

ANALYTICAL CHARACTERIZATION
AND COMPARABILITY ASSESSMENT
OF BIOTHERAPEUTIC PROTEINS

NEH NUPUR



DEPARTMENT OF CHEMICAL ENGINEERING
INDIAN INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY DELHI

June 2022

© Indian Institute of Technology Delhi (IITD), 2022

ANALYTICAL CHARACTERIZATION
AND COMPARABILITY ASSESSMENT
OF BIOTHERAPEUTIC PROTEINS

by

Neh Nupur

Department of Chemical Engineering

Submitted

in fulfilment of the requirements of the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

to the



Indian Institute of Technology Delhi

June 2022

Dedicated to my family

Certificate

This is to certify that the thesis entitled “ANALYTICAL CHARACTERIZATION AND COMPARABILITY ASSESSMENT OF BIOTHERAPEUTIC PROTEINS” being submitted by NEH NUPUR to the Indian Institute of Technology Delhi for the award of the degree of Doctor of Philosophy is a record of the original bonafide research work carried out by her under my guidance and supervision. The results contained in this thesis have not been submitted in part or in full to any other University or Institute for the award of any degree or diploma.

I certify that she has pursued the prescribed course of research.

Prof. Anurag S. Rathore

Department of Chemical Engineering

Indian Institute of Technology Delhi

Acknowledgements

This thesis would not have been materialized without the immeasurable help from many people who gave their support in different ways. To them I would like to convey my heartfelt gratitude and sincere appreciation.

First and foremost, I owe profound gratitude and reverence to my PhD supervisor, Prof. Anurag S. Rathore for his invaluable guidance, words of unswerving support and encouragement, and incessant effort to shape my research ideas in a proper direction. He has been instrumental in the successful completion of my research work through his insightful discussions and constructive feedback. I thank him wholeheartedly to help me overcome numerous obstacles and to give ample moral support and freedom. Without his guidance, generosity, and continuous optimism this thesis would not have been possible.

It is with great pleasure that I acknowledge my PhD research committee members, Prof. Sudip Pattanayek, Prof. Manidipa Banerjee, and Dr. Gaurav Goel whose periodic assessment and review of my work progress has helped me move forward in the right direction and provided insights on ways to approach my research problems in a more systematic way.

Words are insufficient to thank my senior colleagues and friends, Dr. Sumit Kumar Singh, Dr. Nikhil Kateja, Dr. Vishwanath Hebhi, and Dr. Jashwant Kumar for their immense support in providing research ideas and helping me with downstream purification, analytical characterization, troubleshooting, and statistical analysis. I am extremely thankful to Dr. Srishti Joshi for being the go-to person in the analytical lab for her profound, fruitful and insightful technical discussions during my work, particularly reviewing articles. I also gratefully acknowledge Dr. Rozaleen Dash for performing functional assays reported in this work. I feel indebted and am thankful to them again for providing me constant assistance and suggestions as and when needed, which eventually helped me to improve my work.

I would like to express my heartfelt thanks to Dr. Arunkumar Padmanaban, Dr. Ravindra Gudihal, Dr. Ashish Pargaonkar, and Mr. Saurabh Nagpal from Agilent Technologies India Pvt. Ltd. for conducting and teaching me the skills to carry out mass spectrometric analysis. I specially thank Ms. Gunjan Narula, Ms. Nidhi Chhabra, Ms. Gayatri Vishwakarma, Mr. Himanshu Malani for their crucial help rendered in carrying out the experiments and writing the manuscripts. I would like to specially thank the entire analytical team- Dr. Rohan, Dr. Deepak, Dr. Rohit, Dr. Hemlata, Dr. Sunil, Dr. Sanghati, Surbhi, Shravan, Ramesh, Niharika,

Ankita, Anuj, Manya, Tushar, and Kratika for their helpful discussions, kind support and motivation when I felt exhausted.

I also thank all past and present lab members of the CBT lab: Dr. Varsha, Dr. Vijesh, Dr. Muthukumar, Dr. Viki, Dr. Mili, Dr. Gautam, Dr. Lalita, Dr. Ashish, Dr. Shyamapada, Dr. Sharad, Anamika, Nitika, Abhilasha, Rucha and Shantanu for their scintillating cooperation during my work in the lab. I am pleased to thank Mr. Naresh Kumar and Mr. Mohit Lohiya for their immense cooperation at times of need.

No words of gratitude can justify the support, care, faith, and love that I have received from my family. I am falling short of words to express my feelings towards my parents, Mr. Mohan Lal Das, and Mrs. Sudha Das whose blessings, constant efforts and continuous encouragement motivated me to pursue higher studies and work hard to attain success in life, without which I would not have made it so far. Very special thanks to my in-laws, my father in-law, Mr. Amrendra Kumar Mallick for their prayers and tremendous support for the successful completion of my work. Finally, I dedicate this work to my husband, Mr. Avinash Kumar, whose perseverance during the gestation period was conducive towards the successful completion of my work, and thank him for his patience, sacrifice, support, and understanding throughout my PhD research work.

NEH NUPUR

Abstract

The ever-increasing global prevalence of the various human diseases, the advancements in treatment methods and the demand for targeted therapies have fueled rapid commercialization of biotherapeutic proteins. Despite their enormous potential in providing an efficient model of healthcare, the associated quality, safety, and efficacy issues are a major concern. Following the patent cliff of certain innovator products, biosimilar development has gained momentum and has resulted in several biosimilar approvals across the globe. Owing to structural complexities of biotherapeutic proteins, regulatory agencies mandate thorough analytical characterization of these products, including the microheterogeneity, batch-to-batch variability, stability studies, and impurity profiling as per International Council for Harmonisation of Technical Requirements for Pharmaceuticals for Human Use (ICH) Q6B guidelines. Analytical characterization and comparability assessment of critical quality attributes (CQAs) of these proteins consist of extensive physicochemical and functional characterization using appropriate, validated, and orthogonal analytical methods. A major hurdle in this entire exercise is to accurately quantify the various CQAs as well as our limited understanding of the CQAs and their inter-attribute relationships. Another challenge is to assess the impact of each CQA on the product's bioactivity. Hence, an analytical characterization platform should consist of modality and/ or product-specific, tailor-made methods that have been optimized as per the product under consideration.

The first objective presents the comprehensive comparability exercise performed on biotherapeutic products namely insulin glargine, filgrastim (two microbial products) and rituximab (one mammalian product) by means of a wide array of state-of-the-art, validated, and orthogonal analytical methods in accordance with the regulatory guidelines on Similar Biologics. It offers robust evidence of physicochemical and functional similarity of the biosimilars approved in the Indian market with the pertinent innovator products. It also provides significant analytical evidence to help reduce reliance on non-clinical, preclinical, and clinical studies and increase biosimilar acceptance among patients for affordable healthcare. For insulin glargine, an overall analytical comparability was observed across biosimilars with respect to Lantus®, low amounts of product-related variants were observed in Biosimilar 4 with glutamine deamidation, which was found to impact product stability. Also, % aggregation at 14 days exhibited statistical correlation with % aggregation at 0 day and the number of months from expiry. For filgrastim, the biosimilars were found to be comparable to Neupogen®, but

an anomaly was also reported, where a conformational variant was identified in the shoulder peak of Biosimilar 3 using reverse phase chromatography with fluorescence detection and electrospray ionization-mass spectrometry initially recognized as oxidized variant. For rituximab, the biosimilars exhibited analytical comparability to Ristova® with respect to structure and function, but significant charge and glycan-based heterogeneities were also observed, which resulted in effect on bioactivity from the in-vitro assays.

