Fully Automated and Closed Cell Processing System for Clinical-Scale Final Formulation, Fill, and Finish of Engineered T-Cells **T**SCAN THERAPEUTICS

Kyra Sur¹, Elisaveta Todorova¹, Savannah Szemethy¹, Tyler Sinacola¹, Brent Mcavoy¹, Casey Kuenn², Vandana Keskar¹ ¹TScan Therapeutics, Waltham, MA, USA; ²ScaleReady, Saint Paul, MN, USA

INTRODUCTION

- The final formulation, fill, and finish (F/F/F) step in the manufacturing of Cell and Gene therapies is essential to harvest, wash, and prepare engineered cells for cryopreservation.
- Current methods of F/F/F either require manual processing, which has the potential to result in operator error, or utilize automated systems with limited system capabilities. Manual methods or semi-automated systems may present the risk of increased exposure time of cells to the cryoprotectant, causing a reduction in post-thaw viability and low recovery.
- The Cue[®] Cell Processing System (Fresenius Kabi) provides an opportunity to fully automate a functionally closed F/F/F unit operation using enhanced system features for consistent and robust processing.



Table 1. Cue [®] Cell Processing System for fully automated and closed F/F/F		
Desired Instrument Criteria	Cue®	Competitor(s)
GMP Status	GMP Certified	GMP Certified
Closed/Automated	\checkmark / Fully automated	\checkmark / Semi-automated
Sampling In-Process	\checkmark	×
Mixing Capabilities	\checkmark	×
Temperature Controlled	\checkmark	×
Aliquoting Flexibility	\checkmark	×
Air Removal	\checkmark	×
Output Format	Bags, Closed system vials, QC sample	Bags, Vials
Fill Accuracy	Max ± 10% or 1mL ¹	Max ± 25%
Additional Unit Ops	\checkmark	\checkmark
Processing Time	< 30 min per cycle	1-2 hrs²
Maximum Cell Input	N/A	Max 5e10 total cells ³
Integrated Interface	\checkmark	\checkmark
Footprint (sqft)	4.6	Max 4.8 ³

¹Whichever is greater; ²Dependent on input volume; ³Device dependen



recovery and standard deviation of total engineered T cells. Recoveries were calculated following automated processing for each F/F/F method. significantly higher (p=0.0046) for the Cue[®] compared to the Competitor (98.6% ± 7.9% vs. 68.9% ± 6.2% respectively).

Sources Fig. 1. Copyright of ScaleReady Image used with permission. Source: ScaleReady.com/Cue

METHODS

 \geq T cells were isolated from healthy donor samples (n=2), engineered, and subsequently expanded in culture. > On harvest day, cells were split (1 billion total engineered T cells for n=3 runs) and run on both the Cue®, using a fully automated protocol generated by ScaleReady, and the Competitor, using a semi-automated protocol. > The Cue[®] system performed a washout of spent culture media and reformulated cells into complete cryopreservation media at the desired final cell concentration. The Competitor performed a washout of spent culture media and suspended cells into formulation buffer, cryopreservation medium was then manually added to achieve the desired final cell concentration.

> Cell count and viability (CCV) samples were taken following harvest from bioreactor, suspension in buffer, and final formulation with cryoprotectant. Flow cytometry was performed on harvest samples.

> Final formulated cell suspension for both the Cue[®] and the Competitor was manually aliquoted into cryovials, all cryovials were cryopreserved using a controlled rate freezer.

> Samples for all runs (n=3 per F/F/F method) were thawed and recovered in culture media, post-thaw samples were analyzed for CCVs and via flow cytometry.

Property

All trademarks referred to are property of their respective owners.



