International Journal of Progressive Sciences and Technologies (IJPSAT)
ISSN: 2509-0119.

Vol. 35 No. 2 November 2022, pp. 83-97

Xenotransplantation: Is a Clinical Challenge Literature Review

Maged Naser[1], Mohamed M. Naser[2], Lamia H. Shehata[3]

[1]Mazahmiya Hospital, Ministry of Health, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, Department of Ob/Gyn,

[2] King Fahd Hospital, Ministry of Health, Kingdom of Saudi, Department of Surgery, Consultant Endoscopic Surgery,

[3]Department of Radiology Care National Hospital, Department of Radiology Care National Hospital, KSA

Abstract – Tissue and organ failure that outcomes from congenital abnormalities, injury, illness, or aging to significant morbidity and mortality. Albeit the twentieth and early 21st centuries have gotten dramatic progressions in the utilization of synthetic and mechanical devices to replace tissues, the restoration of tissue and organ structure and function stays a clinical challenge. Numerous biologic functions can't be replicated with such devices, and the unavoidable immune reactions that are prompted when allografts of human organs, tissues, or cells are implanted can restrict the functionality and longevity of biologic approaches. Regenerative medicine has arisen as a potential alternative approach for tissue and organ restoration in which the engineered tissue is biologically functional. Traditional methodologies for regenerative medicine include biomaterial platforms, stem and progenitor cells, and biologic signalling molecules, alone or in mix, to advance new development of healthy tissue. A recent technique, "regenerative immunology," advances tissue recuperating and recovery through reprogramming of the host immune system. Be that as it may, organ transplantation is as yet the most incredibly complete choice in regenerative medicine, giving an autologous, allogeneic, or possibly xenogeneic replacement for complete physical and biologic restoration. Advances in immune and genome engineering (or editing) make an establishment for new treatments to speed up the restoration and substitution of tissues and organs, including those from xenogeneic sources. Regenerative immunology depends on the way that immune cells, for example, macrophages and T-cells, which are usually considered as in their protective role against pathogens or "nonself" cells and as mediators of inflammation, can be made to adopt on programs that can advance healing of tissues that have been damaged by the initial inflammatory antimicrobial response.[1,2] Such regenerative immune reactions can likewise promote healing after xenogeneic transplantation, provided that the anti-xenogeneic reaction to nonself tissue can be suppressed. Genome engineering has the ability to enrich xenogeneic tissues with down-modulating, anti-xenogeneic immune reactions that can facilitate with cross-species transplantation. Thusly, the origins, challanges, innovations, and future of regenerative medicine and transplantation are firmly interlaced inside the fields of immune and genome engineering. In this review, we sum up some recent developments in this field.

Keywords – Xenotransplantation, graft, rejection, T-cells, B-cells, xenoantigens, Transgenic Proteins.

I. INTRODUCTION

It is difficult to envision factories of pulsating hearts or expanding and collapsing lungs prepared for implantation when required, given both the cost and the fundamental planned operations. A natural option in contrast to de novo engineering of organs is to involve a live donor of one more animal species as a source. The benefits of this approach are significant, since a characteristic living organ is by definition fully functional, yet cross-species immune reactions make difficulties. Engineering to defeat this limitation should be genetic. In particular, a long-known hyperacute immune reaction to animal organs is to a great extent eliminated by knocking out genes encoding machinery that synthesizes cell-surface carbohydrate xenoantigens — explicitly, the α-1,3-galactosidase encoded by GGTG1. Two other genes (CMAH and B4GALNT2, which encode proteins that produce N-

Corresponding Author: Maged Naser

glycolylneuraminic acid) and SD (a) xenoantigens have been concentrated in knockout models and furthermore lessen cross-reactivity. Different difficulties related with xenotransplants incorporate risks of zoonoses related with the animal species that provisions the organ and sociocultural hesitance among patients to accept an animal sourced organ. Pigs are thought to be an optimal expected source of organs for xenotransplantation in humans. Porcine and human organs are comparable in size and shape and are promptly available, and both inbred and outbred strains are being used for preclinical studies. Also, pigs can be cloned through somatic cell nuclear transplantation strategies, and their genomes can now be promptly engineered (or "edited") by designer nucleases, for example, zinc-finger nucleases, transcription activator-like effector nucleases (TALENs, which incorporate a nonspecific DNA-cleavage nuclease fused to a DNA-binding domain that can target on any sequence), and the versatile RNA-targeted CRISPR-Cas9 (grouped routinely interspaced short palindromic repeats and related Cas9 endonuclease) system. At last, since pigs are more related with humans than are nonhuman primates, it has been contemplated that they are significantly more outlandish than nonhuman primates to transmit pathogens through a transplanted organ. Sensitive polymerase-chain-response arrays are accessible to recognize pathogens, and a robust surveillance program would be required to keep donor pathogen- free, however it would be practical. Moreover, an in-depth checking program for the products would be required to agree with Food and Drug Administration (FDA) prerequisites. These positives should be adjusted against the certainty that the number of "minor antigens" as amino acid sequence varieties — and in this way the potential for immunologic incompatibilities — unyieldingly increases with phylogenetic distance.

The first whole organ xenotransplantations were acted in the early 1900s, and the report about them was both good and bad.[3,4] The organs were successfully transplanted and functional, yet we currently perceive that the vast majority of them failed rapidly due to hyperacute rejection in light of glycosylated proteins, like galactose-α-1,3-galactose, which are available in massive amounts in the graft cell membranes of donor animals.[5,6] The utilization of donor pigs with an engineered knockout of GGTG1, which is liable for primary glycosylation activity, had the option to extraordinarily decrease hyperacute rejection experimentally; nonetheless, when the tissue was transplanted into nonhuman primates, an imperfect proxy for humans, it was as still rejected within weeks.[7] In a series of studies, researchers have set out determined to identify human genes, for the most part encoding the CD (cluster of differentiation) family of layer proteins, that can be expressed as transgenic proteins, fusion proteins, or even as antibodies against porcine proteins in the pig to further mitigate human anti- porcine immune reactions (Table 1).[7] A several such transgenes have been tried, albeit not efficiently, over the course of the last ten years, and the proteins they encode fall into three classes: immune cloaking, by which explicit transgenic proteins slow down killing by natural killer (NK) or T-cells, and complement humanization and coagulation humanization, in which explicit components of the human complement or human coagulation pathways are utilized rather than or notwithstanding porcine partners. The capacity of a portion of these mediations to advance successful xenotransplantation into nonhuman primates has been assessed, and at times significant enhancements in organ rejection have been noted. [8,9]

Table 1. Transgenic Proteins and Their Potential Uses in Transplantation.

