

**MAXIMIZING SAFETY AND EFFICACY OF
BIOTHERAPEUTICS BY CONTROLLING CRITICAL
QUALITY ATTRIBUTES**

SUMIT KUMAR SINGH



**DEPARTMENT OF CHEMICAL ENGINEERING
INDIAN INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY DELHI
FEBRUARY 2020**

©Indian Institute of Technology Delhi (IITD), New Delhi, 2020

**MAXIMIZING SAFETY AND EFFICACY OF
BIOTHERAPEUTICS BY CONTROLLING CRITICAL
QUALITY ATTRIBUTES**

by

Sumit Kumar Singh

Department of Chemical Engineering

Submitted

in fulfillment of the requirements of the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

to the



INDIAN INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY DELHI

FEBRUARY 2020

.....Dedicated to my grandfather

Late Sh. Rajaram Singh

*Your ideals and teachings of life will keep guiding me towards the path of
Truth and Integrity.*

CERTIFICATE

This is to certify that the thesis entitled “**MAXIMIZING SAFETY AND EFFICACY OF BIOTHERAPEUTICS BY CONTROLLING CRITICAL QUALITY ATTRIBUTES**” being submitted by **SUMIT KUMAR SINGH** 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 him 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 he 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.

It is with great pleasure that I acknowledge my esteemed guide, Prof. Anurag S. Rathore for his invaluable guidance, constant encouragement with praise, effective criticism by example and creating an ecosystem so conducive for doing research in biopharma. He has been instrumental in smooth flow of this research work. This period has been an enriching experience of working under his guidance. I thank him whole heartedly.

I would like to thank my PhD research committee members, Prof. Sudip Pattanayek, Prof. Anupam Shukla and Prof. Bishwajit Kundu whose periodic assessment and review of my work helped in going forward in the right direction. Their comments helped me in shaping my research ideas and has helped me immensely in developing a thought process to approach research problems in a systematic way.

I would like to express my gratitude to Prof. Gaurav Goel and Dr. Avinash Mishra for their contribution in performing computational studies reported in this thesis.

I gratefully acknowledge Saurabh Nagpal, Nitin Vig, Chander Mani, Deepak Maurya and Vijaykamal Ahuja in helping me with mass spectrometry analysis for characterization of various variants that were used in this work.

I am indebted to the technical discussions and comments from Dr. Narendra Chirmule and Dr. Manjula Das on choosing appropriate model systems and setting up the right experimental plan for cell assays and animal studies for supporting criticality evaluation of the product variants of GCSF and monoclonal antibodies. Special thanks to Dr. Renu Jain (NIB) and Dr. Sujata Mohanty (AIIMS) in providing us access to the MNFS-60 and HUVEC cell lines used in this study.

I would like to express my heartfelt gratitude and thanks to Dr. Dinesh Yadav (Animal House, JNU) for his constructive help, care and responsibility taken to provide the facilities at their centre which made my venture an easier one. I am also deeply thankful to Mr. S.S. Pandey in teaching me the skills to effectively handle animals during experimentation.

Words are insufficient to thank my senior colleague and friend, Dr. Deepak Kumar with whom I did most of my work. I thank him for being with me always at times of need, both personally as well as professionally.

I am extremely grateful to Dr. Vijesh Kumar, Dr. Viki Chopda and Dr. Mili Pathak who taught me various lab instruments and shaping my ideas for my PhD work upon joining the bioseparations lab.

I specially thank my friend Vishwanath Hebhi and Nikhil Kateja who provided immense and crucial help in developing downstream purification processes for generating materials for my work. I also thank Himanshu Malani for his help always as and when needed. Special thanks is also due to Naresh Kumar and Sanjeev Ji for all their immense co-operation at times of need.

