In vivo generation of chimeric antigen receptor T cells using optimally
retargeted and functionalized lentiviral vectors with reduced immune
clearance

Kepler S. Mears[1,2,†], Kyrellos Ibrahim[1,2,†], Peter M. Allen[1,2,†], Jordan M. Chinai[1,2,3,‡], Omar I. Avila.

[1,2,‡], Audrey J. Muscato[1,2,‡], Sarah K. Lane-Reticker[1,2], Alexander Rojas[1,2], Nelson H.

Knudsen[1,2], Chun-Cheih Chao[1,2] , Kathleen B. Yates[1,2,#,*], Robert T. Manguso[1,2,#,*]

[1]Broad Institute of Massachusetts Institute of Technology and Harvard, Cambridge, MA, USA.
[2]Krantz Family Center for Cancer Research and Department of Medicine, Massachusetts
General Hospital, Boston, MA, USA.
[3]Dana-Farber Cancer Institute, Gastrointestinal Cancer Center, Boston, MA, USA.
† These authors contributed equally

‡ These authors contributed equally
# These authors jointly supervised this work
* To whom correspondence should be addressed: yates@broadistitute.org,
rmanguso@broadinstitute.org

Abstract

Despite striking efficacy against hematologic malignancies, the cost and complexity of
CAR T manufacturing present significant barriers to broader patient access. Beyond
manufacturing challenges, *ex vivo* expansion of T cells may be detrimental for their function and
persistence. Thus, delivery of CARs to reprogram host cells *in vivo* would represent a significant
advance toward "off-the-shelf" therapy but has been limited by low efficiency, low specificity, and
immunogenicity of viral vectors. Here we describe the design of pseudotyped lentiviral vectors
(LV) with superior functionality and high target specificity. We show that LV pseudotyped with
chimeric envelope glycoproteins from dolphin morbillivirus (DMV) can be engineered to selectively
infect human T cells and evade neutralizing antibody responses in measles-vaccinated human
serum. We further demonstrate that camelid-derived nanobodies are a superior retargeting
domain, overcoming limitations inherent to the use of single chain variable fragment antibodies.
Using a chimeric DMV-pseudotyped virus targeting the CD7 receptor, we demonstrate efficient
and highly specific infection of T cells both *in vitro* and *in vivo*, generating functional CAR T cells
and inducing therapeutic efficacy in a preclinical B cell lymphoma model.

Introduction

Efficient and selective genetic reprogramming of host cells *in vivo* is a major goal for cell and gene therapy. Replication-incompetent lentiviral-like particles (LVs) have been extensively developed for genetic and protein delivery applications for both research and therapeutic applications[1–3]. LVs are enveloped vectors and will incorporate any transmembrane proteins from the producer cell on their surface. The tropism of LVs can be modified through pseudotyping: heterologously expressing different viral-derived and engineered proteins that are incorporated into the envelope during production[4–7]. Pseudotyping most commonly employs the vesicular stomatitis virus glycoprotein (VSV-G), which binds to the widely expressed low-density lipoprotein receptor (LDLR), providing broad tropism for many cell types and mammalian species. VSV-G pseudotyped LVs are currently used to generate chimeric antigen receptor (CAR) T cells *ex vivo* to treat hematological cancers. However, VSV-G provides minimal cell type selectivity and has been difficult to engineer for specificity, limiting its *in vivo* utility[8,9].

Specific retargeting of LVs can be achieved through direct engineering of the pseudotype by the addition of a cell-selective targeting domain and has been successfully deployed to selectively transduce lymphocyte subsets[7,8,10–14]. The Measles Virus (MeV) envelope proteins have been demonstrated to be particularly amenable for retargeting LVs to a broad array of targets[15–17]. Measles, and all other paramyxoviruses, utilize a tetrameric hemagglutinin (H) protein for target receptor recognition and a separate trimeric fusion (F) protein to mediate membrane fusion[18,19] (**Figure 1A**). Receptor recognition by the H protein triggers fusion to the target cell membrane through the F protein, a mechanism that bypasses the need for endocytosis of the viral particle that is a requirement for many viral Envs. By fusing a targeting domain to the H protein, the receptor preference can be altered. Residues in MeV-H can be further mutated to abolish binding to its natural receptors (SLAMF1 and NECTIN4), preventing aberrant transduction on non-target cells. The MeV Env has been demonstrated to provide highly selective targeting to many targets including those that are not endocytosed[8,20,21]. Single chain variable fragments (scFvs) derived from antibodies, DARPins, and cytokines have all been successfully implemented as targeting domains (**Figure 1A, middle**)[9,12,22–24]. Fusion of MeV-H to scFvs and DARPins targeting human CD8 or CD4 have been used to transduce T cells *in vitro,* and to generate functional CAR T cells to treat B cell lymphomas in humanized mouse models[10,11].

Engineered MeV pseudotypes for *in vivo* CAR T therapy have been limited by several significant hurdles. First, fusion of scFvs to MeV-H can lead to intermolecular VH-VL pairing and reduced stability, resulting in poor functional titer and requiring screening of several scFv sequences to identify effective targeting domains[25]. Second, patients vaccinated against measles have neutralizing antibodies directed towards MeV-H and MeV-F[26,27]. Here we describe two technical advances to address these challenges: First, we find nanobodies (VHHs) are more successful targeting domains for MeV-H fusions and mediate efficient viral entry. Second, we demonstrate that the ectodomains from the H proteins of related morbilliviruses can be used to create chimeric Env proteins that maintain fusogenic ability, while avoiding humoral immunity, and can be successfully retargeted with VHH to pseudotype LVs. We show that retargeted LVs pseudotyped with a chimeric measles virus/Dolphin Morbillivirus (DMV) Env displaying a anti-hCD7 VHH can evade anti-MeV-H neutralizing antibodies and selectively transduce human T cells *in vitro* and *in vivo* to create CAR T cells. The described methods are an advance towards the generation of efficient and specific off-the-shelf CAR T therapies.

Results

Camelid-derived nanobodies are superior targeting domains for measles-virus pseudotyped lentiviral transduction

With the goal of creating targeted LVs for CAR T therapy, we initially designed MeV-H-scFv fusions targeting lineage-defining cell markers for T cells and other immune cells for proof of concept *in vivo* experiments. We obtained commercially available hybridomas with specificity for T cell lineage receptors (CD4, CD8a and Thy1) and sequenced the immunoglobulin complementarity determining region (CDR) sequences to create scFvs (**Extended Data Table 1**)[28]. scFvs were cloned into expression vectors such that the scFv sequence was fused to the extracellular domain of wild-type MeV-H (**Figure 1A, left**). We generated LVs with a GFP transgene pseudotyped with VSV-G or retargeted MeV-H-scFv fusions and evaluated transduction in unmodified, receptor-negative murine MC38 colon cancer cells, or MC38 cells engineered to overexpress target matched receptors (Thy1.2, CD4, or CD8a). As a positive control for re-targeting, we generated LV pseudotyped with a human CD105-targeted MeV envelope previously described (MeV-H-αhCD105^{scFv}), with a corresponding hCD105 overexpressing MC38 cell line[17]. MeV does not bind mouse NECT4 or Slamf1 naturally, so we did not receptor-inactivate MeV-H enabling us to utilize MC38 cells overexpressing human NECT4 as a positive control. WT MeV pseudotyped LV provided moderate transduction of MC38 cells expressing the native receptor NECTIN4 (**Extended Data Figure 1A**).

