Title: CIT tumor lines: A novel series of immunogenic cutaneous squamous cell carcinoma cell

lines derived from chemical carcinogenesis

Authors

Robert Letchworth[1,2,*], Miho Tanaka[3,*], Alina A Barnes[1,2], Lotus Lum[3], Savannah Hughes[1], Grant

Schlauderaff[1], Piyush Chaudhary[1,2], Kenneth M Ng[3], Daphne Superville[3], Corinna Martinez

Luna[3], Maria Gonzalez[3], Dekker C Deacon[1,4], Allie Grossmann[5], Melissa Q Reeves[1,2]

Affiliations

[1]Huntsman Cancer Institute, University of Utah

[2]Department of Pathology, University of Utah

[3]Department of Microbiology and Immunology, University of California, San Francisco

[4]Department of Dermatology, University of Utah

[5]Earle A. Chiles Research Institute, Providence Cancer Institute of Oregon, Portland, OR

[*]These authors contributed equally.

Correspondence: melissa.reeves@hci.utah.edu

Keywords

Cutaneous squamous cell carcinoma, tumor immunology, tumor neoantigen, immune

checkpoint inhibitor, mouse models of cancer

Abstract

Immunotherapy is now widely used to treat advanced-stage skin cancer, but it is effective for

only approximately half of skin cancer patients, including both patients with melanoma and

cutaneous squamous cell carcinoma (cSCC). To overcome current barriers, preclinical mouse

models that faithfully recapitulate the tumor genetics, mutation burdens, and neoantigen

patterns of specific human tumor types are essential. However, while many models exist for

melanoma, there are currently relatively few transplantable murine models of cSCC, which is

responsible for nearly as many deaths as melanoma each year. Here we describe a novel series

of 11 cSCC tumor lines, the Carcinogen-Induced Tumor (CIT) lines, syngeneic to the FVB strain,

that address this need. The CIT lines were established from skin carcinomas induced by DMBA

and TPA treatment and harbor genetic drivers and overall tumor mutational burdens that

recapitulate those found in cSCC. Each CIT line gives rise to tumors with a consistent immune

infiltration pattern, ranging from T cell-rich "hot" tumors to T cell-poor "cold" tumors. Hot CIT

lines exhibit partial responses to treatment with immune checkpoint inhibitors, and we have

identified two neoantigens present in an immunotherapy-responsive CIT line. The CIT lines thus

provide a valuable new series of preclinical models for studying anti-tumor immune responses

and developing strategies to improve immunotherapy efficacy in cSCC.

Background

Cutaneous squamous cell carcinoma (cSCC) is the second most common cancer type in

the United States, affecting approximately 700,000 people annually[1–3] and responsible for

between 8,000 and 15,000 deaths per year[1,4]. Although cSCC carries a relatively low risk of local

advancement or distant metastasis, its high incidence rate means that as many or more

Americans are estimated to die every year from cSCC as from melanoma[4]. Among high-risk

cSCC patients, up to 5% will progress to locally advanced or metastatic tumors that cannot be

treated with surgery or radiation alone[1,5,6]. Immune checkpoint inhibitors (ICIs), which have

revolutionized cancer treatment over the past decade[7,8], are approved for advanced cSCC, and

hold immense potential to be curative for these patients[9,10]. However, overall response rates of

cSCC to ICI therapy are only 50-60% in locally advanced disease[10–12] and drop as low as 35% in

metastatic disease[11]. These statistics highlight an unmet clinical need to understand why ICI

fails for many cSCC patients and how immunotherapy strategies can be improved for these

patients[10–13].

Murine models play a vital role in basic and translational cancer research, providing a

means of conducting mechanistic experiments to dissect cancer and immune cell biology and

their interactions with therapy. Transplantable tumor models, in which cancer cell lines are

implanted into immune-competent syngeneic hosts, play a particularly important role in

preclinical research, as the reliability of their growth kinetics makes them a workhorse for

testing the efficacy of new therapies or combinations. Additionally, transplantable murine

models are essential for studying immunotherapy. Because ICIs primarily act directly on T cells,

they are effective only in immune-competent hosts, making patient-derived xenografts

(PDXs)—which grow only in mice with compromised immune systems—unsuitable models to

study immunotherapy. However, while transplantable murine models of melanoma are widely

available and have contributed to substantial advancements in immunotherapy, relatively few

transplantable tumor models are available for cSCC. Many barriers to the efficacy of

immunotherapy are cancer type-specific, and there is a need for mouse models that accurately

recapitulate the unique features of each disease. As such, the lack of availability of

transplantable cSCC models represents a significant gap in the field.

Here we describe the Carcinogen-Induced Tumor (CIT) cell line panel, a novel series of

murine cSCC cell lines, to address this need. The CIT lines are derived from DMBA/TPA-induced

cutaneous SCCs, and they are syngeneic to the FVB strain. Notably, the CIT cell lines

recapitulate the mutational profiles of human cSCC, including harboring cSCC-relevant driver

mutations in *Hras* and *Trp53* and deletions of *Cdkn2a*. As a result of being chemically induced in

immune-competent hosts, the CIT lines carry a moderate to high mutation burden, like human

cSCC[14,15]. The tumors that arise from the CIT lines exhibit a range of reproducible patterns of

immune infiltration—from high to low T cell infiltrate—along with a corresponding range of

responses to immunotherapy. Additionally, as a consequence of their high mutation burden,

the CIT lines harbor endogeneous neoantigens, which are mutant proteins—resulting from

genetic mutations—that can be recognized by T cells[8]. Neoantigens enable T cells to identify

tumor cells as "foreign," and this recognition is a critical central mechanism of the anti-tumor

immune response that is enhanced by ICI therapy[8,16]. The presence of these neoantigens—two

of which we describe in this manuscript—are an additional valuable tool to facilitate the study

of tumor-specific T cells during immunotherapy responses in cSCC.

The CIT cell line series thus offers a panel of cSCC tumor models that exhibit a range of

mutational burdens, immune infiltrates, and neoantigens, while being driven by cSCC-relevant

genomic drivers and exhibiting histopathologic features characteristic of cSCC. These properties

make the CIT lines a valuable set of preclinical models for investigating tumor biology and

responses to therapy, particularly immunotherapy, in cSCC.

Results

CIT lines display a range of reproducible immune infiltration phenotypes.