I thank all other lab members of bioseparations lab: Lalita, Rohit, Gautam, Varsha, Kathire, Gunjan, Nupur, Jyoti, Shantanu, Surbhi, Rohan, Suraj, Niharika, Ankita, Priyanka, Jashwant, Ashish Chauhan, Somesh Mishra and Srishti Joshi for their kind support and co-operation during this work.

No words of gratitude can justify the support, help, care and love I have received from my dear friends Sandeep Rathi, Anirban Saikia, Rahul Gautam, Pradeep Singh, Pankaj Nagwani, Romen Singh and Nanao Soibam Oasis. I feel privileged and lucky to have you all in my life.

I also thank my parents, sister and Ananmaya whose smiling faces provide me with the motivation to find a purpose of life and help in doing tasks that I venture upon with dedication and integrity.

Lastly, I believe that all persons who have directly or indirectly contributed to this study whom I have not mentioned personally are aware of my deep and sincere appreciation.

SUMIT KUMAR SINGH

ABSTRACT

The number of biologic drugs that are gaining approval across the globe are rapidly increasing. Prominent among these modalities include monoclonal antibodies (mAbs) and growth factors as they constituted 30% and 15% respectively. However, the process to go from the idea to getting marketing approval for a biotech drug is long, expensive and arduous. A major hurdle in the entire exercise is high chances of product failure due to compromised safety and efficacy. Complicating this further, the number of product attributes that can potentially impact safety and efficacy of a biotech drug are overwhelmingly large. It is a challenge to assess the impact of each attribute on the product's safety and efficacy therefore warranting innovative and novel preclinical approaches are needed to bridge the gap. In this work, product as well as process related impurities associated with mAbs and Granulocyte Colony Stimulating Factor (GCSF) has been investigated with regard to their impact on safety and efficacy. In the first part of the thesis, a risk analysis was performed for various impurities that could be formed as a result of GCSF bioprocessing i.e., oxidized, reduced, aggregates, f-Met forms. Based on the severity and likelihood of their presence in the drug product, a criticality score were assigned to each of these impurities. Oxidation of all the methionine's was recognized as a critical quality attribute (CQA) in GCSF. The mechanism of how methionine oxidation affects the structure and function of GCSF is proposed. Further, a strategy involving substituting methionine with alanine in GCSF using site directed mutagenesis to overcome the loss in efficacy due to oxidation is shown. The second part of thesis investigates whether charge variants in mAbs should be considered as CQAs. An empirical model incorporating charge variant levels and their corresponding biological activity is suggested to obtain product pool with maximum activity and yield. Further, the risks and therapeutic benefits of the most commonly found charge variants in mAbs, i.e, lysine variants were investigated. It was found that though lysine variants of monoclonal antibodies have longer half-lives, yet they exhibit high tendency of tumor metastasis. The last part of the thesis establishes mechanism of co-purification of ten host cell protein (HCP)s impurities in Chinese Hamster Ovary (CHO) cells. The proposed mechanism can be used to guide downstream process design or avenues for protein engineering during product discovery to achieve more effective removal of these persisting HCP impurities.

