Martin, W. J., Gipson, T. G., Martin, S. E., and Rice, J. H.: Derepressed all cantigen on transplancentally induced lung tumor coded for by an H-2 linked gene. Science 194:532-533, 1976.
- McBride, R. A., Cutting, J. A., Schierman, I. W., Strebel, F. S., and Wantanate, E. H.: Genetically controlled regression of avian sarcoma virus-induced tumors in inbred chickens is determined by the virus strain-Fed. Picc. (3, part 2):1154, 1980.

- McGrail, T. F.: Serum blocking and serum unblocking of anti-turor lymphocytotoxicity during Rous sarcoma virus-induced turcrigenesis in the chicken. M. S. thesis, Department of Animal Sciences, University of New Hampshire, Durham, 124 pp., 1977.
- McGrail, T. F., Collins, W. M., and Dunler, W. F.:

  Lymphocytetexicity of chickens hearing Reus sarcomas.

  Poultry Sci. 57:90-94, 1978.
- Meschini, A., Invernizzi, G. M., and Farmiani, G.:
  Expression of alien H-2 specificities on a chemically
  induced EALB/c fibiosarccua. <u>Int.</u> <u>J. Cancer</u>
  20:271-283, 1977.
- More, R., Yron, I., Sasson, S. F., and Weiss, L. W.: <u>In vitro</u> studies of cell mediated cytotoxicity by means of a terminal labeling technique. <u>Cellular Immuncl.</u> 15:382-391, 1975.
- Nathenson, S. G., Brown, J. L., Ewenstein, E. M., Nisizawa, T., Sears, C. W., and Freed, J. H.: Structural differences between parent and varient H-2K glycoproteins from mouse strains carrying H-2 gene mutations. Cold Spring Harbor Symp. Cuant. Fiol. 41: 343-349, 1977.
- Parmiani, G. and Inverrizzi, G.: Alien histocompatibility determinants on the cell surface of sarcomas induced by methylcclanthrene. I. In vivo studies. Int. J. Cancer 16:756-767, 1975.
- Parmiani, G., Carbone, G., Invernizzi, G., Perctti, M. A., Sensi, M. L., Boqers, M. J., and Appella, F.: Alien histocompatibility antigens on tumor cells.

  Immunogenetics 9: 1-24, 1979.
- Paul, W. E. and Eenacerraf, E.: Functional specificity of thymus-dependent lymphocytes. <u>Science</u> 95:1293-1299, 1977.
- Payne, L. N. and Biggs, F. M.: Genetic resistance of fewl to MH2 reticulcerdethelicma virts. J. Gen. Virol. 7:177-185, 1970.
- Pazderka, F., Longenecker, E. B., Law, G. R. J., Stone, H. A., and Ruth, F. F.: Eistcompatibility of chicken populations selected for resistance to Marek's disease.

  Immunogenetics 2:93-100, 1975.
- Fellengrino, M. A., Ferrone, S., and Hayflick, L.: Changes in HL-A antiger profiles on SV40-transformed human fibrollasts. <u>Exp. Cell Res.</u> 97:340-345, 1976.

- Perry, L. L. and Greene, M.I.: the relationship between tumor antigens and alloantigens: Cross-reactivity due to differential context of T cell antigen recognition.

  J. Issunclogy in press, 1980.
- Pevzner, I., Nordskog, A. W., Kaeberle, M. I.: Immune response and the <u>E</u> blocd group locus in chickens. <u>Genetics</u> 80:759, 1975.
- Fevzner, I. Y., Towhridge, C. L., and Nordskog, A. W.:
  Recombination betweer genes coding for immune response
  and serologically determined antigens in the chicken <u>B</u>
  system. <u>Immunogenetics</u> 7:25-33, 1978.
- Pfizenmaier, K., Hartmut, J., Kurrle, R., Rclinghoff, M., and Wagner, H.: Anti-E-2D(d) alloreactivity mediated by Herres-Simplex-Virus specific cytotoxic H-2(k) T lymphocytes is associated with H-2D(k). <u>Immurogenetics</u> 10:395-404, 1980.
- Fierce, C. W., Rapp, J. A., and Benacerraf, B.: Regulation by the H-2 cene complex of macrophage-lymphoid cell interactions in secondary antibody responses in vitro.