The CIT cell lines were derived from skin carcinomas that arose by topically treating *K5-*

CreER^{T2}-Confetti FVB/N mice with a single dose of 7,12-dimethylbenzanthracene (DMBA)

followed by 12-O-tetradecanoylphorbol-13-acetate (TPA) twice weekly for 20 weeks, using a

well-established skin carcinogenesis protocol[17,18] (**Fig. 1A**). In the DMBA/TPA model, benign

papillomas arise after about 6 weeks of TPA treatment, and approximately 10% of these

progress to malignant carcinomas. Primary carcinomas were resected when they were

approximately 1cm in longest diameter, digested into a single cell suspension, and grown under

standard tissue culture conditions. Each cell line was established in tissue culture for >10

passages. Implantation of 1.25×10^5 tumor cells into the subcutaneous flank of FVB mice gave

rise to tumors with 100% penetrance, and we subsequently profiled the histopathologic and

immune characteristics of these tumors.

We carried out immune profiling of 11 CIT cell lines by flow cytometry, quantifying the

number of total T cells, CD4+ and CD8+ T cells in tumors from each CIT model (**Supp. Fig. 1A**).

110 We found each CIT line gave rise to tumors with a consistent pattern of immune infiltration,

111 spanning the range of immune "hot" (highly infiltrated by T cells, e.g., CIT18) to immune "cold"

112 (poorly infiltrated by T cells, e.g., CIT9) (**Fig. 1B**). Interestingly, we observed a consistent bias in

113 the T cell compartment toward CD4+ T cells, about half of which were Tregs (**Supp. Fig. 1B**). We

114 selected 5 CIT lines, including representation of both hot and cold models, for more extensive

115 immune profiling. On the whole, we found the myeloid compartment of CIT tumors was

116 strongly biased toward macrophages (CD11b+MHCII+F4/80+), with relatively fewer Ly6C+ and

117 Ly6G+ myeloid cells (monocytes and neutrophils, respectively) and DCs (CD11c+MHCII+) (**Fig.**

118 **1C, Supp. Fig. 1A**). Macrophage infiltration was highest in the two coldest (lowest T cell

119 infiltrate) CIT models, CIT22 and CIT9. Conversely, hot models CIT18 and CIT6 exhibited the

120 highest B cell infiltration (**Fig. 1C**). There was no clear trend between hot and cold tumors for

121 Ly6G^{hi}Ly6C^{mid} neutrophils, Ly6C^{hi}CD11b+ monocytes, or CD11c+MHCII+ dendritic cells (**Fig. 1C**).

122  Tumor histology for the same five selected CIT tumor models was reviewed by a board-

123 certified pathologist. Tumors from all five CIT models were poorly differentiated, spindled,

124 arranged in fascicles, and highly mitotic (**Fig. 1D**). Some CIT18 tumors contained pleomorphic,

125 rhabdoid, or epithelioid malignant cell morphologies. Among the hot models, CIT18 and CIT17

126 tumors contained brisk tumor-infiltrating lymphocyte (TIL) infiltration, while CIT6 tumors

127 contained focal clusters of TILs or TILs localized to the edge of the tumor. In comparison,

128 tumors arising from the cold lines CIT9 and CIT22 displayed very little TIL infiltration. CIT6,

129 CIT17, CIT18 and CIT22 tumors contained diffuse infiltration of polymorphonuclear (PMN) cells,

130 while PMNs in cold CIT9 tumors were largely restricted to the edge of the tumors. Altogether,

131 we find that the CIT cell lines give rise to tumors that recapitulate the histologic features of high

grade, sarcomatoid SCC, and each exhibits characteristic patterns of immune infiltration

congruent with flow cytometry-based immune profiling.

Genomic profiles of CIT lines recapitulate human SCC.

All 11 CIT cell lines were subjected to exome sequencing, to a median depth of 153X.

Consistent with previous sequencing of DMBA/TPA tumors by ourselves and others[17,19,20], CIT

cell lines were genomically characterized by *Hras* driver mutations, *Cdkn2a* losses, a substantial

mutation burden, and whole-chromosome copy number alterations. The mutation burden

among the CIT lines ranged from 174 to 703 mutations (5.2-21.0 mutations/Mb; average of 10

mutations/Mb), including 46 to 256 non-synonymous mutations (**Fig. 2A-B, Supp. Table 1**). Ten

of our CIT lines exhibited an *Hras* Q61L mutation, while one, CIT16, exhibited an *Hras* G12V as

well as a *Kras* G13R mutation (**Fig. 2C**). Seven CIT lines displayed additional non-synonymous

mutations in driver genes known to be mutated in human cSCC, including *Trp53* and *Fgfr3*,

while nine CIT lines harbored a deletion at the *Cdkn2a* locus (**Fig. 2C**). The majority of total

mutations were T>A transversions, with a particular prevalence of CTN>A mutations (with N

representing any nucleotide) consistent with the known mutagenic signature of DMBA[17,19,20]

(**Fig. 2D**). While this signature is not identical to the C>T mutations induced by UV and typically

found in cSCC[14,15], we note that the genes mutated in the CIT lines were nonetheless cSCC-

relevant driver genes, including mutations at classical *Hras* hotspots in codons 12 and 61. The

CIT lines also harbored whole-chromosome alterations, primarily amplifications, especially on

chromosomes 6 and 15 (**Fig. 2E**). Chromosome 6 amplifications are common in DMBA/TPA-

induced skin carcinomas[17]. Chromosome 15 amplifications were also previously observed, but

they were more heavily represented in the CIT lines than in a previously sequenced cohort of

primary tumors[17], suggesting perhaps a selection in cell culture for lines with this amplification.

Interestingly, we saw only one whole-chromosome amplification each of chromosome 1 and

chromosome 7. We previously reported that chromosome 1 and 7 amplifications are common

in DMBA/TPA carcinomas with an epithelial-like "squamous" morphology, but largely absent in

DMBA/TPA carcinomas with a mesenchymal-like "spindle" morphology[17]. The

underrepresentation of these alterations is perhaps not surprising given that the CIT lines

primarily give rise to tumors with spindle cell morphology, but may again suggest a selection

bias of the cell lines we were able to establish in culture.

Given that mutation burden information and immune phenotypes were available for all

11 cell lines, we examined whether a relationship existed between these metrics. While two of

the tumors with the highest T cell infiltration, CIT18 and CIT6, exhibited two of the three

highest mutation burdens, we observed that tumor model with the second-highest T cell

infiltration, CIT16, had a relatively low mutation burden. CIT23 tumors, which had the second-

highest mutation burden, were by contrast very poorly infiltrated by T cells. Thus, aligning with

observations from patients, mutation burden alone was insufficient to predict the immune

response to any given tumor, and there was not a significant correlation between mutation

burden and T cell infiltrate across CIT models (**Fig. 2F**).

Immunologically hot CIT lines respond to immunotherapy.

Because our CIT lines exhibited moderate to high tumor mutation burdens, we

hypothesized they would carry neoantigens and would be sensitive to immune checkpoint

inhibitors (ICIs). We tested the efficacy of a combination ICI regimen—anti-PD-1 plus anti-CTLA-

4, administered as two doses 3 days apart—on CIT18, CIT6, and CIT9 tumors (**Fig. 3A**).