सार

दुनिया भर में अनुमोदन प्राप्त करने वाली जैविक दवाओं की संख्या तेजी से बढ़ रही है। इन तौर-तरीकों में प्रमुख रूप से मोनोक्लोनल एंटीबॉडी (mAbs) और वृद्धि कारक शामिल हैं क्योंकि वे क्रमशः 30% और 15% का गठन करते हैं। हालांकि, बायोटेक दवा के लिए विपणन की मंजूरी लेने के लिए विचार से विपणन अनुमोदन जाने की प्रक्रिया लंबी, महंगी और कठिन है। संपूर्ण अभ्यास में एक प्रमुख बाधा सुरक्षा और प्रभावकारिता के कारण उत्पाद की विफलता की उच्च संभावना है। इसे और आगे बढ़ाते हुए, एक बायोटेक दवा की सुरक्षा और प्रभावकारिता को संभावित रूप से प्रभावित करने वाले उत्पाद विशेषताओं की संख्या बहुत अधिक हो सकती है। यह उत्पाद की सुरक्षा और प्रभावकारिता पर प्रत्येक गुण के प्रभाव का आकलन करने के लिए एक चुनौती है, इसलिए अंतर को पाटने के लिए नवीन और उपन्यास के पूर्ववर्ती दृष्टिकोणों की आवश्यकता होती है। इस काम में, उत्पाद के साथ-साथ mAbs और ग्रैनुलोसाइट कॉलोनी स्टिमुलेटिंग फैक्टर (GCSF) से जुड़ी प्रक्रिया संबंधी अशुद्धियों को सुरक्षा और प्रभावकारिता पर उनके प्रभाव के संबंध में जांच की गई है। थीसिस के पहले भाग में, विभिन्न अशुद्धियों के लिए एक जोखिम विश्लेषण किया गया था जिसे जीसीएसएफ बायोप्रोसेसिंग के परिणामस्वरूप बनाया जा सकता है, यानी ऑक्सिडीज़ेड, रेडूसेड, अग्रेगेटेड, फ-मेट फॉर्म। दवा उत्पाद में उनकी उपस्थिति की गंभीरता और संभावना के आधार पर, इन अशुद्धियों में से प्रत्येक को एक आलोचनात्मक स्कोर सौंपा गया था। GCSF में सभी मेथियोनिन के ऑक्सीडेशन को एक महत्वपूर्ण गुणवत्ता विशेषता (CQA) के रूप में मान्यता दी गई थी। मेथियोनिन ऑक्सीडेशन की संरचना GCSF की संरचना और कार्य को कैसे प्रभावित करती है, इसका तंत्र प्रस्तावित है। इसके अलावा, जीसीएसएफ में अलनीन के साथ मेथियोनिन को प्रतिस्थापित करने वाली एक रणनीति का उपयोग किया गया है, जिसमें ऑक्सीडेशन के कारण प्रभावकारिता में होने वाले नुकसान को दूर करने के लिए निर्देशित उत्परिवर्तन का उपयोग किया गया है। थीसिस का दूसरा भाग यह जांच करता है कि mAbs में चार्ज वेरिएंट को CQAs माना जाना चाहिए या नहीं। एक अनुभवजन्य मॉडल जिसमें प्रभारी प्रकार स्तर शामिल हैं और उनकी इसी जैविक गतिविधि को अधिकतम गतिविधि और उपज के साथ उत्पाद पूल प्राप्त करने का सुझाव दिया गया है। इसके अलावा, mAbs में सबसे अधिक पाए जाने वाले चार्ज वेरिएंट के जोखिम और चिकित्सीय लाभों, यानी, लाइसिन वेरिएंट की जांच की गई। यह पाया गया कि हालांकि मोनोक्लोनल एंटीबॉडी के लाइसिन वेरिएंट में ज्यादा हाफ-लाइफ रहता है, फिर भी वे ट्यूमर मेटास्टेसिस की उच्च प्रवृत्ति का प्रदर्शन करते हैं। थीसिस का अंतिम भाग चायीनिज हैम्टर ओवरी (CHO) कोशिकाओं में दस होस्ट सेल प्रोटीन (HCP) की अशुद्धियों के सह-शुद्धिकरण का तंत्र स्थापित करता है। प्रस्तावित तंत्र का उपयोग उत्पाद की खोज के दौरान प्रोटीन इंजीनियरिंग के लिए डाउनस्ट्रीम प्रक्रिया डिजाइन का

मार्गदर्शन करने के लिए किया जा सकता है ताकि इन स्थायी एचसीपी अशुद्धियों को और अधिक प्रभावी ढंग से हटाया जा सके।