The second objective was to elucidate charge and size-based heterogeneities in monoclonal antibody (mAb)-based therapeutic proteins. Product instabilities are a major concern during manufacturing, formulation development, storage, filling, and shipping. Both size-based (fragments and aggregates) and charge-based (basic and acidic variants) heterogeneities of two products, bevacizumab, and trastuzumab were assessed upon application of different stresses i.e., thermal, mechanical, and hypertonic and low pH stresses. Both mAbs exhibited wide variability in charge variant distribution and behaved differently concerning product stability under different stress conditions. However, the presence of certain charge variants dominated mAb degradation. It was observed that thermal stress had the most significant impact, low pH generated a higher proportion of soluble aggregates while salt and thermal stresses induced precipitation. It was concluded that deamidation-induced aggregation was the most significant contributor to product degradation in bevacizumab, and high acidification causing significant loss of the main variant along with deamidation-induced aggregation were observed in trastuzumab.

The third objective was to elucidate the relationship between charge and glycan-based heterogeneities in mAb-based products. By virtue of their origin, mAbs are inherently complex molecules with a range of heterogeneities with respect to charge and glycan in the final formulation, likely to impact the bioactivity, efficacy, and stability of the product. Charge variants are critical in affirming the need for identification and characterization of these modifications. With respect to glycosylation, different charge variants exhibited significant differences in their glycoform distribution, but certain glycoforms dominated certain charge variants. While the acidic variant, A1, consisted of deamidation and pyroglutamate forms, basic variants, B1 and B2, were lysine variants, and B3, contained methionine oxidation. Statistical models were developed to study the impact of glycan distribution on complement-dependent cytotoxicity activity and charge distribution. It was found that while bioactivity statistically correlated with G1F, galactosylated, high mannose, and afucosylated glycans (linearly), it

correlated with G1F/G2F and [G1F/G2]SA (non-linearly). Also, galactosylated glycans showed increasing dependence (non-linearly) for main and basic fractions, whereas sialylated glycans showed increasing dependence (linearly) for acidic fractions.

The fourth objective was to elucidate disulfide heterogeneities in mAb-based products. Reduced and non-reduced peptide mapping by mass spectrometry analysis is a commonly used method for characterization of post translational modifications (PTMs) and disulfide bridging to assess structural integrity, and heterogeneity of the therapeutic proteins. However, non-enzymatic artifacts induced during sample preparation are often observed when basic pH is used during denaturation and digestion. A reduced and non-reduced peptide mapping method has been proposed for mAb's primary structure characterization with low concentration of reducing and alkylating agent at high temperature under acidic pH. Two rituximab products, commercial and in-house, were used as model proteins to develop and optimize the method. Using this method, PTMs and disulfide scrambled peptides were significantly accessed and found to be less compared to traditional methods at alkaline pH. Results demonstrated that the method is robust, identifies and minimizes artifacts produced during the sample preparation.

Overall, the work presented in the thesis aims to establish robust analytical platforms for characterization and comparability studies of biotherapeutic proteins and provide an insight into quality attributes and the cofactors affecting stability and bioactivity. This information is of significant interest to biopharma manufacturers as well as academic researchers working on development of biotherapeutic products.

सार

विभिन्न मानव रोगों के बढ़ते वैश्विक प्रसार, उपचार विधियों में प्रगति और लक्षित उपचारों की मांग ने जैव-चिकित्सीय प्रोटीन के तेजी से व्यावसायीकरण को जन्म दिया है। स्वास्थ्य देखभाल का एक कुशल मॉडल प्रदान करने में उनकी विशाल क्षमता के बावजूद, गुणवत्ता, सुरक्षा और प्रभावकारिता के मुद्दे एक प्रमुख चिंता का विषय हैं। कुछ नवोन्मेषी उत्पादों की पेटेंट समाप्ति के बाद, बायोसिमिलर विकास ने गति प्राप्त की है और इसके परिणामस्वरूप दुनिया भर में कई बायोसिमिलर अनुमोदन प्राप्त हुए हैं। जैव-चिकित्सीय की संरचनात्मक जटिलताओं के कारण आईसीएच क्यू6बी दिशानिर्देशों के अनुसार सूक्ष्म विषमता, बैच-टू-बैच परिवर्तनशीलता, स्थिरता अध्ययन और अशुद्धि प्रोफाइलिंग सहित नियामक एजेंसियों के संपूर्ण विश्लेषणात्मक लक्षण वर्णन को अनिवार्य करता है। इन प्रोटीनों की महत्वपूर्ण गुणवत्ता विशेषताओं (सीक्यूए) के विश्लेषणात्मक लक्षण वर्णन और तुलनात्मक मूल्यांकन में उपयुक्त, मान्य, ऑर्थोगोनल विश्लेषणात्मक विधियों का उपयोग करके व्यापक भौतिक रासायनिक और कार्यात्मक लक्षण वर्णन शामिल है। संपूर्ण अभ्यास में एक बड़ी बाधा विभिन्न सीक्यूए को साथ-साथ और सटीक रूप से निर्धारित करना और सीक्यूए के अंतर-विशेषता संबंधों के बारे में हमारी सीमित समझ है। एक अन्य चुनौती उत्पाद की जैवसक्रियता पर प्रत्येक सीक्यूए के प्रभाव का आकलन करना है, इसलिए एक विश्लेषणात्मक लक्षण वर्णन मंच में एक सुसंगत दवा उत्पाद देने के लिए उत्पाद विकास रणनीतियों के अनुसार सर्वोत्तम रूप से अनुकूलित तौर-तरीके और उत्पाद-विशिष्ट, दर्जी-निर्मित तरीके शामिल होने चाहिए।

पहला उद्देश्य जैव-चिकित्सीय उत्पादों जैसे इंसुलिन ग्लार्गिन, फिल्ग्रास्टिम (दो माइक्रोबियल उत्पाद) और रीटक्सिमैब (एक स्तनधारी उत्पाद) पर अत्याधुनिक, मान्य और ऑर्थोगोनल विश्लेषणात्मक तरीकों की एक विस्तृत श्रृंखला के माध्यम से व्यापक तुलनात्मक अभ्यास समान जीवविज्ञान पर नियामक दिशानिर्देशों के अनुसार प्रस्तुत करता है। यह प्रासंगिक इनोवेटर उत्पादों के साथ भारतीय बाजार में स्वीकृत बायोसिमिलर की भौतिक-रासायनिक और कार्यात्मक समानता का मजबूत प्रमाण प्रस्तुत करता है। यह गैर-नैदानिक, प्रीक्लिनिकल और क्लिनिकल अध्ययनों पर निर्भरता को कम करने और सस्ती स्वास्थ्य देखभाल के लिए रोगियों के बीच बायोसिमिलर स्वीकृति बढ़ाने में मदद करने के लिए महत्वपूर्ण विश्लेषणात्मक साक्ष्य प्रदान करता है। इंसुलिन ग्लार्गिन के लिए, लैंटस के संबंध में बायोसिमिलर में एक समग्र विश्लेषणात्मक तुलना देखी गई है, लेकिन बायोसिमिलर 4 में ग्लूटामाइन डीमिडेशन के साथ उत्पाद-संबंधित वेरिएंट की कम मात्रा देखी गई है, जो उत्पाद स्थिरता को प्रभावित करने के लिए पाया