CIT18 and CIT6 tumors—both of which we had observed to be immunologically hot—

grew significantly slower than controls when treated with anti-PD-1 plus anti-CTLA-4 (hereafter,

"ICI") **(Fig. 3B)**. Conversely, immunologically cold CIT9 tumors displayed no difference in growth

between ICI-treated and control tumors **(Fig. 3B)**. We carried out immune profiling of ICI- and

control-treated tumors to interrogate how ICI remodeled the immune response in these

models. CIT18 tumors had the strongest response to ICIs, both in terms of the reduction in

growth and in the increase in tumor infiltrating T cells. Total T cells, CD8+ T cells and CD4+ T

cells were all more abundant in ICI-treated CIT18 tumors (**Fig. 3C**, **Supp. Fig. 2A**). CIT6 tumors,

which showed a more modest response to ICI than CIT18, only exhibited an influx of CD8+ T

cells following ICI, while CIT9 tumors showed no increase in overall T cell infiltration. **(Fig. 3D-E**,

Supp. Fig. 2A).

ICI treatment also altered the activation profile of tumor-infiltrating T cells. Effective ICI

treatment in CIT18 and CIT6 tumors was accompanied by an increase in the percentage of CD8+

and CD4+ T cells which exhibited a CD44+CD62L- "effector-like" phenotype **(Fig. 3F-G**, **Supp.**

Fig. 2B). Notably, in hot tumors this increase in "effector-like" CD8+ T cells resulted in a skewing

of the CD8+ compartment away from a CD44+CD62L+ "central memory-like" phenotype, even

though the abundance of central memory-like CD8+ T cells as a percent of all immune cells was

unchanged **(Supp. Fig. 2C)**. In contrast, ICI treatment in cold CIT9 tumors was unsuccessful at

shifting the phenotype of either CD8+ or CD4+ T cells **(Fig. 3H**, **Supp. Fig. 2B-C)**. We further

examined the expression of PD-1, which is present on both activated and exhausted T cells, and

Tim3 and TIGIT, both of which mark exhaustion, on CD8+ T cells. The proportion of tumor-

infiltrating CD8+ T cells expressing PD-1 increased after ICI treatment in all three tumor models

(Fig. 3I-K). Interestingly, the "activated" PD-1+Tim3-TIGIT- T cell population was the primary

CD8+ population to increase in CIT18 tumors following ICI **(Fig. 3I, Supp. Fig. 2D)**, and this

corresponded to the best tumor growth control. By contrast in CIT6 tumors, which showed

more modest tumor growth control, the proportion of "activated" PD-1+Tim3-TIGIT- CD8+ T

cells did not increase as a fraction of PD-1+ CD8+ T cells **(Fig. 3J)**. Instead, there was an increase

in the proportion of PD-1+ CD8+ T cells with an exhausted (PD-1+Tim3+ or PD-1+Tim3+TIGIT+)

phenotype after ICI treatment **(Supp. Fig. 2D)**. Together, this data shows that CIT tumor models

exhibit a range of responses to immunotherapy, and that the degree of sensitivity appears to

be approximately correlated with the level of T cell infiltration in untreated tumors.

CIT tumors display identifiable and immunotherapy-sensitive neoantigens.

Cytotoxic CD8+ T cells recognize tumor cells by using their T cell receptor (TCR) to detect

neoantigens, which are fragments of mutant proteins that arise from genetic mutations in the

tumor[8,16], and which allow T cells to see tumor cells as "foreign." Given that improvement in

the CD8+ T cell response corresponded to effective tumor control following ICI, we next sought

to identify the neoantigens recognized by CD8+ T cells during this response. We focused here

on the CIT6 tumor model, which exhibited the intermediate response to ICI among the three

models tested and thus may be most representative of patient tumors which are recognized by

the host immune response but benefit only marginally from current ICI strategies. We

employed the NetH2pan algorithm[21] to predict the binding strength between the H2-D^q and H2-

K^q MHCI alleles carried by FVB/N mice and the neoepitopes predicted to be generated by all

non-synonymous mutations identified in our exome sequencing analysis. We identified 27 top

binders, and these were further filtered to prioritize those for which the mutant sequence was

predicted to exhibit better binding than the wild-type sequence, and for which we could detect

expression of the gene by RNAseq (**Fig. 4A-B**, **Supp. Table 2)**.

Candidate neoantigens identified through this pipeline were subsequently screened by

in vitro IFNγ ELISPOT assay[22,23]. Whole splenocytes, CD8+ T cells, or CD4+ T cells from the spleen

of CIT6 tumor-bearing mice were incubated with synthetic peptides corresponding to each

candidate epitope sequence (**Fig. 4C**). We identified two peptides, CPAFLPCTV (resulting from a

Brinp3 T436P mutation) and VPPSSLLPL (resulting from a Ttll4 Q454L mutation), which

consistently elicited IFNγ production in sorted CD8+ T cells from CIT6-bearing mice in a peptide

concentration-dependent manner (**Fig. 4D-G**). These peptides elicited no response from sorted

CD4+ T cells (**Supp. Fig. 3A**). When the peptide assay was carried out with whole splenocytes

(no prior sorting of CD8+ or CD4+ T cells), the dose-dependent response to VPPSSLLPL (Ttll4

Q454L mutation) was still observed, but the response to CPAFLPCTV (Brinp3 T436P mutation)

was not detectable above background (**Supp. Fig. 3B**).

We next interrogated the effect of ICI therapy on the T cell response to VPPSSLLPL,

focusing on VPPSSLLPL because its response was more clearly detected in whole splenocytes

(Supp. Fig. 3B). CIT6 tumors were treated with three doses of anti-PD-1 and anti-CTLA-4

combination therapy (**Fig. 4H**), and an IFNγ ELISPOT assay was carried out on whole splenocytes

harvested 3 days after the final dose of ICI. Splenocytes from ICI-treated mice produced a

robust IFNγ response when incubated with VPPSSLLPL compared to no peptide **(Fig. 4I)**,

indicating that response to the neoantigen VPPSSLLPL is prominent during immunotherapy

response.

Discussion

We have established the CIT lines as a novel series of *Hras*-driven cSCC tumor lines, and here

present comprehensive histologic, genomic, and immune characterization of these 11 cell lines.

The CIT lines carry genomic drivers relevant to human cSCC, as well as a moderate-to-high

mutation burden[14,15]. We show that each CIT line exhibits a characteristic immune infiltrate,

with individual cell lines ranging from immune hot to immune cold. Immune hot CIT lines CIT6

and CIT18 exhibit partial responses to an immunotherapy regimen of anti-CTLA-4 and anti-PD-1.