Contents

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	ii
ABSTRACT	iv
List of Figures	xii
List of Tables	xiv
1. Chapter I: Introduction and Literature Review	1
1.1 Background	2
1.2.1 Safety and efficacy assessment of product variants of biotherapeutics	5
1.2.2 The wakeup call: TGN1412 Episode and Natalizumab case	9
1.2.3 Preclinical safety and efficacy assessment of biotherapeutics on case-by-case basis	10
1.2.3.1 Bispecific antibodies	10
1.2.3.2 Antibody fragments	11
1.2.3.3 Antibody-drug conjugates (ADC)	13
1.2.3.4 Process and product related impurities of biotherapeutics	14
1.2.3.5 Assessment of host cell proteins	17
1.3 Concluding Remarks.....	19
2. Chapter II: Problem definition and work objectives.....	20
2.1 Problem definition and scope and objectives of research	21
2.1.1 Identification of critical quality attributes of Granulocyte Colony Stimulating Factor (GCSF) ...	21
2.1.2 Structural and functional implications of methionine oxidation in Granulocyte Colony Stimulating Factor	21
2.1.3 Should charge variants of mAbs be considered critical quality attributes?	22
2.1.4 Investigation into the potential risk versus therapeutic benefits of lysine variants of bevacizumab	24
2.1.5 Identification of host cell proteins in biosimilars using a blend of experimental and computational approach.....	25
Chapter III: Identification of critical quality attributes of granulocyte colony stimulating factor... 27	
3.1 Introduction	28
3.2 Materials and Methods.....	30
3.2.1 GCSF refolding.....	30
3.2.2 GCSF purification.....	31
3.2.3 Analytical characterization.....	31
3.2.4 ELISA for quantitation of host cell proteins (HCP)	32
3.2.5 Picogreen assay for quantitation of DNA.....	33
3.2.6 Cell culture	33
3.2.7 Potency assay.....	33

3.2.8 Animal handling:	34
3.2.9 Pharmacokinetic (PK) studies.....	34
3.2.10 Pharmacodynamics (PD) studies.....	34
3.2.11 Histopathology and biochemical test	35
3.2.12 Isolation of neutrophils.....	35
3.2.13 Gene expression studies	35
3.3 Results.....	36
3.3.1 Production of GCSF variants and impurities	36
3.3.2 Isolation of GCSF variants and impurities.....	40
3.3.3 Characterization of GCSF variants and impurities	41
3.3.4 Cell assay.....	45
3.3.5 Pharmacokinetic (PK) studies.....	47
3.3.6 Pharmacodynamic (PD) studies and differential gene expression analysis.....	49
3.3.7 Biochemical and histopathological analysis.....	51
3.4. Discussion.....	53
3.4.1 Criticality Assessment of GCSF product variants	57
3.5. Conclusions	58
Chapter IV: Structural and functional implications of methionine oxidation in Granulocyte Colony Stimulating Factor.....	59
4.1 Introduction	60
4.2 Materials and Methods.....	62
4.2.1 Site directed Mutagenesis for generation of GCSF mutants	62
4.2.2 ICP-MS analysis	63
4.2.3 Refolding and Purification of GCSF	63
4.2.4 Oxidation of GCSF using hydrogen peroxide	63
4.2.5 LC-MS analysis.....	64
4.2.6 Circular Dichroism.....	64
4.2.7 Fluorescence spectroscopy.....	65
4.2.8 GCSFR binding assay	66
4.2.9 Cell assay.....	66
4.2.10 Animal studies.....	66
4.2.11 Computational study.....	67
4.2.11.1 Molecular dynamics (MD) simulations	67
4.2.11.2 Docking	68
4.2.12 Gene Expression study.....	68
4.3. Results.....	68