गया है। इसके अलावा, 14 दिनों के % एकत्रीकरण ने 0 दिन के % एकत्रीकरण और समाप्ति से महीनों की संख्या के साथ सांख्यिकीय सहसंबंध प्रदर्शित किया है। फिल्ट्रास्टिम के लिए, बायोसिमिलर को न्यूपोजेन से तुलनीय पाया गया है, लेकिन एक विसंगति भी बताई गई है, जहां आरपीसी-एफएलडी और ईएसआई-एमएस का उपयोग करते हुए बायोसिमिलर 3 के शोल्डर शिखर में एक गठनात्मक संस्करण की पहचान की गई है, जिसे शुरू में ऑक्सीकृत संस्करण के रूप में मान्यता दी गई थी। रीटक्सिमैब के लिए, बायोसिमिलर ने संरचना और कार्य के संबंध में रिस्तोवा के लिए विश्लेषणात्मक तुलनात्मकता प्रदर्शित की, लेकिन महत्वपूर्ण चार्ज और ग्लाइकेन-आधारित विषमताएं देखी गई हैं, जिसके परिणामस्वरूप इन-विट्रो परख से बायोएक्टिविटी पर कुछ प्रभाव पड़ा है।

दूसरा उद्देश्य मोनोक्लोनल एंटीबॉडी आधारित चिकित्सीय प्रोटीन में चार्ज और आकार-आधारित विषमताओं को स्पष्ट करना है। उत्पाद अस्थिरता निर्माण, निर्माण विकास, भंडारण और परिवहन के दौरान एक प्रमुख चिंता का विषय है। दोनों आकार-आधारित (टुकड़े और समुच्चय) और चार्ज-आधारित (मूल और अम्लीय वेरिएंट) दो मोनोक्लोनल एंटीबॉडी उत्पादों, बेवाकिजुमैब, और ट्रैस्टुजुमैब की विषमताओं का मूल्यांकन विभिन्न तनावों यानी थर्मल, मैकेनिकल और हाइपरटोनिक और निम्न पीएच तनाव के आवेदन पर किया गया है। दोनों मोनोक्लोनल एंटीबॉडी ने चार्ज वेरिएंट वितरण में व्यापक परिवर्तनशीलता का प्रदर्शन किया है और विभिन्न तनाव स्थितियों के तहत उत्पाद स्थिरता के संबंध में अलग-अलग व्यवहार किया है, हालांकि कुछ चार्ज वेरिएंट की उपस्थिति मोनोक्लोनल एंटीबॉडी गिरावट पर हावी रही। यह देखा गया है कि उष्ण तनाव का सबसे महत्वपूर्ण प्रभाव पाया गया है, कम पीएच ने घुलनशील समुच्चय का उच्च अनुपात उत्पन्न किया है जबकि नमक और उष्ण तनाव ने वर्षण को प्रेरित किया है। यह निष्कर्ष निकाला गया है कि बेवाकिजुमैब में उत्पाद की गिरावट के लिए डीमिडेशन-प्रेरित एकत्रीकरण सबसे महत्वपूर्ण योगदानकर्ता है और डीमिडेशन-प्रेरित एकत्रीकरण के साथ-साथ उच्च अम्लीकरण और मुख्य प्रकार के नुकसान को ट्रैस्टुजुमैब में देखा गया है।

तीसरा उद्देश्य मोनोक्लोनल एंटीबॉडी उत्पादों में चार्ज और ग्लाइकेन-आधारित विषमताओं के बीच संबंध को स्पष्ट करना है। अपने मूल के आधार पर, मोनोक्लोनल एंटीबॉडी स्वाभाविक रूप से जटिल अणु होते हैं, जिनमें अंतिम सूत्रीकरण में चार्ज और ग्लाइकेन के संबंध में कई प्रकार की विषमताएं होती हैं, जो उत्पाद की जैव-सक्रियता, प्रभावकारिता और स्थिरता को प्रभावित कर सकती हैं। इन संशोधनों की पहचान और लक्षण वर्णन की आवश्यकता की पूर्ति करने में चार्ज वेरिएंट महत्वपूर्ण हैं। ग्लाइकोसिलेशन के संबंध में, विभिन्न चार्ज वेरिएंट ने अपने ग्लाइकोफॉर्म वितरण में महत्वपूर्ण अंतर प्रदर्शित किया है, लेकिन कुछ ग्लाइकोफॉर्म को कुछ चार्ज वेरिएंट पर हावी पाया गया है। मूल रूप से अम्लीय संस्करण,

ए1, में एस्पारागीन डीमिडेशन और पाइरोग्लूटामेट रूप शामिल है, बी1 और बी2, लाइसिन वेरिण्ट है, और बी3 में मेथियोनीन ऑक्सीकरण है। सीडीसी परख और चार्ज वितरण पर ग्लाइकेन वितरण के प्रभाव का अध्ययन करने के लिए सांख्यिकीय मॉडल विकसित किया गया है और यह पाया गया कि सीडीसी परख सांख्यिकीय रूप से G1F/G1F, G1F, गैलेक्टोसिलेटेड, उच्च मैनोस, और अप्यूकोसिलेटेड (रैखिक रूप से), और [G1F/G2]SA (गैर-रैखिक रूप से) रूपों के साथ सहसंबद्ध है। इसके अलावा, गैलेक्टोसिलेटेड रूपों ने मुख्य और बुनियादी अंशों के लिए बढ़ती निर्भरता (गैर-रैखिक रूप से) दिखाई, जबकि सियालेटेड रूपों ने अम्लीय अंशों के लिए बढ़ती निर्भरता (रैखिक रूप से) दिखाई है।