We have also identified two neoantigens that elicit CD8+ T cell responses in the CIT6 cell line. Of

note, while numerous neoantigens have been identified in tumor models syngeneic to

C57BL/6[22–26], there has been a notable dearth of neoantigen identification in other mouse

strains including FVB, as well as a lack of neoantigens identified in cSCC models. The CIT lines,

with the identification of two MHCI-restricted neoantigens in CIT6, thus provide a valuable new

series of models for immunotherapy research in cSCC.

As noted above, the CIT cell lines are syngeneic to FVB mice. This stands in contrast to

the majority of mouse models currently used for immunotherapy studies—across all cancer

types—which are syngeneic to C57BL/6 mice. C57BL/6 mice are known to have a Th1-biased

immune response[27]. While this is likely beneficial for tumor control—and C57BL/6 mice are

widely known for their resistance to tumorigenesis[28,29]—it is not necessarily representative of

the diversity of human immune responses. FVB mice, in contrast to C57BL/6, are known to

exhibit Th2-biased immune responses[27,30] and to be readily susceptible to tumorigenesis. While

no single mouse model or mouse strain can represent the full spectrum of human immunity,

increasing the diversity of mouse strains used to model anti-tumor immune responses is

essential to capture human diversity and understand the full spectrum of barriers to

immunotherapy success that are found in patients.

Finally, an additional feature of the CIT lines, having been derived from *K5CreER^(T2)*-

Confetti mice, is that cells can be labeled with fluorescent tags following exposure to Cre

recombinase[31,32]. We have successfully labeled CIT lines *in vitro* using adenoviral Cre

recombinase. While the *K5CreER^(T2)* allele will also allow for labeling of K5+ (Keratin 5+) cells

following tamoxifen treatment, we have found low expression of K5 in these poorly

differentiated cell lines—as well as in DMBA/TPA tumors following progression to the

carcinoma stage[31]—making this approach less effective. Introducing Cre and subsequently

sorting cells enables the establishment of isogenic cell lines with each GFP, YFP, RFP or CFP[32];

while introducing Cre to activate labeling without sorting could allow for multiclonal lineage

tracing.

Improving immunotherapy outcomes in advanced cSCC remains an unmet clinical need.

The CIT panel of cutaneous SCC tumor lines provides an important new set of tools to better

understand the mechanisms behind immunotherapy resistance in cSCC, and to preclinically

model novel approaches to overcoming ICI resistance and improving cSCC patient outcomes.

Materials and methods:

<u>Animals</u>

All animal experiments were approved by the by the University of Utah Office of Comparative

Medicine (IACUC #22-02003) or by the University of California San Francisco Laboratory Animal

Resource Center (IACUC #AN187679). This work complies with all the relevant ethical

regulations regarding animal research. *K5CreER-Confetti FVB/N* mice were maintained in the

Reeves Lab colony at the University of California San Francisco. Eight-week-old wild-type FVB/N

mice were purchased from Jackson Laboratories. All experiments were performed on 8-16-

week old mice. Any diversity in mouse age or sex was addressed by distributing age and sex

cohorts evenly between different experimental arms.

Carcinogenesis and cell line generation

To induce tumors, *K5CreER-Confetti FVB/N* mice were treated with 25 μg DMBA followed by

TPA (200 μl of a 10^{-4} M solution in acetone) two times a week for 20 weeks. To generate cell

lines, carcinomas were resected at a size of >1 cm in longest diameter, finely chopped, digested

in DMEM containing Collagenase I and IV and DNase I for 45 minutes at 37 °C, washed with PBS,

plated in DMEM plus 10% heat-inactivated FBS and L-glutamine, with penicillin, streptomycin,

and amphotericin B, and passaged until cells stably grew in culture.

In vivo experiments and immune checkpoint inhibitor treatment

A total of 1.25×10^5 cells were injected subcutaneously into the dorsal flank of 8 to 16 week old

male and female FVB/N mice. For baseline flow cytometric immune profiling and histological

analysis (Fig. 1), tumors were harvested approximately 21 days post-engraftment, when tumors

measured ~1cm in diameter. For immune checkpoint inhibitor (ICI) experiments (Fig. 3), mice

were enrolled in treatment 14 days post-tumor engraftement, when tumors grew to 25-100

mm^3 in volume. Any mice with tumors <25 mm^3 or >100 mm^3 on the day(s) of enrollment were

excluded from the experiment. Mice were treated with 200 µg anti-PD-1 (BioXCell Catalog#

BE0146) and 200 µg anti-CTLA-4 (BioXCell Catalog# BE0131) or 200 µg isotype control (BioXCell

Catalog# BE0089). Mice received two doses 3 days apart. Mice were harvested when tumors

were ~10mm in length, typically 17-21 days post-ICI enrollment and 31-35 days post-tumor

engraftment, or when an ethical endpoint was reached.

<u>Flow cytometric immune profiling</u>

Harvested tumors were finely chopped, digested in DMEM containing Collagenase IV (Sigma-

Aldrich Catalog# 9001-12-1) and DNase I (Sigma-Aldrich Catalog# D5025-15KU) for 45 minutes

at 37 °C, and filtered through 70um filters. Cells were counted using a Countess III, and 5 million

cells were plated and stained with antibodies and Live/Dead NIR stain. Antibodies used for flow

cytometric analyses are listed in Supp. Table 3. Flow cytometry analysis was performed on a

Cytek Aurora.

<u>Histology</u>

Harvested tumors were fixed in formalin for 24 hours, placed in cassettes (VWR Catalog#

18000), submerged in 70% ethanol, and submitted to ARUP Laboratories Research Histology

Core Laboratory, where they were embedded in paraffin, cut into 4µm-thick slices, stained with

hematoxylin and eosin (H&E) and mounted on slides. The 4µm slides were then analyzed by a

board-certified pathologist, A.G.

Cell line sequencing and analysis

DNA was extracted from cultured cells from each cell line and from tails of the mice in which

each tumor originated using the Qiagen DNeasy Blood & Tissue DNA purification kit (Qiagen).

Whole exome sequencing was performed using the Agilent Sure Select Mouse Exon capture kit,

and sequenced to an average depth of 153X on an Illumina HiSeq X by MedGenome, Inc. in

Redwood City, CA. Reads were trimmed with cutadapt (v3.5)[33] and aligned to the mm10 mouse

genome using BWA (v0.7.17)[34]. Reads were deduplicated using MarkDuplicates and

recalibrated using BaseRecalibrator from GATK (v4.1)[35]. Mutations were called using MuTect2

(GATK v4.1)[35,36] and Strelka2 (v2.9.10)[37], using tails from the mice in which each tumor

developed as the matched normal. Mutation calls were filtered using the following criteria:

minimum read depth of 10 at the mutation position in both tumor and normal samples;

minimum of 4 reads supporting the mutation call; for Strelka only, minimum quality QSS score

of 25. Mutations that passed all filters with both callers were kept and were additionally filtered

to remove any germline SNP detected in the panel of normals. Final mutation calls were

annotated with Annovar[38]. Copy number calling was performed with CNVkit (v0.9.10)[39], using

all tails as a pooled normal. *Cdkn2a* deletions were confirmed by samtools (v1.16)[40] mpileups of

all reads aligning to the *Cdkn2a* locus (chr4:89,274,541-89,294,653). Exome sequencing data

from CIT lines is available in SRA (accession number PRJNA1129114).