  J. Exp. Med. 144:371, 1976.
- Pink, J. R. C., Droege, W., Hala, R., Miggiano, V. C., and Ziegler, A.: A three locus model for the chicken major histocompatibility complex. <u>Immunogenetics</u> 5:203-216, 1977.
- Piranio, F.: The mechanism of genetic resistance of chick embryo cells to infection by Rous sarcoma virus-Bryan strain (BS-RSV). <u>Virology</u> 32:700-707, 1967.
- Prat, M., Rocers, M. J., and Apella, E.: Alloantisera reacting with tumor cells of inappropriate haplotype. I. Characterization of target antigens. J. Natl. Cancer Inst. 61:527-534, 1978.
- Press, J. L., Klinman, N. R., and McDevitt, H. C.: Expression of la antiques on hapten specific B cells.

  J. Exp. Med. 144:414, 1976.
- Pross, H. F. and Erdinger, D.: Antigenic competition: A review of non-specific antigen-induced suppression.

  In. Advances in innurcledy Dixon, P. J. and Kunkel, H. J. (ed.), 18:133-161, Academic press, New York, 1974.
- Radzichovskaja, R.: Agglutinating antibodies in the sera of chickens with regressing Rous sarcomas. Nature 219:407-408, 1968.

- Rathbun, W. F. and Hildemann, W. H.: Genetic control of the antibody response to simple haptens in congenic strains of mice. <u>Genetics</u> 61:49, 1969.
- Robinson, P. J. and Schirrmacher, V.: Differences in the expression of histocompatibility antigens on mouse lymphocytes and tumor cells: Immunochemical studies. <u>Eur. J. Immunol.</u> 9:61-66, 1979.
- Rcman, J. M. and Bonivida, P.: Expression of inappropriate H-2 antiquens on SJL reticulum cell tumors.

  Transplantation Froc. 11:1365-1366, 1979.
- Rous, P.: A sarcoma of the fowl transmissible by an agent separable from the tumor cells. J. Exp. Med. 13:397-411, 1911.
- Russell, J. H., Ginns, I. C., Terres, G., and Fisen, H. N.:
  Tumor antiqens as inappropriately expressed normal
  alloanticens. J. Immuncledy 122:912-919, 1979.
- Scheele, C. E. and Hanafusa, H.: Proteins of a helper-dependent RSV. <u>Virology</u> 45:401, 1971.
- Schierman, I. W. and Mcbride, B. A.: Eviderce for a mutational event at the <u>B</u> blood group histocompatibility locus in chickens. <u>Transplantation</u> 8:515-516, 1969.
- Schierman, L. W. and Nordskog, A. W.: Immunogenetic studies with fcwl: Relationship of blood groups to transplantion immurity and tolerance. Ann. N.Y.A.S. 120:348-355, 1964.
- Schierman, L. W. and Nordskog, A. W.: Relationship of blood type to histocompatibility in chickers. <u>Science</u> 134:1008-1009, 1961.
- Schierman, I. W., Watanabe, C. H., and McBride, R. A.: Genetic control of Rous sarcoma regression in chickens: Linkage with the major histocompatibility complex. Immunogenetics 5:325-332, 1977.
- Schnaql, H. Y. and Ecyl, W.: Separate clones of cytotoxic T lymphocytes are generated against private and public H-2 antigens. <u>Transplantation</u> 29:492-497, 1980.
- Schwartz, B. C., Kask, A. M., Sharrow, S. C., Lavid, C. S., and Schwartz, R. H.: Fartial chemical characterization of Ia anticen derived from murine thymocytes. <u>Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.</u> 74:1195, 1977.
- Shearer, G. M., Fhem, T. G., and Garkarino, C. A.: Cell mediated lympholysis of trinitrophenyl-modified autologous lymphocytes. J. Exp. Med. 141: 1348-1364,

- She wach, E. M. and Rosenthal, A. S.: Function of macrophages in antique recognition by Grinea pig T lymphocytes. J. Exp. Med. 138:1213-1227, 1973.
- Shreffler, D. C.: The S region of the mouse major histocompatibility complex (H-2): genetic variation and functional role in complement system. <u>Transplant</u>.