4.3.1 Structural characterization	69
4.3.1.1 Mapping of the oxidation site.....	69
4.3.1.2 Physicochemical characterization	73
4.3.1.3 Impact of tertiary structure change on stability.....	75
4.3.1.4 Impact on receptor binding and biological activity	77
4.3.1.5 Impact on neutrophil activation and proliferation	80
4.3.2 MD simulations	81
4.3.2.1 GCSF-receptor binding interface.....	81
4.3.2.2 Assessing changes in local environment around methionine residues	82
4.3.2.3 Docking of oxidative variants with GCSFR.....	83
4.3.2.4 GCSF Signalling Pathway Analysis	86
4.4 Efficacy loss management using site directed mutagenesis.....	87
4.4.1 Characterization of the GCSF mutants.....	87
4.4.2 Biological activity of the GCSF mutants	88
4.5 Discussion.....	89
Chapter V: Should charge variants of mAbs be considered critical quality attributes?	95
5.1. Introduction	96
5.2. Material and methods	98
5.2.1. Materials	98
5.2.2. Overall approach.....	98
5.2.3 Cation exchange chromatography (CEX) process separation mAb charge variants.....	99
5.2.4 Analytical cation exchange-high performance liquid chromatography (CEX-HPLC).....	99
5.2.5. Size exclusion chromatography (SEC)	100
5.2.6. Liquid chromatography-mass spectrometry (LC-MS)	100
5.2.7. Cell assay	100
5.2.7.1 Cell culture	100
5.2.7.2 <i>In vitro</i> evaluation of anti-proliferative activity of mAb charge variants on L929 cells.....	101
5.2.8. Correlating percentage variant to proliferation activity.....	101
5.3 Model validation	101
5.3.1 Isolation of individual bevacizumab charge variants.....	101
5.3.2 Purity analysis of the isolated fractions	102
5.3.3 LC-MS for Intact mass analysis.....	102
5.3.4 Peptide mapping analysis	102
5.3.5 Biophysical characterization	103
5.3.5.1 CD spectroscopy.....	103
5.3.5.2 Fluorescence spectroscopy	103

5.3.5.3 Time resolved fluorescence spectroscopy	104
5.3.5.4 FTIR Spectroscopy	104
5.3.6 Functional Characterization	105
5.3.6.1 Cell proliferation assay.....	105
5.4 Results	106
5.4.1 CEX separation of mAb charge variants	106
5.4.2 CEX-HPLC analysis of fractions	107
5.4.3 SEC analysis	110
5.4.4 LC-MS analysis.....	110
5.4.5 Cell assay	112
5.5 Correlating percentage of individual variant to cell proliferation	114
5.6 Validation of the results.....	117
5.6.1 Isolation of the mAb charge variants.....	117
5.6.2 Characterization of the charge variants using LC-MS	119
5.6.2.1 Main Peak	119
5.6.2.2 Basic Peak 1 and 2.....	121
5.6.2.3 Basic Peak 3.....	123
5.6.2.4 Basic Peak 4.....	124
5.6.2.5 Acidic Peak	125
5.7 Structural characterization	126
5.7.1 CD spectroscopy.....	126
5.7.2 Fluorescence spectroscopy	128
5.7.3 Time Resolved Fluorescence Spectroscopy	131
5.7.4 FTIR Spectroscopy	132
5.7.5 Cell Proliferation Assay	134
5.8 Discussion.....	135
5.9 Conclusions	138
Chapter VI: Investigation into the potential risk versus therapeutic benefits of lysine variants of bevacizumab.....	139
6.1 Introduction	140
6.2 Material and Methods	141
6.2.1 Isolation and analytical characterization	141
6.2.2 Screening for variants with enhanced FcRn binding at pH 6	142
6.2.3 Animal handling	142
6.2.4 Pharmacokinetic (PK) analysis	142
6.2.5 Cell Lines	142

