参考資料７

過去の報告書・英訳・論文掲載の事例

- iPS 細胞等をもとに製造される細胞組織加藤製品の造腫瘍性に関する議論のまとめ
（第 1 期：細胞組織加工製品専門部会）

- 抗悪性腫瘍薬開発における非臨床試験の活用に関する提言
（第 2 期：非臨床試験の活用に関する専門部会）

- 「ゲノム編集技術を用いた遺伝子治療用製品等の品質・安全性等の考慮事項に関する報告書」
（第 4 期：ゲノム編集専門部会）

平成25年8月20日

iPS 細胞等をもとに製造される細胞組織加工製品の造腫瘍性に関する議論のまとめ

細胞組織加工製品専門部会 部会長　　中畑龍俊
細胞組織加工製品専門部会 副部会長　岡野栄之

1. はじめに

独立行政法人医薬品医療機器総合機構（PMDA）科学委員会細胞組織加工製品専門部会（以下、本専門部会と略）は、細胞組織加工製品に関し、iPS 細胞等の安全性に関する大きな懸念事項である「造腫瘍性」について、科学的見地から議論を重ね、とりまとめを行った。

細胞組織加工製品の開発を適切に推進するためには、科学的に想定される懸念事項に対し、現時点で認識し得る問題をできる限り整理した上で、実施可能性をも考慮した対応がなされるべきである。ただし、細胞組織加工製品の開発に関しては、今まさに様々な研究が進行中であり、現時点での知見は限られている。したがって、本専門部会は、可能な限りの現状分析と対応を提示するものの、近い将来関連データが集積された段階で随時検討を重ねる必要があることを併せて提言するものである。

「造腫瘍性(tumorigenicity)」とは、動物に移植された細胞集団が増殖することにより悪性または良性の腫瘍を形成する能力をいう。ヒト iPS 細胞やヒト ES 細胞は、元来、奇形腫形成という造腫瘍性を有しており、この点がヒト体細胞・体性幹細胞とは大きく異なる。これらの多能性幹細胞に由来する細胞組織加工製品においては、未分化の多能性幹細胞の残留・混入等により異所性組織や腫瘍が形成されるおそれがあるため、最終製品の造腫瘍性の評価と適切な管理が重要な課題である。

細胞組織加工製品の安全性を確保するために、今回、本専門部会は、「造腫瘍性」に焦点を当て関連する課題を整理した。具体的には、現時点でどのような科学的試験方法が存在するか、さらに、個別の試験方法の実力と限界についての現状をまとめ、考え得る対応案を提示した。したがって、本報告は細胞組織加工製品の開発に関する科学的見地からのまとめであって、細胞組織加工製品の薬事承認のための要件等を示すものではない。

2. 細胞組織加工製品における造腫瘍性

細胞組織加工製品の由来細胞の種類（体細胞、体性幹細胞、iPS 細胞等）は多様である。また、最終製品ごとに必要な細胞数は、例えば、網膜色素上皮細胞製品では 10^4個、心筋細胞製品では 10^8～10^9 個と様々である。さらに、由来する細胞についても、自己、同種、及び

HLA ホモ接合型の同種のものが想定される。その上、細胞組織加工製品の臨床利用に際しては、その様態（例：細胞懸濁液や細胞シート等）、適用の経路、適用部位、免疫抑制剤の使用の有無、患者の病状の緊急性等、様々なケースが想定される。したがって、このような多様性に基づき、造腫瘍性の評価においては、総合的な考察が求められる。実際、このような考え方は、米国・EU の規制当局のガイドライン及び厚生労働省指針でも見て取れるが、現時点では細胞組織加工製品及びその由来細胞に関する造腫瘍性評価の公的ガイドラインは存在しない。（注1）

細胞組織加工製品の造腫瘍性を評価する上で、「製造に用いる（幹）細胞の造腫瘍性と最終製品の造腫瘍性との相関・因果関係は未解明である」という点は重要であり、多能性幹細胞をもとに製造される細胞組織加工製品に関して、ことに iPS 細胞由来細胞組織加工製品の場合、その由来する iPS 細胞ストック等における造腫瘍性と最終製品としての iPS 細胞等加工製品の造腫瘍性は区別して検討しなければならない。

3. iPS 細胞等に由来する細胞組織加工製品における未分化細胞・造腫瘍性細胞の混入及び造腫瘍性の評価

iPS 細胞等に分化を誘導して製造した最終製品が造腫瘍性を有する場合、その原因として、未分化な iPS 細胞等の混在、及び分化誘導の過程で造腫瘍性を有する細胞が生じた可能性が想定される。これらを評価する方法としては幾つかの試験系が存在する。

造腫瘍性を持つおそれのある未分化 iPS 細胞等の混入を評価する試験系としては、未分化多能性細胞特異的なマーカーの発現を指標にしたフローサイトメトリーや定量的 RT-PCR（qRT-PCR）が挙げられる。しかし、いずれも一定の頻度以下の未分化多能性幹細胞の混入は検出できず、最終製品を未分化多能性幹細胞培養条件に戻して培養して iPS 細胞等のコロニーが出現しないことの確認など新たな検査法の確立が重要である。

一方、これらの試験方法は、使用した未分化細胞マーカーを発現していない（すなわち想定外の）造腫瘍性細胞を検出することはできない。したがって、製造工程中において意図しない形質転換により生じる造腫瘍性を有する細胞をいかに検出するかは、重要な課題である。

悪性形質転換細胞を検出するための試験系としては、軟寒天コロニー形成試験、フォーカス形成試験、成長因子非依存性増殖アッセイ、ヌードマウスへの皮下移植による造腫瘍性試験（注1 WHO TRS878 を参照）等が挙げられるが、これらの方法はもともと細胞株ないしセル・バンクのような比較的均一な細胞集団の特性解析を目的としており、ごく少数の造腫瘍性を有する細胞に起因する造腫瘍性を評価するためには、ヒトへの外挿性も含め、十分な感度があるかどうかに注意する必要がある。

造腫瘍性細胞を包括的かつ高感度で検出する試験法としては、NOG マウスもしくは NSG マウス等の重度免疫不全マウスへの皮下移植による造腫瘍性試験が考えられる。ただし、こ

れらの系における定量化の方策・標準化は未整備である。

細胞組織加工製品に関する上記の試験系はすべて、最終製品における造腫瘍性を有する細胞の混入量あるいは有無を試験するものである。上述の通り最終製品は多様な要素を持つと想定されるので、個々の最終製品ごとに、許容される造腫瘍性細胞の混入量を考察し、それを検出しうる試験法を確立した上で、カットオフ値を定める必要がある。（注2）

iPS 細胞等加工製品の造腫瘍性に関する一つの懸念として、「生着する微小環境が腫瘍形成に影響を及ぼすか否か」が挙げられる。これを非臨床で検証する系としては、重度免疫不全マウス等を用い、ヒトでの適用部位に相当する部位に当該製品を適用して造腫瘍性を試験する方法が考えられる。ただし、その臨床への外挿性は未だ検証されておらず今後の課題である。

4. iPS 細胞等に由来する細胞組織加工製品の製造に用いるヒト（同種）由来 iPS 細胞の造腫瘍性の評価と管理

iPS 細胞ストックは、特定の最終製品の製造を想定して開発されているものではなく、多様な最終製品の製造に用いることを想定したヒト（同種）由来 iPS 細胞のコレクションである。米国NIH等、海外でもヒト iPS 細胞コレクションが樹立されつつある。そこで、本専門部会では、一般論として、このようにコレクションされた臨床用ヒト iPS 細胞の造腫瘍性をどのように評価、管理するべきかについて議論した。

最終製品の造腫瘍性の評価は、上述の通り、重要であるが、最終製品の造腫瘍性は、その由来 iPS 細胞コレクションにおける個々の iPS 細胞の造腫瘍性及び最終製品に至る分化誘導のプロセス(製造工程)に依存する可能性がある。共通の iPS 細胞からそれぞれ固有の特性を持つ多様な最終製品が製造されると同時に、多数の患者に同一の最終製品が適用される可能性も想定される。最終製品中の細胞の分化度・増殖性等の特性によって、または適用される母集団が大きくなることによって腫瘍を発症する患者が出現してくるおそれがある。したがって、この場合、製造に用いる iPS 細胞について造腫瘍性の評価を厳密に行う必要がある。ヒトの iPS 細胞が発がんに関与するとした場合、主な懸念事項として、「継続的な細胞増殖を誘導する遺伝子異常」と「ゲノムの不安定性」が考えられ、これらについて討議した。

「継続的な細胞増殖を誘導する遺伝子異常」は、いくつかの発がんに関与する遺伝子変異の積み重なりによる異常と考えられている。したがって、発がんに関与する遺伝子変異を持つ細胞が患者に導入された場合、がんの発症リスク上昇が懸念される。iPS 細胞の遺伝子異常誘発に関して、レトロウイルスを用いた遺伝子導入では必ずホストのゲノムに遺伝子が組み込まれるが、それに比べ、現在行われているプラスミド（エピソーマルベクター）による遺伝子導入ではホストのゲノムに遺伝子が導入される確率は低い。しかしながら、ホストのゲノムに遺伝子やプラスミド断片が導入される可能性は否定できないため、導入の手法は問わずに iPS 細胞の作製に用いた初期化遺伝子がホストのゲノムに組み込まれていないことを検証することが重要となる。初期化遺伝子等の残留が、PCR によって検出できるような場合には、そ

の細胞の造腫瘍性が高まっていることが懸念される。PCR については、検出感度を把握した上で実施することが重要であり、実施可能性にも留意した上で、できるだけ高感度であることが望ましい。なお、プラスミド断片の挿入について検出可能な新規検査法（アレイ、全ゲノムシークエンス、濃縮トラップ法等）の開発も望まれる。また、エピソーマルベクターに含まれるプロモーター及びエンハンサー配列はゲノムに挿入された際に内在性遺伝子を活性化させる危険性がある。そのため、初期化遺伝子に加えてプロモーター及びエンハンサー配列の有無についても PCR で検査することが望ましい。

iPS 細胞が樹立された後、基礎的な情報として、核型、及び全エクソンの塩基配列に異常がないか確認しておくべきと考えられる。現時点で発がんへの関与が判明している遺伝子を【表 1】に例示する。これらの遺伝子の変異やそれに基づくアミノ酸置換が iPS 細胞で生じていないこと（新たな付加変異がないこと）の確認は重要である。ただし、発がんへの関与が報告されている遺伝子は【表 1】以外にも存在し、また、がん関連遺伝子に関する知見・情報は日々刷新されている。したがって、【表 1】の内容は随時更新する必要があることを付記する。他方、がん遺伝子及びがん抑制遺伝子を網羅的に確認することは実際上困難である。また、確認対象の遺伝子の設定の仕方によっては実際の発がんへの寄与が極めて少ない遺伝子の変異のみを含むような iPS 細胞までも最終製品の製造に用いるには不適切として排除することになり、合理的でなくなるおそれがある。試験に際しては、細胞の種類、製造方法、あるいは対象疾患や使用目的等も踏まえて、COSMIC 等の既存のがんゲノム変異データベースも参考にして、合理的な範囲で確認対象とする遺伝子を決める必要がある。

もう一つの大きな問題は「ゲノムの不安定性」である。ゲノムの不安定性により、生体内でがんにとって有利なクローンがセレクションされると考えられている。がん細胞にとってゲノムの不安定性は進化の駆動力であり、一般的に、がんは全てゲノムの不安定性を獲得していると考えられる。長期的にはゲノムの不安定性は発がんに大きく寄与するものと考えられ、このことは iPS 細胞に外来性のがん原性遺伝子が残るかどうかとは異なる問題であることに留意する必要がある。また、ES 細胞が初期胚由来であるのに対して、iPS 細胞は分化細胞を人為的にリプログラミングするため、エピジェネティックな構造も含め、不安定性がより高いことが考えられる。

ヒトにおける多くのがんは、増殖に強く寄与する遺伝子（おそらく数個から 20 個程度）の変異が蓄積して生じるため、晩発性の発がんが促進されないようにするためには、通常の細胞よりもゲノムの変異率が上がっていないことを確認しておく必要がある。例えば、基礎的なデータとして、iPS 細胞を継代培養した際のゲノムの変異率について、通常の細胞レベルと比較してどの程度であるかを確認しておくことは有用と考えられる。確認方法の一例としては、経時的なエクソンシークエンスが挙げられる。例えば、元の細胞と 10 継代後の細胞の全エクソンを比較し、その変異率を通常の細胞のレベルと比較するというやり方等が考えられる。また、分化誘導を行う場合には、分化誘導後のゲノム（エクソン）の変異率のデータも有用と考えられる。

なお、染色体の構造異常を来すものと、塩基配列異常を来すものは必ずしもオーバーラップしない。したがって、継代培養後のゲノム（エクソン）の配列情報は核型解析の情報の代替にはならない。