All LVs pseudotyped with in-house MeV-H-scFvs demonstrated minimal or no transduction of cognate receptor expressing MC38 cells expressing, while the published MeV-H-hCD105^{scFv} did result in some measurable transduction (**Extended Data Figure 1A**). Most MeV-H-scFvs were able to transduce the native NECTIN4 indicating the engineered envelopes were still fusion competent. We concentrated LVs pseudotyped with our best performing MeV-H-αmThy1.2A^{scFv} which provided a slight increase in transduction of mThy1.2 MC38 cells (**Extended Data Figure 1B**). As overexpression cell lines do not strictly recapitulate the native protein, we attempted transduction of primary mouse splenocytes with endogenous Thy1.2 expression with lentivirus pseudotyped with the MeV-H-αmThy1.2A^{scFv} and did observe specific transduction (**Extended Data Figure 1C**), however the signal was unstable over the subsequent days. Our results suggest that improper receptor expression, and function of the retargeted envelope, do not explain the low transduction rates we observed using MeV-H-scFv retargeted lentivirus.

We hypothesized the poor transduction efficiencies could be due to low surface expression of the MeV-H-scFv in the HEK293T packaging cells as LV pseudotyping relies on abundant surface expression of viral glycoproteins on the packaging cell line for incorporation into virus particles. We transfected HEK293T cells with HA-tagged MeV-H-scFv expression vectors targeting CD4, Thy1, and CD8a, and compared cell surface expression of the fusions to surface expression of WT MeV-H (**Figure 1B**). Surface expression of MeV-H-scFv fusions was consistently lower than MeV-H alone or the previously reported MeV-H-αhCD105^{scFv} (**Figure 1C, Extended Data Figure 2A**)[17]. Moreover, the level of surface expression across HA-tagged MeV-H fusions correlated with transduction rates of hNECT4 MC38 cells (**Extended Data Figure 2B**), suggesting that viral retargeting was impeded by poor surface expression of the engineered envelope proteins.

scFvs are prone to aggregation due to the hydrophobic domains of VH and VL which
facilitate their association in natural antibody tertiary structure[29]. However, in the context of an
scFv, these regions can facilitate self-aggregation and mispairing[30]. To address whether inherent
stability of scFvs impacted surface expression we purified His-tagged soluble scFvs from HEK293
cells. We observed scFvs that exhibited higher functional titer and/or surface expression also
produced higher yields by SDS-PAGE gels (**Extended Data Figure 2C**), suggesting that intrinsic
properties associated with scFv expression and/or stability may impact their potential as targeting
domains. However, while the Thy1.2A^{scFv} produced purified yields comparable to hCD105^{scFv}, the
MeV-H-αThy1.2A^{scFv} fusion exhibited low surface expression and functional titer compared to
MeV-H-αhCD105^{scFv}, indicating additional factors contribute to impaired MeV-H-scFv expression.
All purified 6His-tagged scFvs bound their cognate targets on engineered MC38s
overexpressing cells *in vitro* (**Extended Data Figure 2D**), leading us to conclude the fusion of the
scFv to MeV-H was the driver of low transduction rather than the binding ability of an scFv. To
determine whether this phenomenon was generalizable, we evaluated a wider selection of scFvs
targeting immune lineage markers including CD45, Thy1, CD4, CD8a, and CD8b and compared
surface expression to WT MeV-H (**Figure 1C**, grey bars; **Extended Data Table 1**). Across all
scFv sequences tested, we were unable to obtain surface expression comparable to WT MeV-H
or the hCD105 scFv fusion (**Figure 1B**, left column; **Figure 1C**, gray bars). Since MeV-H
assembles into tetrameric complexes (**Figure 1A**)[18] and the hydrophobic regions of the heavy
and light antibody chains within scFvs are prone to aggregation, we hypothesized that the close
proximity of multiple scFvs was enhancing aggregation and reducing surface expression
(**Extended Data Figure 2E**)[30,31]. As it has been reported that the success of retargeted LVs is
highly dependent on the scFv used[25], we sought alternative targeting domains.
Camelid-derived single-domain antibodies (nanobodies or VHHs) are smaller and more
soluble than scFvs as they lack a light chain and consequently also lack the hydrophobic domains
required for heavy and light chain assembly in human and murine antibodies (**Figure 1D**). We
identified published VHHs targeting murine and human immune lineage markers (**Extended Data
Table 1**) and cloned a subset into HA-tagged MeV-H expression vectors, then evaluated their
surface expression in 293T producer cells. We found much higher surface expression of MeV-H-
VHH on the producer cell surface compared to MeV-H-scFvs, at levels comparable to wild-type
MeV-H for almost all VHH clones surveyed (**Figure 1B**, right column; **Figure 1C**, orange bars;
Extended Data Figure 2F). LVs pseudotyped with MeV-H-VHH fusions targeting murine MHC
class II or CD45 were generated and applied *in vitro* to activated mouse splenocytes. When
compared to transduction using VSV-G-pseudotyped LV, the MeV-H-VHH constructs drove
comparable or improved transduction efficiencies with increased target cell selectivity (**Figure
1E).** We then generated similar LVs targeting human CD4, CD8a, or CD7, and applied them to
activated human PBMCs which resulted in similar high selectivity when compared to VSV-G,
however less efficient transduction. These data suggest that VHH retargeting domains showed
improved surface expression and functional titer over scFvs for MeV-H pseudotyped LV.
Recently, several methods of LV targeting have exploited a receptor blind vesicular
stomatitis virus glycoprotein (VSV-G) that maintains fusogenic function, referred to as dead VSV-
G (dVSV-G) for retargeting. When dVSV-G is expressed in combination with a separate surface
protein for receptor targeting, specific delivery can be achieved [32–35]. To benchmark our method
to these approaches, we compared transduction of activated primary human T cells with LV

pseudotyped with MeV-H-VHH targeting CD7 or LV pseudotyped with dVSV-G and the
costimulatory pair of a membrane-bound scFv targeting CD3 and human CD80, and observed
similar efficiencies (**Figure 1F**)[33].