Function and suspected mechanism transgenic protein*	
Immune cloaking	
CD47 (integrin-associated protein)10,11	Reduces macrophage-mediated toxicity through signal regulatory protein α (SIRPα); “don’t eat me” signal
CD95L (Fas ligand)8	Prevents apoptosis
Anti-pCD152 (anti-pCTLA4 antibody)8	Minimizes effect of porcine cytotoxic T-cell antigen 4
MGAT3 (GnT-III)	Humanizes glycosylation

Function and suspected mechanism transgenic protein*	
HLA-E–β2 M (fusion protein)12	Prevents natural killer cell attack in a swine leukocyte antigen knockout
SIRPα (signal regulatory protein)11	Reduces macrophage-mediated toxicity (see CD47)
TNF-α (tumor necrosis factor α)13	Prevents apoptosis
TRAIL (TNF-α apoptosis-inducing ligand)13	Prevents apoptosis
Complement humanization	
CD46 (membrane cofactor protein)14	Inhibits complement damage
CD55 (decay-accelerating factor)8	Inhibits complement membrane attack complex
CD59 (MAC-inhibitory protein)8	Inhibits complement membrane attack complex
Coagulation humanization	
CD39 (ecto-NTP diphosphohydrolase 1)8	Inhibits platelet aggregation
PROCR (endothelial protein C receptor)14	Enhances anticoagulant serine protease protein C
TFPI (tissue factor pathway inhibitor)8	Inhibits factor Xa and tissue factor, minimizing thrombin formation
THBD (thrombomodulin)14	Activates antithrombotic protein C, minimizing clot formation

*Selected references are provided here; a more complete list of references is provided by Cooper et al.8,14 and Yue et al.[15]

The utilization of nonhuman primates in preclinical examinations might be all around expected, yet it might add a pointless complexity to clinical examinations. Beside the cost and moral difficulties encompassing such studies, this approach adds a stage to what ought to be a much simpler question: might we at any point work on the practicality of transplanting organs from donor species A (pig) into species B (human) by adding an "outsider," species C (nonhuman primate), as a test step? Differences between the immune systems of nonhuman primates and humans, also the distinctions in size and physiology, would enormously entangle the assessment of efficacy and safety in going from A to B, the relevant trajectory. A genuine illustration of an "irrelevant" immunologic phenotype is differential glycosylation sensitivity to CMAH-knockout pig cells in nonhuman primates as compared with humans.[16] It would be essential to develop extra evaluative platforms that keep away from the introduction of

relevant antigens and organs into nonhuman primates, for example, "reversing the polarity" of transplantation by transplanting surplus human tissues or organs into pigs, as well as the more extreme idea of utilizing recently dead organ donors to assess the human xenoresponse. Such moves could work with xenotransplantation implementation in the clinic. [17-19]

1. Adaptive immunity

B cells: The role of Nabs (*neutralizing antibodies*) might be considered innate immunity, notwithstanding the probable role of exposure to microbial carbohydrate moieties in driving their formation. IgG antibodies shaped by earlier exposure to human alloantigen obviously have a place with the adaptive immune response. Notwithstanding, one more class of anti-pig antibodies has been accounted for in exceptionally sensitive individuals whose anti-H LA alloantibodies cross-respond to pig leukocyte antigen (SLA, that is porcine MHC) class II [20] and SLA class I [21] antigens, recommending that knocking out or mutating certain SLA alleles could further improve xenotransplant outcomes[22,23] . In early xenotransplantation preliminaries, avoidance of patients with elevated levels of IgG Nabs in crossmatch to potential contributor pigs will be fundamental; nonetheless, desensitization strategies may be assessed in later studies.

T-cell: The development of IgG antibody reactions to source pig antigens following xenotransplantation generally demonstrates the presence of a T-cell reaction. In spite of the fact that T-cells are for the most part appointed to the adaptive immunity reaction, γδ White blood cells have highlights of both innate and adaptive immunity [24,25]. γδ Lymphocytes play a significant role in rejecting rat bone marrow in mice [26]; nonetheless, their likely role in organ xenograft rejection has not been broadly investigated.

Customary αβ T-cells represent a powerful barrier to xenotransplantation, both by directly attacking the graft and by promoting antibody and NK cell reactions. T-cell reactions that incorporate cytotoxicity, cytokine production and the recruitment and activation of innate cytotoxic cells are challenging to overcome in pig and primate xenotransplantation, even with elevated levels of immunosuppression [27,28]. Early studies that reported weak mouse anti-pig direct T-cell xenoresponses[29] likely reflected the failure of several key receptor-ligand interactions between these evolutionary disparate species[30] and didn't be guaranteed to indicate decreased T-cell receptor (TCR)- ligand interactions in xenogeneic compared with allogeneic combinations.

MHC molecules from pigs can positively choose a different collection of murine [31-33] and human T-cells [34], proposing that these xenogeneic TCR-MHC interactions are quite effective. As opposed to mouse anti-pig reactions, the majority of the tested molecular interactions appear to be effective in the human anti-pig T-cell reaction. Porcine SLA class I and class II molecules can straight forwardly activate human CD8+ and CD4+ T -cells, respectively, and human direct T-cell reactions to pig and HLA-mismatched human antigens are similar in magnitude [35]. Interactions of human T-cells with porcine ligands for human LFA1 (otherwise called CD11a-CD18), CD2 and CD28 are effective [35-40]. Human CD4+ T-cells (through the Fas-FasL pathway) and, to lesser degree, CD8+ T-cells, are prepared to do straight forwardly killing porcine target cells [41,42]. Notwithstanding, an absence of signalling from human IFN-γ [43] through porcine receptors could restrict the capacity of human T-cells to advance the up-regulation of MHC and costimulatory molecules on porcine antigen-presenting cells (APCs).

Powerful indirect xenorecognition, in which recipient APCs cycle and present donor antigens on recipient MHC molecules, happens in the human anti-pig direction [35,36]. This indirect xenorecognition reaction is by all accounts more grounded than indirect reaction to alloantigens [35], consistent with the a much more noteworthy number of protein polymorphisms between different species than between individuals of similar species. Studies in rhesus macaques implicated indirect actuation of IFN-γ-producing recipient T-cell in the rejection of porcine islet xenografts, which likewise showed macrophage invasion. A strong immunosuppressive regimen that prevented allograft rejection was inadequate to prevent this xenograft rejection, underscoring the strength of the T-cell xenoresponse [44]. Indirect memory T-cell reactions to porcine antigens in NHPs are refractory to immunosuppression adequate to suppress direct xenoresponses [45]. As induction of T-cell dependant antibodies includes presentation of donor antigens by antigen-specific B -cells to peptide-reactive CD4 T cells, the early IgG reactions seen in NHPs receiving porcine heart or kidney transplants [46,47] may mirror the strength of the indirect T-cell xenoresponse.

Porcine B7 molecules can costimulate human T-cell through CD28 [48], making this interaction a viable target for immunosuppression in xenotransplantation. Blockade of this costimulation pathway attenuated the anti-n on-Gal antibody reaction in pig to baboon heart transplantation [49]. Despite CD40-CD154 blockade didn't suppress the human anti- pig proliferative T-cell reaction in vitro[48],such blockade has been utilized widely to supress organ[50,52] and islet [53] graft

rejection in large animal xenotransplantation and seems to be fundamental to prevent fast ABMR (antibody-mediated rejection) of cardiovascular xenografts in baboons[54].