また、臨床用ヒト iPS 細胞ストック作製においては、幾つかの遺伝子を導入したことに伴う事象と、培養に伴うゲノムの不安定性の2種類の問題が考えられるが、現時点の科学では、両者を区別することなく、導入操作時及び継代した後のゲノムの不安定性について確認することが現実的である。全エクソン解析は、ゲノム変異におけるサブポピュレーションの解析も行えることから、この目的に使用することが可能と考えられる。

臨床用ヒト iPS 細胞ストックの造腫瘍性に関し、遺伝子レベルでの確認を行う場合、ゲノムの変異や同一人物由来の体細胞の遺伝子配列のある程度の多様性が、健常人にも認められることは注意すべきである。iPS 細胞の作製過程で新たに生じた変異を同定し、それががん関連のアミノ酸変異を起こすものかという視点での検討も必要である。ドナー由来の変異の取扱いについては慎重に対応する必要があるが、同意を取得した範囲を踏まえて、細胞組織加工製品の安全性を確保するよう適切に対応する必要がある。

5. おわりに

本専門部会では、今回、細胞組織加工製品の開発において懸念されるリスクとして「造腫瘍性」を取り上げ、特に iPS 細胞に焦点を絞って議論を行った。その結果、現段階での造腫瘍性リスクに関する知識及びその評価法についての一定の整理がなされた。

本専門部会においては、iPS 細胞等に由来する細胞組織加工製品の造腫瘍性について、そのリスクをゼロにすることは現在の科学技術では困難であること、また、一方で、疾患というリスク及びその時間的経過により増大するリスクを抱えた患者から細胞組織加工製品の実用化が期待されていることについては明確なコンセンサスが得られた。そのことを承知した上で、現時点で活用可能な手段を合理的な範囲で活用し、できるだけリスクを減らすよう努力する必要がある。本報告書は、このような観点で、現時点での見解をまとめたものである。

なお、iPS 細胞等に由来する細胞組織加工製品については、分化誘導過程での造腫瘍性の増強の有無やエピジェネティックな要因による造腫瘍性等、今回、議論していない課題も存在し、今後の議論が必要と考えられる。また、臨床適用される最終製品は多様な形態となることが想定され、その特性を踏まえて適用すべき試験を適切に選択した上で、臨床適用においてはできるだけ長期フォローを行うことが必要と考えられる。

細胞組織加工製品の開発は日進月歩である。先端的な分野であるほど、「誰もが未経験」であるために、品質や安全性確保は困難になる。その克服には、既存の評価技術の活用を諮ると共に新規評価法の開発を継続的に推進する努力が必要である。本専門部会では、今後も細胞組織加工製品の品質、有効性及び安全性をいかに評価するか、について最新の知識を収集し、かつ叡智を集めて議論をつくしながら、現時点で利用可能な科学技術の可能性と限界について科学的コンセンサスを醸成する努力を継続して行く所存である。

表1　がん関連遺伝子の例（Gene Symbol で表示）

ABL1	CBFA2T3	ERCC4	GATA1	MEN1	NUP214	SH3GL1
ABL2	CBLB	ERCC5	GATA3	MET	NUP98	SMAD4
ACVR1B	CBLC	ERCC6	GNA11	MITF	PALB2	SMARCA4
AFF3	CCND1	ETV4	GNAQ	MLH1	PAX8	SMARCB1
AKAP9	CCND2	ETV6	GNAS	MLH3	PBRM1	SMO
AKT1	CCND3	EVI1	GOLGA5	MLL	PDE4DIP	SOCS1
AKT2	CDC73	EWSR1	GOPC	MLL2	PDGFB	SRGAP3
ALK	CDH1	EXT1	GPC3	MLL3	PDGFRA	SRSF2
APC	CDH11	EXT2	H3F3A	MLLT3	PDGFRB	SS18
ARHGEF12	CDK6	EZH2	HMGA1	MPL	PIK3CA	STAT3
ARID1A	CDKN2A	FAM123B	HMGA2	MSH2	PIK3R1	STK11
ARID2	CDKN2C	FANCA	HNF1A	MSH6	PIM1	SUFU
ASXL1	CDX2	FANCB	HRAS	MUTYH	PLAG1	SUZ12
ATF1	CEBPA	FANCC	IDH1	MYB	PML	SYK
ATM	CHEK1	FANCD2	IDH2	MYC	PMS2	TCF3
ATR	CHEK2	FANCE	IKZF1	MYCL1	POLE	TCL1A
ATRX	CIC	FANCF	IL2	MYCN	POLH	TET2
AXIN1	COL1A1	FANCG	IL7R	MYD88	PPARG	TFG
AXIN2	CREB1	FANCI	IRF4	MYST3	PPP2R1A	TLX1
BAP1	CREBBP	FANCJ	JAK2	NCOA2	PRKAR1A	TNFAIP3
BCL11A	CTNNB1	FANCL	JUN	NCOA4	PTCH1	TP53
BCL11B	CYLD	FANCM	KDM5C	NF1	PTEN	TPR
BCL2	DAXX	FANCP	KDM6A	NF2	PTPN11	TSC1
BCL3	DDB2	FBXW7	KDR	NFE2L2	RAD51C	TSC2
BCL6	DDIT3	FEV	KIT	NFKB2	RAF1	TSHR
BCOR	DDX5	FGFR1	KRAS	NIN	RB1	USP6
BCR	DDX6	FGFR1OP	LCK	NONO	REL	VHL
BHD	DEK	FGFR2	LMO2	NOTCH1	RET	WRN
BLM	DICER	FGFR3	MAF	NOTCH2	RNF213	WT1
BMPR1A	DNMT3A	FH	MAFB	NPM1	ROS1	XPA
BRAF	EGFR	FLCN	MAML2	NR4A3	RUNX1	XPC
BRCA1	ELK4	FLT3	MAP2K4	NRAS	SDHB	ZNF521
BRCA2	EP300	FOXL2	MDM2	NSD1	SDHD	
CARD11	ERBB2	FOXP1	MDM4	NTRK1	SETD2	
CARS	ERCC3	FUS	MED12	NTRK3	SF3B1	

がん関連遺伝子に関し、Cancer Research 72:636-644, 2012　及び外部有識者（柴田龍弘先生）提出資料（※）より作成。

※：外部有識者提出資料は、家族性腫瘍の原因遺伝子として報告されているもの（米国 NCBI の OMIM(Online Mendelian Inheritance in Man)(http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/omim)）、これまでの報告からがんにおいて最初の体細胞変異と想定されるもの及びがん変異データベース（英国サンガーセンターの COSMIC(http://cancer.sanger.ac.uk/cancergenome/projects/cosmic/)）等において高頻度に認められる（上位20位）遺伝子（全てのがん種についての全体集合）をリスト化した資料。

注1：細胞組織加工製品の品質・安全性確保に関しては、既に厚生労働省より「ヒト（自己）由来細胞・組織加工医薬品等の品質及び安全性の確保に関する指針」（平成 20 年 2 月 8 日薬食発第 0208003 号）、「ヒト（同種）由来細胞・組織加工医薬品等の品質及び安全性の確保に関する指針」（平成 20 年 9 月 12 日薬食発第 0912006 号）、「ヒト（自己）体性幹細胞加工医薬品等の品質及び安全性の確保について」（平成 24 年 9 月 7 日薬食発 0907 第 2 号）、「ヒト（同種）体性幹細胞加工医薬品等の品質及び安全性の確保について」（平成 24 年 9 月 7 日薬食発 0907 第 3 号）、「ヒト（自己）iPS（様）細胞加工医薬品等の品質及び安全性の確保について」（平成 24 年 9 月 7 日薬食発 0907 第 4 号）、「ヒト（同種）iPS（様）細胞加工医薬品等の品質及び安全性の確保について」（平成 24 年 9 月 7 日薬食発 0907 第 5 号）、「ヒト ES 細胞加工医薬品等の品質及び安全性の確保に関する指針」（平成 24 年 9 月 7 日薬食発 0907 第 6 号）などの指針が発出されている。現在、細胞の造腫瘍性試験に関する国際的なガイドラインとして唯一存在するのは、世界保健機関（WHO）の生物薬品標準化専門委員会第 47 次報告(1998) (Technical Report Series No. 878, TRS 878)Annex I「生物薬品製造用の *in vitro* 基材としての動物細胞の使用の要件」である。WHO TRS 878 にある造腫瘍性試験の内容は、極めて大雑把に言えば、「ヌードマウス等の動物 10 匹に 10^7 個の細胞を投与して 16 週間観察し、陽性対照としては HeLa 細胞などを用いる」というものであり、この試験の目的は、生物薬品用細胞基材となる細胞株の均一なバンク（セル・バンク）の造腫瘍性の程度又は有無を正確に把握することにある。造腫瘍性の程度の大幅な変化又はその有無に変化が生じた場合、細胞特性に何らかの異常が起こった指標となる。つまり、既知あるいは未知のウイルス感染、変異原性物質やストレスによる遺伝子変異・発がん遺伝子活性化など、原因はいずれにせよ、セル・バンクの安定性上の異常が発生したことを検出するための方策として、セル・バンクの造腫瘍性を細胞特性指標の一つとして評価し、品質管理に活用することが WHO TRS 878 では必要とされている。ここで注意しなければならないのは、その適用対象である。WHO TRS 878 の適用対象は、あくまでワクチンやタンパク質製剤など、ヒトに投与される生物薬品を製造する際に *in vitro* 基材として用いられるヒト又は動物由来の細胞であって、「患者に移植する細胞」及び「治療を目的に患者に移植する細胞株の原料となる細胞」は、対象外とされている。

注2：iPS 細胞等加工製品中の未分化 iPS 細胞ないし造腫瘍性細胞の混入の評価の最終的な目的は、製品中の細胞の増殖異常の検出にある。したがって、iPS 細胞等加工製品の場合、厚生労働省の指針である「ヒト（自己）iPS（様）細胞加工医薬品等の品質及び安全性の確保について」（平成 24 年 9 月 7 日薬食発 0907 第 4 号）及び「ヒト（同種）iPS（様）細胞加工医薬品等の品質及び安全性の確保について」（平成 24 年 9 月 7 日薬食発 0907 第 5 号）に例示されている非臨床安全性試験に関する確認事項の中でも「培養期間を超えて培養した細胞について、目的外の形質転換を起こしていないことや目的細胞以外の細胞が異常増殖していないことを明らかにすること」が重要となる。

＜参考＞　委員名簿・開催日程等

1.　委員名簿（敬称略）

	飯原　弘二	国立循環器病研究センター　脳血管部門長・脳神経外科部長
○	岡野　栄之	慶應義塾大学医学部　生理学教室　教授
	尾崎　博	東京大学大学院農学生命科学研究科　教授
	澤　芳樹	大阪大学大学院医学系研究科　外科学講座心臓血管外科学　教授
	榛村　重人	慶應義塾大学医学部　准教授
	末盛　博文	京都大学　再生医科学研究所　胚性幹細胞研究分野　准教授
	高田　英俊	九州大学大学院医学研究院　成長発達医学　准教授
	高橋　和利	京都大学　iPS 細胞研究所　講師
	豊田　雅士	地方独立行政法人東京都健康長寿医療センター　研究副部長
◎	中畑　龍俊	京都大学　iPS 細胞研究所　副所長
	中村　利孝	独立行政法人国立国際医療研究センター　総長特任補佐
	松井　茂之	名古屋大学大学院医学系研究科　教授
	間野　博行	東京大学大学院医学系研究科　教授
	森尾　友宏	東京医科歯科大学大学院　発生発達病態学分野　准教授
※	佐藤　陽治	国立医薬品食品衛生研究所　遺伝子細胞医薬部　部長

（◎：部会長　○：副部会長　※：臨時委員）

2.　開催日程等

○第三回細胞組織加工製品専門部会

開催日時：平成 24 年 12 月 26 日

検討事項：提供された話題を踏まえ討議

話題提供：高橋和利委員　iPS 細胞の品質評価について

○第四回細胞組織加工製品専門部会

開催日時：平成 25 年 2 月 6 日

検討事項：提供された話題を踏まえ討議

話題提供：間野博行委員　発がんメカニズムとその検証法

○第五回細胞組織加工製品専門部会

開催日時：平成 25 年 4 月 25 日

検討事項：提供された話題を踏まえ討議

話題提供：佐藤陽治臨時委員　再生医療製品（細胞組織加工製品）の造腫瘍性評価

〇第六回細胞組織加工製品専門部会

開催日時：平成 25 年 5 月 15 日

検討事項：提供された話題を踏まえ討議

外部有識者からの話題提供：公益財団法人先端医療振興財団　松山晃文氏

再生医療とレギュラトリーサイエンス

〇第七回細胞組織加工製品専門部会

開催日時：平成 25 年 7 月 16 日

検討事項：提供された話題を踏まえ討議及び造腫瘍性について取りまとめ

外部有識者からの話題提供：国立がん研究センター　柴田龍弘氏

iPS 細胞における造腫瘍性リスク評価に関して

日本医科大学　島田隆氏

遺伝子治療の現状と課題

Cancer Science
Japanese Cancer Association JCA
Open Access

Report

Report on the use of non-clinical studies in the regulatory evaluation of oncology drugs