However, the use of dVSV-G may suffer from a decrease in specificity due to the
requirement of low pH via endocytosis to trigger membrane fusion[36], as non-specific interactions
can result in endocytosis. Viral targeting using pH dependent Env has been reported to promote
such off-target activity[37]. An endocytosis requirement also limits the potential receptors used for
targeting. *In vitro* transduction of MC38 cells with LVs pseudotyped with dVSV-G demonstrated
that dead VSV-G still drove detectable transduction activity (**Extended Data Figure 3A-B**),
suggesting that targeted delivery strategies relying on dVSV-G pseudotyping maintain a risk of
off-target transduction. For *in vivo* therapeutic applications, the MeV-H method represents a
superior method for true selectivity and VHH a superior targeting domain [8,38].

Alternative morbillivirus envelope pseudotyping enables evasion of measles-directed antibodies

Broad measles vaccination rates represent a significant potential obstacle to LV
retargeting with MeV-H-VHH pseudotyping, as antibodies directed against MeV envelope proteins
can neutralize infection, including transduction of MeV pseudotyped LVs [39–41]. We collected sera
from a cohort of 21 patients, aged 12 to 75 (median age of 52), that had balanced representation
of males and females (**Extended Data Table 2**) and quantified the measles-specific IgG titers of
donor samples by ELISA. As expected, the majority were seropositive aside from a single donor,
confirming the broad presence of measles targeted antibodies (**Figure 2A**). A subset of donors
representing high, medium and low titer was selected for further analysis (**Figure 2A**, colored
bars). We developed a serum binding assay to measure serum immunoglobulin (IgG) binding to
HEK293T cells expressing HA-tagged MeV-H and -F envelope proteins. HEK293T cells
expressing HA-tagged MeV-H or MeV-F were incubated with heat-denatured patient serum
before staining with anti-HA and anti-IgG antibodies and analyzing by flow cytometry (**Figure 2B**).
Unsurprisingly serum-derived measles-directed antibodies bound surface-expressed MeV
envelope glycoproteins in a serum dose- and anti-measles antibody titer- dependent manner
(**Figure 2C**), potentially inhibiting the function of the envelope proteins.

The mechanism for receptor recognition and envelope fusion is conserved among all
morbilliviruses (MoV) and the greater paramyxovirus family[20]. However the surface glycoproteins
have low overall sequence similarity, particularly in their extracellular domains, while still
maintaining structural homology from AlphaFold3 predictions (**Figure 2D, Extended Data Figure
4A-B**)[20,42]. Measles-neutralizing antibodies primarily target the extracellular domains of H and F
proteins, as such we hypothesized that alternative MoV glycoproteins could be similarly
engineered for re-targeting but evade neutralization from preexisting immunity against MeV[43–45],
as has been accomplished with Nipah Virus for LVs[46] and CDV for oncolytic virus therapy[27], and
modified for MeV [41]. We expressed HA-tagged retargeted hemagglutinin proteins from several
morbillivirus species and evaluated surface expression on HEK293T cells compared to a well-
expressed MeV-H-αmMHCII[VHH]. Each retargeted MoV-H fusion protein was successfully
expressed on the surface of HEK293T producer cells at levels comparable to MeV-H, except for
Phocine mobillivirus (PDV)-H (**Figure 2E, Extended Data Figure 4C**). We attempted to measure
wild-type unmodified PDV-H surface expression but were unable to detect any in HEK293T cells

(data not shown). In a serum binding assay we observed higher binding of measles-directed
antibodies to H proteins of Rinderpest (RPV) and Small ruminant virus (RMV), and reduced
binding to the less homologous Canine distemper virus (CDV)- and Dolphin morbillivirus (DMV)-
H proteins (**Figure 2F**). As prior work has demonstrated that measles neutralizing antibodies
primarily target MeV-H[43–45], we focused our efforts on optimizing CDV and DMV glycoproteins for
further engineering and in vivo CAR delivery.
DMV-F exhibited high levels of surface expression on HEK293T cells while CDV-F was
barely detectable (**Figure 2E**, right). Given the large reduction in anti-measles antibody binding
to CDV-H, we attempted to optimize CDV-F expression. We replaced the unusually long signal
peptide of CDV-F with shorter alternative signal peptides[47,48] and tested previously reported
truncations[49], but were unable to drive higher CDV-F expression (**Extended Data Figure 5A**).
DMV-H also exhibited resistance to measles-directed antibody binding and both DMV-H and
DMV-F were well expressed in HEK293T, thus we opted to focus on DMV for LV pseudotyping
and VHH retargeting. Previous studies found that functional pseudotyping of LVs with MoV
required truncation of the cytoplasmic tail of MoV-F[15,50]. We designed DMV-H fused to a VHH
targeting mouse MHC-II and co-expressed the construct with full-length or truncated DMV-F to
generate LV and compare transduction of target cells to MeV-H-VHH. While we detected low
transduction of MHCII+ A20 leukemia cells with DMV-pseudotyped LV, the functional titer was
much lower than that of MeV pseudotypes and further engineering would be required to enhance
transduction efficiency (**Figure 2G, Extended Data Figure 5B**).

Chimerized DMV/MeV glycoproteins improve functional titer while maintaining immune evasion

The structural similarities between MoV glycoproteins have been leveraged to create
functionally chimeric H hybrid proteins swapping the domains between MoV[51]. MoV-H proteins
play a role in triggering membrane fusion through interactions with MoV-F, In addition to receptor
recognition. Regions in the globular head (aa244-250) and in the stalk (aa84-105) of MeV-H have
been shown to interact with MeV-F[52]. Functional hybrids of MeV/CDV glycoproteins have been
created that preserve the key interactions between species-matched H and F domains have been
successfully pseudotyped, in addition to resisting neutralization by measles-immune serum[51]. We
hypothesized a similar strategy could produce chimeric proteins that preserve the functional MeV-
H core while decreasing immune recognition with the ectodomains of DMV or CDV (**Figure 3A**).
Chimeric MeV/DMV-H and MeV/CDV-H were generated with the HA tagged αMHCII[VHH] and were
well expressed on the surface of producer cells (**Extended Data Figure 6A)**. Furthermore, both
H protein chimeras produced affected pseudotyped LVs with MeV-F, that demonstrated
comparable if not superior functional titer when applied to A20 cells (**Figure 3B**).
Neutralizing responses to measles are predominantly directed toward MeV-H with some
reports suggesting MeV-F is also targeted[44,45]. We detected some serum antibody binding to most
MoV-Fs with the functional titer of wild-type DMV-pseudotyped lentivirus being too low to
accurately test neutralization (**Figure 2G**). We reasoned that by generating chimeric DMV/MeV-
F proteins, we could further reduce potential neutralization while maintaining high viral titers
(**Figure 3C**). MoV-F proteins are type I transmembrane proteins so to replace the ectodomain
requires substitution of the N terminus and signal peptide. We designed and confirmed surface
expression of several chimeras DMV and MeV Fusion constructs with increasing contributions of