Neoantigen peptide prediction

Mutations identified by exome sequencing were used to construct wild-type and mutant amino

acid sequences of all 7mer, 8mer, and 9mer peptides that included each identified single

nucleotide variant. The NetH2pan algorithm was used to predict binding affinity and percentile

rank for each wild-type and mutant peptide sequence. This data was filtered using the following

criteria: mutant peptide with a percentile rank <0.5, log affinity ratio >0 (affinity ratio defined as

ratio of predicted binding affinity of mutant sequence dividesd by wild-type sequence), and a

gene expression >300 RPM based on RNAseq of whole CIT6 and CIT9 tumors.

<u>ELISpot assays</u>

Whole spleens were harvested from FVB mice and processed by crushing through a 70μm mesh

filter, pre-wet with 1X PBS, using a syringe plunger and washed. Red blood cells were lysed for 5

minutes using ACK lysis buffer and splenocytes counted. Spleens from CIT6-bearing FVB mice

were harvested 2-4 weeks after tumor inoculation. CD8+ T cells were isolated from whole

spleens using EasySep^{TM} Mouse CD8+ T Cell Isolation Kits (STEMCELL Technologies Catalog#

19853) and CD4+ T cells were isolated from whole spleens using EasySep^{TM} Mouse CD4+ T Cell

Isolation (STEMCELL Technologies Catalog# 19852).

Interferon-gamma (IFNγ) ELISpots were performed over a three-day assay.

Multiscreen®HTS 96-well filtration plate(s) were coated with IFNγ capture antibody (clone AN-

18, Catalog# 517902), diluted 1:500 in 1X PBS. Plates were wrapped in aluminum foil to equally

distribute temperature and incubated overnight, or at least 18 hours, at 4°C. The following day

plates were washed twice with 200μl RPMI-2 (RPMI with 2% FBS, 1% L-glutamate, 1%

streptococcus and penicillin antibiotic solution, and 0.09% 2-Mercaptoethanol (BME)) and

blocked for two hours with 200µl of RPMI-20 (RPMI with 20% FBS, 1% L-glutamate, 1%

streptococcus and penicillin antibiotic solution, and 0.09% 2-Mercaptoethanol (BME)) before

splenocytes or T cells were added. For assays where total splenocytes were used, 500,000

splenocytes were plated per well. For assays using CD8+ and CD4+ T cells, 20,000 cells per well

were co-cultured with 500,000 splenocytes from a non-tumor-bearing mouse to provide a

source of antigen presenting cells. Stimulation medium was prepared by diluting synthetic

peptide in RPMI-10 to desired peptide concentration(s). All synthetic peptides used for these

assays were ordered through GenScript. Peptides were reconstituted in DMSO or MilliQ water

according to solubility testing provided by the manufacturer. Reconstituted peptides were

aliquoted and frozen at -80°C. The negative control consisted of MilliQ water and RPMI-10.

Positive control contained 0.04% Phorbol 12-myristate 13-acetate (PMA) and 0.09% Ionomycin

in RPMI-10.

Plates were wrapped in aluminum foil and incubated undisturbed at 37°C and 5% CO_2

for 44-48 hours before developing using biotinylated anti-IFNγ detection antibody (clone R4-

6A2, Catalog# 505704), streptavidin-HRP enzyme conjugation (Thermofisher, Catalog# 405210),

and AEC (3-amino-9-ethyl-carbazole) substrate. AEC substrate was prepared by dissolving 20

mg of AEC in 2 ml of N, N Dimethylforamamide (Sigma-Aldrich, Catalog# 227056), diluting in 0.1

M Acetate Solution, adding hydrogen peroxide and filtering with a 0.45µM filter. Spots were

Imaged using the Agilent BioTek Cytation7 and analyzed using the Gen5 software.

Statistical analysis

To determine significant statistical differences, Welch's t-test was used when comparing 2

groups, and one-way ANOVA with Tukey post-hoc test was uses when comparing 3 or more

groups. Paired analyses were performed by paired t-test. Hypothesis testing was performed

using R open-source software (v4.4.2) and Prism software (GraphPad v10.4.2). Significant p

values are marked as * $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$, **** $p < 0.0001$. Studies were not

blinded. Power calculations to determine appropriate cohort size were performed using

Sample-Size software available online.

Data availability

Exome sequencing of CIT lines is available in SRA (accession number PRJNA1129114).

Acknowledgements

This work was supported by the UCSF Program for Breakthrough Biomedical Research (PBBR)

Sandler Fellowship, US National Cancer Institute (NCI) grant R21CA264599, the Huntsman

Cancer Institute Cancer Center Support Grant P30CA040214, the American Cancer Society IRG-

21-131-01, Five For The Fight, The Cancer League, and the V Foundation (V2024-002). G.S. is

supported by the Institute of General Medical Sciences grant T32GM141848. The

computational resources used for exome sequencing analysis were partially funded by the NIH

Shared Instrumentation Grant 1S10OD021644-01A1. We thank the University of Utah Flow

Cytometry Core; the Associated Regional and University Pathologists, Inc. (ARUP Laboratories)

Research Histology Core; the University of Utah Center for High Performance Computing

(CHPC); the Huntsman Cancer Institute Precision Cancer Models (PCM) Shared Resource

(supported by P30CA042014), in particular D. Lum and W. Sun; the Immune Oncology Network

(ION), in particular E. Cortes-Sanchez; and the UCSF Parnassus Flow CoLab. We also thank A. Lai

for help establishing the ELISPOT methods. We thank and all members of the Reeves Lab for

thoughtful input during the development of this story. Some figures were created with

Biorender.com.

Author contributions

M.T., R.L., L.L., A.B., and M.Q.R. designed the project and experiments. R.L., S.H., M.T., L.L. and

M.Q.R. led experiment implementation and data analysis. A.B. designed and carried out the

neoantigen identification experiments. S.H. and G.S. carried out the immune checkpoint

inhibitor experiments, with support from R.L. Board-certified pathologist A.G. provided

histology review. R.L., M.T., D.C.D., and M.Q.R. wrote the manuscript, with input from other co-

authors. P.C., K.N., D.S., C.M.L. and M.G. assisted with experiments.