Human CD4+CD25+FOXP3+ regulatory T(Treg) cells can suppress anti- pig responses in vitro [55]. Treg cells also can suppress porcine islet xenograft rejection through human T-cells in HIS mice [56] and CD4 T-cell-dependent human macrophage activation in vitro [57]. Prolonged porcine skin graft survival was achieved in baboons that acquired polyclonally multiplied recipient Treg cells in combination with donor HCs [58]. However, autologous Treg cells failed to enhance porcine islet graft survival in immunosuppressed rhesus macaques [59]. In vitro xenogeneic research propose that modified porcine dendritic cells can lessen human anti- pig responses [60,61]. CD8+CD28− Treg cells have additionally been mentioned to suppress human anti-pig CD4 responses in vitro [62].

2. Genetic ways to avoid rejection

As innovative advances have significantly improved the ability to genetically engineered pigs, this approach has shown its capability to overcome immune barrier to xenotransplantation.

2.1 Antibody-mediated rejection

NAbs that bond to porcine cell surface antigens and fix complement are answerable for HAR in pig-to-primate transplantation. Perceiving the possible incompatibility of porcine CRPs with primate actuated complement, early endeavours to deliver genetically modified pigs for xenotransplantation included introducing human CRPs, including CD55, CD46 and CD59, into porcine fertilized ova through pro-nuclear injection [63]. This approach produced pigs that expressed human CRPs (*Complex regional pain syndrome*) on endothelial cells and could be bred. Nonetheless, human CRP expression mitigated, however didn't eliminate, HAR (a type of humoral rejection and is mediated by preformed antibodies that naturally pre-exist in the recipient). Removal of NAbs by absorption procedures enabled organs from CRP-t ransgenic pigs to survive for days to weeks in NHPs [64] however rapid recuperation of NAbs, frequently at expanded levels, was related with delayed ABMR [65]. Complete knockout of Gal utilizing nuclear transfer was expected to prevent HAR and especially broaden survival of pig to baboon xenotransplants in recipients with high titres of against G al Nabs [46,66].

Further advances in genome editing, including the utilization of zinc finger nucleases, transcription activator-like effector nucleases (TALENS) and Clustered Regularly Interspaced Short Palindromic Rehashes (CRISPR)- Cas9 [67] have accelerated and upgraded the feasibility of humanizing the pig genome to improve the success of xenotransplantation. These strategies require transfer of nuclei from gene edited somatic cells into enucleated oocytes and implantation into receptive sows to generate cloned pigs.

CRISPR has been utilized to generate pigs with knockout of the genes liable for production of the B4Gal and NeuGc carbohydrate epitopes in addition to Gal. Human sera show particularly decreased levels of NAbs restricting to pig cells with knockout of GGTA1, B4GALNT2 and CMAH (known as triple knockout (TKO) cells) contrasted with pig cells that lack Gal and NeuGc , while pig cells with twofold knockout of CMAH and GGTA1 show expanded binding of baboon antibodies contrasted and pig cells with knockout of GGTA1 alone or TKO pig cells[68]. The binding of antibodies in sera from transplant waitlisted patients to technical knockout pig target cells is supposedly like their limiting to allogeneic targets [21]. As exceptionally sensitized patients with alloantibodies against numerous HLA alleles have difficulty finding suitable allograft donors, they may be suitable possibility for starting preliminaries of pig technical knockout kidney or heart xenotransplantation. Two studies have shown an absence of correlation between board panel-reactive levels and reactivity to GGTA1 knockout pig PBMCs (Isolated Peripheral Blood Mononuclear Cells) [69,70] proposing that profoundly allosensitised patients may be fitting possibility for porcine organ transplants [71].

The analysis of sera from planned transplant recipients to detect antibodies against potential source pigs doesn't represent the likelihood that xenoantibodies can be rapidly prompted after transplantation, causing deferred xenograft response a few of days after placement of a xenograft, as was observed in early hamster to rat transplants[72,73] . Given the capability for the technology of latest carbohydrate epitopes while enzymes generating NAb goals are deleted from pigs, the induction of tolerance amongst B-cells that produce all NAb specificities that apprehend donor antigens, might be the ideal way to deal with avoiding non-Gal NAb -mediated rejection.

Extra genetic modification has been brought into pigs with the goal of early ABMR. Transgenic expression of human haem oxygenase-1 (HO-1), which switches haem to bilirubin, carbon monoxide and free iron, protects cells from oxidative injury through different mechanisms including anti-inflammatory, cytoprotective and anti- apoptotic effects [74]. Albeit a several NHP transplant studies have utilized pigs with transgenic human HO-1 expression [75], the impact of human HO1 on xenograft survival has not been efficiently evaluated. In pig hearts, expression of human A20 (otherwise called TNFAIP3), a TNF-Induced zinc finger protein catalyst that represses NF-κB activation and TNF-mediated apoptosis, protected porcine endothelial cells from CD95-mediated cell death and complement mediated cytotoxicity in vitro and, in combination with human HO1, deferred ABMR in pig kidneys perfused ex vivo with human blood[76].

Given the prominent activation of coagulation processes during ABMR and the species incompatibily of some regulators of coagulation, source pigs that produce human inhibitors of clotting and coagulation have likewise been generated. Transgenic expression of human thrombomodulin (TM, otherwise called CD141), an endothelial cell protein that inhibits coagulation by changing over thrombin from a procoagulant to an anticoagulant enzyme, is believed to be instrumental in empowering long-term survival of heart xenografts in baboons [54,77]. Humanization of porcine von Willebrand Factor (vWF), a glycoprotein that interacts with Variable VIII to promote platelet adhesion at sites of vascular harm, has been viewed as defensive ex vivo and in organ perfusion studies [78], however its impact on xenograft endurance is unknown. A transgene for human CD39 (otherwise called ENTPD1), an enzyme that hydrolyses ATP and ADP to AMP, which is consequently hydrolysed to adenosine (which has anti- thrombotic and cardiovascular protective impacts), has been included in several pig to primate xenograft models [79]. In the same way as other of the human transgenes introduced into pigs, the impact of human CD39 has not been systematically analysed independently from other transgenes, making its conceivable advantage challenging to find out.

Serial nuclear transfer has been utilized to produce pigs that have GGTA1 and CMAH knocked out and express different human CRPs and transgenes encoding the anti-inflammatory and anti- apoptotic molecules HO1 and A20 [80]. Albeit no studies have included trials to pinpoint the activity of individual genetic modifications added to double knockout pigs or to GGTA1, B4GALNT2 and CMAH knockout pigs, one review revealed that longer rejection free survival (as long as 217 days) could be accomplished utilizing kidneys from animals that expressed higher instead of lower levels of human CRPs[81]. All grafts were ultimately lost owing to rejection as well as thrombotic microangiopathy; infectious complications of the immunosuppressive treatments were additionally a significant constraint. Whether technical knockout source pigs have any upper hand over GGTA1 knockout pigs for xenotransplantation is unclear from existing data, as they have not been compared directly. Comparable survival of kidney xenografts has been acquired in NHPs utilizing GGTA1 knockout pigs transgenically expressing human CD55 and utilizing technical knockout pigs expressing human CRPs [81,82]. Limits of the Old-World primate model, in which a new epitope is uncovered by the CMAH knockout, make it hard to reach conclusions about the best genetic modifications to use for human xenotransplantation. Notwithstanding, at times kidneys from GGTA1 and B4GALNT2 twofold knockout pigs went through quick ABMR not long after transplantation into Rhesus monkeys, showing that extra NAb targets exist in this species combination, in spite of the fact that survival of as long as 435 days was accomplished in one animal[83].