6.2.6 Xenograft Models.....	143
6.2.7 Treatment plan	143
6.2.8 Protein extraction and quantification of tumor xenografts	143
6.2.9 Proteomic analysis	144
6.2.10 <i>In vivo</i> efficacy assays	144
6.2.11 Proteomic analysis	144
6.3 Results.....	145
6.3.1 Isolation and characterization of the charge variants	145
6.3.2 FcRn binding and in-vitro proliferation assays.....	146
6.3.3 Pharmacokinetics of the lysine variants in swiss albino mice	148
6.3.4 In-vivo efficacy assays	149
6.3.5 Immunohistochemistry.....	150
6.3.6 Proteomic analysis	153
6.4 Discussion.....	154
6.5 Conclusion:.....	157
Chapter VII: Characterization of ‘difficult to remove’ host cell proteins in rituximab biosimilar products using a blend of experimental and computational approaches.....	158
7.1 Introduction	159
7.2 Materials and Methods.....	161
7.2.1. Analysis of Host Cell Proteins using Octet	161
7.2.2. Analysis of Host Cell Proteins by MALDI TOF-MS/MS.....	162
7.2.3. Homology Modeling of the “Difficult to Remove” CHO HCPs	163
7.2.4. Protein- Protein Molecular Docking and Interaction Profiling	163
7.2.5 Structural & Functional Analysis	164
7.3. Results.....	165
7.3.1. Quantitative Analysis of Host Cell Proteins	165
7.3.2. Surface Study of Rituximab.....	167
7.3.3. Structure Modeling HCPs.....	168
7.3.4. Molecular Docking	172
7.4 Structural Integrity and Functional Analysis	173
7.5 Discussion.....	174
7.6 Conclusions	176
Chapter VIII: Conclusions and scope of future work.....	177
8.1 Conclusions	178
8.2 Scope of future work.....	179

List of Figures

Figure 1.1 Overview of the different types of innovative biologics either approved or in various stages of clinical trials.	5
Figure 1.2 Depiction of the roadmap of current status and future prospects involving the use of transgenic animals for non-clinical studies of biotherapeutics.	8
Figure 1.3 Schematic representation of the mode of action of a Blincyto, a bispecific antibody (BiTE) targeting CD3 receptor of T cell on one end and CD19 on the tumor cell on the other.	12
Figure 1.4 Illustration of the desired attributes of the components of ADC. Adapted with permission (Kamath and Iyer, 2015)	14
Figure 3.1 Design of experiments reveal conditions that favor formation of targeted impurities during GCSF refolding.	38
Figure 3.2 Chromatogram for HEA Hypercel chromatography for refolded GCSF protein.	41
Figure 3.3 Analytical characterization of native GCSF sample.	42
Figure 3.4 Analytical characterization of the GCSF aggregate and the GCSF-oxidized variant.	43
Figure 3.5 Analytical characterization of f-Met GCSF and reduced GCSF variants.....	44
Figure 3.6 Dose-response curve of the GCSF and the product variants upon treatment of GCSFR expressing MNFS-60 cell lines.....	45
Figure 3.7 Mean plasma concentration profiles (n=3) after subcutaneous administration of 50µg/kg native GCSF, oxidized GCSF, Aggregated GCSF, reduced GCSF and f-Met GCSF to healthy normal female wistar rats.	47
Figure 3.8: Evaluation of the impact on pharmacodynamics and gene expression due to methionine oxidation	50
Figure 3.9 Histopathological evaluation of vital organs of rats in repeated dose toxicity study.	51
Figure 3.10 Histopathological images of the brain sections of the animal group administered with GCSF aggregate samples A: 10x and B: 400X magnification.....	53
Figure 3.11 : Principle component analysis of the RP-HPLC and SE-HPLC data of the GCSF fractions collected during HEA chromatography.....	55
Figure 4.1 Sanger sequencing chromatogram of different mutants of GCSF.....	63
Figure 4.2 Comparison of the Iron and Copper content in ten commercial biosimilars of GCSF using ICP-MS.....	69
Figure 4.4 Secondary and tertiary structure spectra of GCSF and variants along with higher order clustering.....	74
Figure 4.5 Fluorescence spectra of GCSF and the oxidized variants at pH 4.0 in 10mM acetate buffer	75
Figure 4.6 Thermal CD denaturation profile of GCSF and oxidized variants	76
Figure 4.7 Overlay of SEC chromatograms (at 280nm) of the thermally denatured GCSF and the oxidized variants.	77
Figure 4.8 Comparison of different kinetic parameters of GCSF interaction with GCSFR.....	79
Figure 4.9 Effect of oxidized variants on ANC and neutrophil morphology.	80
Figure 4.10 GCSF Computational results.	82
Figure 4.11 Alignment of docked complex of GCSF: GCSFR with the crystal structure of wtGCSF: GCSFR complex.	85
Figure 4.12 Differential gene expression in JAK-STAT pathway..	86
Figure 4.13 Analytical characterization of SDM generated mutants.....	88
Figure 4.14 Structural analysis and biological activity of GCSF mutants.....	89
Figure 4.15 Orientation of GCSF:GCSFR docked poses.....	91
Figure 5.1 Proposed approach for characterization of charge variants of mAb therapeutics.	99