  <u>Rev.</u> 32:140-167, 1976.
- Silver, D. M. and Lane, C. P: Identification of the gene locus controlling dominant non-responsiveness to P-antiger. <u>Immuncceretics</u> 4:295-299, 1977.
- Simcnsen, M.: Artificial production of immunological telerance to heterological cells and induced susceptibility to virus. Nature 175:763-764, 1955.
- Simonsen, M., Hala, K., and Vihelmova, M.: Allcaggressicn in chickers: Analysis of the E-complex by means of GVH splencmecely and by inhibitory antibodies. In: Avian Immunclecy Benedict, A. A. (ed.), pp. 267-274, Plenum Press, New York, 1977.
- Smith, J. L., Gyles, N. R., and Patterson, I. T.: Hematclcqical responses associated with resistance to Rous sarccma in four strains of chickens. <u>Poultry Sci</u>53:1220-1230, 1974.
- Snedecor, G. W. and Cochran, W. G.: <u>Statistical methods</u> 6th edition, Icwa State University Press, Ages, Iwca, 1967.
- Schmes, R. G.: Registry of poultry genetic stocks in North America. Conn. (Storrs) Agr. Exp. Stat. Bul. 473:1-46, 1975.
- Stone, H. A.: Use of highly intred chickens in research.

  <u>U.S.</u> <u>Dert.</u> <u>Agr.</u> <u>Res.</u> <u>Ser.</u> <u>Tech.</u> <u>Bul.</u> 1514:1-22,
  1975.
- Tennent, J. F. and Snell, G. L.: The H-2 locus and viral
  leukeacqenesis as studied in congenic strains of mice.
  J. Natl. Cancer Inst. 41:597-604, 1968.
- Tcivanen, A. and Toivanen, F.: Histocompatibility requirements for cellular cooperation in the chicken: Generation of germinal centers. J. Immunol. 118:431-436, 1977.
- Uhr, J. W., Capra, J. D., Vihetta, E. S., and Cock, R. G.: Organization of the immune response genes. <u>Science</u> 206:292-297, 1979.

- Vogt, P. K.: Avian tumor viruses. Adv. Virus Res. 11:293-385, 1965.
- Voqt, P. K. and Hu, S. S. F.: The genetic structure of RNA tumor viruses. Ann. Sev. Genet. 11:203, 1977.
- von Boehmer, A., Hengartner, H., Nabholz, Lenhardt, W., Schreier, M. H., and Haas, W.: Fine specificity of a continuously growing killer cell clone specific for H-Y antiqen. <u>Fur.</u> J. <u>Immunol.</u> 9:592-597, 1979.
- Wainberg, M. A. and Fhillips, E. R.: Immunity against Avian sarcomas <u>Israel J. Med. Sci.</u> 12:388-406, 1976.
- Wainberg, M. A., Beiss, E., Wahi, R., and Israel, E.:
  Thymic dependence of cell-mediated immunity to Avian sarcomas in chickens. Cell Immunology 45:344-355, 1979.
- Wainterq, M. A., Markscr, Y., Weiss, C. W., and Ecljanski, F.: Cellular immurity against Rous sarcomas of chickens. Preferential reactivity against autochthches target cells as determined by lymphocyte adherence and cytotoxicity tests in vitro. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA 71:3565-3569, 1974.
- Watanabe, C. E., Cutting, J. A., Strebel, F. S., and McBride, F. A.: Genetic complementation of MHC genes which control regression of avian sarcoma virus-induced tumors in inbred lines of chickens. Fed. Proc. (3, part 2):1154, 1980.
- Wettstein, P. J. and Frelinger, J. A.: H-2 effects on cell-cell interactions in the response to single non-H-2 alloantigens: III. evidence for a second <u>Ir</u>-qene system marring in the <u>H-2K</u> and <u>H-2F</u> regions. <u>Immunogenetics</u> 10:211-225, 1980.
- Wick, G., Sundick, R. S., and Albini, E.: The chese strain (OS) of chickers: An animal model with spontaneous autoimmune thyroiditis. Clin. Immunol. Immunopathol. 3:272-300, 1974.
- Wicker, L. S., Urba, W. J., and Hildemann, W. H.: Hierarchy of H-2 harlctyres governing inheritance of immune responsiveness to TNF-MSA. <u>Immunogenetics</u> 10:235-246, 1980.
- Ziegler, A. and Pink, J. R. C.: Structural similarity of major histocompatibility antigens on leukocytes and erythrocytes. <u>Immunogenetics</u> 15:515-516, 1978.
- Ziegler, A. and Pink, J. R. C.: Chemical properties of two antiqens controlled by the major histocompatibility complex of the chicken. J. Biol. Chem.