DMV-derived ectodomain (**Figure 3D**). We generated LVs pseudotyped with each chimera
construct paired with MeV/DMV-H-αMHCII[VHH] or MeV-H-αMHCII[VHH] and assessed transduction
of A20 cells. Only the DMV[311]/MeV-F construct exhibited comparable transduction efficiency of
target cells compared to MeV-pseudotyped LV, confirming the chimeric proteins retained critical
interactions and fusogenic capacity (**Figure 3E**). Parallel attempts to functionalize chimeric
CDV/MeV-F, including the signal peptide modifications and additional rational engineering
strategies, failed to generate well-expressed or functional CDV/MeV-F chimeras (**Extended Data**
Figure 6B-C).
The MeV-DMV-H chimera had a large reduction in serum binding while theDMV[311]/MeV-
F demonstrated no change (**Figure 3F**). However not all antibody responses are neutralizing, so
we performed serum neutralization assays (as previously described) with the MeV/DMV-H-
αMHCII[VHH];DMV[311]/MeV-F-pseudotyped LVs applied to A20 cells and compared to VSV-G-LVs
and MeV-αMHCII[VHH]-LVs (**Figure 3G**). Across serum three donors we observed a significant
increase in average transduction of the dual-chimeric approach compared to MeV-αMHCII[VHH]-LV,
and rates comparable to the VSV-G-LV condition (**Figure 3H)**. Despite reported low levels of
VSV-G-specific antibodies in humans[53], we observed a dose-dependent decrease in transduction
with the VSV-G-LV, suggesting non-specific factors in human serum limit *in vitro* transduction[54]
(**Figure 3H**, black). Collectively, this data demonstrates chimerization successfully evaded
measles-specific antibody neutralization. With a successful fully chimeric immune resistance and
selective re-targeted pseudotyping strategy in hand, we set out to evaluate feasibility of *in vivo*
targeting for CAR T generation using this approach.

Retargeted LV enables CAR T generation and killing in mixed *in vitro* cultures

In vivo CAR T cell generation poses a challenge as resting T cells are extremely resistant
to lentiviral transduction[55–57]. During conventional *ex vivo* CAR T cell manufacturing, T cells are
activated and expanded *in vitro*, which increases expression of LDLR, the receptor for VSV-G,
increasing the transducability of the cells[58,59]. T cell activation also induces effector differentiation
and increases cytotoxic functions, enhancing the therapeutic potential of the CAR T cells when
reintroduced to the patient[60]. Activation of T cells in both research and clinical contexts is typically
accomplished with reagents derived from antibodies targeting CD3 and CD28 to deliver TCR
stimulation and costimulation, respectively, as well as supplemental cytokines[61]. For *in vivo*
generation of CAR T we set out to incorporate co-activation signals to drive T cell activation and
expansion in our re-targeted LVs. We engineered producer HEK293T cells to express both a
membrane-tethered scFv targeting CD3 (αCD3) and human CD80, the natural ligand for the T
cell costimulatory receptor CD28. These cell surface molecules would then be incorporated into
virions, as has been previously described, and activate target T cells[33]. As CD19 CAR T products
composed of mixed CD8+ and CD4+ cells are associated with superior and more durable
responses[38,62], we elected to use a pan T cell targeting construct MeV/DMV-H-αCD7[VHH] for CAR
delivery and included a GFP reporter.
We first tested the activation of primary T cells co-cultured with unmodified or αCD3/CD80
HEK293T cells in vitro, and observed significant upregulation of T cell activation markers CD25
and CD69 in the αCD3/CD80 condition (**Extended Data Figure 7**). We generated CAR-GFP LV
in unmodified HEK293T or αCD3/CD80 HEK293T cell lines, with either VSV-G and MeV/DMV-H-
αCD7[VHH] pseudotypes and tested their transduction and activation of primary T cells *in vitro*

(**Figure 4A**). We tested both unstimulated human primary T cells and pre-stimmulated T cells
using standard αCD3/αCD28 bead-based activation, and measured activation by expression of
CD69 and transduction by GFP fluorescence. As expected, T cells preactivated with beads
showed high levels of activation markers and GFP expression regardless of packaging cell line
and pseudotype, though LV carrying αCD3/CD80 drove further increases in activation and GFP+
cells (**Figure 4B**, top). Transduction of non-activated T cells with αCD3/CD80 HEK293 produced
LVs induced a marked increase in CD69 and GFP expression compared to standard HEK293
(**Figure 4B**, bottom). These data support that LVs enhanced with αCD3/CD80 can successfully
drive activation of target T cells and enhance transduction efficiency.
To confirm that αCD3/CD80 enhancement did not impact the specificity of the chimeric
retargeting approach we used MeV/DMV-H-αCD7^{VHH} LVs to transduce a mixed population of
wildtype (CD7+) and CRISPR knock out (CD7-) Jurkat T cells. MeV/DMV-H-αCD7^{VHH} LV only
transduced CD7+ cells, with minimal GFP signal detected in Jurkats lacking expression of CD7
while VSV-G-LVs transduced both populations equally (**Figure 4C**). In an *in vitro* co-culture assay
we mixed unstimulated human primary T cells with CD19+ NALM6 B cell lymphoma cells at
varying effector to target ratios (**Figure 4D**), then we added αCD3/CD80 enhanced LVs
pseudotyped with VSV-G or MeV/DMV-H-αCD7^{VHH} and monitored T cell activation, CAR+, and
tumor killing by flow cytometry. By Day 3 a significant proportion of the CD19+ NALM6 cancer
cells were CAR+ in the VSV-G-LV condition, while the MeV/DMV-H-αCD7^{VHH} LV only transduced
T cells (**Figure 4E**). This effect grew more pronounced by day 6, which was also marked by a
relative expansion of CAR+ T cells and a reduction in total NALM6 cancer cells in the MeV/DMV-
H-αCD7^{VHH} condition (**Figure 4E**). Indeed, as the ratio of effector to target cells increased in
MeV/DMV-H-αCD7^{VHH} wells, we observed a significant reduction in total recovered NALM6 cells
at the earlier time point, and all conditions eliminated target CD19+ cells by day 6 (**Figure 4F**). In
the VSV-G-LV condition by contrast only CAR+ cancer cells were detected in co-culture, and we
were unable to detect CAR T generation or cancer-directed cytotoxicity. Surface enhanced and
retargeted LV can specifically and successfully generate CAR T cells in a heterogeneous context
without the need for additional T cell stimulation.

In Vivo administration of retargeted LV generates effective CAR T response

With successful *in vitro* experiments we moved on to *in vivo* models using an LV composed
of MeV/DMV-H-αCD7^{VHH}, DMV^{311}/MeV-F, and αCD3/CD80, now referred to as Targeted and
Stimulatory Engineered Lentivirus (TaSEL) (**Figure 4A**, bottom right). We used a xenograft
mouse model to evaluate the capacity of TaSEL vectors to generate human CAR T cells *in vivo*
and compared anti-tumor efficacy to conventional *ex vivo* generated CAR T cells. Luciferase-
expressing NAML6 B cell leukemia cells were injected into immunodeficient NOD.Cg-
Prkdc^{scid}Il2rg^{tm1Wjl}/SzJ (NSG) mice at day -8 to establish B-ALL tumors. On day -1, a subset of
mice then received intravenous (i.v.) injections of human T cells, of which one cohort also received
a single injection of TaSEL delivering αCD19 CAR-GFP and the other received no virus. As a
control for the expected efficacy of CAR T cell therapy in this model, we included a group of tumor-
bearing mice treated with a dose of conventional αCD19 CAR-GFP T cells made ex vivo (**Figure
5A)**. Throughout the experiment, mice were imaged twice weekly to monitor tumor burden, and
peripheral blood was collected weekly via submandibular bleeds to assess CAR T production.