Yoshihiro Hayakawa,[1,2] Manabu Kawada,[1,3] Hiroyoshi Nishikawa,[1,4] Takahiro Ochiya,[1,5] Hideyuki Saya,[1,6] Hiroyuki Seimiya,[1,7] Ryoji Yao,[1,8] Masahiro Hayashi,[1,9] Chieko Kai,[1,10] Akira Matsuda,[1,11] Tomoki Naoe,[1,12] Atsushi Ohtsu,[1,13] Taku Okazaki,[1,14] Hideo Saji,[1,15] Masataka Sata,[1,16] Haruhiko Sugimura,[1,17] Yuichi Sugiyama,[1,18] Masakazu Toi[1,19] and Tatsuro Irimura[1,20]

[1]Subcommittee on Non-clinical Studies, The Science Board to the Pharmaceuticals and Medical Devices Agency, Tokyo; [2]Division of Pathogenic Biochemistry, Department of Bioscience, Institute of Natural Medicine, University of Toyama, Toyama; [3]Institute of Microbial Chemistry, Microbial Chemistry Research Foundation, Numazu-shi; [4]Division of Cancer Immunology, Exploratory Oncology Research and Clinical Trial Center, National Cancer Center, Chiba; [5]Division of Molecular and Cellular Medicine, National Cancer Center Research Institute, Tokyo; [6]Division of Gene Regulation, Institute for Advanced Medical Research, School of Medicine, Keio University, Tokyo; [7]Division of Molecular Biotherapy, Cancer Chemotherapy Center, Japanese Foundation for Cancer Research, Tokyo; [8]Division of Cell Biology, Cancer Institute, Japanese Foundation for Cancer Research, Tokyo; [9]Department of Pharmacy, Toranomon Hospital, Tokyo; [10]Laboratory Animal Research Center, Institute of Medical Science, The University of Tokyo, Tokyo; [11]Department of Medicinal Chemistry, Faculty of Pharmaceutical Sciences, Hokkaido University, Sapporo; [12]National Hospital Organization Nagoya Medical Center, Nagoya; [13]Exploratory Oncology Research and Clinical Trial Center, National Cancer Center, Chiba; [14]Division of Immune Regulation, Institute for Genome Research, Tokushima University, Tokushima; [15]Department of Patho-Functional Bioanalysis, Graduate School of Pharmaceutical Sciences, Kyoto University, Kyoto; [16]Department of Cardiovascular Medicine, Institute of Biomedical Sciences, Tokushima University Graduate School, Tokushima; [17]Department of Tumor Pathology, Hamamatsu University School of Medicine, Shizuoka; [18]Sugiyama Laboratory, RIKEN Innovation Center, RIKEN Cluster for Industry Partnerships, Kanagawa; [19]Department of Breast Surgery, Graduate School of Medicine, Kyoto University, Kyoto; [20]Juntendo University School of Medicine, Tokyo, Japan

Key words

Animal model, cancer, drug development, oncology drug, regulatory science

Correspondence

Tatsuro Irimura, Pharmaceuticals and Medical Devises Agency, 3-3-2 Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda-ku, Tokyo 100-0013, Japan or Juntendo University School of Medicine, 2-1-1 Hongo, Bunkyo-ku, Tokyo 113-8421, Japan.
Tel: +81-3-3506-9407 (ext 3802) or +81-3-5802-1222; Fax: +81-3-3813-3307;
E-mail: t-irimura@juntendo.ac.jp

Funding Information

The work was conducted as a part of activity of the Science Board of Pharmaceuticals and Medical Devices Agency.

Received October 21, 2015; Revised December 4, 2015; Accepted December 4, 2015

Cancer Sci **107** (2016) 189–202

doi: 10.1111/cas.12857

Non-clinical studies are necessary at each stage of the development of oncology drugs. Many experimental cancer models have been developed to investigate carcinogenesis, cancer progression, metastasis, and other aspects in cancer biology and these models turned out to be useful in the efficacy evaluation and the safety prediction of oncology drugs. While the diversity and the degree of engagement in genetic changes in the initiation of cancer cell growth and progression are widely accepted, it has become increasingly clear that the roles of host cells, tissue microenvironment, and the immune system also play important roles in cancer. Therefore, the methods used to develop oncology drugs should continuously be revised based on the advances in our understanding of cancer. In this review, we extensively summarize the effective use of those models, their advantages and disadvantages, ranges to be evaluated and limitations of the models currently used for the development and for the evaluation of oncology drugs.

Progress of Cancer Biology is Closely Linked to Oncology Drug Development

The history of the development of oncology drugs, so-called chemotherapeutic agents, is closely associated with the progress of the biological understanding of cancer. Based on the concept that cancer cells are capable of unlimited proliferation, substances that inhibit DNA replication or cell division have been used as drugs for cancer treatment for a long period, since the 1950s. Although the concept has remained unchanged to the present day,[1] the discovery of cancer cell-specific metabolic pathways has led to the development of antimetabolites.[2] After the discovery of cancer cell-specific molecular and cellular mechanisms that are essential for the survival and growth of cancer cells, therapeutic drugs targeting these mechanisms, so-called molecular targeted drugs, started to be developed.[3] Research into viral oncogenesis, started in the 1960s, led to the discovery of oncogenes,[4] and research into the genetic backgrounds of cancers led to the discovery of tumor suppressor genes.[5] In the course of such studies, it also became apparent that cancer is caused by genetic abnormalities such as mutations, deletions, duplications, and translocations.[6–9] Molecular targeted cancer drugs appeared in the 1990s;[10] can-

cer was considered a disease characterized by abnormal differentiation, and the efficacy of differentiation-inducing agents was demonstrated.[11,12] Furthermore, it was shown that a solid tumor tissue consists of cancer and host cells such as vascular cells, fibroblasts, and cells in the immune system and that these host cells are essential for tumor growth. Drugs targeting the function of these host cells and their interactions with cancer cells were proven to be effective.[13] Based on these findings, it has been thought that regulatory mechanisms for the entire organism are involved in the action of oncology drugs that regulate the immune system.[14]

Significance of Non-Clinical Studies in Efficacy Evaluation and Safety Prediction

Non-clinical studies are necessary at each stage of the development of oncology drugs. Particularly, the efficacy and the safety of a drug must be examined and evaluated before undertaking any clinical study of the drug. Types of non-clinical studies and how critical they are vary depending on the types and mechanisms of action of oncology drugs. Non-clinical studies required to develop drugs targeting cancer–host interactions differ markedly from those on substances having direct killing effects on cancer cells. Many experimental cancer models (animal models, *ex vivo* models, and *in vitro* models) have been developed to investigate carcinogenesis, cancer progression, metastasis, and other aspects in cancer biology. These models turned out to be useful in the efficacy evaluation and the safety prediction of oncology drugs. The present review summarizes the effective use of those models, their advantages and disadvantages, ranges to be evaluated, and limitations of the models used in non-clinical study.

Evaluation of Oncology Drugs Using Experimental Animal Models

Two classes of experimental animal models for human cancers are currently used for the evaluation of oncology drugs: transplantation models and autochthonous cancer models. Transplantation models have been playing an important role in the non-clinical evaluation of oncology drugs. They are generally categorized into two types, namely xenograft models using human cancer cells and orthograft models using murine cancer cells. There has been some debate that the efficacy evaluation of oncology drugs in transplantation models might not be adequate for predicting the clinical efficacy or the types of cancer for which the drug could be effective. As autochthonous cancer models, chemical carcinogen-induced models were first established and the subsequent technological progress in gene manipulation allowed researchers to produce models harboring the genetic mutations of human cancer. Although a number of technical issues regarding the ability to maximize the utility of these models need to be addressed, such as their usability, reproducibility, and throughput compared with transplantation models, autochthonous cancer models clearly show some promise. In Table 1, we summarize the characteristics of those experimental cancer models used to evaluate the efficacy of oncology drugs in non-clinical studies.

Transplantation cancer models. In general, the s.c. (heterotopic) transplantation models with cancer cell lines have been used, and the efficacies of oncology drug response are evaluated based on tumor size. These models are particularly useful when a drug has a marked antiproliferative effect on cancer cells. It is also easy to access tumor tissue samples from these models for subsequent pharmacodynamic evaluations. Despite such clear advantages, these models may not reflect the actual characteristics of the cancer microenvironment because the s.c. tissue is "heterotopic" for most cancer cells. In this context, orthotopic transplantation models may reproduce the cancer microenvironment more faithfully, although their utility caused by species differences should be considered. To analyze metastasis dissemination of cancer cells, experimental metastasis models have been considered as useful for evaluating drug efficacy in the process after the invasion of cancer cells from the primary tumor into the nearby blood vessel. Although these models have clear advantage in their usability and reproducibility, they cannot reproduce the entire step before the extravasation of cancer cells and may not accurately represent actual metastases by injecting a substantial number of cancer cells into the blood vessel. In this regard, spontaneous metastasis models have been considered to reflect the process of the metastasis of cancer cells more accurately than the heterotopic or orthotopic transplantations. Despite the clear advantages of these models, only a limited number of cancer cell lines are available and the results of experiments often vary. In addition to the above transplantation cancer models with cancer cell lines, patient-derived xenograft models have been considered as emerging animal models recapitulating the clinical condition of individual cancer patients, and therefore attracted much attention on precision treatment.[15–17]

Autochthonous cancer models. There are two major types of autochthonous cancer models, carcinogen-induced models and gene-engineered mouse (GEM) models. Of these, GEM models have been regarded as a better choice for testing drug efficacy, because the drug effects can be evaluated on autochthonous cancer cells induced by gene mutations resembling human cancer. As summarized in Table 2, there are several pros and cons to using autochthonous cancer models for drug efficacy tests in non-clinical studies. In particular, the timing of tumor occurrence and tissue specificity are often the major concerns of carcinogen-induced models and conventional knockout/transgenic mice. To overcome these issues, conditional gene knockout or gene expression technology provide us with the opportunity to use GEM models that more closely represent the pathology of human cancers. In addition to the above technical difficulties, the administrative challenges, such as maintenance of mouse strains to acquire a sufficient number of mice as well as the characters of each mouse model, including the latency and incidence of tumor and other relevant issues, need to be considered before undertaking efficacy studies testing oncology drugs in GEM models. Nevertheless, new technologies, such as *in vivo* imaging methods for small animals, have been introduced as powerful tools for quantitative evaluation of cancer occurrence and subsequent growth in GEM models. In Table 3, GEM models developing tumors induced by genetic mutations found in corresponding human cancers are summarized.

Spontaneous cancer models using companion animals. Even in companion animals, such as dogs and cats, the incidence of cancer has been increasing, likely due to their life extension together with genetic factors. In fact, cancer has become the leading cause of death among those companion animals. In particular, it has been known that the mortality from cancer is reported to be 47% (based on the report by the Veterinary Cancer Society, http://www.vetcancersociety.org/members/) in large breed dogs aged 10 years or more. Therefore, the establishment of early diagnosis methods and the development of

Table 1. Characteristics of preclinical animal models for oncology drug development

Model			Outline	Advantage	Disadvantage
Mouse cancer model	Transplantation model	Heterotopic model	Models s.c. transplanted with tumor cell lines	Easy to monitor the drug efficacy on tumor growth by examining visible size	May not fully reproduce human cancer tissue because of poor stroma involvement Efficacy data in this model may not accurately correlate with clinical outcomes in some cases
		Orthotropic model	Models transplanted tumor cell lines into tissue where they were originated or to which they metastasize	Account for tissue microenvironment for cancer cells where originated or metastasized	Requires relatively complicated methods for transplantation Difficult to monitor tumor growth over time
	Autochthonous model	Carcinogen-induced model	Models induced tumors by carcinogen such as chemicals or UV radiation	Reproduce carcinogenesis-associated events such as host inflammation	Requires complicated methods and expects potential variability among individual animals Difficulties in preparing a sufficient number of mice and relatively time-consuming
		GEM model	Models induced tumors by modifying cancer-related genes	Reproduce human tumor development in the genetic character and the originating tissue	Difficult to maintain mouse with multiple mutant alleles May not accurately reproduce human cancer types Challenges for using drug efficacy evaluation (tumor latency, time for tumor formation etc.)
Human cancer model	Transplantation model	Cell line	Transplantation of human cancer cell lines or human tumor tissues into immune-compromised mice	Ability for testing human cell lines in relevant tumor types or with genetic backgrounds	Accuracy of the model in its clinical relevance has been questioned in some cases
		PDX	Direct transplantation of patient-derived cancer tissue into immune-compromised mice	Ability for testing clinical patient-derived tumor tissues	Clear restriction in availability and utility
Spontaneous dog cancer model	Naturally occurring canine cancer		Use of dogs who naturally develop cancers Conduct as veterinary clinical trial	Share many characteristics with human malignancies	Difficulties in preparing a sufficient number of dogs

Summary of the characteristics of preclinical animal models and their potential advantages and disadvantages for use in oncology drug development. GEM, gene-engineered mouse; PDX, patient-derived xenograft.