References

1.   Karia, P. S., Han, J. & Schmults, C. D. Cutaneous squamous cell carcinoma: Estimated

incidence of disease, nodal metastasis, and deaths from disease in the United States, 2012.

J. Am. Acad. Dermatol. **68**, 957–966 (2013).

2.   Rogers, H. W., Weinstock, M. A., Feldman, S. R. & Coldiron, B. M. Incidence Estimate of

Nonmelanoma Skin Cancer (Keratinocyte Carcinomas) in the US Population, 2012. *JAMA*

Dermatol. **151**, 1081 (2015).

3.   Nehal, K. S. & Bichakjian, C. K. Update on Keratinocyte Carcinomas. *N. Engl. J. Med.* **379**,

363–374 (2018).

4.   Mansouri, B. & Housewright, C. D. The Treatment of Actinic Keratoses—The Rule Rather

Than the Exception. *JAMA Dermatol.* **153**, 1200 (2017).

5.   Mourouzis, C. *et al.* Cutaneous head and neck SCCs and risk of nodal metastasis – UK

experience. *J. Cranio-Maxillofac. Surg.* **37**, 443–447 (2009).

6.   Brantsch, K. D. *et al.* Analysis of risk factors determining prognosis of cutaneous squamous-

cell carcinoma: a prospective study. *Lancet Oncol.* **9**, 713–720 (2008).

7.   Ribas, A. & Wolchok, J. D. Cancer immunotherapy using checkpoint blockade. *Science* **359**,

1350–1355 (2018).

8.   Chen, D. S. & Mellman, I. Elements of cancer immunity and the cancer–immune set point.

Nature **541**, 321–330 (2017).

9.   Ansary, T. M., Hossain, M. R., Komine, M. & Ohtsuki, M. Immunotherapy for the Treatment

of Squamous Cell Carcinoma: Potential Benefits and Challenges. *Int. J. Mol. Sci.* **23**, 8530

(2022).

10. Gross, N. D. *et al.* Neoadjuvant Cemiplimab for Stage II to IV Cutaneous Squamous-Cell

Carcinoma. *N. Engl. J. Med.* **387**, 1557–1568 (2022).

11. Hughes, B. G. M. *et al.* Pembrolizumab for locally advanced and recurrent/metastatic

cutaneous squamous cell carcinoma (KEYNOTE-629 study): an open-label, nonrandomized,

multicenter, phase II trial. *Ann. Oncol.* **32**, 1276–1285 (2021).

12. Migden, M. R. *et al.* PD-1 Blockade with Cemiplimab in Advanced Cutaneous Squamous-Cell

Carcinoma. *N. Engl. J. Med.* **379**, 341–351 (2018).

13. Grob, J.-J. *et al.* Pembrolizumab Monotherapy for Recurrent or Metastatic Cutaneous

Squamous Cell Carcinoma: A Single-Arm Phase II Trial (KEYNOTE-629). *J. Clin. Oncol.* **38**,

2916–2925 (2020).

14. Chang, D. & Shain, A. H. The landscape of driver mutations in cutaneous squamous cell

carcinoma. *Npj Genomic Med.* **6**, 61 (2021).

15. Pickering, C. R. *et al.* Mutational Landscape of Aggressive Cutaneous Squamous Cell

Carcinoma. *Clin. Cancer Res.* **20**, 6582–6592 (2014).

16. Gubin, M. M. *et al.* Checkpoint blockade cancer immunotherapy targets tumour-specific

mutant antigens. *Nature* **515**, 577–581 (2014).

17. McCreery, M. Q. *et al.* Evolution of metastasis revealed by mutational landscapes of

chemically induced skin cancers. *Nat. Med.* **21**, 1514–1520 (2015).

18. Wong, C. E. *et al.* Inflammation and Hras signaling control epithelial–mesenchymal

transition during skin tumor progression. *Genes Dev.* **27**, 670–682 (2013).

19. Li, Y. R. *et al.* Long-Term Latency of Highly Mutated Cells in Normal Mouse Skin Is Reversed

by Exposure to Tumor Promoters and Chronic Tissue Damage. *Cancer Discov.* **15**, 1115–

1128 (2025).

20. Nassar, D., Latil, M., Boeckx, B., Lambrechts, D. & Blanpain, C. Genomic landscape of

carcinogen-induced and genetically induced mouse skin squamous cell carcinoma. *Nat.*

Med. **21**, 946–954 (2015).

21. DeVette, C. I. *et al.* NetH2pan: A Computational Tool to Guide MHC Peptide Prediction on

Murine Tumors. *Cancer Immunol. Res.* **6**, 636–644 (2018).

22. Castle, J. C. *et al.* Exploiting the Mutanome for Tumor Vaccination. *Cancer Res.* **72**, 1081–

1091 (2012).

23. Alspach, E. *et al.* MHC-II neoantigens shape tumour immunity and response to

immunotherapy. *Nature* **574**, 696–701 (2019).

24. Matsushita, H. *et al.* Cancer exome analysis reveals a T-cell-dependent mechanism of

cancer immunoediting. *Nature* **482**, 400–404 (2012).

25. Yadav, M. *et al.* Predicting immunogenic tumour mutations by combining mass

spectrometry and exome sequencing. *Nature* **515**, 572–576 (2014).

26. Roerden, M. *et al.* Neoantigen architectures define immunogenicity and drive immune

evasion of tumors with heterogenous neoantigen expression. *J. Immunother. Cancer* **12**,

e010249 (2024).

27. Sellers, R. S., Clifford, C. B., Treuting, P. M. & Brayton, C. Immunological Variation Between

Inbred Laboratory Mouse Strains: Points to Consider in Phenotyping Genetically

Immunomodified Mice. *Vet. Pathol.* **49**, 32–43 (2012).

28. Davie, S. A. *et al.* Effects of FVB/NJ and C57Bl/6J strain backgrounds on mammary tumor

phenotype in inducible nitric oxide synthase deficient mice. *Transgenic Res.* **16**, 193–201

(2007).

29. Hennings, H., Shores, R., Mitchell, P., Spangler, E. F. & Yuspa, S. H. Induction of papillomas

with a high probability of conversion to malignancy. *Carcinogenesis* **6**, 1607–1610 (1985).

30. Kim, E.-M., Bae, Y. M., Choi, M.-H. & Hong, S.-T. Cyst formation, increased anti-

inflammatory cytokines and expression of chemokines support for Clonorchis sinensis

infection in FVB mice. *Parasitol. Int.* **61**, 124–129 (2012).

31. Reeves, M. Q., Kandyba, E., Harris, S., Del Rosario, R. & Balmain, A. Multicolour lineage

tracing reveals clonal dynamics of squamous carcinoma evolution from initiation to

metastasis. *Nat. Cell Biol.* **20**, 699–709 (2018).