At day 6 post injection the transferred human T cells had engrafted into mice and TaSEL
had successfully transduced target T cells to generate CAR+ T cells *in vivo* at frequencies
comparable to that of conventional CAR T cell transfer (**Figure 5B**). Additionally, no GFP
fluorescence was detected in off-target cell populations by flow, indicating highly selective
transduction by TaSEL (**Figure 5C).** To understand the functionality of the CAR T response, we
also monitored tumor burden with non-invasive luciferase imaging over time and observed that
untreated animals (NALM6 only, T cells only) rapidly succumbed to disease (**Figure 5D-E**). Mice
that had received conventional CAR T cells showed modest control and slowing of tumor growth,
although none survived beyond 30 days. In the cohort of mice that received T cells and a single
dose of TaSEL, two of three mice showed striking and prolonged control of tumor growth and
survived long enough that they began showing signs of xenographic graft-versus-host disease (x-
GVHD), a common limiting factor in humanized mouse models (**Figure 5D-E**).
We analyzed tissue collected in sacrificed animals for evidence of on- and off-target
infection events. Flow cytometry of bone marrow and spleen cells revealed comparable engrafted
GFP+ CAR T cell frequencies at endpoint in animals that received either conventional CAR T or
in vivo administration of TaSEL (**Figure 5F**). Analysis of non-T cell populations (CD3-) in collected
blood at endpoint failed to detect off-target transduction in TaSEL-treated mice (**Extended Data
Table 3**). CAR-GFP signal was also undetected in off-target cells in the bone marrow or spleen,
corroborating our earlier findings in peripheral blood (**Figure 5F**). To further interrogate off-target
effects we performed multiplexed immunofluorescence analysis of liver tissue sections to
determine whether LV-delivered GFP could be detected in cells other than T cells (αCD3) or
Kupffer cells/macrophages (αF4/80), which are known to sequester lentiviral particles in the
liver[63,64](**Figure 5G, Extended Data Figure 8**). The GFP+(CAR+) cells identified in these sections
were over 99.7% CD3-positive. Across multiple broad tissue sections, no GFP-positive
hepatocytes were observed. Rare off-target (CD3-negative) GFP-positive cells were identified at
a frequency less than 1/6,700th of that observed within the CD3-positive T cell compartment.
These events occurred at such a low frequency that we cannot exclude them as being attributed
to fluorescent staining artifacts which are prone to occur in large-tissue multiplex
immunofluorescence studies such as this. Thus, *in vivo* delivery of TaSEL can selectively and
efficiently generate CAR T with comparable or improved anti-tumor function, relative to
conventional manufactured CAR T.

Discussion

Here we demonstrate that TaSEL is a significant advance for *in vivo* CAR T generation
that drives efficient and specific cell type transduction and evades broad vaccine-induced
immunity and neutralization. To optimize this system for the *in vivo* delivery of chimeric antigen
receptors to T cells, we made two major advances: First, we show that the use of camelid-derived
heavy chain-only (VHH) antibodies dramatically improves the function of morbillivirus envelope
glycoprotein pseudotyping as a strategy for redirecting virus specificity. Second, we generate a
chimeric envelope where the extracellular region is derived from dolphin morbillivirus (DMV),
which has low amino acid identity with measles virus and substantially evades neutralization from
anti-measles antibodies. We further functionalized the retargeted viral particles by incorporating
αCD3 and CD80 to activate T cells upon viral encounter to ensure T cells are competent for
transduction. These strategies combined enable the selective and efficient delivery of CARs to T

cells in an in vivo model, which shows efficacy that is at least comparable to conventional *ex vivo*
generated CAR T cells.

Lentivirus can be pseudotyped with viral envelope proteins from several families of
viruses[4–6,32], and receptor engineering to accomplish cell type-selective retargeting has been
demonstrated using envelope glycoproteins from several viruses including Sindbis virus envelope
[65–68] and a receptor binding mutated "blind" version of VSV-G[33–35]. However, these exhibit
mediocre specificity, likely because membrane fusion requires a pH-dependent trigger from
endocytosis[36], which can also result from nonspecific interactions with the host cells, independent
of receptor binding[37]. The technologies that have proven to be the most selective are those that
employ envelope glycoproteins from the paramyxovirus family, including Nipah virus (NiV) and
measles virus[37,46]. Paramyxovirus envelope glycoproteins are multiprotein complexes where the
receptor recognition performed the tetrametic H protein, and fusion by the trimeric F protein.
Fusion of the envelope complex is triggered by receptor recognition at the cell surface, and is
independent of pH or endocytosis[20]. This is an optimal mechanism for receptor retargeting as it
eliminates unwanted off-target transduction from the inevitable envelope-independent
endocytosis of viral particles[37].

While the envelopes of MeV and NiV are amenable to engineering both viruses are human
pathogens. Immunity to MeV is widespread in the human population due to worldwide vaccination
efforts. Neutralizing antibodies induced by vaccination have been found directed against the
envelope H protein and possibly against the F protein of measles[43,69]. While NiV infection is
currently rare and immunity in humans not widespread, NiV has a documented history of
outbreaks[70]. NiV infection is life-threatening and the World Health Organization has identified
Nipah virus as a potential cause of future epidemics and vaccine development efforts are
underway[70,71], which would preclude the use of Nipah virus envelope for therapeutic lentiviral
engineering.

In this work, we have demonstrated that chimeric envelope proteins between different
morbillivirus' can pseudotype lentiviral particles and be engineered for cell specific transduction.
These viruses are not known to infect humans so future widespread immunity against them is
unlikely. Their envelope glycoproteins share significant structural homology with measles virus
but have low amino acid identity, and thus the ability for anti-measles antibodies to neutralize
transduction via these envelopes is limited. We show here that even in donors with a high anti-
measles antibody titer, binding of s chimeric MeV/DMV pseudotyped lentivirus is reduced at least
100-fold and neutralization of transduction is equivalent to a VSV-G control. As the conserved
epitopes for anti-measles neutralizing antibody binding have been well-studied[69], future work to
alter amino acids in these key areas could even further reduce antibody binding. Thus, our method
of using dolphin morbillivirus envelope enables specific and neutralization-resistant lentiviral
pseudotyping that is not threatened by future public health efforts.