चौथा उद्देश्य मोनोक्लोनल एंटीबॉडी उत्पादों में डाइसल्फ़ाइड विषमताओं को स्पष्ट करना है। मास स्पेक्ट्रोमेट्री विश्लेषण द्वारा रेड्यूसड और गैर-रेड्यूसड पेप्टाइड मैपिंग संरचनात्मक अखंडता, विविधता और चिकित्सीय प्रोटीन की गुणवत्ता का आकलन करने के लिए पीटीएम और डाइसल्फ़ाइड लिंकेज लक्षण वर्णन के लिए आमतौर पर इस्तेमाल की जाने वाली विधि है। हालांकि, आकलन करने के दौरान विषमताओं को अक्सर तब देखा जाता है जब मूल पीएच विकृतीकरण और पाचनक्रिया के दौरान उपयोग किया जाता है। इन विषमताओं को कम करने के लिए, कई शोधकर्ताओं द्वारा विभिन्न अम्लीय पीएच स्थितियों का उपयोग करने वाले तरीके विकसित किए गए हैं। हालांकि, अम्लीय पीएच छूटी हुई और गैर-विशिष्ट दरारों को बढ़ाता है, जो विश्लेषण करता है। इस अध्ययन में, हमने मोनोक्लोनल एंटीबॉडी के लक्षण वर्णन के लिए एक रेड्यूसड और गैर-रेड्यूसड पेप्टाइड मैपिंग विधि का उपयोग किया है जो टीसीईपी के समावेश के साथ-साथ अल्काइलेटिंग एजेंट की कम सांद्रता, उच्च तापमान और अम्लीय पीएच पर विषमताओं को कम करता है। दो उत्पादों, एक स्वीकृत और एक लैब निर्मित रीटक्सिमैब का उपयोग विधि को विकसित और अनुकूलित करने के लिए मॉडल प्रोटीन के रूप में किया गया है। इस पद्धति का उपयोग करते हुए, पीटीएम और गैर डाइसल्फ़ाइड बॉन्ड पेप्टाइड्स को महत्वपूर्ण रूप से एक्सेस किया गया और क्षारीय पीएच पर पारंपरिक तरीकों की तुलना में कम पाया गया है। इस अध्ययन ने इस बात पर परिणाम प्रदर्शित किया है कि यह विधि मजबूत है और पेप्टाइड मैपिंग विधि में नमूना तैयार करने के दौरान उत्पादित विषमताओं को कम करता है।

कुल मिलाकर, इस थीसिस कार्य का उद्देश्य जैव-चिकित्सीय प्रोटीन के लक्षण वर्णन और तुलनात्मक अध्ययन के लिए मजबूत विश्लेषणात्मक प्लेटफॉर्म स्थापित करना है और गुणवत्ता विशेषताओं, स्थिरता और जैव-सक्रियता को प्रभावित करने वाले सहकारकों में एक अंतर्दृष्टि प्रदान करना है। जानकारी का यह टुकड़ा निर्माताओं को कुछ प्रमुख चुनौतियों का समाधान करने में मदद कर सकता है जो कि उत्पाद की गुणवत्ता प्रोफ़ाइल को प्राप्त करने के लिए प्रक्रिया और उत्पाद विकास के दौरान सामना करना पड़ता है।

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements.....	ii
Abstract.....	iv
List of Figures.....	xvi
List of Tables.....	xxi
List of Abbreviations.....	xxiii
1. INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1. BACKGROUND.....	2
1.2. PROBLEM DEFINITION AND SCOPE.....	4
1.3. OBJECTIVES OF RESEARCH.....	4
<i>1.3.1. Analytical comparability of biotherapeutic proteins.....</i>	<i>4</i>
<i>1.3.2. Elucidating charge and size-based heterogeneity in monoclonal antibody products.....</i>	<i>5</i>
<i>1.3.3. Elucidating charge and glycan-based heterogeneity in monoclonal antibody products ..</i>	<i>6</i>
<i>1.3.4. Elucidating disulfide heterogeneities in monoclonal antibody products.....</i>	<i>8</i>
2. LITERATURE REVIEW.....	10
2.1. GLOBAL REGULATORY LANDSCAPE.....	11
2.3. ANALYTICAL COMPARABILITY ASSESSMENT.....	13
2.4. ADVANCEMENTS IN ANALYTICAL ORTHOGONAL ASSESSMENT.....	17
2.4.1. Primary structure.....	17
2.4.1.1. Intact mass.....	18
2.4.1.2. Peptide mapping.....	18
2.4.1.3. Multi-attribute methods.....	19
2.4.2. Higher-order structure.....	20
2.4.2.1. Secondary Structure.....	21
2.4.2.2. Tertiary structure.....	21
2.4.2.3. Conformational stability.....	24
2.4.3. Glycosylation.....	24
2.4.4. Product-related variants.....	27
2.4.4.1. Aggregates/ fragments.....	27
2.4.4.2. Charge variants.....	29
2.4.4.3. Related proteins/ substances.....	31
2.4.5. Process-related variants.....	31

2.5.	<i>STATISTICS IN ANALYTICAL ASSESSMENT</i>	32
2.6.	<i>CONCLUSIONS</i>	33
3.	ANALYTICAL COMPARABILITY OF BIOTHERAPEUTIC PROTEINS	38
3.1.	<i>CASE STUDY 1 – INSULIN GLARGINE</i>	39
3.1.1.	<i>BACKGROUND</i>	39
3.1.2.	<i>EXPERIMENTAL SECTIONS</i>	40
3.1.2.1.	<i>Materials</i>	40
3.1.2.2.	<i>UV spectroscopy</i>	41
3.1.2.3.	<i>Mass spectrometry – Molecular mass</i>	41
3.1.2.4.	<i>Peptide mapping</i>	42
3.1.2.5.	<i>Disulphide bridging</i>	42
3.1.2.6.	<i>Circular dichroism spectroscopy</i>	43
3.1.2.7.	<i>Fourier transform infrared spectroscopy</i>	43
3.1.2.8.	<i>Fluorescence spectroscopy</i>	43
3.1.2.9.	<i>Size exclusion chromatography</i>	43
3.1.2.10.	<i>Reversed phase chromatography</i>	44
3.1.2.11.	<i>Accelerated stability study</i>	44
3.1.2.12.	<i>Atomic absorption spectroscopy</i>	45
3.1.2.13.	<i>Cell lines and culture conditions</i>	45
3.1.2.14.	<i>Glucose uptake assay</i>	45
3.1.2.15.	<i>Data analysis</i>	46
3.1.3.	<i>RESULTS</i>	46
3.1.3.1.	<i>Primary structure</i>	46
3.1.3.2.	<i>Higher order structure</i>	49
3.1.3.3.	<i>Product-related variants</i>	49
3.1.3.4.	<i>Excipient estimation</i>	51
3.1.3.5.	<i>Accelerated stability study</i>	51
3.1.3.6.	<i>Functional assay</i>	53
3.1.4.	<i>DISCUSSION</i>	53
3.2.1.	<i>BACKGROUND</i>	55
3.2.2.	<i>EXPERIMENTAL SECTIONS</i>	56
3.2.2.1.	<i>Materials</i>	56
3.2.2.2.	<i>Mass spectrometry – Intact mass</i>	57
3.2.2.3.	<i>Peptide mapping</i>	57
3.2.2.4.	<i>Circular dichroism spectroscopy</i>	58
3.2.2.5.	<i>Sodium dodecyl sulphate-polyacrylamide gel electrophoresis</i>	58
3.2.2.6.	<i>Size exclusion chromatography</i>	58