2.2 T-cell mediated rejection

Genetic engineering might actually be utilized to avoid T-cell reactions and accordingly empower decrease of immunosuppressive treatment .Several gatherings have investigated this approach by introducing FasL[84], CTLA4Ig122, PD-L1 [81] or anti- CD2 monoclonal antibodies[86] into pigs fully intent on accomplishing local immunosuppression in the xenograft following transplantation. Corneal transplants from pigs expressing transgenic CTLA4Ig showed further developed endurance compared with wild type corneal transfers in NHPs (Nonhuman primates) [87] and transgenic CTLA4Ig expression in beta cells further developed porcine islet graft endurance in HIS mice [88]. Localized expression of CTLA4Ig is beneficial compared with generalized expression, which might compromise immunocompetence of the source animals [85].

One more expected way to deal with enabling xenografts to evade have host T-cell reactions is to knock out class I SLA from TKO source pigs [89]. The aftereffects of transfers from these pigs into NHPs have not yet been reported. Be that as it may, loss of class I SLA could build the susceptibility of source pigs and xenografts to infection as well as increment the increase of NK cell-mediated rejection. The latter option hazard may be mitigated by transgenic expression of HLA [62,63,90]. In any case, absence of class I SLA wouldn't prevent indirect T-cell recognition of xenoantigens that can promote antibody mediated and cytokine- mediated graft injury and hence wouldn't provide complete immune evasion.

3. Organ xenotransplantation

Utilization of genetic modification draws near, combined with progresses in immunosuppressive treatments, has allowed long term pig islet, kidney and heart unite survival in NHPs and restored interest in clinical xenotransplantation (Table 1). Blockade of the B7-C D28 [86] and CD40-CD154 costimulation pathways has played a significant part in these successes. Liver xenotransplantation has shown to be considerably more challenging and such grafts have not yet survived more than something like a month in NHPs [91].

3.1 Islet xenotransplantation

Islet xenotransplantation is relatively non-invasion and the graft isn't life supporting, possibly simplifying its clinical application. Long term islet survival has been accomplished in NHPs, yet grafts were in the end rejected despite heavy immunosuppression including costimulatory blockade [27,53,92]. Persistent innate inflammatory reactions appear to restrict pig islet survival in NHPs [93]. Genetic changes, for example, human CRPs and CTLA4Ig have been included for certain studies, yet their effects are uncertain [94]. As adult pig islets don't express Gal [95], the GGTA1 knockout is of less significance than other modifications here. Notwithstanding, human CRPs and anti- coagulant protein transgenes could be important in controlling the immediate innate reaction that destroys islets injected into the portal circulation [96].

As diabetes is usually manageable with insulin treatment and islet transplantation doesn't typically cure disease [97], islet xenotransplantation must be justified for a large scope in the event that the requirement for immunosuppression could be avoided, for instance, by islet encapsulation or tolerance induction. To date, clinical preliminaries of xenogeneic islet encapsulation have not shown delayed porcine insulin production [98-101]. Tolerance to partially class II MHC-matched allogeneic islets in NHPs has been accomplished utilizing donor apoptotic cell administration with costimulatory blockade, rapamycin and anti-inflammatory treatments [102]. This approach has been extended to xenograft models in rodents [103] yet has not yet succeeded in NHP xenograft models.

3.2 Kidney xenotransplantation

Survival of GGTA1 knockout pig kidney grafts for >400 days has been reported for in a few of NHPs with low levels of non-Gal Nabs [52,83,104,105]. Nonetheless, unites were at last rejected notwithstanding immunosuppression that included T and B cell exhaustion, steroids and costimulatory blockade together with rapamycin or mycophenolate mofetil. One gathering announced that long term depletion of CD4+ cells was expected to accomplish long-t erm xenograft survival [82] yet others observed that this approach was not necessary [81]. Similar outcomes have been accomplished with technical knockout kidneys expressing different human transgenes in NHP recipients with contrasting levels of anti-donors' antibodies in their sera [81]. Given these information's, some researchers have recommended that kidney xenotransplantation would be suitable for patients who are probably not going to get an allograft for various reasons, including elevated degrees of presentation to alloantigens, primary kidney disease that is probably going to recur rapidly in an allograft or an absence of vascular access for dialysis[106] . The unfortunate translatability of GGTA1, B4GALNT2 and CMAH technical knockout kidney transplants from NHPs to people justifies extra human decedent studies and restricted clinical preliminaries of technical knockout porcine kidney transplantation [107].

In 2022, a several human xenotransplantation experiments were completed involving GGTA1 knockout and technical knockout porcine kidneys in mind dead recipients. GGTA1 knockout pig kidneys were connected with the circulation of two deceased individuals and ex vivo perfused for 54 h at New York College Clinical Centre, USA [108]. The kidneys were functional and didn't go through HAR. The technical knockout experiment included implantation of two pig kidneys containing human transgenes for CD47, HO-1, several CRPs, TM and EPCR and with knockout of growth hormone receptor (GHR), into a deceased individual. The kidneys produced urine but didn't clear creatinine and the grafts underwent through thrombotic microangiopathy during the three-day period of the experiment [109]. The disrupted physiology because of delayed brain death and multi-organ failure in the recipient at the time of transplantation makes this result difficult to interpret.

Despite the fact that xenotransplantation experiments utilizing deceased humans are challenging from an ethical point of view, much could be gained from extra comparative studies, for instance, concerning the threshold levels of anti-donor IgM and IgG antibodies that would result in early ABMR with different genetically modified pigs. Foundation of such standards would greatly facilitate future clinical preliminaries of xenotransplantation.

3.3 Heart transplantation

NHP models of orthotopic, life-sustaining heart xenotransplantation have been published over the recent 5 years. Past studies included heterotopic transplants, in which the grafts serve as an accessory as rather than as a functioning heart. Long-term (several years) survival of heterotopic pig GGTA1 knockout heart grafts immunosuppressive regimen that expected CD40 blockade [54]. Hence, 6-9 months' survival of life-sustaining orthotopic GGTA1 knockout pig hearts that expressed human CD46 and TM was accomplished in baboons treated with rituximab, anti-thymocyte globulin, anti- CD40/CD40L, mycophenolate mofetil and steroids [110,111]. Success was subject to non-ischaemic preservation of the heart before transplantation.

Myocardial hypertrophy was an important starting constraint to long-term survival that could be controlled by keeping up with low blood pressure in the recipient and utilizing rapamycin. Control of graft growth accomplished by knocking out GHR in source pigs with knockout of B4GALNT2 and GGTA1 that were transgenic for human CRPs, CD47, HO-1, TBM and EPCR brought about additional enhancements in survival [111]. Be that as it may, GHR-knockout pigs might not have normal health and metabolic function [112]; accordingly, utilization of miniature pigs may be advantageous for cardiovascular xenotransplantation.