The use of camelid-derived single-domain antibodies as the targeting domain is a key
advance that enables the high efficiency we observe with TaSEL. Previous work has mainly
implemented single chain variable fragment (scFv) antibodies to redirect measles or NiV
pseudotyped lentiviral vectors. While scFvs have produced successful re-targeted LVs,
optimization is often required with testing many potential scFvs, suggesting that scFvs are
generally inefficient for re-targeting[8,25]. We hypothesize that the mechanism for inefficiency is self-
aggregation and mispairing via the hydrophobic regions that natively facilitate Vh and Vl binding[30].

The intrinsic tendency for self-aggregation of scFvs is well documented [72] and could be
exacerbated by the tetrameric H protein complex on the surface leading to poor stability[18]. We
observed universally low expression of our designed MeV-H-scFv fusion, supporting the potential
aggregation. Other binding domains such as DARPins have been used[24], although no systematic
effort has been reported and the success rate for DARPins is unclear. Furthermore DARPins are
used infrequently and require screening large display libraries, limiting potential candidates. VHHs
on the other hand are increasingly popular and as such many more binders are available. Beyond
this, the ability to immunize camelids or the recently developed nanomouse against any target of
interest makes the technology more accessible [73].

Finally, we demonstrate that our DMV-H protein retargeting system can be combined with
lentiviral surface engineering to functionalize viral particles. By engineering viral packaging cells
to overexpress an αCD3 scFv and CD80, these molecules can be incorporated into viral particles
to enable activation of T cells on contact[33]. Efficient LV transduction of T cells requires T cell
activation and proliferation, likely due to retroviral transduction generally being inefficient in non-
dividing cells and downregulation of viral restriction factors[74,75]. The majority of circulating T cells
in human blood and secondary lymphoid organs have either an effector memory (EM) or central
memory (CM) phenotype and are not activated and rapidly proliferating. The inability to efficiently
transduce these populations would severely restrict the "accessible" population of T cells in a
patient, potentially limiting the efficiency of the product. Additionally, recent evidence suggests
that CAR T cells generated from CM T cells have superior efficacy and persistence[76], thus
transducing these populations of T cells *in vivo* would be a priority for an off-the-shelf CAR T cell
product. Surface functionalization is a prime method for further engineering of LVs.

TaSEL provides a significant advantage compared to other current methods of LV re-
targeting for *in vivo* use. There are a few limitations of TaSEL, namely in production and further
immune reduction. Generally, the MoV based pseudotyping methods result in lower functional
titers than VSV-G. The low titers require a large amount of LV to be produced for *in vivo*
experiments and they are difficult to concentrate. Optimizations for production and increases in
functional titer would be beneficial to creating an off-the-shelf therapy. For reduced immune
clearance we focused on DMV for chimerization, however CDV likely provides a further
advantage. While we were unable to generate a usable CDV-F construct, the potential for a further
reduction in avoidance on neutralizing antibodies is possible. Importantly, we still demonstrate a
significant reduction *in vitro* where neutralization is easy to observe, the *in vivo* context may not
require as significant reduction to achieve measurable effects.

In summary, our TaSEL technology overcomes a series of unique challenges for *in vivo* T
cell-focused gene therapy and may represent a path forward to generate off-the-shelf T cell
therapeutics for patients. The system could be used for the delivery of any therapeutic payload
that can be packaged into a lentiviral vector and applied to any therapeutic area where engineered
T cells are currently being evaluated, including hematologic malignancy, solid tumor malignancy,
and autoimmune disease. Given the high unmet need in these therapeutic areas and the ongoing
challenges of manufacturing engineered autologous T cell products for all patients who could
benefit from them, off-the-shelf technologies such as TaSEL should be a major focus for the
biotechnology industry.

Acknowledgements

We thank Branka Horvat and the Measles Virus Biobank for the generous gift of the CL55 and Y503 antibodies, INSERM, France, Measles virus Biobank https://ciri.ens-lyon.fr/teams/IblV/measles-biobank. We thank Nathan Pirete and the Broad Institute Flow Cytometry Core for training and assistance in flow cytometry experiments and the Broad Institute vivarium staff for the assistance with mouse studies. We would like to thank Professor Fritz Melcher from the German Rheumatology Research Center Leibniz-Institute for providing the FGK4.5 hybridoma, Dr. Hasaya Akiba for providing the RMT3-23 hybridoma, and Dr. Yoji Murata for providing the MY-1 and Miap301 hybridomas.

Author information

These authors contributed equally: Kepler S. Mears, Kyrellos Ibrahim, and Peter M. Allen

These authors contributed equally: Jordan M. Chinai, Omar I. Avila and Audrey J. Muscato

Corresponding author

Correspondence to Robert T. Manguso and Kathleen B. Yates.

Ethics Declarations and competing interests

This manuscript was supported in part by funding from Calico Life Sciences, LLC. R.T.M., K.B.Y., K.S.M., K.I., and P.M.A. are authors on a patent related to the technology described in this manuscript. R.T.M. has received speaking or consulting fees from Bristol Myers Squibb, Gilead Sciences, Kumquat Biosciences, Immunai Therapeutics, and BioNTech and has equity ownership in OncoRev, LLC and Jumble Therapeutics.

Author contributions

Conceptualization, K.S.M., K.B.Y., and R.T.M.; formal analysis, K.S.M., P.M.A, K.I., J.M.C., O.I.A., A.J.M, S.K.L-R., A.R. and C.C.; investigation, K.S.M., P.M.A, K.I., J.M.C., O.I.A., A.J.M, S.K.L-R., A.R., N.H.K. and C.C.; resources, K.S.M., P.M.A, K.I., J.M.C., O.I.A., A.J.M, S.K.L-R., A.R., N.H.K. and C.C.; writing – original draft, K.S.M., P.M.A, K.I., J.M.C., K.B.Y., and R.T.M.; writing – review and editing, K.S.M., P.M.A, K.I., K.B.Y., J.M.C., and R.T.M.; visualization K.S.M., P.M.A, K.I., J.M.C.; supervision, , K.S.M., K.B.Y., and R.T.M.

Figure 1: Camelid-derived VHH are a superior targeting domain for MeV-based lentiviral particle retargeting

(A) The hemagglutinin protein of MeV governs target recognition to trigger membrane fusion by proximity;, by adding an exogenous targeting domain the envelope can be re-targeted. (B) Surface expression flow cytometry staining for the MeV-H protein with scFvs and VHHs targeting a variety of relevant murine targets compared to the WT MeV-H protein. (C) MFI ratio of MeV-H-TD vs wt MeV-H for a selection of screened scFvs and VHH. (D) Human antibodies are larger than those from camelids, which lack the light chain and consist of a single heavy domain (VHH). (E) Flow cytometry of primary activated murine splenocytes or human PBMCs transduced with traditional VSVg pseudotyped LV carrying a GFP transgene or VHH re-targeted MeV across several targets. (F) Comparison of anti hCD7 MeV-H-VHH targeted LVs (top) to dVSVG pseudotyped LV with a CD3/28 targeting moiety (bottom).

