# Comparing the Immunosuppressive Capacity of Human Mesenchymal Stromal Cells to Prescription Drugs in a Dose Dependent Manner Using Principal Component Analysis

Maxwell Ederer<sup>1\*</sup>, Stephen W. Sawyer<sup>1\*</sup>, Kyung Sung<sup>1#</sup>, and Steven R. Bauer<sup>1</sup>. <sup>1</sup>Center for Biologics Evaluation and Research (CBER), Division of Cell Therapy 1, Cellular and Tissue Therapy Branch, U.S. Food and Drug Administration \*Co-First Authors #Corresponding Author

## Background

this develop quantitative The purpose studv was relevant immunosuppression assay clinically and compare immunosuppression drugs to human mesenchymal stromal cells (hMSCs). Many immunosuppressive drugs have been known to target T-cell function by inhibiting certain signals that lead to activation of T-cells, while hMSCs have gained significant attention due to their anti-inflammatory and immunomodulatory properties. In this work, a parallel dose response study was performed using three FDA approved drug treatments (Cyclosporin; Mycophenolic acid (MPA); Rapamycin) and two hMSC lines (BM2893; RB14), and the immunomodulatory properties of the drug treatments and cell lines were quantitatively compared.

### Introduction

Traditionally, immunosuppression assays have measured decreases in Tcell proliferation in response to an immunosuppressive treatment. To receive a more nuanced idea of a treatment's effect on a group of Tlymphocytes, one could use this canonical method of measurement and measure proliferation at different doses to the treatment being applied. As technology advances, methods that examine multiple parameters and produce more nuanced datasets provide a potentially more complete view of immunosuppression than just measuring T-cell proliferation alone. As measuring proliferation at multiple doses gives a more complete idea of how the treatments effect the cells, measuring multiple parameters at different treatment dosages would present a more complete explanation of how the cells are responding to a particular treatment.

In this work, we measured 7 different parameters of T-cells (PBMCs) exposed to either drug treatments or hMSCs. In addition to the canonical measurement of proliferation, we stained the treated PBMCs for viability, TNF $\alpha$ , INF $\gamma$ , and CD25, as well as group the various PBMCs into populations of CD4+ and CD8+ cells. In order to analyzed this information, we used principle component analysis (PCA) to reduce the dimensionality of the data.



Figure 1. Schematic of the workflow for the immunosuppression assay and analysis. PBMCs are activated with CD3/CD28 beads and immunosuppressive treatments are added to the plate at different concentrations to suppress the activation from the beads. After incubation with the immunosuppressive treatments, the PBMCs (both CD4+ and CD8+ cells) are stained for cell viability (ZombieRed), proliferation (CellTrace Violet), cytokine production (TNF- $\alpha$  and INF- $\gamma$ ), and activation (CD25). Flow cytometry is subsequently used to measure each parameter.

# **Principle Component Analysis and T-Cell Proliferation**





Figure 2. Principal component analysis reduces multiple parameters indicative of T-cell immunosuppression. Principal component 1 of the PCA as it changes in response to the concentration of A: Rapamycin; B: MPA; C: Cyclosporin; D: BM2893 hMSCs; E: RB14 hMSCs. Data shown is from PBMCs from three different donors – Blue Donor 1, Orange Donor 2, Green Donor 3.



Rapamycin; B: MPA; C: Cyclosporin; D: BM2893 hMSCs; E: RB14 hMSCs. Data shown is from PBMC donor 1.

Figure 3. CellTrace Violet Staining of CD4+ T-cells Shows Different Patterns of Immunosuppression showing the proliferation of T-cells when treated with A:



Figure 4. Heatmaps of the multiple parameters measured and analyzed for MPA and BM2893. Color indicates magnitude of the decrease in parameters, with positive control (activated/no treatment) normalized to 100 and negative control (unactivated) normalized to o. Measurements are either Median Fluorescence Intensity (MFI) or percentage of activated cells. Data shown is from PBMC donor 1.

Acknowledgements This work was funded in part by the Medical Countermeasures Initiative (MCMI) as well as Division of Cellular Therapy 1 funds. This work was also funded in part by M.E.'s appointment to the Research Participation Program at the Center for Biologics Evaluation and Research administered by the Oak Ridge Institute for Science and Education.



#### hMSC Lines

Proportion of CD4+ T-cells Proportion of CD4+ T-cells that have divided (%CTV<sup>--</sup>) that have divided (%CTV--) 60