32. Tanaka, M. *et al.* Tumor cell heterogeneity drives spatial organization of the intratumoral

immune response. *J. Exp. Med.* **222**, e20242282 (2025).

33. Martin, M. Cutadapt removes adapter sequences from high-throughput sequencing reads.

EMBnet.journal **17**, 10 (2011).

34. Li, H. & Durbin, R. Fast and accurate short read alignment with Burrows–Wheeler

transform. *Bioinformatics* **25**, 1754–1760 (2009).

35. Van der Auwera, G. A. & O'Connor, B. D. *Genomics in the Cloud: Using Docker, GATK, and*

WDL in Terra. (O'Reilly Media, 2020).

36. Cibulskis, K. *et al.* Sensitive detection of somatic point mutations in impure and

heterogeneous cancer samples. *Nat. Biotechnol.* **31**, 213–219 (2013).

37. Kim, S. *et al.* Strelka2: fast and accurate calling of germline and somatic variants. *Nat.*

Methods **15**, 591–594 (2018).

38. Wang, K., Li, M. & Hakonarson, H. ANNOVAR: functional annotation of genetic variants from

high-throughput sequencing data. *Nucleic Acids Res.* **38**, e164–e164 (2010).

39. Talevich, E., Shain, A. H., Botton, T. & Bastian, B. C. CNVkit: Genome-Wide Copy Number

Detection and Visualization from Targeted DNA Sequencing. *PLOS Comput. Biol.* **12**,

e1004873 (2016).

40. Li, H. A statistical framework for SNP calling, mutation discovery, association mapping and

population genetical parameter estimation from sequencing data. *Bioinformatics* **27**, 2987–

2993 (2011).

Figure 1

Figure 1. Immune infiltration and histology profiles of CIT lines.

(A) Schematic of CIT cell line generation. Tumors were induced with the DMBA/TPA

carcinogenesis model, and cell lines were established from malignant carcinomas. **(B)**

Quantification of total T cells, CD4+ T cells and CD8+ T cells by flow cytometry in each CIT line.

(n=5-7 mice per group; * $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$) **(C)** Quantification of

macrophages, neutrophils, monocytes, B cells and dendritic cells by flow cytometry in 5

selected CIT lines. (n=5-7 mice per group; * $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, ns = not significant) **(D)**

Representative images of tumors from selected CIT lines stained with hematoxylin and eosin

(H&E) for histological analysis. Scale bar = 20 μm. Statistical analysis in (B-C) by one-way ANOVA

with Tukey post-hoc test.

Figure 2

Figure 2. Genetic profiling of CIT lines.

(A-B) Number of total (A) and non-synonymous (B) mutations per cell line, based on exome

sequencing. **(C)** Genes mutated in CIT lines which are known to be commonly mutated in

human SCC, and CIT lines with *Cdkn2a* deletions. **(D)** Frequencies of mutations observed in each

of 96 possible trinucleotide contexts for all mutations in CIT cell lines. Trinucleotide contexts,

arranged on the x axis, are grouped by the base pair change of the mutation. Highest peaks are

observed at CTG>A and GTG>A. **(E)** CNV alterations detected in each chromosome in CIT lines

based on exome sequencing. Red denotes copy number gains, blue denotes copy number

losses. **(F)** Scatter plot showing relationship between non-synonymous mutations (based on

exome sequencing) and T cell infiltrate (based on flow cytometry) for CIT lines. There is no

significant correlation between these metrics.

Figure 3

Figure 3. Immunologically hot CIT lines are responsive to combined anti-PD-1 and anti-CTLA-4

immune checkpoint inhibitor (ICI) therapy.

(A) Schematic of ICI treatment regimen on CIT tumor-bearing mice. **(B)** Average tumor volumes

of immunologically hot CIT18 and CIT6 tumors and immunologically cold CIT9 tumors after

combined ICI therapy, compared to tumors treated with isotype control antibodies. Error bars

represent mean and standard error. **(C-E)** Total T cell, CD4+ T cell, and CD8+ T cell infiltration of

CIT18 (C), CIT6 (D) and CIT9 (E) tumors as a percentage of all CD45+ immune cells for control-

treated ("Ctrl") or ICI-treated ("Tx") tumors. **(F-H)** Abundance of effector subsets of CD8+ T cells

defined by the combinatorial expressions of CD44 and CD62L in CIT18 (F), CIT6 (G) and CIT9 (H)

tumors. **(I-K)** Abundance of CD8+ T cells expressing PD-1, and frequency of "activated" PD-

1+Tim3-TIGIT- CD8+ T cells in CIT18 (I), CIT6 (J) and CIT9 (K) tumors. All statistical analyses

performed with Welch's t-test, n=7-13 mice per group. * $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$,

**** $p < 0.0001$.

Figure 4

Figure 4. CIT lines express identifiable neoantigens whose cognate CD8+ T cells are responsive

to immunotherapy.

(A) Selection criteria for CIT6 mutations predicted to generate neoantigens. **(B)** Predicted

peptide log affinity ratio (affinity ratio is defined as ratio between predicted binding affinity of

mutant versus wild-type sequence) and gene expression level of mutations predicted to be top

CIT6 candidate neoantigens, shown for H2-Dq and H2-Kq alleles. Affinity predictions were

generated using NetH2Pan algorithm. **(C)** Schematic of IFNγ ELISpot assay. For screening of

CD8+ T cell and CD4+ T cell responses, CD8+ or CD4+ T cells were isolated from the spleens of

tumor bearing mice and co-cultured with total splenoyctes from a healthy tumor-naïve mouse.

(D) Representative IFNγ ELISpot images of assay peformed with CD8+ T cells from the spleen of

CIT6-bearing mice cultured with 160ug/ml of Brinp3 peptide CPAFLPCTV (top row) and negative

control (no peptide, bottom row). **(E)** Quantification of average IFNγ ELISpot spot counts for

CD8+ T cells from the spleen of CIT6-bearing mice cultured with different concentrations of

Brinp3 peptide CPAFLPCTV. Each colored line represents data points from a different mouse

(n=4 mice). **(F)** Representative IFNγ ELISpot images of assay peformed with CD8+ T cells from

the spleen of CIT6-bearing mice cultured with 160ug/ml of Ttll4 peptide VPPSSLLPL (top row)

and negative control (no peptide, bottom row). **(G)** Quantification of average IFNγ ELISpot spot

counts for CD8+ T cells from the spleen of CIT6-bearing mice cultured with different

concentrations of Ttll4 peptide VPPSSLLPL. Each colored line represents data points from a

different mouse (n=4 mice). **(H)** Schematic of immune checkpoint inhibitor (ICI) treatment

regimen and ELISpot analysis. **(I)** Average spot counts of ICI-treated splenocytes cultured with

80ug/ml of Ttll4 peptide vs negative control. Each line represents data points from a different

mouse (n=6 mice). Statistical analysis in panels E, G, and I was done by paired t-test. * $p < 0.05$,

** $p < 0.01$. Error bars in panels E and G represent mean and standard deviation.

Supplemental Figure 1

A

B

Regulatory T cells (%CD4)

589 **Supp. Fig 1. Flow cytometry gating strategy and regulatory T cell infiltration in CIT tumors.**

590 **(A**) Flow cytometric gating strategy of main immune cell types. Immune analysis of a CIT6

591 tumor is shown as representative data. **(B)** Abundance of Foxp3+CD25+ regulatory T cells

592 (Tregs) as percentage of CD4+ T cells in CIT18, CIT6 and CIT9 tumors (n=9-10 mice per group).