Figure 2: Pseudotyping with alternative morbillivirus glycoproteins can evade measles-directed antibodies

(A) Serum reactivity to measles from a cohort of self-reported MMR patients. A subset of low, medium and high reactivity (color bars) was selected for experiments. (B) Flow cytometry assay to determine MeV envelope binding of patient serum. Envelope expressing producer cells are incubated with patient serum, followed by staining with an anti-human IgG to determine serum Ab binding and an HA antibody to measure envelope expression. (C) Results from the assay in (B) for producer cells expressing MeV-H and MeV-F for the subset of patient samples. (D) Genetic distance for the MoV-H proteins in the morbillivirus family (top). Alignment of MoV envelopes to MeV shows low overall sequence similarity for the H protein. (E) Expression of DMV-αMHCII[VHH], CDV-αMHCII[VHH] and MeV-αMHCII[VHH] envelope proteins in HEK293 producer cells. (F) Serum antibody binding to producer cells expressing a subset of MoV-H cells that demonstrated high surface expression. (G) LVs pseudotyped with MHCII-targeted DMV-H demonstrate minimal transduction. Through truncation of the F protein a slight increase was observed but significantly less than measles.

 Figure 3: Lentivirus pseudotyped with MeV/DMV chimeric envelope proteins are not
neutralized in measles-vaccinated sera

(A) Design of chimeric Hemmagluttinin protein. Residues 1-N are MeV while N-End are DMV. (B)
Chimeric MeV/DMV-H produces infectious LVs with MeV-F comparable to that of standard MeV-
H/F LVs. (C) Design of complementary chimeric fusion proteins. As the MoV-F proteins are type
I transmembrane proteins and thus the signal peptide is that of the extravirion MoV. (D) Surface
expression of tested chimeric MeV/DMV-F proteins. (E) Transduction of chimeric MeV/DMV-F
protein LVs with Chimeric MeV/DMV-H protein (left) and standard MeV-H (right). Chimeric
MeV/DMV-H and DMV^{311}/Mev-F produce titers comparable to that of fully MeV pseudotyped LVs.
(F) Patient serum binding to chimeric envelope proteins utilizing the assay described in 2B. (G)
Flow cytometry assay to determine neutralization of viral particle infectivity. Re-targeted LV is
plated in a series of dilutions of patient donor serum. Target cells are then added, and the plate
is incubated for 48 hours before analysis by flow cytometry. (H) Quantification of neutralized
infection comparing LV pseudotyped with full MeV (MeV-H-αMHCII^{VHH} + MeV-F), chimeric
MeV/DMV (MeV/DMV-H-αMHCII^{VHH}; DMV^{311}/Mev-F), or VSV-G envelopes (n=3, patient IDs
6526, 6201, 9411).

Figure 4: Retargeted and stimulatory LV enables CAR T generation and killing in mixed
in vitro cultures

(A) Stimulatory functionalization of pseudotyped lentiviral vectors with chimeric MoV targeted
envelopes. Co-stim HEK293s have been engineered to express a surface anchored αCD3 scFv
and CD80 to enable activation of T cells. (B) Comparison of standard and co-stim functionalized
VSV-G and chimeric MeV/DMV αCD7 pseudotypes on pre-activated and unactivated human T
cells. Co-stim LVs successfully activate unactivated T cells as measured by CD69 expression
and result in greater transduction. (C) Specificity analysis of finalized TaSEL vectors on CD7
knock-out Jurkat cells. (D) *In vitro* CAR-T generation and cancer killing assay. Unactivated T cells
(effector) and NALM6 (target) cells are mixed at varying ratios with LVs containing a CAR-GFP
transgene. (E) Example data from (D) comparing VSVG and TaSEL pseudotypes. (F)
Quantification at day 3 and 6 post mix of D with VSV-G and TaSEL pseudotypes at varying
effector to target ratios.

Figure 5: *In vivo* administration of TaSEL generates CAR T cells and controls NALM6 tumors.

(A) Experimental scheme for *in vivo* CAR T cell generation and evaluation. Cohorts of mice all
received NALM6 leukemia cells expressing luciferase. Control mice either received no T cells or
unmodified human pan T cells. Treatment mice received unmodified T cells chased by TaSEL the
following day (*In Vivo* CAR) or *ex vivo* generated CAR T cells (Conventional CAR). Analysis
consisted of luciferase imaging for tumor quantification, per. (B) CAR T cell content of peripheral
blood collected on D6 post virus injection via submandibular bleeds. X-axis is CAR+ (FITC), y-
axis is CD3+ (APC) (C) Quantification of CAR+ frequencies in target T cells (CD3+) and off-target
cells (CD3-). (D) Representative IVIS imaging at each indicated timepoint following TaSEL
administration. Mice not shown were sacrificed according to Body Condition Score guidelines and
tissues were collected and analyzed. Bioluminescence overlays represent current tumor burden
for a given mouse (E) Quantification of individual mouse tumor burden in radiance
(photons/second) over time and probability of survival for each mouse group over time. (F)
Quantification of transduction frequencies of cell types of interest in spleen and bone marrow.
CD19+ = NALM6 cells, CD3+ = T cells, CAR+ = CAR T cells. Data represents mean ± SEM (all
groups n = 3, used one-way ANOVA) (G) Multiplex immunofluorescence staining of liver sections
from mice with *In Vivo* CAR. Large tissue sections were stained, imaged, and analyzed. Cell
segmentation, and classification was performed followed by assessment of GFP staining
intensity. Breakdown of GFP-positive cells (CAR+) within each cell-type is shown. Groups were
compared with a Mann-Whitney statistical test.

Methods

Mouse experiments

Immunodeficient NOD.Cg-*Prkdc*^{scid}*Il2rg*^{tm1Wjl}/SzJ (NSG) mice were raised in-house. NALM6 cells, human pan T cells, and TaSEL were all administered via tail vein injections using a rodent restrainer. Tumor cells were prepared by 3 washes in HBSS (Gibco/ThermoFisher 14065056) as follows: pellet by centrifugation at 350×g for 5 minutes, decant supernatant, then resuspend at 5e5 - 8e5 cells/mL. Tumor cells were counted with a Countess II (ThermoFisher) and diluted to a final concentration of 5e5 cells/mL HBSS. Mice were administered 100 µL (5e4 tumor cells) via tail vein injection 8 days before TaSEL injections. Human pan T cells were similarly prepared with 500×g centrifugation. T cells were counted with a Countess II and verified by hand with a hemacytometer, then diluted to a final concentration of 2.5e7 cells/mL. Mice were administered 100 µL (2.5e6 T cells) via tail vein injection 1 day before TaSEL injections. CAR T cells were generated as described for *In vitro CAR T cell activation and killing assay* and CAR expression rates were quantified by flow cytometry. Cell preparation was adjusted to administer 2.5e6 CAR-positive T cells per 100 µL injection. Finally, 100 µL TaSEL was administered on Day 0 via tail vein injection.