Table 2. Characters of genetically engineered mouse models

Mutation type	Conventional mutation	Conditional mutation		
Mutation induction	NA	Viral (e.g. adex-Cre)	Tissue-specific (e.g. GFAP-Cre, FABP-Cre)	Induced (e.g. R26-CreERT2, Tyr-CreERT2)
Generation of embryonic lethal knockout animals	Not available	Available	Available	Available
Tissue specificity	Uncontrollable Tumors generated are not necessarily present in the same tissues as those in humans	Induce tissue-specific/local mutation Tumors can be generated in the same tissues as those in humans	Induce selective mutation at a cellular level Reproduce cancer initiating cells	Inducible selective mutation at a tissue or cellular level
Time specificity	No	Controllable	Promoter-dependent Uncontrollable	Promoter context Controllable
Induction process	NA	Extremely complicated Tissue limitation	NA	Required (but not complicated)
Induction efficiency	Excellent	Low	Promoter-dependent Relatively high	Promoter-dependent Difficult to achieve high efficiency
Homogeneity of tumors	Relatively consistent	High variability Skill-dependent	Low variability	Low variability Skill-dependent
Acquisition of the number of mice	Easy	Difficult	Easy	Manageable (but requires induction process)
Maintenance of mouse strains	Generally easy (dependent on target genes; difficult in the case of tumor generation in heterozygous mice)	Easy	Complicated to maintain animals having multiple mutant alleles	Complicated to maintain animals having multiple mutant alleles

This table summarizes the advantages and potential problems in various types of genetically engineered mouse models for use in preclinical studies of oncology drugs. NA, not applicable.

therapeutic drugs for cancer in companion animals is being actively pursued in the USA and Europe. Considering the pathology of cancer in large breed dogs seems to be similar to those in humans,[68] the utility of spontaneous cancer in large breed dogs for testing new oncology drugs has already been initiated in the USA and Europe.[69] In Japan, the leading cause of death in dogs is also cancer with a mortality of 54% ("The Ten Leading Causes of Death in Dogs and Cats" reported by the Animal Insurance System Japan Animal Club), which is much higher than the mortality rate of other diseases such as heart disease (17%). Given these circumstances, studies for developing methods for the diagnosis and treatment of cancer in dogs have been actively initiated. Based on the results of these studies, the Japanese Society of Clinical Veterinary Medicine have been discussing the significance of cancer models using companion animals in non-clinical studies for developing oncology drugs as well as preparing for the establishment of relevant administrative and management systems for its application.

Evaluation of Oncology Drugs that Directly Target Cancer Cells

The efforts of oncology drug development originally concentrated on the production of drugs that directly target the proliferation or metabolic properties of cancer cells. Along with discovery of oncogenic driver genes, development of molecular targeted drugs has been highlighted, which directly pinpoint signal transduction pathways involving those driver genes, as well as the protein degradation systems, epigenome, and metabolic systems of cancer cells. As molecular targeted drugs, tyrosine kinase inhibitors (TKI), multi-targeted kinase inhibitors (MTKI), and drugs that target molecular mechanisms for cell cycle regulation and others have been successfully developed. Although the classical anticancer chemotherapeutic drugs also show cytotoxicity by attacking specific intracellular molecules, the term "molecular targeted drug" in this report is defined as a drug that has been developed through primary identification of a molecule or a signaling pathway as a therapeutic target, which is highly activated or deregulated in cancer cells. Table 4 summarizes the pros and cons for evaluating molecular targeted drugs in non-clinical cancer models. The results produced by the use of these models have been included in the application of new drugs; the models believed to be essential.

Tyrosine kinase inhibitors and other kinase inhibitors. Tyrosine kinase inhibitors include epidermal growth factor receptor inhibitors (gefitinib, erlotinib, lapatinib, and afatinib), human epidermal growth factor receptor 2 inhibitors (lapatinib and afatinib), anaplastic lymphoma kinase inhibitors (crizotinib, ceritinib, and alectinib), BCR-ABL inhibitors (imatinib, dasatinib, nilotinib, ponatinib, and bosutinib), a KIT inhibitor (imatinib), SRC inhibitors (dasatinib and bosutinib), a JAK inhibitor (ruxolitinib), a Bruton's tyrosine kinase inhibitor (ibrutinib), and a dual kinase MEK inhibitor (trametinib). There are several other kinase inhibitors, including BRAF inhibitors (vemurafenib and dabrafenib), a phosphatidylinositol-3 kinase inhibitor (idelalisib), and mammalian target of rapamycin inhibitors (temsirolimus and everolimus). In addition, drugs that target p38, AKT, p70S6 kinase, insulin-like growth factor 1 receptor, platelet-derived growth factor receptor (PDGFR), fibroblast growth factor receptor (FGFR), MET, ROS 1, and RET are currently being developed. For evaluating the effica-

Table 3. Mouse models corresponding to genetic mutations in human cancers

Human disease		Mouse model			
Cancer type	Mutated gene	Mutated gene	Mutation type	Mutation induction	Tumor produced
Medulloblastoma	*RB1*	*Rb1/Tp53*	Conditional KO/conditional KO	GFAP-Cre	Medulloblastoma[18]
		Rb1/Bmi1	Conditional KO/conditional activation	GFAP-Cre	Medulloblastoma[19]
	PTCH1	*Ptch1*	Conditional KO	math1-cre/ GFAP-Cre	Medulloblastoma[20]
Gorlin syndrome	*PTCH1*	*Ptch1*	Conventional		Medulloblastoma, rhabdomyosarcoma[21]
Pituitary gland tumor	*RB1*	*Rb1*	Conventional KO		Pituitary gland tumor[22,23]
		Rb1	Conditional KO	Pomc-Flp	Pituitary gland tumor[24]
Lung cancer	*KRAS*	*Kras*	Conventional KO (sporadic activation)		Lung cancer[25]
	BRAF	*Braf*	Conditional activation	Adex-Cre	Lung cancer[26,27]
	RB1	*Rb1/Tp53/Pten*	Conditional KO/conditional KO/ conditional KO	CGRP-CreER	Lung cancer[28]
	EML4-ALK	*EML4-ALK*	Conventional activation (SPC promoter)		Lung cancer[29]
		EML4-ALK	Conditional activation	Tet system	Lung cancer[30]
	KIF5B-RET	*KIF5B-RET*	Conventional activation (SPC promoter)		Lung cancer[31]
	EZR-ROS1	*EZR-ROS1*	Conventional activation (SPC promoter)		Lung cancer[32]
Breast cancer	*PIK3CA*	*Pik3ca*	Conditional activation	MMTV-Cre	Breast cancer[33]
	TRP53	*Pik3ca/Tp53*	Conditional activation/conditional KO	MMTV-Cre	Breast cancer, leukemia[34]
	PTEN	*Pten*	Conditional KO (stromal fibroblast)	Fsp-Cre	Breast cancer[35]
	ERBB2	*ErbB2*	Conventional activation (MMTV promoter)		Breast cancer[36,37]
		ErbB2/Pten	Conditional activation/conventional KO	MMTV-Cre	Breast cancer[38]
	RB1	*Rb1/Tp53*	Conditional KO/conditional KO	MMTV-Cre	Breast cancer[39]
Hereditary breast cancer	*BRCA1*	*Brca1/Tp53*	Conditional KO/conventional KO	BLG-Cre	Breast cancer[40]
		Brca1/Chk2	Conditional KO/conventional KO	Wap-Cre	Breast cancer[41]
	BRCA2	*Brca2/Tp53*	Conditional KO/conventional KO	K14-Cre	Breast cancer, skin tumor[42]
Colorectal cancer	*APC*	*Apc/Kras*	Conditional KO/conditional activation	Adex-Cre	Colorectal cancer[43]
	KRAS	*Apc/Kras*	Conditional KO/conditional activation	Fapbl-Cre	Colorectal cancer[44]
	PTEN	*Apc/Pten*	Conditional KO/conditional KO	Cyp1a1-CreERT2	Tumor of the digestive tract[45]
	Smad4	*Apc/Smad4*	Conventional KO/conventional KO		Tumor of the digestive tract[46]
Familial adenomatous polyposis	*APC*	*Apc*	Conventional KO		Tumor of the digestive tract[47–49]
		Apc	Conditional KO	Adex-Cre	Tumor of the digestive tract,[50] liver cancer[51]
Hereditary non-polyposis colorectal cancer	*MSH3*	*Msh3*	Conventional KO		Lymphoma[52]
	MSH6	*Msh6*	Conventional KO		Lymphoma,[52] tumor of the digestive tract, skin cancer, uterine cancer[53]
		Msh3/Msh6	Conventional KO		Lymphoma,[52] tumor of the digestive tract,[54] skin tumor[53]
Cowden syndrome	*PTEN*	*Pten*	Conventional KO		Tumor of the digestive tract, lymphoma, adrenal tumor, breast cancer, prostate cancer[55,56]
Pancreatic cancer	*KRAS*	*Kras/Tp53*	Conditional activation/conditional KO	pdx1-cre	Pancreatic cancer[57]
		Kras/Tgfbr2	Conditional activation/conditional KO	Ptf1a-cre	Pancreatic cancer[58]
		Kras/Pten	Conditional activation/conditional KO	pdx1-cre	Pancreatic cancer[59]
Endometrial cancer	*PTEN*	*Pten/Mig6*	Conditional KO/conditional KO	PR-Cre	Endometrial cancer[60]
		Pten/Tp53	Conditional KO/conditional KO	PR-Cre	Endometrial cancer[61]
Ovarian cancer	*KRAS*	*Kras/Pten*	Conditional activation/conditional KO	Adex-Cre	Ovarian cancer[62]
	APC	*Apc*	Conditional KO	Pgr-Cre	Ovarian cancer[63]
	BRCA2	*Brca2/Tp53*	Conditional KO/conventional KO	K18-Cre	Ovarian cancer[64]
Prostate cancer	*BRCA2*	*Brca2/Tp53*	Conditional KO/conventional KO	Pbsn-Cre	Prostate cancer[65]

Table 3 (Continued)

Human disease		Mouse model			
Cancer type	Mutated gene	Mutated gene	Mutation type	Mutation induction	Tumor produced
Skin tumor	*BRAF*	*Braf*	Conditional activation	Tyr-CreERT2	Malignant melanoma[66]
		Braf/Pten	Conditional activation/conditional KO	Tyr-CreERT2	Malignant melanoma[67]
	PTCH1	*Ptch1*	Conditional KO	R26-CreERT2	Basal cell tumor[20]

Mouse models reproducing generative tissues and mutations found in human caner. While many other scientifically excellent mouse models for human cancers have been generated, the table preferentially lists those harboring relatively simple mutant alleles suitable for preclinical studies. It should be noted some mouse models do not completely recapitulate pathologies of human cancer.

cies of those kinase inhibitors, transplantation models with target (mutant) gene-positive cancer cells or GEM models driven by target (mutant) genes have been generally used. In general, cancer cells that have potent driver gene mutations ("gain-of-function" mutations) show a high degree of so-called oncogene addiction, and therefore it would be relatively easy to predict or evaluate the drug response *in vivo*. These non-clinical cancer models are also useful for evaluating pharmacodynamics of the drugs by monitoring the phosphorylation status of the target molecules, their downstream factors, or both. Meanwhile, it should also be noted that established cancer cell lines may have altered their phenotypes and characters compared with the original cancers during *in vitro* culture, whereas genetically engineered cell lines may not be able to accurately replicate the etiology of the relevant clinical cancer types.

Multitargeted kinase inhibitors. Multitargeted kinase inhibitors include a RAF/vascular endothelial growth factor receptor-2 (VEGFR-2)/PDGFR-β inhibitor (sorafenib), a VEGFR2/PDGFR-β/KIT/FLT-3 inhibitor (sunitinib), a VEGFR/KIT/PDGFR inhibitor (pazopanib), a RET/VEGFR2/EGFR inhibitor (vandetanib), a VEGF/PDGF inhibitor (axitinib), a VEGFR/RET/KIT/PDGFR/RAF inhibitor (regorafenib), a MET/RET/VEGFR/KIT/FLT-3/TIE-2/TRKB/AXL inhibitor (cabozantinib), and a VEGFR/FGFR/PDGFR/SRC/LCK/LYN/FLT-3 inhibitor (nintedanib). Similarly to TKIs, the efficacy of MTKIs can be evaluated in non-clinical cancer models. However, MTKIs target multiple kinases and it is generally difficult to prepare genetically engineered cell lines that reproduce the pathology of the target cancers. In the case of MTKIs that target angiogenic factors, such as VEGFR, FGFR, and PDGFR, accurate prediction of *in vitro* efficacy would be difficult: pazopanib, for example, does not necessarily show a direct antiproliferative effect on many cancer cell lines *in vitro*, but it significantly inhibits tumor growth *in vivo* by blocking angiogenesis.[74] Also, because MTKIs could have multiple modes of action, establishment of the proof-of-concept at the pharmacodynamic level in non-clinical cancer models might require a complex procedure.