Figure 5.2 CEX process chromatogram of the mAb product	107
Figure 5.3 (a,b) Peaks representing acidic variants, main product, and basic variants as observed in the CEX-HPLC chromatogram.	108
Figure 5.4 (a-c) Representative CEX-HPLC chromatogram of the three fractions with >80% of acidic, main, and basic variants..	111
Figure 5.6 (a) Effect of main mAb species on proliferation of L929 cells.	113
Figure 5.7 Empirical model correlating charge heterogeneity to biological activity	114
Figure 5.8 a) CEX chromatogram showing separation of the charge variants of bevacizumab at preparative scale.....	118
Figure 5.9 Illustration of the sequence of the light and heavy chain and the sequence coverage obtained for the bevacizumab main product.	120
Figure 5.10 Deconvoluted intact mass of the bevacizumab main product	121
Figure 5.11 Identification of modification in basic 1 and 2 variants..	122
Figure 5.12 Identification of modification of basic variant 3.....	124
Figure 5.13 Mirror plot the deconvoluted mass of the bevacizumab main product and basic variant 4	125
Figure 5.14 Characterization of bevacizumab acidic charge variant using peptide mapping	126
Figure 5.15 CD spectra and HT-CD voltage of plots for mAb and charge variants.	127
Figure 5.16 Fluorescence spectra of bevacizumab and its charge variants isolated from the semi-preparative cation exchange chromatography.....	129
Figure 5.17 Assessment of the thermal stability of the charge variants of bevacizumab using fluorescence spectroscopy.	130
Figure 5.18 Determination of average fluorescence lifetime distribution of bevacizumab and its charge variants using time-correlated single photon counting spectroscopy.	131
Figure 5.19 Structural analysis by FTIR spectroscopy.....	133
Figure 5.20 The anti-proliferative activity of bevacizumab and its charge variants on HUVEC cells... ..	134
Figure 6.1 Representative CEX chromatogram showing separation of five basic, one acidic and one main charge variant species of bevacizumab.	145
Figure 6.2 Steady state concentration-response fit using 2:1 heterogenous ligand fit of binding sensogram of bevacizumab charge variants.....	147
Figure 6.3 Plasma concentration- time profile of the bevacizumab and the basic (lysine) variants	148
Figure 6.4 In-vivo tumor efficacy after treatment with bevacizumab and the basic charge variants on CRC tumor bearing nude mice.	150
Figure 6.5 High-powered photomicrographs of the immunohistochemistry staining of the excised tumor tissue	153
Figure 6.6 Cartoon depiction of the metabolic reprogramming resulting from the treatment with basic charge variant	154
Figure 7.1 Classification of HCPs impurities that exhibit characteristics of product association, co-elution and age related variable expression.....	160
Figure 7.2 Quantification of CHO host cell proteins using bio layer interferometry based assay	165
Figure 7.3 Surface analysis of mAb protein.	168
Figure 7.4 Depiction of the high quality homology modeled structures of the ten difficult to remove HCPs.	1169
Figure 7.5 Binding affinity estimation of best poses of ten HCP-mAb complexes.	172
Figure 7.6 Higher order structure and function analysis.....	174