Potential candidates for cardiovascular xenotransplantation would almost certainly incorporate patients encountering failure of left ventricular assist devices (LVADs), alloantibody formation while on LVADs, other contraindications to LVADs, failure of primary cardiovascular allografts, and complications of or contraindications to total artificial hearts [106]. In 2022, the field was galvanized by a report of cardiovascular xenotransplantation from a pig with 10 genetic modifications, including knockout of GGTA1, B4GALNT2, CMAH and GHR and transgenic expression of human CRPs, CD47, HO-1, TM and EPCR, to a patient at the university of Maryland, USA[113]. The pig heart didn't go through rapid rejection and was life sustaining for 7weeks, giving an achievement of clinical xenotransplantation. Albeit the heart failed, the observing that a pig heart is fit for sustaining human life is exceptionally reassuring. Studies are underway to determine the precise reason for the failure of the heart. Pig-specific cytomegalovirus was recognized in the patient however the role, if any, of this infection in causing graft loss is currently unclear. Such infections might actually be stayed away from by more thorough screening and elimination of viruses from source pigs.

3.4 Thymic transplantation

Rat studies, Xenogeneic thymus transplantation can tolerize the T-cell arm of the immune reaction. Normal self-tolerance induction in the thymus includes deletion, anergy or T reg cell differentiation of possibly autoreactive T- cell by exposure to the suitable self-antigens introduced by either bone marrow-derived cells or thymic stromal cells. The tolerance actuated by mixed chimerism relies upon negative selection of developing T cell in the thymus by both donor and host bone marrow-derived cells that migrate to the host thymus, explicitly deleting reactivity to both host and donor. On the other hand, transplantation of a donor thymus into a recipient that is depleted of mature T-cell results in intrathymic generation of new recipient T-cell that are exposed to negative selection by host bone marrow-derived APCs entering the thymic graft and by donor APCs and thymic epithelial cells, resulting in loss of reactivity to both host and donor[114,115]. Intra-thymic self-tolerance induction additionally includes exposure to tissue-restricted antigens (TRAs) expressed by medullary thymic epithelial cells, which results in or Treg cell differentiation of thymocytes that recognize these antigens.

II. Conclusion

Enhancements in approaches for genetic engineering of pigs and immunosuppression have prompted energizing advances in xenotransplantation, which are reflected in long term organ xenograft survival in NHPs and early forays into clinical xenotransplantation. Standards for kidney xenotransplantation in living individuals and for recipient selection have been previously discussed [116] and such studies are probable imminent. Tremendous potential exists for further modifications to make pig organs more compatible with human immune systems and physiology. Nevertheless, immune barriers to xenotransplantation are probably to stay considerable and tolerance may eventually be required to enable xenotransplantation to become into the standard of care. Stepwise advances towards this goal are anticipated in the near future, and it is hoped that the aim of organ transplantation for all who need it will at last be achieved.

Conflict of Interest

All authors declare no conflicts of interest.

AUTHORS CONTRIBUTION

Authors have equally participated and shared every item of the work.

GLOSSARY

	A graft of cells or tissues from one individual member of a species to another
Chimeric antigen receptor (CAR) T cell	A T-cell engineered to express a chimeric antigen receptor
CD (cluster of differentiation)	Cell-surface molecules that help define cell identity and other properties
CRISPR-Cas9	Clustered regularly interspaced short palindromic repeats and associated Cas9 endonuclease; a sequence-specific nuclease with sequence specificity conferred by a guide RNA molecule
Exogenesis	The production of a tissue or organ through transplantation of stem cells from a donor species (e.g., human) into the blastocyst of suitably engineered recipient species (e.g., pig), leading to formation of an organ or tissue from cells with the genome of the donor species in the recipient species
Immune cloaking	Expression of cell-surface molecules that minimizes immune system damage to a heterologous cell
Major histocompatibility complex (MHC)	A complex of linked genes encoding cell-surface proteins that display peptides produced by cleavage of intracellular proteins; these proteins help T cells recognize foreign or mutated proteins. Its human form is referred to as HLA, and its porcine counterpart is SLA
Natural killer (NK) cell	A type of cytotoxic lymphocyte critical to the function of the innate immune system
Regulatory T cell (Treg)	A specialized type of T-cell that dampens the immune response and maintains self-tolerance
Xenograft	A graft of tissue from a donor to a recipient of a different species
Xenotransplantation	The transplantation of cells, tissue, or organs to a recipient organism of a different species

REFERENCES

[1] Viebahn, Cornelia S., et al. "Invading macrophages play a major role in the liver progenitor cell response to chronic liver injury." *Journal of hepatology* 53.3 (2010): 500-507.

[2] Debuque, Ryan J., et al. "Identification of the adult hematopoietic liver as the primary reservoir for the recruitment of pro-regenerative macrophages required for salamander limb regeneration." *Frontiers in cell and developmental biology*9 (2021).

[3] Doyle, Alden M., Robert I. Lechler, and Laurence A. Turka. "Organ transplantation: halfway through the first century." *Journal of the American Society of Nephrology* 15.12 (2004): 2965-2971.

[4] Reemtsma, Keith. "Xenotransplantation: a historical perspective." *ILAR journal* 37.1 (1995): 9-12.

[5] Galili, Uri. "COVID-19 variants as moving targets and how to stop them by glycoengineered whole-virus vaccines." *Virulence* 12.1 (2021): 1717-1720.

[6] Joziasse, D. Hv, and R. Oriol. "Xenotransplantation: the importance of the Galα1, 3Gal epitope in hyperacute vascular rejection." *Biochimica et Biophysica Acta (BBA)-Molecular Basis of Disease* 1455.2-3 (1999): 403-418.

[7] Elisseeff, Jennifer, Stephen F. Badylak, and Jef D. Boeke. "Immune and genome engineering as the future of transplantable tissue." *New England Journal of Medicine*385.26 (2021): 2451-2462.

[8] Cooper, David KC, et al. "Pig liver xenotransplantation: a review of progress towards the clinic." *Transplantation* 100.10 (2016): 2039.

[9] Cooper, David KC, et al. "Justification of specific genetic modifications in pigs for clinical organ xenotransplantation." *Xenotransplantation* 26.4 (2019): e12516.

[10] Yamada, Kazuhiko, Megan Sykes, and David H. Sachs. "Tolerance in xenotransplantation." *Current opinion in organ transplantation* 22.6 (2017): 522.

[11] Teraoka, Yoshifumi, et al. "Expression of recipient CD47 on rat insulinoma cell xenografts prevents macrophage-mediated rejection through SIRPα inhibitory signalling in mice." *PloS one*8.3 (2013): e58359.

[12] Weiss, Elisabeth H., et al. "HLA-E/human β2-microglobulin transgenic pigs: protection against xenogeneic human anti-pig natural killer cell cytotoxicity." *Transplantation* 87.1 (2009): 35-43.

[13] Hauschild, Janet, et al. "Efficient generation of a biallelic knockout in pigs using zinc-finger nucleases." *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 108.29 (2011): 12013-12017.

[14] Cooper, David KC, et al. "Justification of specific genetic modifications in pigs for clinical organ xenotransplantation." *Xenotransplantation* 26.4 (2019): e12516.

[15] Yue, Yanan, et al. "Extensive germline genome engineering in pigs." *Nature Biomedical Engineering* 5.2 (2021): 134-143.