Targeting cell cycle. Palbociclib inhibits cyclin-dependent kinases 4 and 6 (CDK4 and CDK6), which are involved in cell cycle control. Furthermore, drugs targeting various cell cycle regulators, such as WEE1, cell division cycle 7, checkpoint kinase 1 and 2, ATR, Aurora, PLK, and mitotic kinesins, are under clinical development. Efficacies of these drugs can be evaluated using relevant cancer cell lines that have abnormalities in the target molecules or their regulators (e.g. CCND1/CDK6 amplification or CDKN2 deletion/mutation) in transplantation models.

Targeting protein degradation systems. Protein degradation systems have been recognized as an emerging therapeutic target for particular types of cancer. While several target molecules have been described in this category, proteasome inhibitors, such as bortezomib and carfilzomib, have been developed most extensively and approved as anticancer drugs. Meanwhile, other molecular targets include the NEDD8-activating enzyme, the ubiquitin-activating enzyme, and stress proteins that are involved in protein folding, such as heat shock protein 90 and glucose-regulated protein 78. Given that the preferential efficacies of proteasome inhibitors against multiple myeloma have been well established, transplantation models with multiple myeloma cell lines could be applicable for evaluating the efficacy of the drugs in this category. However, there are several potential issues and limitations for predicting the clinical efficacy of these drugs from non-clinical cancer models: detailed mechanisms for the action of the drugs and predictive biomarkers for the drug responses are rather elusive, and cancer types that are susceptible to the anticancer effects of the drugs in non-clinical studies may not be consistent with those in the clinical settings. Therefore, the latest knowledge from basic research and clinical phase I studies on various cancer types should be taken into consideration for additional indication of the drugs.

Targeting genomes and epigenomes. The anticancer efficacies of drugs that target cancer epigenomes, such as DNA methyltransferase inhibitors (azacytidine and decitabine) and histone deacetylase (HDAC) inhibitors (vorinostat, panobinostat, romidepsin, and belinostat), have been shown *in vivo*, although the cancer types against which the drugs are effective differ between the non-clinical studies and clinical practice in some cases.[84] As these drugs affect many target sites in a genome-wide manner, detailed mechanisms and predictive biomarkers for the drug response often remain elusive. Drugs targeting the genomic repair systems include poly(ADP-ribose) polymerase (PARP) inhibitors, such as olaparib. Because there is a synthetic lethal relationship between PARP and tumor suppressors, BRCA1 and 2, It would be relatively easy to predict the therapeutic efficacy of PARP inhibitors by using transplant models of cell lines with BRCA1 or 2 deficiency.[85,86] Besides BRCA1/2, it has been also postulated that there are many synthetic lethal factors with PARP inhibition. However, the clinical validity of those candidates has not been fully established. However, it should be also noted that synthetic lethality confirmed in the non-clinical studies (e.g. effect of a PARP inhibitor on EWS-FLI1-positive Ewing's sarcoma)[87,89] could be sometimes abolished by the formerly applied therapies in the clinical settings.

Targeting cancer cell metabolisms. Metabolic enzymes favored by cancer cells, such as isocitrate dehydrogenases 1/2 (IDH1/2) and fatty acid synthase, are potential targets for cancer therapy. For IDH1/2 inhibitors, transplant models of IDH1

Table 4. Evaluation of drugs directly targeting cancer cells

Classification (type of inhibitors)	Target molecule	Evaluation methods (drug efficacy study)	Characteristics	Problems
Tyrosine kinases	EGFR, HER2, ALK, BCR-ABL, KIT, SRC, JAK, BTK, IGF1R, PDGFR, FGFR, MET, ROS1, RET	(i) Transplantation models of target (mutant) gene positive cancer cells Cancer cell lines with target (mutant) genes[70] Alternative cell lines into which target (mutant) genes are transfected[71] (e.g. Ba/F3) (ii) GEM models[29]	Can predict/evaluate drug efficacy in the model with potent driver gene activities and oncogene addiction[72] Can generate resistant cells as negative control Can establish proof-of-concept pharmacodynamically by evaluating autophosphorylation of target kinases or phosphorylation of downstream factors	(i) Cancer cell lines may change their phenotypes during the process of their establishment due to selective pressure and stresses (ii) Alternative cell lines may not accurately replicate the etiology of the relevant cancer types
Kinases (multi-targeted)	RAF, VEGFR-2, PDGFR-β, KIT, FLT-3, RET, EGFR, MET, RET, TIE-2, TRKB, AXL, SRC, LCK, LYN	The same as (i) and (ii) above[31] For anti-angiogenic agents, Matrigel plug assay could be used[73]	Can predict/evaluate drug efficacy in the model with potent driver gene activities[31]	In addition to (i) and (ii) above: It is difficult to generate alternative cell lines reproducing the pathology of target cancers by genetic engineering when the drug acts on multiple kinases in the target cancer cells *In vitro* cell growth assays do not reflect the antiangiogenic action *in vivo*[74] May require complicated pharmacodynamic analyses due to the presence of multiple targets
MAPK pathway	MEK, BRAF, p38	Cancer cell lines with mutations in the target pathway of interest (target molecule or upstream target) or transplantation animal models with alternative cell lines generated by genetic engineering[75,76] GEM models[27]	Can predict/evaluate drug efficacy in the model with potent driver gene activities[77] Can establish proof-of-concept pharmacodynamically by evaluating phosphorylation of downstream factors	In addition to (i) and (ii) above: (iii) It is difficult to achieve sufficient drug response in some cancer types including colorectal cancer with less potent driver activities, in which other coexisting (i.e. not mutually exclusive) driver pathways contribute to tumor proliferation[77]
PI3K/mTOR pathway	PI3K, mTOR, AKT, p70S6K	Cancer cell lines with mutations in the target pathway of interest (target molecule or upstream target) or transplantation animal models with alternative cell lines generated by genetic engineering[78] GEM models[33]	Can predict/evaluate drug efficacy in the model with potent driver gene activities[79] Can establish proof-of-concept pharmacodynamically by evaluating phosphorylation of downstream factors	The same as (i), (ii), and (iii) above
Cell cycle	CDK4/6, WEE1, CDC7, CHK1, CHK2, ATR, Aurora, PLK, mitotic kinesins	Cancer cell lines with mutations in the target pathway of interest (target molecule or upstream target) or transplantation animal models with alternative cell lines generated by genetic engineering[80]	Drug efficacy may be achieved in cancer cell lines with an abnormality as shown in the left-hand column	The same as (i), (ii), and (iii) above

Table 4 (Continued)

Classification (type of inhibitors)	Target molecule	Evaluation methods (drug efficacy study)	Characteristics	Problems
Protein degradation system	Proteasome, related target molecules (NEDD8-activating enzyme, ubiquitin-activating enzyme, HSP90, GRP78)	Allograft/xenograft models of multiple myeloma cell lines[81]	Can predict/evaluate drug efficacy with multiple myeloma cell lines used in the studies of previously developed drugs	In addition to (i) above: (iv) Cancer types for which drugs are effective in preclinical studies may not be consistent with those in clinic
Genome /epigenome	DNMT, related target molecules (histone methyltransferase, histone demethylase)	Allograft/xenograft models of MDS cell lines[82] MDS models generated by implanting MDS cell lines into genetically engineered NSG mice[83]	MDS mouse models replicate the pathology more accurately than other transplantation animal models	In addition to (i) and (iv) above: Due to a very small number of available cell lines, clinical relevance of the model may be limited (v) Due to the genome-wide distribution of target sites, detailed mechanisms of action and predictive biomarkers for the drug response remain unclear
	HDAC	Allograft/xenograft models of colorectal /prostate/lung cancer cell lines[84]	Drug efficacy may be achieved in some cancer types in addition to those shown in the left-hand column	The same as (i), (iv), and (v) above Cutaneous T-cell lymphoma and peripheral T-cell lymphoma are currently approved for HDAC inhibitors
	PARP1/PARP2, related target molecules (DNA-dependent protein kinase, telomerase)	Allograft/xenograft models of cancer cell lines with *BRCA1* or *BRCA2* (tumor suppressor gene) mutation or inactivation[85,86]	Can predict/evaluate drug efficacy by using cancer cell lines with BRCA1/2 deficiency: there is a synthetic lethal relationship between PARP1/2 and BRCA1/2	The same as (i) and (iv) above In addition to BRCA1/2, substantial numbers of synthetic lethal factors are reported, (however, most of them are described only at a basic research level and the clinical relevance has not been fully established) Synthetic lethality may be diminished by pretreatment in the clinical cases even if preclinically confirmed[87]
Metabolic systems	IDH1/IDH2 (mutant-type), Fatty acid synthase	Xenograft models of IDH1 (R132)/IDH2 (R172) mutant-positive AML or glioma cell lines[88]	Can predict/evaluate drug efficacy by examining the presence of mutation Pharmacodynamic study can be carried out by monitoring mutation-specific metabolites (oncometabolites)[88] Drugs targeting molecules that produce no oncometabolites may be effective to a wider range of cancer types	If the target produces no oncometabolites, mechanisms of action or predictive biomarkers for the drug response may not be available and it may be difficult to design evidence-based studies to evaluate the drug response

This table classifies the target molecules of approved/investigational drugs used in Japan, overseas, or both and lists representative non-clinical evaluation methods of these drugs. Due to their usefulness and usability, evaluation results have been used for publication data of original papers and oncology drug application dossiers for approval. Meanwhile, it should be noted that these technologies have technical limitations and contain a number of limitations/problems attributable to the properties or unclarified factors of target molecules and diseases. ALK, anaplastic lymphoma kinase; BTK, Bruton's tyrosine kinase; CDC7, cell division cycle 7; CHK, checkpoint kinase; DMNT, DNA methyltransferase; EGFR, epidermal growth factor receptor; FGFR, fibroblast growth factor receptor; GRP, glucose-regulated protein; HDAC, histone deacetylase; HER2, human epidermal growth factor receptor 2; HSP, heat shock protein; IDH, isocitrate dehydrogenase; IGF1R, insulin-like growth factor 1 receptor; MDS, myelodysplastic syndromes; mTOR, mammalian target of rapamycin; PARP, poly(ADP-ribose) polymerase; PDGFR, platelet-derived growth factor receptor; PI3K, phosphatidylinositol-3 kinase; VEGFR, vascular endothelial growth factor receptor.

(R132) or IDH2(R172) mutation-positive AML and glioma cell lines are useful for predicting drug efficacies.[88] The pharmacodynamics of these drugs can be evaluated by monitoring the mutation-specific metabolite (oncometabolite), 2-hydroxyglutaric acid. However, if the target molecule does not produce a characteristic oncometabolite, one may expect a broader spectrum of anticancer efficacies of the inhibitors. In that case, however, it may be relatively difficult to evaluate

Table 5. Evaluations of drugs targeting angiogenesis and tumor stroma

Classification	Target	Evaluation method (drug efficacy study)	Characteristics	Problems
Targeting angiogenesis	Angiogenic factors (ligands) e.g. VEGF antibody	(i) Mouse cancer models (ii) Human cancer models (iii) Angiogenesis models (e.g. Matrigel plug assay, CAM assay, hollow fiber assay)	Evaluate in mouse/human cancer transplantation models with drugs and targets exhibit cross-reactivity between species Mechanisms of action can be examined depending on phenotypes of target molecule deficiency in GEM models	(i) Mouse transplantation models, GEM models (ii) Human cancer models: Cross-reactivity of the target molecule in mice should be considered (iii) Angiogenesis models: Consider the cross-reactivity of the drug between species. Generally difficult to evaluate drug efficacy in chemical carcinogen-induced models
	Receptors/receptor signals e.g. TKI (VEGFRs)	As above, (i), (ii), and (iii)	(i) Mouse transplantation models (ii) Human cancer models (cell line transplantation, PDX): The effect of the drug on mouse angiogenesis can be evaluated Mechanisms of action can be examined depending on phenotypes of target molecule deficiency in GEM models	As above, (i) and (ii).
	Production of angiogenesis factors e.g. mTOR inhibitor	As above, (i), (ii), and (iii)	(i) Mouse transplantation models (ii) Human cancer models (cell line transplantation, PDX): The effect of the drug on mouse angiogenesis can be evaluated. Mechanisms of action can be examined depending on phenotypes of target molecule deficiency in GEM models.	(i) Mouse transplantation models, GEM models: Consider the cross-reactivity of the drug between species. (ii) Human cancer models: Cross-reactivity of the target molecule in mice should be considered (iii) Angiogenesis models: Difficult to evaluate drug efficacy due to the lack of angiogenesis factor production
Targeting tumor stroma	Drug resistance/sensitivity, growth/metastasis, inflammation	(i) Mouse/human cancer transplantation model (s.c. transplantation models, orthotopic transplantation /metastasis models), cancer cell–stromal cell co-transplantation models (ii) GEM models	(i) Evaluate in mouse /human cancer transplantation models with drugs and targets exhibit cross-reactivity between species (ii) Mechanisms of action can be examined depending on phenotypes of target molecule deficiency in GEM models	(i) Transplantation models: Consider the cross-reactivity of the drug (mouse) or target (human). Human cancer s.c. transplantation models: Difficult to evaluate drug efficacy due to insufficient involvement of microenvironments (ii) GEM models: Cross-reactivity of the target molecule in mice should be considered. Generally difficult to evaluate drug efficacy in chemical carcinogen-induced models

Animal (mainly mouse) models used for the evaluation of oncology drugs targeting angiogenesis and tumor stroma are classified in this table. As the efficacy of these drugs depends on cancer–host interactions or host factors, consideration should be given to the cross-reactivity of therapeutic drugs and/or their target molecules between species (mainly between humans and mice). CAM, chick chorioallantoic membrane; GEM, gene-engineered mouse; mTOR, mammalian target of rapamycin; PDX, patient-derived xenograft; TKI, tyrosine kinase inhibitor; VEGF, vascular endothelial growth factor; VEGFR, VEGF receptor.

the efficacy of the drugs because the mechanism of action and predictive biomarkers would remain unclear.