List of Tables

Table 1.1 List of innovator antibody therapeutics approved in 2018 envisioned to reach blockbuster drugs status (> \$ 1 billion sales) by 2024.	8
Table 1.2 Key differences in the safety and efficacy data requirements for small molecule drugs, mAbs, and next generation biotherapeutics.	19
Table 3.1 Listing primer sequence used for evaluating expression of genes responsive to GCSF treatment.	36
Table 3.2 Full factorial screening design of experiments and their results.	37
Table 3.3 Summary of the effect of the refold parameters on GCSF product attributes.	39
Table 3.4 Composition of the refold buffer for generation of aggregated GCSF and reduced GCSF in the refold output (for a volume of 50 ml).	39
Table 3.5 Each pooled samples have a specific attribute of interest as the sole significant difference between the samples.	40
Table 3.6 Di-sulfide linkage map of the chymotrypsin digest of the early eluting peak of the reduced GCSF variant under non-reducing conditions.	44
Table 3.7 Di-sulfide linkage map of the chymotrypsin digest of the later eluting peak of the reduced GCSF variant under non-reducing conditions.	44
Table 3.8 Cell-Based Potency Estimation for Variants Results in Underestimation or Overestimation Owing to Variant Instability.	45
Table 3.9 Listing PK parameters of GCSF and variants	48
Table 3.10 Biochemical tests results	52
Table 3.11 ELISA spike and recovery of GCSF and its product variants.	54
Table 3.12 Listing the severity score for each product variants of GCSF based on the A-MAB case study approach for criticality evaluation of biotherapeutics	58
Table 4.1 Listing the relative summed percentage peak areas of the wtGCSF subjected to H ₂ O ₂ treatment for 0, 0.5, 4 and 24 hours	73
Table 4.2 Kinetic parameters of GCSF-GCSFR interaction obtained using global fitting of BLI data. 1:1 kinetic model was used for deriving the parameters (KD, kon and kdis)	78
Table 4.3 Potency of GCSF and the oxidized variants on mouse derived MNFS 60 cell line.	79
Table 4.4 Listing of aminoacid residues having RMSD>0.3nm in MetO (1,138,127) and MetO (1,138,127,122) Variants (highlighted in yellow). Residues at the receptor binding site having RMSD>0.35nm are highlighted in red.	84
Table 5.1 Percentage of individual variants in each fraction as per analysis by CEX. The percentage of variants in respective fractions were calculated by dividing the peak area of the variant to the sum of the areas of all the peaks present in the fraction. The proliferation activity of the fractions (Mean ±SEM) is derived from at least three experiments in duplicate.	109
Table 5.2 Amount of aggregates present in each fraction determined by SEC analysis. Fractions in red were not considered for further analysis	110
Table 5.3 Illustration of the application of the model in determining proliferation activity for different proportion of variants in the therapeutic product.	116
Table 5.4 Listing the average fluorescence lifetimes, pre-exponential factors and fractional intensities of time resolved fluorescence decay for bevacizumab and its charge variants	132
Table 6.1 Listing the kinetic affinity values of the bevacizumab charge variants and the corresponding fold-change improvements at pH 6.	147
Table 6.2 Listing the pharmacokinetic parameters of the bevacizumab and the basic variants obtained by fitting concentration-time data using non-compartmental analysis.	149

Table 7.1 List of HCP species identified in the flow through fractions (co-eluting HCPs) from protein L chromatography of the three rituximab biosimilars	166
Table 7.2 Listing the quality scores (ProTSA, galaxyWeb and 3D refine) of the homology modeled structures of the 'difficult to remove' HCPs.	170
Table 7.3 Top five residues that showed maximum change in exposed surface area in free to bound state from heavy and light chain of mAb in complex with HCPs. Residues detected as unstable in surface study (Figure 7.3) of mAb are bold.	171