[16] Estrada, Jose L., et al. "Evaluation of human and non-human primate antibody binding to pig cells lacking GGTA 1/CMAH/β4Gal NT 2 genes." *Xenotransplantation* 22.3 (2015): 194-202.

[17] Hozain, Ahmed E., et al. "Xenogeneic cross-circulation for extracorporeal recovery of injured human lungs." *Nature Medicine* 26.7 (2020): 1102-1113.

[18] Hozain, Ahmed E., et al. "Multiday maintenance of extracorporeal lungs using cross-circulation with conscious swine." *The Journal of Thoracic and Cardiovascular Surgery*159.4 (2020): 1640-1653.

[19] Parent, Brendan, et al. "The ethics of testing and research of manufactured organs on brain-dead/recently deceased subjects." *Journal of Medical Ethics* 46.3 (2020): 199-204.

[20] Ladowski, Joseph M., et al. "Swine leukocyte antigen (SLA) class II is a xenoantigen." *Transplantation* 102.2 (2018): 249.

[21] Martens, Gregory R., et al. "Humoral reactivity of renal transplant-waitlisted patients to cells from GGTA1/CMAH/B4GalNT2, and SLA class I knockout pigs." *Transplantation* 101.4 (2017): e86.

[22] Martens, Gregory R., et al. "HLA Class I–sensitized Renal Transplant Patients Have Antibody Binding to SLA Class I Epitopes." *Transplantation* 103.8 (2019): 1620-1629.

[23] Ladowski, Joseph M., et al. "Examining epitope mutagenesis as a strategy to reduce and eliminate human antibody binding to class II swine leukocyte antigens." *Immunogenetics* 71.7 (2019): 479-487.

[24] Barcy, Serge, et al. "γδ+ T cells involvement in viral immune control of chronic human herpesvirus 8 infection." *The Journal of Immunology* 180.5 (2008): 3417-3425.

[25] Wu, Yin, et al. "Human γδ T cells: a lymphoid lineage cell capable of professional phagocytosis." *The Journal of Immunology* 183.9 (2009): 5622-5629.

[26] Nikolic, Boris, et al. "Both γδ T cells and NK cells inhibit the engraftment of xenogeneic rat bone marrow cells and the induction of xenograft tolerance in mice." *The Journal of Immunology* 166.2 (2001): 1398-1404.

[27] Hering, Bernhard J., et al. "Prolonged diabetes reversal after intraportal xenotransplantation of wild-type porcine islets in immunosuppressed nonhuman primates." *Nature medicine*12.3 (2006): 301-303.

[28] Karim, Mahzuz, et al. "The role of the graft in establishing tolerance." *Frontiers in Bioscience-Landmark* 7.5 (2002): 129-154.

[29] Moses, Robert D., et al. "Xenogeneic proliferation and lymphokine production are dependent on CD4+ helper T cells and self-antigen-presenting cells in the mouse." *The Journal of experimental medicine* 172.2 (1990): 567-575.

[30] Moses, Robert D., Henry J. Winn, and Hugh Auchincloss Jr. "EVIDENCE THAT MULTIPLE DEFECTS IN CELL-SURFACE MOLECULE INTERACTIONS ACROSS SPECIES DIFFERENCES ARE RESPONSIBLE FOR DIMINISHED XENOGENEIC T CELL RESPONSES1." *Transplantation* 53.1 (1992): 203-209.

[31] Zhao, Yong, et al. "Despite efficient intrathymic negative selection of host-reactive T cells, autoimmune disease may develop in porcine thymus-grafted athymic mice: evidence for failure of regulatory mechanisms suppressing autoimmunity1." *Transplantation* 75.11 (2003): 1832-1840.

[32] Zhao, Yong, et al. "Positive and negative selection of functional mouse CD4 cells by porcine MHC in pig thymus grafts." *The Journal of Immunology* 159.5 (1997): 2100-2107.

[33] Zhao, Yong, et al. "Pig MHC mediates positive selection of mouse CD4+ T cells with a mouse MHC-restricted TCR in pig thymus grafts." *The Journal of Immunology* 161.3 (1998): 1320-1326.

[34] Shimizu, Ichiro, et al. "Comparison of human T cell repertoire generated in xenogeneic porcine and human thymus grafts." *Transplantation* 86.4 (2008): 601.

[35] Dorling, Anthony, et al. "Detection of primary direct and indirect human anti-porcine T cell responses using a porcine dendritic cell population." *European journal of immunology*26.6 (1996): 1378-1387.

[36] Yamada, Kazuhiko, David H. Sachs, and Harout DerSimonian. "Human anti-porcine xenogeneic T cell response. Evidence for allelic specificity of mixed leukocyte reaction and for both direct and indirect pathways of recognition." *The Journal of Immunology* 155.11 (1995): 5249-5256.

[37] Rollins, S. A., and L. A. Matis. "Cellular interactions in discordant xenotransplantation." *Xenotransplantation*. Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg, 1997. 190-198.

[38] Yamada, K., D. H. Sachs, and H. DerSimonian. "Direct and indirect recognition of pig class II antigens by human T cells." *Transplantation proceedings*. Vol. 27. No. 1. 1995.

[39] Godwin, James W., Anthony JF d'Apice, and Peter J. Cowan. "Characterization of pig intercellular adhesion molecule-2 and its interaction with human LFA-1." *American Journal of Transplantation* 4.4 (2004): 515-525.

[40] Murray, Allen G., et al. "Porcine aortic endothelial cells activate human T cells: direct presentation of MHC antigens and costimulation by ligands for human CD2 and CD28." *Immunity* 1.1 (1994): 57-63.

[41] Zheng, Lian, et al. "Porcine endothelial cells, unlike human endothelial cells, can be killed by human CTL via Fas ligand and cannot be protected by Bcl-2." *The Journal of Immunology* 169.12 (2002): 6850-6855.

[42] Zhan, Yifan, et al. "Without CD4 help, CD8 rejection of pig xenografts requires CD28 costimulation but not perforin killing." *The Journal of Immunology* 167.11 (2001): 6279-6285.

[43] Sultan, Parvez, et al. "Pig but not human interferon-γ initiates human cell-mediated rejection of pig tissue in vivo." *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 94.16 (1997): 8767-8772.

[44] Hering, Bernhard J., and Niketa Walawalkar. "Pig-to-nonhuman primate islet xenotransplantation." *Transplant immunology* 21.2 (2009): 81-86.

[45] Sykes, Megan, and David H. Sachs. "Transplanting organs from pigs to humans." *Science immunology* 4.41 (2019): eaau6298.

[46] Yamada, Kazuhiko, et al. "Marked prolongation of porcine renal xenograft survival in baboons through the use of α1, 3-galactosyltransferase gene-knockout donors and the cotransplantation of vascularized thymic tissue." *Nature medicine* 11.1 (2005): 32-34.

[47] Davila, Eduardo, et al. "T-cell responses during pig-to-primate xenotransplantation." *Xenotransplantation* 13.1 (2006): 31-40.

[48] Lee, Richard S., et al. "Blockade of CD28-B7, but not CD40-CD154, prevents costimulation of allogeneic porcine and xenogeneic human anti-porcine T cell responses." *The Journal of Immunology* 164.6 (2000): 3434-3444.