3.2.2.7.	<i>Reverse phase chromatography</i>	58
3.2.2.8.	<i>In vitro cell proliferation assay</i>	59
3.2.3.	RESULTS	59
3.2.3.1.	<i>Primary structure</i>	59
3.2.3.2.	<i>Secondary structure</i>	61
3.2.3.3.	<i>Functional assay</i>	61
3.2.3.4.	<i>Product-related variants</i>	61
3.2.4.	DISCUSSION	62
3.3.	CASE STUDY 3 – RITUXIMAB	64
3.3.1.	BACKGROUND	64
3.3.2.	EXPERIMENTAL SECTIONS	65
3.3.2.1.	<i>Materials</i>	65
3.3.2.2.	<i>Protein concentration</i>	66
3.3.2.3.	<i>Mass spectrometry - Molecular mass</i>	66
3.3.2.4.	<i>Peptide mapping</i>	67
3.3.2.5.	<i>Glycan profiling</i>	68
3.3.2.6.	<i>Circular dichroism spectroscopy</i>	68
3.3.2.7.	<i>Fluorescence spectroscopy</i>	69
3.3.2.8.	<i>Fourier transform infrared spectroscopy</i>	69
3.3.2.9.	<i>Sodium dodecyl sulfate-polyacrylamide gel electrophoresis</i>	69
3.3.2.10.	<i>Size exclusion chromatography</i>	70
3.3.2.11.	<i>Dynamic light scattering</i>	70
3.3.2.12.	<i>Cation exchange chromatography</i>	70
3.3.2.13.	<i>Accelerated stability study</i>	71
3.3.2.14.	<i>Cell lines and culture conditions</i>	71
3.3.2.15.	<i>Antibody-dependent cell-mediated cytotoxicity assay</i>	71
3.3.2.16.	<i>Complement-dependent cytotoxicity assay</i>	72
3.3.2.17.	<i>Fluorescence-activated cell sorting</i>	72
3.3.2.18.	<i>Surface plasmon resonance</i>	72
3.3.3.	RESULTS	73
3.3.3.1.	<i>Primary structure</i>	73
3.3.3.2.	<i>Glycosylation</i>	76
3.3.3.3.	<i>Higher order structure</i>	77
3.3.3.4.	<i>Product-related variants</i>	78
3.3.3.5.	<i>Acelerated stability study</i>	80
3.3.3.6.	<i>Functional assays</i>	81
3.3.4.	DISCUSSION	83

4. ELUCIDATING CHARGE AND SIZE-BASED HETEROGENEITIES IN MONOCLONAL ANTIBODY PRODUCTS	86
4.1. INTRODUCTION.....	87
4.2. EXPERIMENTAL SECTION.....	88
4.2.1. <i>Materials</i>	88
4.2.2. <i>Methods</i>	89
4.2.2.1. <i>Charge variant separation and isolation</i>	89
4.2.2.2. <i>Preparation of aggregate samples</i>	90
4.2.2.3. <i>UV spectroscopy</i>	90
4.2.2.4. <i>Cation exchange chromatography</i>	91
4.2.2.5. <i>Size exclusion chromatography</i>	91
4.2.2.6. <i>Dynamic light scattering</i>	91
4.2.2.7. <i>Statistical analysis</i>	92
4.3. RESULTS	92
4.3.1. <i>Isolation of charge variants</i>	92
4.3.2. <i>Accelerated stability studies</i>	95
4.3.2.1. <i>Soluble aggregation (HMWs vs. LMWs)</i>	95
4.3.2.2. <i>Insoluble aggregation (precipitates vs. subvisible particles)</i>	98
4.3.2.3. <i>Deamidation-induced aggregation</i>	101
4.3.3. <i>Regression analysis</i>	104
4.4. DISCUSSION	107
4.5. CONCLUSIONS	108
5. ELUCIDATING CHARGE AND GLYCAN-BASED HETEROGENEITIES IN MONOCLONAL ANTIBODY PRODUCTS	109
5.1. INTRODUCTION.....	110
5.2. EXPERIMENTAL SECTIONS.....	112
5.2.1. <i>Materials</i>	112
5.2.2. <i>Methods</i>	113
5.2.3. <i>Charge variant separation and isolation</i>	113
5.2.4. <i>Nomenclature of the peaks</i>	114
5.2.5. <i>UV spectroscopy</i>	114
5.2.6. <i>Cation exchange chromatography</i>	114
5.2.7. <i>Size exclusion chromatography</i>	115
5.2.8. <i>CDC assay</i>	115

5.2.9.	<i>Mass spectrometry</i>	115
5.2.9.1.	<i>Intact mass</i>	115
5.2.9.2.	<i>Glycan profiling</i>	116
5.2.10.	<i>Statistical analysis</i>	117
5.3.	RESULTS	118
5.3.1.	<i>Isolation of charge variants</i>	118
5.3.2.	<i>CDC activity</i>	119
5.3.3.	<i>MS analysis</i>	121
5.3.3.1.	<i>Intact mass</i>	122
5.3.3.2.	<i>Glycan profiling</i>	125
5.3.4.	<i>Correlation analysis</i>	128
5.4.	DISCUSSION	132
6.	ELUCIDATING DISULFIDE HETEROGENEITIES IN MONOCLONAL ANTIBODY PRODUCTS	134
6.1.	INTRODUCTION	135
6.2.	EXPERIMENTAL SECTION	137
6.2.1.	<i>Materials</i>	137
6.2.2.	<i>Sample preparation</i>	137
6.2.3.	<i>Preparation of stock solutions and solubilizing buffers</i>	137
6.2.4.	<i>Digestion conditions</i>	138
6.2.4.1.	<i>Digestion at pH 8</i>	138
6.2.4.2.	<i>Digestion at pH 5</i>	139
6.2.4.3.	<i>Digestion at pH 3</i>	139
6.2.5.	<i>Liquid chromatography</i>	139
6.2.6.	<i>Mass spectrometry</i>	140
6.3.	RESULTS AND DISCUSSION	140
6.3.1.	<i>Case study: Rituximab as model protein</i>	140
6.3.2.	<i>Non-reduced peptide mapping and disulfide bond analysis</i>	142
6.3.2.1.	<i>Digestion by trypsin plus Glu-C</i>	144
6.3.2.2.	<i>Digestion by trypsin plus Lys-C</i>	144
6.3.3.	<i>Reduced peptide mapping and PTM analysis</i>	147
6.4.	CONCLUSIONS	148
7.	CONCLUSIONS AND SCOPE OF FUTURE WORK	150
7.1.	CONCLUSIONS	151