Targeting Cancer Cell–Host Interactions

The importance of microenvironments on the growth, progression, and therapeutic resistance of cancer cells has been drawn much attention. Such tumor microenvironments have been known to support cancer cell proliferation directly or indirectly through interactions between surrounding stroma cells. In general, it is relatively difficult to carry out an appropriate *in vivo* efficacy test for drugs targeting interactions between cancer cell and host microenvironment in non-clinical cancer models.

Targeting angiogenesis. It has been widely recognized that generation of new blood vessels into tumor (angiogenesis) is a critical step for cancer cells to be adequately supplied nutrition and oxygen, therefore, it is assumed that tumors are unable to grow progressively without angiogenesis. There are also several relevant studies suggesting that angiogenesis is involved in not only cancer cell proliferation but also cancer cell progression, including metastases to distant organs. As represented by VEGF inhibitors (bevacizumab), drugs targeting angiogenesis may not exert direct antitumor effects on cancer cells, however, should inhibit the activity of various angiogenic factors that mainly affect vascular endothelial cells for generating new blood vessels. Consequently, non-clinical evaluation of the efficacy of drugs targeting angiogenesis can be greatly affected by host factors in experimental animals; therefore, it is critical to use appropriate models for drug evaluation, as summarized in Table 5.

For carrying out appropriate *in vivo* tests for drugs targeting angiogenesis, it is very important to consider whether cancer cell lines or patient-derived samples produce angiogenic factors for targeting and, moreover, their cross-reactivity in non-clinical cancer models. It is also relevant for other angiogenesis models such as the Matrigel plug assay, chick chorioallantoic membrane assay, or hollow fiber assay.

Targeting cancer stroma. Diverse cellular components of tumor stroma (e.g. fibroblasts, mesenchymal cells, and inflammatory cells) and extracellular matrices (e.g. fibronectin, collagen, laminin, and proteoglycan) have been shown to be involved in cancer cell proliferation and progression. Although tumor stroma is expected to be an attractive therapeutic target, the development of drugs targeting cancer stroma is still in the early stages.

Similar to those targeting angiogenesis, non-clinical evaluation of drugs targeting tumor stroma should be greatly affected by host factors. In immune-compromised mice (e.g. nude, SCID, NOD/SCID, and NOG) often used for transplantation models of human cancer cells display a range of different

Table 6. Evaluations of drugs targeting host immune response

Model	Outline	Characteristics	Problems
Allograft model	Syngeneic (mainly mouse) cancer cell lines implanted into s.c. as heterotopic transplantation models, or implanted into original tissues /organs in orthotopic transplantation models, or injected into tail vein as metastasis models Use of cell lines with ectopic expression of model antigens (e.g. OVA,[90,91] HA,[92] CEA[93]) or cell lines known with their immunogenicity (e.g. B16 melanoma,[94] Meth A,[95] colon 26[96])	Immune responses against cancer cells can be monitored over time and the mechanism of action can be tested Tumor antigen-specific immune responses can be evaluated where antigens have been specified Orthotopic transplantation models and metastasis models may be better for analyzing tumor-infiltrating lymphocytes considering the organ microenvironment of cancer cells.	Heterotopic transplantation models may not immunologically completely reproduce human cancer tissues due to insufficient tumor stroma Orthotopic/metastasis models require technical skills and are generally difficult for quantitative monitoring of tumor growth.
Carcinogen-induced mouse model	Mouse models developing tumors by challenging with carcinogenic substances (e.g. MCA, AOM/DSS, DMBA/TPA), or external stimuli such as UV, or inducing genetic abnormalities (e.g. p53 deficiency, transduction of SV40T antigen, APC deficiency)	Immune response during the carcinogenic process can be evaluated The clinical cancer pathology is closely represented.	Requires complicated procedure and poses difficulty in maintaining mouse strains Longer experimental period Difficult to evaluate antigen-specific immune response due to the lack of defined tumor antigens with some exceptions
Xenograft (human cancer) model (includes PDX)	Xenograft with human cell lines or patient-derived tumor tissues into immune-compromised mice (e.g. nude mice, SCID mice, NOG mice).	Antitumor activities can be analyzed by using human (cancer patients') immune cells.	Limitation for analyzing immune responses due to its incompetence of the intact immune system Application of humanized mice engrafted with human immune cells clearly requires further investigation

Animal (mainly mouse) models used for evaluating drugs targeting host immune response are classified in this table. As the efficacy of cancer immunotherapy depends on the host's immune system, concurrent use of multiple models should also be considered. In such a case, it is necessary to devise optimal combinations of models to be used, taking into account the potential limitations/problems of each model presented in the table as advantages or disadvantages. AOM, azoxymethane; APC, Adenomatous polyposis coli; CEA, carcinoembryonic antigen; DMBA, 7,12-dimethylbenz(a)anthracene; DSS, Dextran sulfate sodium; HA, hemagglutinin; MCA, 3-Methylcholanthrene; OVA, ovalbumin; PDX, patient-derived xenograft; TPA, 12-O-Tetradecanoyl-phorbol-13-acetate.

immunological environments. Even in these immune-compromised animals, myeloid compartment and mesenchymal cells are known as relatively normal, therefore the efficacy of drugs targeting those stromal cells may be evaluated even in animal models if the target shows cross-reactivity between species.

Targeting host immune responses. The immune system has been regarded as an important constituent of the tumor microenvironment. Many series of studies have been undertaken to understand the regulatory mechanisms by which cancer cells control, either positively or negatively, hosts' immune responses. Recent clinical successes of immune checkpoint inhibitors, such as anti-CTLA-4 mAbs (ipilimumab and tremelimumab) and anti-PD-1 mAbs (nivolumab and pembrolizumab) highlight targeting hosts' immune responses against cancer cells as a promising target for drug development.

Obviously, drugs targeting hosts' immune responses should be tested in the appropriate non-clinical cancer models in which the targets are involved in the immune responses against cancer cells, for elucidating the mechanisms of action and predicting potential side-effects. In general, it is ideal to test the importance of drug targets or potential drug candidates in different experimental models (multiple cell lines, different mouse strains). Considering there should be a limitation for predicting cancer types to which the drug shows clinical benefit by testing only in non-clinical models, the results of phase I clinical studies need to be carefully considered. For testing drug candidates in which certain HLA haplotypes are required to show antitumor effects (e.g. cancer vaccine therapy), an application of humanized mice may be worth considering as non-clinical models. In Table 6, we summarize pros and cons of non-clinical models for testing drugs targeting hosts' immune responses.

Evaluation of Oncology Drugs Based on New Concepts

Along with gaining our knowledge with the biological characteristics of cancer, there are several new approaches to develop oncology drugs, such as targeting cancer stem cells.

Targeting cancer stem cells. The concept of cancer stem cells was originally introduced in hematological malignancies and further extended to solid cancers such as breast cancer and brain tumors.[97] Cancer stem cells have been characterized by their self-renewal potential, multidirectional differentiation potential, and niche dependence, similar to other stem cells, in addition to their highly tumorigenic potential. Furthermore, cancer stem cells have been known for their resistance to conventional chemotherapy or radiotherapy; therefore, they may be an emerging target for drug development. In Table 7, we summarize the current methods for testing drugs targeting cancer stem cells in non-clinical evaluations.

Targeting other novel concepts or methods. In Table 8, we summarize the current status of oncology drug development targeting new concepts other than cancer stem cells, or novel methods for developing new oncology drugs. Non-clinical evaluation of some of those oncology drugs targeting novel

Table 7. Evaluation of drugs targeting cancer stem cells

Evaluation method	Outline	Characteristics	Problems
Spheroid formation potential	Culture a single non-adherent cell in the presence of specific growth factors (without serum) to test the capability of forming spheroids	Evaluation can be made using cultured cells, and the dose- and time-dependence can be quantitatively measured	General cytotoxicity of drugs mislead as positive without testing on normal tissue stem cells
Cell surface marker	Measuring the frequency of CD44 high/CD24 low fraction, known as cancer stem cells in breast cancer by flow cytometry	Cytotoxic drugs can be tested by comparing effect on cancer stem cell fraction and others	Surface markers for cancer stem cell fractions differ depending on cancer types
ALDH	ALDH activities positively correlate to chemoresistance and stemness in breast cancer, gastrointestinal tract cancer, and hematological tumors	Established methods for measuring activity by flow cytometry	Not all ALDH-positive cells are cancer stem cells
Xenograft models with human cancer stem cells in immune-compromised mouse	Human cancer stem cells transplanted into immune-compromised mice for testing drug efficacy on tumor formation /growth	Evaluating the inhibitory effect of drugs on tumor formation or growth and cancer stem cell frequency within tumor tissue (assessed based on surface markers, ALDH, and spheroid formation potential)	Not applicable for testing drugs targeting immune responses or microenvironments
Syngeneic mouse models with mouse cancer stem cells	Mouse cancer stem cells transplanted into syngeneic mice for testing drug efficacy on tumor formation /growth	Evaluating the inhibitory effect of drugs on tumor formation or growth and cancer stem cell frequency within tumor tissue (assessed based on surface markers, ALDH, and spheroid formation potential) Applicable for testing drugs targeting immune responses or microenvironments	Efficacy may need to be confirmed in models using human cancer stem cells
Genetically engineered animal models	Testing drugs targeting cancer stem cells using genetically engineered mice, rats, or zebrafish to develop tumors	Ideal models closely resembles an autochthonous tumor	Evaluation requires a prolonged time period because of late onset of cancer compared with transplantation models

This table lists commonly used methods to evaluate cancer stem cell functions. ALDH, aldehyde dehydrogenase.

Table 8. Emerging new concepts in oncology drug development

Example	Outline	Problems	International comparison (e.g. clinical study information)
Nucleic acid medicine	Chemically synthesized oligonucleotide	Need to consider appropriate DDS for tumor targeting, efficiency for cellular uptake, organ accumulation such as liver	Japan: Phase I Overseas: Phase I–III (sponsored by OncoGenex Pharmaceuticals Inc., etc.)
Oncolytic virus	Modified viruses reacting specifically against tumors	Requirement for support system of clinical studies/international joint research, review system, guideline establishment, and research funds	Japan: Phase I–II Overseas: Approved (China); phase I–III (USA and Europe)
Cell therapy	Regenerative therapy using iPS cells or immune cell therapy	Tumor development risk Accumulation of evidence for therapeutic efficacies	Japan: Phase I–II Overseas: Approved (USA); phase I–III
Nanotechnology-based drugs	Application to DDS; treatment using microscopic particles (embolization therapy)	Safety concerns by using nano-materials Tumor-specific delivery	Japan: Phase I–III Overseas: Approved; phase I–III
Companion diagnostic drugs	Diagnostic drugs to evaluate the efficacy and safety of specific drugs	Not fully available for all pharmaceutical products Appropriate review system Not fully clear for applying medical service payment system	Japan: *ALK* fusion gene, *KRAS* gene mutations, etc. Overseas: *BRAF* gene mutations, and many others
Hyperthermia	Delivery of antineoplastic agents to a tumor by heat	Safety concerns by using nano-materials	Japan: Phase I–II Overseas: Phase I–III
Imaging-based therapy	Specific labeling of cancer cells; effective for evaluation of treatment effects	Not applicable to all cancer types Requirement for efficacy/safety verification	Japan: Under development Overseas: Practical use in assessment of the effect of cell transplantation therapy
Cancer cell line panel†	Assessment of mechanisms of action of candidate molecules using a set of diverse cell types	Limited number of cell lines (potential expansion) Distinct nature from actual human tumor samples	Japan: Panel of human cancer cell lines (JFCR39) Overseas: NCI-60 cell lines (NCI/NIH, USA); ATCC tumor cell panels (USA); Oncolines™ cancer cell line panel contains 66 cancer cell lines (NTRC, Netherlands)

This table exclusively presents oncology drugs that are being or about to be investigated in Japan and overseas based on new concepts.
†Although "Cancer cell line panel" cannot be classified as a therapeutic drug, it is presented here as an assay that is extensively used in the development of new therapeutic drugs. DDS, drug delivery system; iPS, induced pluripotent stem cells.

concepts may require approaches that are different from those used for the evaluation of conventional oncology drugs.