251:5391-5396, 1976.

- Zinkernagel, F. M. and Doherty, P. C.: Innunclegical surveillance against altered self components by sensitised T lymphocytes in lymphocytic choricaeringitis. Nature 251:547-548, 1974.
- Zinkernagel, B. M., Callahan, G. N., Althage, A., Cooper, S., Klein, P. A., and Klein, J.: On the thymus in the differentiation of H-2 self-recognition by T cells: Evidence for dual recognition. J. Exp. Med. 147:862-896, 1978.
- Zirkernagel, R. M., Callahan, G. N., Althage, A., Cooper, S., Streilein, W., and Klein, J.: Necnatally tolerant mice fail to react against virus-infected tolerant cells. Nature 266:837, 1977.

### EICGRAPHICAL DATA

Name

Fric Warren Heinzelmann

Date of Birth

November 9, 1955

Flace of Firth

Ecston, Massachusetts

Secondary Education

The Cerryfield School
Manchester, New Hampshire

Collegiate Institutions Attended Dates Degrees

Colby College, Waterville Maine 1973-1977 B.A. (Biology)

University of New Hampshire 1977-1980 Ph.D. (Genetics)

# Honors or Awards:

Selected for participation in the International Union against Cancer, Sixth Training Course in Cancer Research teld at The Jackson Laboratory, Bar Earbor, Maine; Sept. 9-21, 1979.

Sigma Xi - UNH Charter: 1979 - present.

Project assistant at UNH, NIH grant (CA-17680); 1978 - present.

Teaching assistant in genetics at UNH: 1977.

Graduated with honors in the major of Biology from Colby College, Waterville, Maine: May 1977.

Completion of the Jackson Laberatory, Bar Harkor, Maine, Academic year program for college students; 1976 - 1977.

Teaching assistant for the Dept. of Biology, Colhy College, Waterville, Maine; 1976 - 1977.

### Purlications:

- Heinzelmann, E. W., Zsigray, R. M., and Collins, W. M.:
  Increased growth of RSV-induced tumors in chickens
  partially tolerant to MHC alloantigens.
  Immunogenetics (In Press).
- Heinzelmann, E. W., Zsiqray, R. M., and Collins, W. M.:
  Cross-reactivity between RSV-induced tuncr antigen
  and B5 MHC allcantigen in the chicken.
  Immunequetics (In Press).
- Heinzelmann, E. W., Clark, F. R., Collins, W. M., and Eriles, W. E.: Host age and B (MHC) genetyre influence on Rous sarcoma regression in chickens. (manuscript in preparation).
- Collins, W. M., Heinzelmann, F. W., Corlett, A. C.. Zsigray, R. M., and Dunlop, W. R.: Rous sarcoma regression in seven highly inbred lines of White Leghorns. <u>Poultry Sci</u> 59:1172-1177, 1980.
- Heinzelmann, E. W., Zsigray, E. M., and Collins, W. M.:
  Immunclegical telerance to avian bleed cells and
  its association with Reus sarcoma growth in the
  chicker.

#### and

- Collins, W. M., Heinzelmann, E. W., Corhett, A. C., Clark, K. K., Eunlop, W. R., and Zsigray, R. M.: Differences in incidence of regression and metastasis of FSV-induced sarcomas in highly inbred lines of chickens.
- (Abstracts of papers presented at the 4th Regional Cancer Research Symposium, Vermont Regional Cancer Center, Burlington, Vt. Sept. 16-17, 1979)