7.2. SCOPE OF FUTURE WORK	152
8. Annexures	153
9. References	166
10. Biodata.....	197

List of Figures

Figure 1. 1: Bioprocess train with multiple stages of development during biosimilar manufacturing.....	3
Figure 2. 1: Global biosimilar approvals across continents i.e., Europe, North America, Asia, Australia, Latin America, and Africa for (A) mAbs and (B) non-mAbs; trend in biosimilar approval for different modalities under (C) mAbs and (D) non-mAbs.....	12
Figure 2. 2: (A) Timeline on patent expirations of reference products in EMA and USFDA, and publications on analytical similarity studies for biosimilars under (B) mAbs, and (C) non-mAbs	14
Figure 2. 3: Evolutionary timeline of analytical platforms used for different CQAs with respect to analytical biosimilarity assessment	16
Figure 2. 4: A comprehensive map of orthogonal analytical platforms for different CQAs used in analytical similarity assessment	35
Figure 3. 1: Deconvoluted ESI-TOF mass spectra for (A) intact mass, (B) A chain, and B chain, Base peak chromatogram (BPC) for (C) reduced, and (D) non reduced peptide map upon Glu-C digestion comparing insulin glargine innovator and biosimilars for batch 1.	49
Figure 3. 2: (A) Far UV CD spectra, (B) Secondary derivative of FTIR spectra, (C) Tyrosine fluorescence spectra at 295 nm comparing insulin glargine innovator and biosimilars for batches 1 and 2.	50
Figure 3. 3: (A) Reverse phase chromatogram for deamidated forms, (B) Size exclusion chromatogram for size heterogeneity, (C) Reverse phase chromatogram for m-cresol estimation comparing insulin glargine innovator and biosimilars for batches 1 and 2.	50
Figure 3. 4: (A) Size exclusion chromatogram showing aggregation on Day 0, 7, and 14, (B) Summary of the regression model developed for %aggregation at 14 days (Y) as a function of %aggregation at 0 day and months from expiry (X).	52
Figure 3. 5: (A) ESI-TOF mass spectra (B) Deconvoluted mass spectra for intact mass, (C) Total compound chromatogram (TCC) for reduced peptide map upon chymotrypsin digestion comparing filgrastim innovator and biosimilars.	60
Figure 3. 6: (A) Far UV CD spectra for secondary structure, (B) Reduced SDS-PAGE, (C) SEC chromatogram, (D) RPC chromatogram for product-related variants comparing filgrastim innovator and biosimilars.	62

Figure 3. 7: (A) RPC-UV, (B) ESI-MS, (C) RPC-FLD, (D) Fluorescence results showing presence of conformational variant in shoulder peak with respect to the main peak of filgrastim biosimilars	63
Figure 3. 8: Deconvoluted ESI-TOF mass spectra for (A) Intact and (B) Reduced mass analysis for light chain (LC) and heavy chain (HC), (C) Total compound chromatogram (TCC) for reduced peptide map upon trypsin digestion comparing rituximab innovator and biosimilars.	75
Figure 3. 9: (A) Far UV CD spectra, (B) Near UV CD spectra, (C) Secondary derivative FTIR spectra, (D) Intrinsic fluorescence spectra comparing rituximab innovator and biosimilars...	78
Figure 3. 10: (A) SEC chromatogram, (B) Particle size distribution by DLS, (C). CEX chromatogram before CpB digestion, (D) CEX chromatogram after CpB digestion.	80
Figure 4. 1: Strategy for isolation and characterization of charge and aggregate in mAb-based products.	89
Figure 4. 2: (a) Semi-preparative scale CEX separation of bevacizumab charge variants using pH gradient elution, (b) Analytical scale CEX separation of bevacizumab control sample, (c) Analytical CEX profiles of the individual isolated bevacizumab charge variants, (d) Semi-preparative scale CEX separation of trastuzumab charge variants using salt gradient elution, (e) Analytical scale CEX separation of trastuzumab control sample, (f) Analytical CEX profiles of the individual isolated trastuzumab charge variant.	93
Figure 4. 3: Size heterogeneity of bevacizumab using SEC upon application of stress	97
Figure 4. 4: Size heterogeneity of trastuzumab using SEC upon application of stress.....	98
Figure 4. 5: Similar increasing trend was observed in the formation of %HMW (A) and insoluble aggregates (B) for charge variants. Acidic and B3 have a higher HMW formation tendency	99
Figure 4. 6: Size heterogeneity of bevacizumab using DLS upon application of stress	100
Figure 4. 7: Size heterogeneity of trastuzumab using DLS upon application of stress.....	101
Figure 4. 8: Charge variant distribution of bevacizumab upon application of stress (A) Thermal stress (55 °C) (B) Mechanical stress (agitation at 750 rpm) (C) salt stress (1M)	102
Figure 4. 9: Charge variant distribution of trastuzumab upon application of stress (A) Thermal stress (55 °C) (B) Mechanical stress (agitation at 750 rpm) (C) salt stress (1M)	103
Figure 4. 10: Hierarchical cluster analysis dendrogram showing grouping of thermal and mechanical stresses as time progresses. These stresses can be considered more critical in such evaluation studies.	105

Figure 4. 11: (A, C) Loading plots and (B, D) VIP plots for the PLS model correlating charge and size heterogeneity in bevacizumab and trastuzumab, respectively. The variables in blue are the Y variables while the variables in green are X variables. Variables marked red in all the plots are the ones that show significant variation in the regression model. 106

Figure 5. 1: Strategy for isolation and characterization of charge and glycan in rituximab drug products. 113

Figure 5. 2: (A) Semi-prep CEX chromatogram of rituximab on YMC Biopro S10 resin using pH gradient, (B) Semi-prep CEX overlay of rituximab products, (C) Charge variant distribution of rituximab control samples, (D) Analytical CEX chromatogram of rituximab charge variants (A1, M, B1 and so on) using MAbPac SCX-10 RS, (E) Relative potency of rituximab charge variants using CDC assay 120

Figure 5. 3: Deconvoluted ESI-TOF mass results of Ristova® from intact mass analysis for (A) Acidic fractions, (B) Main fraction, (C) Basic fractions, (D) Intact mass spectral overlay of isolated charge variant fractions..... 123

Figure 5. 4: Bar plots showing percentages of major glycoforms present in different rituximab drug products from intact mass analysis (A) Overall % glycans (B) G0F/G0F, (C) G0F/G1F, (D) G1F/G1F, (E) G1F/G2F, (F) [G1F/G2F] SA..... 123

Figure 5. 5: N-glycan structure and nomenclature denoted using standard MS/MS glycan library i.e., Personal Compound Database Library (PCDL) database of PCA-labelled glycans (procainamide labelling) 125

Figure 5. 6: ESI-QTOF mass results from released glycan analysis of PCA labelled glycans: (A) Total ion chromatogram (TIC), (B) Extracted ion chromatogram (EIC) of G0F glycan of main fraction, (C) Compound mass spectrum of G0F glycan for main fraction of Ristova®, (D) Glycan groups as based on impact on effector function 126

Figure 5. 7: Plots showing percentages of glycoforms detected in different rituximab drug products from released glycan analysis (A) Overall % glycans, (B) Glycan group, (C) G0F, (D) GAL, (E) AF, (F) HM, (G) SA, (H) B 126

Figure 5. 8: Standard least square regression model showing Actual vs. Predicted plot, sorted parameter estimates and prediction profiler developed between % glycan (X) and CDC potency (Y) from (A) Intact mass, (B) Released glycan, and (C) Glycan groups of rituximab products (GAL: denoted as G; AF: denoted as F0; HM denoted as M) 128