[49] Wu, Guosheng, et al. "Co-stimulation blockade targeting CD154 and CD28/B7 modulates the induced antibody response after a pig-to-baboon cardiac xenograft." *Xenotransplantation* 12.3 (2005): 197-208.

[50] Brenner, P., et al. "Breakthrough in Orthotopic Cardiac Xenotransplantation: In a Preclinical Life-Supporting Pig-To-Baboon Model Worldwide First Continuous Successful Long-Term Survival (Up To 172/187 Days, Both Ongoing)." *The Thoracic and Cardiovascular Surgeon* 67.S 01 (2019): DGTHG-V218.

[51] Mohiuddin, Muhammad M., et al. "One-year heterotopic cardiac xenograft survival in a pig to baboon model." *American journal of transplantation: official journal of the American Society of Transplantation and the American Society of Transplant Surgeons* 14.2 (2014): 488.

[52] Iwase, Hayato, et al. "Pig kidney graft survival in a baboon for 136 days: longest life-supporting organ graft survival to date." *Xenotransplantation* 22.4 (2015): 302-309.

[53] Cardona, K., et al. "Engraftment of adult porcine islet xenografts in diabetic nonhuman primates through targeting of costimulation pathways." *American Journal of Transplantation*7.10 (2007): 2260-2268

[54] Mohiuddin, Muhammad M., et al. "Chimeric 2C10R4 anti-CD40 antibody therapy is critical for long-term survival of GTKO. hCD46. hTBM pig-to-primate cardiac xenograft." *Nature communications* 7.1 (2016): 1-10.

[55] Jin, Xi, et al. "Enhanced suppression of the xenogeneic T-cell response in vitro by xenoantigen stimulated and expanded regulatory T cells." *Transplantation* 97.1 (2014): 30-38.

[56] Yi, Shounan, et al. "Adoptive transfer with in vitro expanded human regulatory T cells protects against porcine islet xenograft rejection via interleukin-10 in humanized mice." *Diabetes* 61.5 (2012): 1180-1191.

[57] Fu, Yiling, et al. "In vitro suppression of xenoimmune-mediated macrophage activation by human CD4+ CD25+ regulatory T cells." *Transplantation* 86.6 (2008): 865-874.

[58] Stern, Jeffrey, et al. "Extended pig skin graft survival in baboons receiving Hcd47 Tg/Galt-KO pig PBSC plus host Treg infusion." *Xenotransplantation*. Vol. 24. No. 5. 111 RIVER ST, HOBOKEN 07030-5774, NJ USA: WILEY, 2017.

[59] Shin, Jun-Seop, et al. "Failure of transplantation tolerance induction by autologous regulatory T cells in the pig-to-non-human primate islet xenotransplantation model." *Xenotransplantation* 23.4 (2016): 300-309.

[60] Layton, Daniel Stuart, et al. "Differential cytokine expression and regulation of human anti-pig xenogeneic responses by modified porcine dendritic cells." *Xenotransplantation* 15.4 (2008): 257-267.

[61] Madelon, Natacha, Gisella L. Puga Yung, and Jörg D. Seebach. "Human anti-pig NK cell and CD 8+ T-cell responses in the presence of regulatory dendritic cells." *Xenotransplantation* 23.6 (2016): 479-489.

[62] Ciubotariu, Rodica, et al. "Specific suppression of human CD4+ Th cell responses to pig MHC antigens by CD8+ CD28− regulatory T cells." *The Journal of Immunology* 161.10 (1998): 5193-5202.

[63] Niemann, H., and D. Rath. "Progress in reproductive biotechnology in swine." *Theriogenology* 56.8 (2001): 1291-1304.

[64] Buehler, Leo Hans, et al. "Xenotransplantation--state of the art--update 1999." *Frontiers in bioscience* 4 (1999): D416-32.

[65] Kozlowski, T., et al. "Apheresis and column absorption for specific removal of Gal-α-1, 3 Gal natural antibodies in a pig-to-baboon model." *Transplantation proceedings*. Vol. 29. No. 1-2. Elsevier, 1997.

[66] Kuwaki, Kenji, et al. "Heart transplantation in baboons using α1, 3-galactosyltransferase gene-knockout pigs as donors: initial experience." *Nature medicine* 11.1 (2005): 29-31.

[67] Hsu, Patrick D., Eric S. Lander, and Feng Zhang. "Development and applications of CRISPR-Cas9 for genome engineering." *Cell* 157.6 (2014): 1262-1278.

[68] Martens, Gregory R., et al. "Humoral reactivity of renal transplant-waitlisted patients to cells from GGTA1/CMAH/B4GalNT2, and SLA class I knockout pigs." *Transplantation* 101.4 (2017): e86.

[69] Wong, Banny S., et al. "Allosensitization does not increase the risk of xenoreactivity to α1, 3-galactosyltransferase gene-knockout miniature swine in patients on transplantation waiting lists." *Transplantation* 82.3 (2006): 314-319.

[70] Hara, Hidetaka, et al. "Allosensitized humans are at no greater risk of humoral rejection of GT-KO pig organs than other humans." *Xenotransplantation* 13.4 (2006): 357-365.

[71] Cooper, D. K. C., Y. L. Tseng, and S. L. Saidman. "Alloantibody and xenoantibody cross-reactivity in transplantation1." *Transplantation* 77.1 (2004): 1-5.

[72] Chong, Anita SF, et al. "DELAYED XENOGRAFT REJECTION IN THE CONCORDANT HAMSTER HEART INTO LEWIS RAT MODEL1." *Transplantation* 62.1 (1996): 90-96.

[73] Lin, Y., et al. "Mechanism of leflunomide-induced prevention of xenoantibody formation and xenograft rejection in the hamster to rat heart transplantation model." *Transplantation proceedings*. Vol. 27. No. 1. 1995.

[74] Lundvig, Ditte MS, Stephan Immenschuh, and Frank ADTG Wagener. "Heme oxygenase, inflammation, and fibrosis: the good, the bad, and the ugly?" *Frontiers in pharmacology* 3 (2012): 81.

[75] Mohiuddin, Muhammad M., et al. "Progressive genetic modifications of porcine cardiac xenografts extend survival to 9 months." *Xenotransplantation* (2022): e12744.

[76] Niemann, Heiner, and Bjoern Petersen. "The production of multi-transgenic pigs: update and perspectives for xenotransplantation." *Transgenic research* 25.3 (2016): 361-374.

[77] Singh, Avneesh K., et al. "Cardiac xenografts show reduced survival in the absence of transgenic human thrombomodulin expression in donor pigs." *Xenotransplantation* 26.2 (2019): e12465.

[78] Connolly, Margaret R., et al. "Humanized von Willebrand factor reduces platelet sequestration in ex vivo and in vivo xenotransplant models." *Xenotransplantation* 28.6 (2021): e12712.

[79] Lee, S. J., et al. "Seven years of experiences of preclinical experiments of xeno-heart transplantation of pig to non-human primate (cynomolgus monkey)." *Transplantation proceedings*. Vol. 50. No. 4. Elsevier, 2018.

[80] Fischer, Konrad, et al. "Efficient production of multi-modified pigs for xenotransplantation by 'combineering', gene stacking and gene editing." *Scientific reports* 6.1 (2016): 1-11.