A deeper understanding of the biological characteristics of cancer is leading to the development of novel oncology drugs based on new concepts such as "cancer stem cells" in addition to the developmental targets presented in earlier sections.

Concluding Remarks

This review summarizes present non-clinical investigations by listing the common methods currently used for the development of oncology drugs as extensively as possible. Their types, profiles, and problems are briefly described. Characteristics of a variety of animal models, which provide indispensable information to formulate clinical research and clinical trials, are summarized according to each category of oncology drug. Experimental models obtain the proof of evidence at the molecular, cellular, and tissue levels, and unique oncology drugs are also covered. It is hoped that this review provides information to undertake regulatory science relevant to the development of oncology drugs.

Studies with cancer models, including animal experiments, *ex vivo* studies, and *in vitro* studies, are essential technology in cancer biology and have contributed to the development and evaluation of oncology drugs. Particularly, cancer cell lines derived from humans and experimental animals have been used for decades as indispensable tools for the biological understanding of cancer and for the development of oncology drugs. Properties of cancer cells represented by a cell have been changing cell line, it was discovered that the accumulation of multiple abnormalities in genes causes cancer and that the properties of individual cancer cell lines depend not only on their organ origins but also on the types of abnormal genes. Growing knowledge on cancer as a disease has led to the understanding that interactions between cancer and host cells and the regulatory molecules play critical roles. The growth of tumors strongly depends on tissue microenvironments and immunological milieu that are difficult to reproduce *in vitro*. As shown in this review, a substantial number of models reflecting these various aspects of cancer–host interactions have been developed in the past decade. These models have significantly contributed to the expansion of the range of non-clinical studies and their role, in the exploration, development, and clinical investigation of oncology drugs have become indispensable.

The diversity and the degree of engagement in genetic changes in the initiation of cancer cell growth and progression are widely accepted. The roles of host cells, tissue, and the immune system also vary depending on the type, properties, and the stage of individual tumors are also becoming clear than before. Therefore, the methods used to select and use oncology drugs should continuously be revised based on the

advance in understanding of cancer. As stated earlier in this review, models established for the biological understanding of cancer have proven to be useful as tools for non-clinical investigations. When developing a new drug that is in the same class as those for which efficacy and safety information was already acquired from clinical studies, it is also useful to select non-clinical models based on the clinical information. Collectively, it will become increasingly important to design, to select, and to use appropriate non-clinical models in order to design clinical research and trials. Investigations with these models should be effective in interpreting the results of such investigations and to re-evaluate the effects of oncology drugs used in clinical practice. It is strongly hoped that non-clinical investigation will continuously be successfully used for the development, approval, and proper use of oncology drugs, which accelerate drug development.

Acknowledgments

This article was prepared as the summary statement of a subcommittee for non-clinical studies of the Science Board of the Pharmaceuticals and Medical Devices Agency. We are grateful to Takao Yamori, Tetsuo Nagano, Eiji Saito, and all other members in the Regulatory Science Division, Scientific Committee of the Pharmaceuticals and Medical Devices Agency for their assistance and discussion.

Disclosure Statement

The authors have no conflict of interest.

References

1 Hurley LH. DNA and its associated processes as targets for cancer therapy. *Nat Rev Cancer* 2002; **2**: 188–200.
2 DeVita VT Jr, Chu E. A history of cancer chemotherapy. *Cancer Res* 2008; **68**: 8643–53.
3 Dobbelstein M, Moll U. Targeting tumour-supportive cellular machineries in anticancer drug development. *Nat Rev Drug Discov* 2014; **13**: 179–96.
4 Land H, Parada LF, Weinberg RA. Cellular oncogenes and multistep carcinogenesis. *Science* 1983; **222**: 771–8.
5 Hollingsworth RE, Lee WH. Tumor suppressor genes: new prospects for cancer research. *J Natl Cancer Inst* 1991; **83**: 91–6.
6 Croce CM. Genetic approaches to the study of the molecular basis of human cancer. *Cancer Res* 1991; **51**(18 Suppl): 5015s–8s.
7 Barrett JC, Thomassen DG, Hesterberg TW. Role of gene and chromosomal mutations in cell transformation. *Ann N Y Acad Sci* 1983; **407**: 291–300.
8 Cowell JK. Double minutes and homogeneously staining regions: gene amplification in mammalian cells. *Annu Rev Genet* 1982; **16**: 21–59.
9 Bloomfield CD, Lindquist LL, Arthur D *et al.* Chromosomal abnormalities in acute lymphoblastic leukemia. *Cancer Res* 1981; **41**(11 Pt 2): 4838–43.
10 Tsuruo T, Naito M, Tomida A *et al.* Molecular targeting therapy of cancer: drug resistance, apoptosis and survival signal. *Cancer Sci* 2003; **94**(1): 15–21.
11 Pierce GB, Speers WC. Tumors as caricatures of the process of tissue renewal: prospects for therapy by directing differentiation. *Cancer Res* 1988; **48**: 1996–2004.
12 Hoffman SJ, Robinson WA. Use of differentiation-inducing agents in the myelodysplastic syndrome and acute non-lymphocytic leukemia. *Am J Hematol* 1988; **28**: 124–7.
13 McMillin DW, Negri JM, Mitsiades CS. The role of tumour-stromal interactions in modifying drug response: challenges and opportunities. *Nat Rev Drug Discov* 2013; **12**: 217–28.
14 Miller JF, Sadelain M. The journey from discoveries in fundamental immunology to cancer immunotherapy. *Cancer Cell* 2015; **27**: 439–49.
15 Siolas D, Hannon GJ. Patient-derived tumor xenografts: transforming clinical samples into mouse models. *Cancer Res* 2013; **73**: 5315–9.
16 Marangoni E, Poupon MF. Patient-derived tumour xenografts as models for breast cancer drug development. *Curr Opin Oncol* 2014; **26**: 556–61.
17 Hidalgo M, Amant F, Biankin AV *et al.* Patient-derived xenograft models: an emerging platform for translational cancer research. *Cancer Discov* 2014; **4**: 998–1013.
18 Marino S, Vooijs M, van Der Gulden H, Jonkers J, Berns A. Induction of medulloblastomas in p53-null mutant mice by somatic inactivation of Rb in the external granular layer cells of the cerebellum. *Genes Dev* 2000; **14**: 994–1004.
19 Westerman BA, Blom M, Tanger E *et al.* GFAP-Cre-mediated transgenic activation of Bmi1 results in pituitary tumors. *PLoS ONE* 2012; **7**: e35943.
20 Yang ZJ, Ellis T, Markant SL *et al.* Medulloblastoma can be initiated by deletion of Patched in lineage-restricted progenitors or stem cells. *Cancer Cell* 2008; **14**: 135–45.
21 Zibat A, Uhmann A, Nitzki F *et al.* Time-point and dosage of gene inactivation determine the tumor spectrum in conditional Ptch knockouts. *Carcinogenesis* 2009; **30**: 918–26.
22 Tonks ID, Hacker E, Irwin N *et al.* Melanocytes in conditional Rb−/− mice are normal *in vivo* but exhibit proliferation and pigmentation defects *in vitro*. *Pigment Cell Res* 2005; **18**: 252–64.
23 Hu N, Gutsmann A, Herbert DC, Bradley A, Lee WH, Lee EY. Heterozygous Rb-1 delta 20/+mice are predisposed to tumors of the pituitary gland with a nearly complete penetrance. *Oncogene* 1994; **9**: 1021–7.
24 Vooijs M, van der Valk M, te Riele H, Berns A. Flp-mediated tissue-specific inactivation of the retinoblastoma tumor suppressor gene in the mouse. *Oncogene* 1998; **17**(1): 1–12.
25 Shaw AT, Meissner A, Dowdle JA *et al.* Sprouty-2 regulates oncogenic K-ras in lung development and tumorigenesis. *Genes Dev* 2007; **21**: 694–707.
26 Andreadi C, Cheung LK, Giblett S *et al.* The intermediate-activity (L597V) BRAF mutant acts as an epistatic modifier of oncogenic RAS by enhancing signaling through the RAF/MEK/ERK pathway. *Genes Dev* 2012; **26**: 1945–58.
27 Dankort D, Filenova E, Collado M, Serrano M, Jones K, McMahon M. A new mouse model to explore the initiation, progression, and therapy of BRAFV600E-induced lung tumors. *Genes Dev* 2007; **21**: 379–84.
28 Song H, Yao E, Lin C, Gacayan R, Chen MH, Chuang PT. Functional characterization of pulmonary neuroendocrine cells in lung development, injury, and tumorigenesis. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* 2012; **109**: 17531–6.
29 Soda M, Takada S, Takeuchi K *et al.* A mouse model for EML4-ALK-positive lung cancer. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* 2008; **105**: 19893–7.
30 Chen Z, Sasaki T, Tan X *et al.* Inhibition of ALK, PI3K/MEK, and HSP90 in murine lung adenocarcinoma induced by EML4-ALK fusion oncogene. *Cancer Res* 2010; **70**: 9827–36.
31 Saito M, Ishigame T, Tsuta K, Kumamoto K, Imai T, Kohno T. A mouse model of KIF5B-RET fusion-dependent lung tumorigenesis. *Carcinogenesis* 2014; **35**: 2452–6.
32 Arai Y, Totoki Y, Takahashi H *et al.* Mouse model for ROS1-rearranged lung cancer. *PLoS ONE* 2013; **8**: e56010.
33 Yuan W, Stawiski E, Janakiraman V *et al.* Conditional activation of Pik3ca (H1047R) in a knock-in mouse model promotes mammary tumorigenesis and emergence of mutations. *Oncogene* 2013; **32**: 318–26.
34 Adams JR, Xu K, Liu JC *et al.* Cooperation between Pik3ca and p53 mutations in mouse mammary tumor formation. *Cancer Res* 2011; **71**: 2706–17.
35 Trimboli AJ, Cantemir-Stone CZ, Li F *et al.* Pten in stromal fibroblasts suppresses mammary epithelial tumours. *Nature* 2009; **461**: 1084–91.
36 Finkle D, Quan ZR, Asghari V *et al.* HER2-targeted therapy reduces incidence and progression of midlife mammary tumors in female murine mammary tumor virus huHER2-transgenic mice. *Clin Cancer Res* 2004; **10**: 2499–511.
37 Rao GN, Ney E, Herbert RA. Effect of melatonin and linolenic acid on mammary cancer in transgenic mice with c-neu breast cancer oncogene. *Breast Cancer Res Treat* 2000; **64**: 287–96.
38 Dourdin N, Schade B, Lesurf R *et al.* Phosphatase and tensin homologue deleted on chromosome 10 deficiency accelerates tumor induction in a mouse model of ErbB-2 mammary tumorigenesis. *Cancer Res* 2008; **68**: 2122–31.
39 Cheng L, Zhou Z, Flesken-Nikitin A *et al.* Rb inactivation accelerates neoplastic growth and substitutes for recurrent amplification of cIAP1, cIAP2 and Yap1 in sporadic mammary carcinoma associated with p53 deficiency. *Oncogene* 2010; **29**: 5700–11.
40 McCarthy A, Savage K, Gabriel A, Naceur C, Reis-Filho JS, Ashworth A. A mouse model of basal-like breast carcinoma with metaplastic elements. *J Pathol* 2007; **211**: 389–98.
41 McPherson JP, Lemmers B, Hirao A *et al.* Collaboration of Brca1 and Chk2 in tumorigenesis. *Genes Dev* 2004; **18**: 1144–53.
42 Jonkers J, Meuwissen R, van der Gulden H, Peterse H, van der Valk M, Berns A. Synergistic tumor suppressor activity of BRCA2 and p53 in a conditional mouse model for breast cancer. *Nat Genet* 2001; **29**: 418–25.
43 Hung KE, Maricevich MA, Richard LG *et al.* Development of a mouse model for sporadic and metastatic colon tumors and its use in assessing drug treatment. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* 2010; **107**: 1565–70.