Figure 5. 9: Standard least square regression models showing Actual vs. Predicted plot, and prediction profiler developed between % glycan and CDC potency (X) and % charge (Y) data for (A) G0F/G0F, (B) G0F/G1F, (C) G1F/G1F, (D) G1F/G2F, (E) [G1F/G2F] SA from intact mass analysis of rituximab products	130
Figure 5. 10: Standard least square regression models showing Actual vs. Predicted plot, and prediction profiler developed between % glycan and CDC potency (X) and % charge (Y) data for (A) G0F, (B) GAL, (C) AF, (D) HM, (E) SA, (F) B glycans from released glycan analysis of rituximab products	131
Figure 6. 1: Outline of different digestion protocols for reduced and non-reduced peptide mapping	138
Figure 6. 2: Total ion chromatogram (TIC) of (A, C) reduced, and (B, D) non-reduced peptide mapping for rituximab products at different conditions upon trypsin plus Glu-C digestion .	143
Figure 6. 3: Total ion chromatogram (TIC) of (A, C) reduced, and (B, D) non-reduced peptide mapping for rituximab products at different conditions upon trypsin plus Lys-C digestion .	143
Figure 6. 4: The percentage volume of (A, C) native, and (B, D) non-native disulfide bonds identified at different conditions for rituximab products	147
Figure 6. 5: The percentage quantification of PTMs identified upon (A, C) trypsin plus Glu-C and (B, D) trypsin plus Lys-C digestions for rituximab products	148
Figure 8. 1 (Annex): (A) SEC, and (B) CEX chromatogram overlay for size and charge-based heterogeneities of bevacizumab upon application of thermal stress at 55 °C	162
Figure 8. 2 (Annex): (A) SEC, and (B) CEX chromatogram overlay for size and charge-based heterogeneities of bevacizumab upon application of acidic stress at pH 3	162
Figure 8. 3 (Annex): (A) SEC, and (B) CEX chromatogram overlay for size and charge-based heterogeneities of bevacizumab upon application of mechanical stress at 750 rpm.....	163
Figure 8. 4 (Annex): (A) SEC, and (B) CEX chromatogram overlay for size and charge-based heterogeneities of bevacizumab upon application of salt stress at 1M NaCl.....	163
Figure 8. 5 (Annex): (A) SEC, and (B) CEX chromatogram overlay for size and charge-based heterogeneities of trastuzumab upon application of thermal stress at 55 °C	164
Figure 8. 6 (Annex): (A) SEC, and (B) CEX chromatogram overlay for size and charge-based heterogeneities of trastuzumab upon application of acidic stress at pH 3	164

Figure 8. 7 (Annex): (A) SEC, and (B) CEX chromatogram overlay for size and charge-based heterogeneities of trastuzumab upon application of mechanical stress at 750 rpm 165

Figure 8. 8 (Annex): (A) SEC, and (B) CEX chromatogram overlay for size and charge-based heterogeneities of trastuzumab upon application of salt stress at 1M NaCl 165

List of Tables

Table 2. 1: Patent expiration of various rDNA-based products (mAbs/ non mAbs) in European Union (EU) and United States (US).....	15
Table 3. 1: Overview of extensive structural and functional similarity assessment of insulin glargine innovator (Lantus®) and biosimilar products.	47
Table 3. 2: Overview of extensive structural and functional similarity assessment of filgrastim innovator (Neupogen®) and biosimilar products.....	60
Table 3. 3: Overview of extensive structural and functional similarity assessment of rituximab innovator (Ristova®) and biosimilar products.....	74
Table 4. 1: Charge variant distribution, purity, and identity of bevacizumab and trastuzumab using analytical CEX, SEC and mass spectrometry.....	94
Table 5. 1: Charge and glycan heterogeneities present in rituximab products.	119
Table 5. 2: Charge heterogeneity, purity, and relative potency of isolated charge variants rituximab products analysed using CEX, SEC, and CDC assay.....	121
Table 5. 3: Glycan heterogeneities identified using intact mass (RP-ESI-TOF-MS) in rituximab products.....	124
Table 5. 4: Glycan heterogeneities identified using released glycan (HILIC-ESI-QTOF-MS) in rituximab products.....	127
Table 6. 1: The percentages of PTMs reported in literature for different rituximab products.....	141
Table 6. 2: Disulfide linked peptides of in-silico digested rituximab with trypsin, trypsin plus Glu-C, and trypsin plus Lys-C. (Bold illustrate peptides not within MS detection range).....	142
Table 6. 3: The native disulfide bond peptides identified at different conditions for rituximab products.....	146
Table 6. 4: The non-enzymatic PTMs identified and quantified at different conditions for rituximab products.....	148
Table 8. 1 (Annex): A region/ country-wise account of regulatory guidelines for biosimilar approvals to date*.....	153

Table 8. 2 (Annex): CQA-wise summary of orthogonal platforms in published literature for analytical similarity assessment 155

Table 8. 3 (Annex): CQA-wise methodological advancements and orthogonal tools introduced since 2015 applicable to similarity assessment exercise 157

List of Abbreviations

2AB	<i>2-Aminobenzamide</i>
2D-LC	<i>Two-Dimensional Liquid Chromatography</i>
AAS	<i>Atomic Absorption Spectroscopy</i>
ABC	<i>Ammonium Bicarbonate</i>
ACN	<i>Acetonitrile</i>
ADCC	<i>Antibody-Dependent Cellular Cytotoxicity</i>
AF	<i>Afucosylated Glycans</i>
AF4	<i>Asymmetric Field-Flow Fractionation</i>
APS	<i>Ammonium Persulfate</i>
Arg	<i>Arginine</i>
Asn	<i>Asparagine</i>
Asp	<i>Aspartate</i>
CD	<i>Circular Dichroism Spectroscopy</i>
CDC	<i>Complement-Dependent Cytotoxicity</i>
CDR	<i>Complementarity-Determining Regions</i>
CDSCO	<i>Central Drugs Standard Control Organisation</i>
CE	<i>Capillary Electrophoresis</i>
CEX	<i>Cation Exchange Chromatography</i>
CGE	<i>Capillary Gel Electrophoresis</i>
CHO	<i>Chinese Hamster Ovary</i>
CID	<i>Collision-Induced Dissociation</i>
CIEF	<i>Capillary Isoelectric Focussing</i>
CM	<i>Carboxy-Methyl</i>
cm	<i>Centimeter</i>
CpB	<i>Carboxypeptidase B</i>
CQA	<i>Critical Quality Attribute</i>
CSD	<i>Comparative Signature Diagram</i>
Cys	<i>Cysteine</i>
CZE	<i>Capillary Zone Electrophoresis</i>
Da	<i>Dalton</i>
DAD	<i>Diode Array Detector</i>
DBT	<i>Department of Biotechnology</i>
DLS	<i>Dynamic Light Scattering</i>
DMB	<i>1, 2-Diamino-4, 5-Methylenedioxy-Benzenedihydrochloride</i>
DMEM	<i>Dulbecco's Modified Eagle's Medium</i>
DP	<i>Drug Product</i>
DSC	<i>Differential Scanning Calorimetry</i>
DTT	<i>Dithiothreitol</i>
EC ₅₀	<i>Half Maximal Effective Concentration</i>
EDTA	<i>Ethylenediaminetetraacetic Acid</i>
ELISA	<i>Enzyme-Linked Immunosorbent Assay</i>
EMA	<i>European Medicines Agency</i>
ESI	<i>Electrospray Ionization</i>
ETD	<i>Electron-Transfer Dissociation</i>
EU	<i>European Union</i>
FA	<i>Formic acid</i>
FACS	<i>Fluorescence-Activated Cell Sorting</i>