593 Statistical analysis by One-way ANOVA with Tukey post-hoc test.

Supplemental Figure 2

Supp. Fig. 2. Tumor-infiltrating T cell effector activity after treatment with combined anti-PD-

1 and anti-CTLA-4 immune checkpoint inhibitor (ICI) therapy.

(A) Total T cell, CD4+ T cell, and CD8+ T cell infiltration of CIT18, CIT6 and CIT9 as percentage of

all live cells, including tumor and stromal cells, for control-treated ("Ctrl") or ICI-treated ("Tx")

tumors. **(B)** Abundance of effector subsets of CD4+ T cells defined by the combinatorial

expressions of CD44 and CD62L in CIT18, CIT6 and CIT9. **(C)** Infiltration of CD44+CD62L-

"effector-like" CD8+ T cells and CD44+CD62L+ "central memory-like" CD8+ T cells as percentage

of all CD45+ immune cells. **(D)** Abundance of CD8+ PD-1+ T cells expressing specific

combinations of TIGIT and Tim3 exhaustion markers in CIT18, CIT6 and CIT9 tumors. All

statistical analyses performed with Welch's t-test, n=7-13 mice per group. * $p < 0.05$, ** $p <$

0.01, *** $p < 0.001$, **** $p < 0.0001$.

Supplemental Figure 3

A

B

Supp. Fig. 3. CIT6 ELISpot analysis of unfractionated splenocytes and CD4+ splenocytes.

(A) Spot counts from ELISpot assays performed with CD4+ T cells isolated from the spleens of

CIT6-bearing mice and cultured with splenocytes from tumor-naïve mice loaded with increasing

concentrations of Brinp3 and Ttll4 peptides. Each colored line represents data points from a

different mouse (n=4 mice). **(B)** Spot counts from ELISpot assays performed with total

splenocytes from CIT6-bearing mice cultured with increasing concentrations of Brinp3 and Ttll4

peptides. Each colored line represents data points from a different mouse (n=10-11 mice). All

statistical analyses performed with paired t-test. * $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.001$. Error bars represent

mean and standard deviation.

	Supp. Table 1: Mutations per CIT Cell Line		
Cell Line	Total Mutations	Total Mutations per MB	Non-Synonymous Mutations
CIT18	503	14.92	170
CIT16	259	7.76	86
CIT6	703	20.95	256
CIT17	258	7.74	74
CIT19	179	5.36	56
CIT20	324	9.66	113
CIT21	309	9.32	111
CIT22	264	7.91	94
CIT23	468	14.13	176
CIT24	174	5.22	46
CIT9	252	7.58	102

620   **Supp. Table 1: Number of total and non-synonymous mutations per CIT cell line.** Number of

621   total mutations, mutations per megabase, and non-synonymous mutations based on exome

622   sequencing of CIT cell lines.

Supp. Table 2: List of Filtered Peptide Candidates for CIT6 Antigens

Gene	Amino Acid Change	Peptide	Allele	Percentile Rank
Slc39a10	S286I	LPEHIGHEL	Dq	0.0225
Ttll4	Q454L	VPPSSLLPL	Dq	0.1367
Brinp3	T436P	CPAFLPCTV	Dq	0.2119
Cep76	P158A	VPCACEADF	Dq	0.4240
Atp9a	I216F	EPNIDFHNF	Dq	0.4662
Fam83f	Q4L	VPALPTESL	Dq	0.1392
Emc1	H307L	SHYALLHYL	Dq	0.2106
Cnot10	A543P	VPLALGDNL	Dq	0.0063
Fam13b	D766H	QEKLARHL	Kq	0.1266
Setbp1	N1160Y	HDYLSGLF	Kq	0.2688
Pcdh18	M631I	NEENIFII	Kq	0.1341
Cpt1c	Q29H	HEIYLCAL	Kq	0.3203
Trip4	Q423L	HQHQLRIL	Kq	0.3234

625   **Supp. Table 2: List of filtered peptide candidates for CIT6 neoantigens.** List of all neoantigen

626   peptide candidates that met the criteria specified in Fig. 4A. Percentile ranked based on

627   NetH2pan algorithm.

Supp. Table 3: List of Antibodies and Conjugated Fluorophores used for Flow Cytometry Analysis

Target	Fluorophore	Clone	Dilution	Manufacturer	Catalog #
B220	BUV661	RA3-6B2	1:200	BD Biosciences	612972
CD11b	BV711	M1/70	1:100	BioLegend	101242
CD11c	BV605	N418	1:100	BioLegend	117334
CD16/CD32 (FcR Block)	N/A	2.4G2	1:167	Tonbo	70-0161-U500
CD3e	BUV395	145-2C11	1:62.5	BD Biosciences	563565
CD4	BUV563	GK1.5	1:200	BD Biosciences	612923
CD44	BV785	1M7	1:200	BioLegend	103059
CD45	AlexaFluor700	30-F11	1:400	BioLegend	103128
CD62L	FITC	MEL-14	1:200	Invitrogen	11-0621-81
CD8a	BV570	53-6.7	1:200	BioLegend	100739
CD8a	BV785	53-6.7	1:200	BioLegend	100750
F4/80	APC	BM8	1:100	BioLegend	123116
FoxP3	PE-Cy7	FJK-16s	1:50	eBioscience	25-5773-82
Live/Dead	NIR	N/A	1:1000	Invitrogen	L34976A
Ly6C	BV650	HK1.4	1:200	BioLegend	128049
Ly6G	PE-CF594	1A8	1:200	BD Biosciences	562700
MHCII	PE-Cy7	M5/114.15.2	1:400	BioLegend	107630
PD-1	BV605	29F.1A12	1:100	BD Biosciences	135220
TIGIT	BV421	1G9	1:100	BioLegend	142111
Tim3	APC	RMT3-23	1:100	BioLegend	119705

630 **Supp. Table 3: List of antibodies used for flow cytometry analysis.** All antibodies, clone

631 number, and conjugated fluorophores for antibodies used for flow cytometry.

633