44 Haigis KM, Kendall KR, Wang Y *et al.* Differential effects of oncogenic K-Ras and N-Ras on proliferation, differentiation and tumor progression in the colon. *Nat Genet* 2008; **40**: 600–8.
45 Marsh V, Winton DJ, Williams GT *et al.* Epithelial Pten is dispensable for intestinal homeostasis but suppresses adenoma development and progression after Apc mutation. *Nat Genet* 2008; **40**: 1436–44.
46 Takaku K, Oshima M, Miyoshi H, Matsui M, Seldin MF, Taketo MM. Intestinal tumorigenesis in compound mutant mice of both Dpc4 (Smad4) and Apc genes. *Cell* 1998; **92**: 645–56.
47 Moser AR, Pitot HC, Dove WF. A dominant mutation that predisposes to multiple intestinal neoplasia in the mouse. *Science* 1990; **247**: 322–4.
48 Pollard P, Deheragoda M, Segditsas S *et al.* The Apc 1322T mouse develops severe polyposis associated with submaximal nuclear beta-catenin expression. *Gastroenterology* 2009; **136**: 2204–13 e1-13.
49 Oshima M, Oshima H, Kitagawa K, Kobayashi M, Itakura C, Taketo M. Loss of Apc heterozygosity and abnormal tissue building in nascent intestinal polyps in mice carrying a truncated Apc gene. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* 1995; **92**: 4482–6.
50 Shibata H, Toyama K, Shioya H *et al.* Rapid colorectal adenoma formation initiated by conditional targeting of the Apc gene. *Science* 1997; **278**: 120–3.
51 Colnot S, Decaens T, Niwa-Kawakita M *et al.* Liver-targeted disruption of Apc in mice activates beta-catenin signaling and leads to hepatocellular carcinomas. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* 2004; **101**: 17216–21.
52 de Wind N, Dekker M, Claij N *et al.* HNPCC-like cancer predisposition in mice through simultaneous loss of Msh3 and Msh6 mismatch-repair protein functions. *Nat Genet* 1999; **23**: 359–62.
53 Edelmann W, Yang K, Umar A *et al.* Mutation in the mismatch repair gene Msh6 causes cancer susceptibility. *Cell* 1997; **91**: 467–77.
54 Edelmann W, Umar A, Yang K *et al.* The DNA mismatch repair genes Msh3 and Msh6 cooperate in intestinal tumor suppression. *Cancer Res* 2000; **60**: 803–7.
55 Freeman D, Lesche R, Kertesz N *et al.* Genetic background controls tumor development in PTEN-deficient mice. *Cancer Res* 2006; **66**: 6492–6.
56 Marino S, Krimpenfort P, Leung C *et al.* PTEN is essential for cell migration but not for fate determination and tumourigenesis in the cerebellum. *Development* 2002; **129**: 3513–22.
57 Bardeesy N, Aguirre AJ, Chu GC *et al.* Both p16(Ink4a) and the p19(Arf)-p53 pathway constrain progression of pancreatic adenocarcinoma in the mouse. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* 2006; **103**: 5947–52.
58 Ijichi H, Chytil A, Gorska AE *et al.* Aggressive pancreatic ductal adenocarcinoma in mice caused by pancreas-specific blockade of transforming growth factor-beta signaling in cooperation with active Kras expression. *Genes Dev* 2006; **20**: 3147–60.
59 Hill R, Calvopina JH, Kim C *et al.* PTEN loss accelerates KrasG12D-induced pancreatic cancer development. *Cancer Res* 2010; **70**: 7114–24.
60 Kim TH, Franco HL, Jung SY *et al.* The synergistic effect of Mig-6 and Pten ablation on endometrial cancer development and progression. *Oncogene* 2010; **29**: 3770–80.
61 Daikoku T, Hirota Y, Tranguch S *et al.* Conditional loss of uterine Pten unfailingly and rapidly induces endometrial cancer in mice. *Cancer Res* 2008; **68**: 5619–27.
62 Chen L, Park SM, Tumanov AV *et al.* CD95 promotes tumour growth. *Nature* 2010; **465**: 492–6.
63 van der Horst PH, van der Zee M, Heijmans-Antonissen C *et al.* A mouse model for endometrioid ovarian cancer arising from the distal oviduct. *Int J Cancer* 2014; **135**: 1028–37.
64 Szabova L, Yin C, Bupp S *et al.* Perturbation of Rb, p53, and Brca1 or Brca2 cooperate in inducing metastatic serous epithelial ovarian cancer. *Cancer Res* 2012; **72**: 4141–53.
65 Francis JC, McCarthy A, Thomsen MK, Ashworth A, Swain A. Brca2 and Trp53 deficiency cooperate in the progression of mouse prostate tumourigenesis. *PLoS Genet* 2010; **6**: e1000995.
66 Dhomen N, Da Rocha Dias S, Hayward R *et al.* Inducible expression of (V600E) Braf using tyrosinase-driven Cre recombinase results in embryonic lethality. *Pigment Cell Melanoma Res* 2010; **23**(1): 112–20.
67 Hooijkaas A, Gadiot J, Morrow M, Stewart R, Schumacher T, Blank CU. Selective BRAF inhibition decreases tumor-resident lymphocyte frequencies in a mouse model of human melanoma. *Oncoimmunology* 2012; **1**: 609–17.
68 Pinho SS, Carvalho S, Cabral J, Reis CA, Gartner F. Canine tumors: a spontaneous animal model of human carcinogenesis. *Transl Res* 2012; **159**: 165–72.
69 Paoloni M, Khanna C. Translation of new cancer treatments from pet dogs to humans. *Nat Rev Cancer* 2008; **8**: 147–56.
70 le Coutre P, Mologni L, Cleris L *et al. In vivo* eradication of human BCR/ABL-positive leukemia cells with an ABL kinase inhibitor. *J Natl Cancer Inst* 1999; **91**: 163–8.
71 Warmuth M, Kim S, Gu XJ, Xia G, Adrian F. Ba/F3 cells and their use in kinase drug discovery. *Curr Opin Oncol* 2007; **19**(1): 55–60.
72 Knight ZA, Lin H, Shokat KM. Targeting the cancer kinome through polypharmacology. *Nat Rev Cancer* 2010; **10**: 130–7.
73 Malinda KM. *In vivo* matrigel migration and angiogenesis assay. *Methods Mol Biol* 2009; **467**: 287–94.
74 Hamberg P, Verweij J, Sleijfer S. (Pre-)clinical pharmacology and activity of pazopanib, a novel multikinase angiogenesis inhibitor. *Oncologist* 2010; **15**: 539–47.
75 Yang H, Higgins B, Kolinsky K *et al.* Antitumor activity of BRAF inhibitor vemurafenib in preclinical models of BRAF-mutant colorectal cancer. *Cancer Res* 2012; **72**: 779–89.
76 Gilmartin AG, Bleam MR, Groy A *et al.* GSK1120212 (JTP-74057) is an inhibitor of MEK activity and activation with favorable pharmacokinetic properties for sustained *in vivo* pathway inhibition. *Clin Cancer Res* 2011; **17**: 989–1000.
77 Bollag G, Tsai J, Zhang J *et al.* Vemurafenib: the first drug approved for BRAF-mutant cancer. *Nat Rev Drug Discov* 2012; **11**: 873–86.
78 Chresta CM, Davies BR, Hickson I *et al.* AZD8055 is a potent, selective, and orally bioavailable ATP-competitive mammalian target of rapamycin kinase inhibitor with *in vitro* and *in vivo* antitumor activity. *Cancer Res* 2010; **70**(1): 288–98.
79 Yang Q, Modi P, Newcomb T, Queva C, Gandhi V. Idelalisib: first-in-Class PI3K delta inhibitor for the treatment of chronic lymphocytic leukemia, small lymphocytic leukemia, and follicular lymphoma. *Clin Cancer Res* 2015; **21**: 1537–42.
80 Fry DW, Harvey PJ, Keller PR *et al.* Specific inhibition of cyclin-dependent kinase 4/6 by PD 0332991 and associated antitumor activity in human tumor xenografts. *Mol Cancer Ther* 2004; **3**: 1427–38.
81 LeBlanc R, Catley LP, Hideshima T *et al.* Proteasome inhibitor PS-341 inhibits human myeloma cell growth *in vivo* and prolongs survival in a murine model. *Cancer Res* 2002; **62**: 4996–5000.
82 Kimura S, Kuramoto K, Homan J *et al.* Antiproliferative and antitumor effects of azacitidine against the human myelodysplastic syndrome cell line SKM-1. *Anticancer Res* 2012; **32**: 795–8.
83 Rhyasen GW, Bolanos L, Fang J *et al.* Targeting IRAK1 as a therapeutic approach for myelodysplastic syndrome. *Cancer Cell* 2013; **24**(1): 90–104.
84 Butler LM, Agus DB, Scher HI *et al.* Suberoylanilide hydroxamic acid, an inhibitor of histone deacetylase, suppresses the growth of prostate cancer cells *in vitro* and *in vivo*. *Cancer Res* 2000; **60**: 5165–70.
85 Bryant HE, Schultz N, Thomas HD *et al.* Specific killing of BRCA2-deficient tumours with inhibitors of poly(ADP-ribose) polymerase. *Nature* 2005; **434**: 913–7.
86 Farmer H, McCabe N, Lord CJ *et al.* Targeting the DNA repair defect in BRCA mutant cells as a therapeutic strategy. *Nature* 2005; **434**: 917–21.
87 Choy E, Butrynski JE, Harmon DC *et al.* Phase II study of olaparib in patients with refractory Ewing sarcoma following failure of standard chemotherapy. *BMC Cancer* 2014; **14**: 813.
88 Rohle D, Popovici-Muller J, Palaskas N *et al.* An inhibitor of mutant IDH1 delays growth and promotes differentiation of glioma cells. *Science* 2013; **340**: 626–30.
89 Garnett MJ, Edelman EJ, Heidorn SJ *et al.* Systematic identification of genomic markers of drug sensitivity in cancer cells. *Nature* 2012; **483**: 570–5.
90 Carbone FR, Moore MW, Sheil JM, Bevan MJ. Induction of cytotoxic T lymphocytes by primary *in vitro* stimulation with peptides. *J Exp Med* 1988; **167**: 1767–79.
91 Brown DM, Fisher TL, Wei C, Frelinger JG, Lord EM. Tumours can act as adjuvants for humoral immunity. *Immunology* 2001; **102**: 486–97.
92 Fearon ER, Itaya T, Hunt B, Vogelstein B, Frost P. Induction in a murine tumor of immunogenic tumor variants by transfection with a foreign gene. *Cancer Res* 1988; **48**: 2975–80.
93 Robbins PF, Kantor JA, Salgaller M, Hand PH, Fernsten PD, Schlom J. Transduction and expression of the human carcinoembryonic antigen gene in a murine colon carcinoma cell line. *Cancer Res* 1991; **51**: 3657–62.
94 Schreurs MW, de Boer AJ, Schmidt A, Figdor CG, Adema GJ. Cloning, expression and tissue distribution of the murine homologue of the melanocyte lineage-specific antigen gp100. *Melanoma Res* 1997; **7**: 463–70.
95 Maeda A, Maeda T, Ohguro H, Palczewski K, Sato N. Vaccination with recoverin, a cancer-associated retinopathy antigen, induces autoimmune retinal dysfunction and tumor cell regression in mice. *Eur J Immunol* 2002; **32**: 2300–7.
96 Huang AY, Gulden PH, Woods AS *et al.* The immunodominant major histocompatibility complex class I-restricted antigen of a murine colon tumor derives from an endogenous retroviral gene product. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* 1996; **93**: 9730–5.
97 Sugihara E, Saya H. Complexity of cancer stem cells. *Int J Cancer* 2013; **132**: 1249–59.

写

事　務　連　絡
令和２年２月７日

各都道府県衛生主管部（局）薬務主管課　御中

厚生労働省医薬・生活衛生局医薬品審査管理課
厚生労働省医薬・生活衛生局医療機器審査管理課

「ゲノム編集技術を用いた遺伝子治療用製品等の品質・安全性等の考慮事項に関する報告書」の送付について

今般、独立行政法人医薬品医療機器総合機構に設置されている科学委員会において、別添「ゲノム編集技術を用いた遺伝子治療用製品等の品質・安全性等の考慮事項に関する報告書」が取りまとめられましたので、ゲノム編集技術を用いた遺伝子治療用製品等の開発に際し、参考とするよう、貴管下関係事業者に対し、周知願います。

なお、本事務連絡の写しを日本製薬団体連合会等の関係団体宛てに送付しますこと、念のため申し添えます。

（別添　略）