FBS	<i>Fetal Bovine Serum</i>
FFF	<i>Field Flow Fractionation</i>
FLD	<i>Fluorescence Detection</i>
FLR	<i>Fluorescence Spectroscopy</i>
FTIR	<i>Fourier Transform Infrared Spectroscopy</i>
GAL	<i>Galactosylated Glycans</i>
gCQA	<i>Glycosylation-Related Critical Quality Attribute</i>
G-CSF	<i>Granulocyte-Colony Stimulating Factor</i>
GI	<i>Glycosimilarity Index</i>
Gln	<i>Glutamine</i>
Gn-HCl	<i>Guanidine Hydrochloride</i>
HC	<i>Heavy Chain</i>
HCD	<i>Host Cell DNA</i>
HCP	<i>Host Cell Protein</i>
HDX	<i>Hydrogen Deuterium Exchange</i>
HECD	<i>Higher-Energy C-trap Dissociation</i>
HEPES	<i>4-(2-Hydroxy-Ethyl)-1-Piperazine-Ethane-Sulfonic acid</i>
HILIC	<i>Hydrophilic Interaction Chromatography</i>
HM	<i>High Mannose</i>
HMWs	<i>High Molecular Weight Species</i>
HOS	<i>Higher Order Structure</i>
HPAEC	<i>High Performance Anion Exchange Chromatography</i>
HSQC	<i>Heteronuclear Single Quantum Coherence</i>
IAM	<i>Iodoacetamide</i>
ICH	<i>International Council for Harmonisation of Technical Requirements for Pharmaceuticals for Human Use</i>
IgG	<i>Immunoglobulin G</i>
IM-MS	<i>Ion Mobility-Mass Spectrometry</i>
IU	<i>International Units</i>
KQA	<i>Key-Quality Attributes</i>
LC	<i>Light Chain</i>
LDH	<i>Lactate Dehydrogenase</i>
LIF	<i>Laser-Induced Fluorescence</i>
LMWs	<i>Low Molecular Weight Species</i>
LO	<i>Light Obscuration</i>
Lys	<i>Lysine</i>
m/z	<i>Mass-to-Charge ratio</i>
mAB	<i>Monoclonal Antibody</i>
MALS	<i>Multi-Angle Light Scattering</i>
MAM	<i>Multi-Attribute Methods</i>
mAU	<i>Milli Absorbance Units</i>
MaxEnt	<i>Maximum Entropy</i>
mdeg	<i>Millidegree</i>
Met	<i>Methionine</i>
MFDS	<i>Ministry of Food and Drug Safety</i>
MFE	<i>Molecular Feature Extraction</i>
MFI	<i>Micro Flow Imaging / Mean Fluorescent Intensity</i>
mg	<i>Milligram</i>
min	<i>Minutes</i>

mM	<i>Millimolar</i>
MRE	<i>Mean Residue Ellipticity</i>
MS	<i>Mass Spectrometry</i>
MVDA	<i>Multivariate Data Analysis</i>
MWCO	<i>Molecular Weight Cut-Off</i>
NaCl	<i>Sodium Chloride</i>
NAGA	<i>N-Glycolyl-Neuraminic Acid</i>
nm	<i>Nanometer</i>
NaN ₃	<i>Sodium Azide</i>
NANA	<i>N-Acetyl-Neuraminic Acid</i>
NanoDSF	<i>Nano Differential Scanning Fluorimetry</i>
NK	<i>Natural Killer Cells</i>
NMR	<i>Nuclear Magnetic Resonance Spectroscopy</i>
NPRA	<i>National Pharmaceutical Regulatory Agency</i>
NTA	<i>Nanoparticle Tracking Analysis</i>
OD	<i>Optical Density</i>
PAD	<i>Pulsed Amperometric Detection</i>
PBMC	<i>Peripheral Blood Mononuclear Cells</i>
PBS	<i>Phosphate-Buffered Saline</i>
PCA	<i>Principal Component Analysis / Procainamide</i>
PCDL	<i>Personal Compound Database Library</i>
PCR	<i>Polymerase Chain Reaction</i>
PD	<i>Pharmacodynamics</i>
Phe	<i>Phenylalanine</i>
pI	<i>Isoelectric Point</i>
PK	<i>Pharmacokinetics</i>
PLS	<i>Partial Least Square</i>
PMDA	<i>Pharmaceuticals and Medical Devices Agency</i>
pMod	<i>Peak Modeling</i>
ppm	<i>Parts per Million</i>
Pro	<i>Proline</i>
PSD	<i>Particle Size Distribution</i>
PTM	<i>Post Translational Modifications</i>
pyroGlu	<i>Pyroglutamate</i>
QTOF	<i>Quadrupole Time-of-Flight</i>
RPC	<i>Reverse Phase Chromatography</i>
RT	<i>Retention Time</i>
RRT	<i>Relative Retention Time</i>
SA	<i>Sialylated Glycans</i>
SBP	<i>Similar Biotherapeutic Product</i>
SD	<i>Standard Deviation</i>
SDS-PAGE	<i>Sodium Dodecyl Sulfate-Polyacrylamide Gel Electrophoresis</i>
SEC	<i>Size Exclusion Chromatography</i>
SH	<i>Sulfhydryl group</i>
SPE	<i>Solid Phase Extraction</i>
SPR	<i>Surface Plasmon Resonance</i>
SV-AUC	<i>Sedimentation Velocity-Analytical Ultra-Centrifugation</i>
T	<i>Absolute Temperature</i>
TCC	<i>Total Compound Chromatogram</i>

TCEP-HCl	<i>Tris(2-Carboxy-Ethyl) Phosphine Hydrochloride</i>
TCSPC	<i>Time-Correlated Single-Photon Counting</i>
TEM	<i>Transmission Electron Microscopy</i>
TEMED	<i>Tetramethylethylenediamine</i>
TFA	<i>Trifluoroacetic Acid</i>
TIC	<i>Total Ion Chromatogram</i>
TOF	<i>Time-of-Flight</i>
Tris-HCl	<i>Tris Hydrochloride</i>
Try	<i>Tryptophan</i>
Tyr	<i>Tyrosine</i>
UATR	<i>Universal Attenuated Total Reflectance</i>
USFDA	<i>United States Food and Drug Administration</i>
UV-Vis	<i>Ultraviolet/ Visible</i>
V _{cap}	<i>Capillary Voltage</i>
V _{frag}	<i>Fragmentor Voltage</i>
WHO	<i>World Health Organisation</i>
XRC	<i>X-Ray Crystallography</i>
λ _{max}	<i>Maximum wavelength</i>
μL	<i>Microliter</i>
°C	<i>Degree Celsius</i>