[81] Ma, David, et al. "Kidney transplantation from triple-knockout pigs expressing multiple human proteins in cynomolgus macaques." *American Journal of Transplantation* 22.1 (2022): 46-57.

[82] Kim, Steven C., et al. "Long-term survival of pig-to-rhesus macaque renal xenografts is dependent on CD4 T cell depletion." *American Journal of Transplantation* 19.8 (2019): 2174-2185.

[83] Kim, Steven C., et al. "Long-term survival of pig-to-rhesus macaque renal xenografts is dependent on CD4 T cell depletion." *American Journal of Transplantation* 19.8 (2019): 2174-2185.

[84] Tsuyuki, Shigeru, Mari Kono, and Eda T. Bloom. "Cloning and potential utility of porcine Fas ligand: overexpression in porcine endothelial cells protects them from attack by human cytolytic cells." *Xenotransplantation* 9.6 (2002): 410-421.

[85] Bähr, Andrea, et al. "Ubiquitous LEA29Y expression blocks T cell co-stimulation but permits sexual reproduction in genetically modified pigs." *PLoS One* 11.5 (2016): e0155676.

[86] Nottle, Mark B., et al. "Targeted insertion of an anti-CD2 monoclonal antibody transgene into the GGTA1 locus in pigs using FokI-dCas9." *Scientific reports* 7.1 (2017): 1-8.

[87] Vabres, Bertrand, et al. "hCTLA 4-Ig transgene expression in keratocytes modulates rejection of corneal xenografts in a pig to non-human primate anterior lamellar keratoplasty model." *Xenotransplantation* 21.5 (2014): 431-443.

[88] Klymiuk, Nikolai, et al. "Xenografted Islet Cell Clusters from INS LEA29Y Transgenic Pigs Rescue Diabetes and Prevent Immune Rejection in Humanized Mice." *Diabetes* 61.6 (2012): 1527-1532.

[89] Fischer, Konrad, et al. "Viable pigs after simultaneous inactivation of porcine MHC class I and three xenoreactive antigen genes GGTA1, CMAH and B4GALNT2." *Xenotransplantation* 27.1 (2020): e12560.

[90] Puga Yung, Gisella, et al. "Release of pig leukocytes and reduced human NK cell recruitment during ex vivo perfusion of HLA-E/human CD 46 double-transgenic pig limbs with human blood." *Xenotransplantation* 25.1 (2018): e12357.

[91] Shah, Jigesh A., et al. "A bridge to somewhere: 25-day survival after pig-to-baboon liver xenotransplantation." *Annals of surgery* 263.6 (2016): 1069-1071.

[92] Markmann, James F., et al. "Executive summary of IPITA-TTS opinion leaders report on the future of β-cell replacement." *Transplantation* 100.7 (2016): e25-e31.

[93] Graham, Melanie L., et al. "Clinically available immunosuppression averts rejection but not systemic inflammation after porcine islet xenotransplant in cynomolgus macaques." *American Journal of Transplantation* 22.3 (2022): 745-760.

[94] Bottino, R., et al. "Pig-to-monkey islet xenotransplantation using multi-transgenic pigs." *American Journal of Transplantation* 14.10 (2014): 2275-2287.

[95] Dor, F. J. M. F., et al. "Galα1, 3Gal expression on porcine pancreatic islets, testis, spleen, and thymus." *Xenotransplantation* 11.1 (2004): 101-106.

[96] Ozmen, Lisa, et al. "Inhibition of thrombin abrogates the instant blood-mediated inflammatory reaction triggered by isolated human islets: possible application of the thrombin inhibitor melagatran in clinical islet transplantation." *Diabetes*51.6 (2002): 1779-1784.

[97] Barton, Franca B., et al. "Improvement in outcomes of clinical islet transplantation: 1999–2010." *Diabetes care* 35.7 (2012): 1436-1445.

[98] Cooper, David KC, et al. "Progress in clinical encapsulated islet xenotransplantation." *Transplantation* 100.11 (2016): 2301.

[99] Morozov, Vladimir A., et al. "No PERV transmission during a clinical trial of pig islet cell transplantation." *Virus research* 227 (2017): 34-40.

[100] Wynyard, Shaun, et al. "Microbiological safety of the first clinical pig islet xenotransplantation trial in New Zealand." *Xenotransplantation* 21.4 (2014): 309-323.

[101] Garkavenko, O., et al. "Developing xenostandards for microbiological safety: New Zealand experience." *Xenotransplantation* (2012).

[102] Singh, Amar, et al. "Long-term tolerance of islet allografts in nonhuman primates induced by apoptotic donor leukocytes." *Nature communications* 10.1 (2019): 1-16.

[103] Wang, Shusen, et al. "Transient B-cell depletion combined with apoptotic donor splenocytes induces xeno-specific T-and B-cell tolerance to islet xenografts." *Diabetes* 62.9 (2013): 3143-3150.

[104] Higginbotham, Laura, et al. "Preventing T cell rejection of pig xenografts." *International Journal of Surgery* 23 (2015): 285-290.

[105] Kim, Steven C., et al. "Fc-Silent Anti-CD 154 Domain Antibody Effectively Prevents Nonhuman Primate Renal Allograft Rejection." *American Journal of Transplantation* 17.5 (2017): 1182-1192.

[106] Cooper, David KC, et al. "Selection of patients for initial clinical trials of solid organ xenotransplantation." *Transplantation*101.7 (2017): 1551.

[107] Cooper, D. K. C., et al. "Xenotransplantation—the current status and prospects." *British Medical Bulletin* 125.1 (2018): 5.

[108] Montgomery, Robert A., et al. "Results of two cases of pig-to-human kidney xenotransplantation." *New England Journal of Medicine* 386.20 (2022): 1889-1898.

[109] Porrett, Paige M., et al. "First clinical-grade porcine kidney xenotransplant using a human decedent model." *American Journal of Transplantation* 22.4 (2022): 1037-1053.

[110] Längin, Matthias, et al. "Consistent success in life-supporting porcine cardiac xenotransplantation." *Nature* 564.7736 (2018): 430-433.

[111] Goerlich, Corbin E., et al. "The growth of xenotransplanted hearts can be reduced with growth hormone receptor knockout pig donors." *The Journal of Thoracic and Cardiovascular Surgery* (2021).

[112] Riedel, Evamaria O., et al. "Functional changes of the liver in the absence of growth hormone (GH) action–proteomic and metabolomic insights from a GH receptor deficient pig model." *Molecular metabolism* 36 (2020): 100978.

[113] Griffith, Bartley P., et al. "Genetically modified porcine-to-human cardiac xenotransplantation." *New England Journal of Medicine* 387.1 (2022): 35-44.

[114] Lee, Lorri A., et al. "Specific tolerance across a discordant xenogeneic transplantation barrier." *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 91.23 (1994): 10864-10867.

[115] Zhao, Yong, et al. "Skin graft tolerance across a discordant xenogeneic barrier." *Nature medicine* 2.11 (1996): 1211-1216.

[116] Hansen-Estruch, Christophe, et al. "The science of xenotransplantation for nephrologists." *Current Opinion in Nephrology and Hypertension* 31.4 (2022): 387-393.