Peripheral bleeds. Submandibular blood was collected by puncturing the vein slightly behind the mandible and below the ear canal with a 4mm animal lancet. Blood was collected in heparin tubes and mice were monitored for recovery. In the event a submandibular bleed could not be initiated, blood was collected from the tail vein using a lancet.

IVIS imaging. Mice were injected with D-luciferin (PerkinElmer, XenoLight) at 150ug/g body weight, prepared following manufacturer's instructions. After a 15 minute incubation, mice were anesthetized with 1% isoflurane. Mice were then transferred to a Perkin Elmer IVIS Spectrum CT and luciferase signals were obtained by bioluminescence imaging. Mice were imaged on average every 3 days during tumor challenge experiments.

Endpoint. When endpoints were reached in accordance with Body Condition Scoring, mice were sacrificed CO_2 and terminal bleeds. Blood, spleen, liver, and lung samples were collected for analysis. Single-cell suspensions of spleen were prepared by pressing the organ through 70 µm filters with the back of a 1 mL syringe. Splenocytes were isolated by filtering collected blood through a 70 µm filter, followed by lysis of erythrocytes (ACK Lysing Buffer, Gibco). Lung and liver samples were prepared as described in *Multiplex Immunofluorescence Staining, Imaging, and Analysis*.

Vector design

MoV envelope proteins were purchased as gene blocks from GenScript and expressed from a CMV promoter from plasmid pCG-HcΔ18 (addgene 84817). Lentiviral reporter transfer vectors were generated from pLX311-Cas9 (addgene 118018) with Cas9 swapped with GFP. CAR lentiviral transfer vectors were pSLCAR-CD19-BBx (addgene 135992).

Hybridomas were sequenced by GenScript to determine the VH and VL domains. Single chain variable fragments were designed by linking the VH and VL domains with a flexible linker $(G_4S)_3$ then codon optimized for human expression and gene blocks ordered from GenScript. VHH sequences were similarly codon optimized and ordered. MoV-H-scFv/VHH fusions were cloned into the pCG backbone.

606 Sequence for the co-stimulatory αCD3 (OKT3 clone)-P2A-hCD80 (UniProt sequence)
607 were purchased as a gene block from GenScript and Gateway assembled into a lentiviral
608 transgene vector pLEX-307 (addgene 41392) to be stably expressed from an EF1a promoter.
609

Lentiviral Preparations
For LVs retargeted with morbillivirus envelope proteins, LentiX-293T cells were
transfected with morbillivirus H and F envelope plasmids, packaging plasmid psPAX2 (Addgene:
12260) and transfer plasmid at a 5:3:24:32 ratio, with $2\mu g$ plasmids DNA transfected per 1e6 cell
seeded. For VSV-G LV, Lenti-X 293T cells were transfected with VSV-G envelope (pMD2.G,
Addgene:12259), psPAX2 and transfer plasmid at a ratio of 1:3:4. The media was changed 8
hours post transfection. Supernatant collected 48 hours post media change was purified by 0.45
um SFCA filter membrane. For in vitro assays, particles were concentrated 100-fold by incubation
with Lenti-X™ Concentrator (Takara Cat. #631232) overnight before being spun down at 1500 x
g for 45 minutes. For *in vivo* assays, particles were concurrently spun in 30mL increments in an
ultracentrifuge at 24,000 rpm for 2hrs. Resulting pellets were supplemented with PBS and left to
resuspend overnight at 4°C. Concentrated stocks were aliquoted and stored at -80°C.
Optimization of large scale production, concentration, and characterization was guided by
previously published protocols [77].
624

Vector Copy Number
Lentiviral preparations were quantified for vector copy number using the Lenti-X™ qRT-
PCR Titration Kit (Takara Bio Cat: #631235). In brief, during lentiviral preparation, aliquots were
taken directly after viral supernatant was collected and filtered. RNA was isolated from each
sample as per the manufacturer's instructions and then frozen. On day of titering, samples were
thawed and prepared on ice, on a lab bench thoroughly cleaned with RNaseZap™ RNase
Decontamination Wipes (ThermoFisher, AM9788). Samples were diluted and plated as per the
Lenti-X™ qRT-PCR Titration Kit instructions and then analyzed by qRT-PCR using a Thermo
Fisher QStudio 6 FLX real-Time PCR System.
HIV p24 content was quantified using the PerkinElmer HIV p24 AlphaLISA kit (no longer
available from PerkinElmer). Briefly, aliquots of unconcentrated and concentrated viral
supernatant were diluted and plated per manufacturer's instructions. AlphaLISA acceptor beads
and biotinylated anti-HIV p24 antibodies were incubated at room temperature for 1 hour.
Streptavidin donor beads were prepared and added to the samples in a dark BL2+ room (<100
lumens) and incubated in the dark at room temperature for 30 minutes. Plate was subsequently
read on a PerkinElmer Envision Plate Reader and analyzed using the manufacturer's AlphaLISA
analysis protocol for GraphPad Prism.
642

Cell culture
LentiX-293T cells were cultured in Dulbecco's modified Eagle's medium (Gibco)
supplemented with 10% fetal bovine serum (FBS), Gentamicin, Penicillin and Streptomycin.
HEK293T cells were sub-cultured three times a week at ratios of either 1:10 or 1:20. A20s and
NALM6 cells were both cultured in RPMI with similar supplementation. These cells were sub-
cultured 3 times a week at a ratio of 1:10. Primary human Pan T cells from Stemcell Technology
were cultured in RPMI supplemented with 10% FBS along with Gentamicin, Pen-Strep, 1x

NEAA(Life Technologies), 10mM HEPES (Thermo Scientific), 1mM Sodium pyruvate, 55uM 2-
Mercaptoethanol (Thermo).
652
Serum envelope protein binding assay
LentiX HEK293T cells were transfected as previously described with 1ug of plasmid
encoding the target envelope protein. 16 hours later, human serum samples of known MeV IgG
titer were thawed and heat inactivated for 20 minutes at 56°C. Following heat inactivation,
stepwise 10-fold dilutions were made of the serum samples with pre-warmed DMEM (formulated
as previously described). The transfected cells were then lifted and re-plated in serum dilutions in
triplicate. Cells were left to incubate on ice for 1 hour. Following incubation, cells were stained
with fluorescent antibodies against Human IgG(APC) (Biolegend, clone: M1310G05) and HA-tag
(BioLegend, clone: 16B12) using standard indirect flow cytometry staining protocol. Cells were
then analyzed by flow cytometry using a Beckman CytoFLEX LX.
663
***In vitro* CAR T cell activation and killing assay**
Re-targeted LV was prepared as previously described, in brief: HEK293s, either
unmodified or stably expressing co-stimulatory αCD3-hCD80, were transfected with env plasmids
encoding VSV-G or MeV/DMV-H-aCD7^{VHH}; DMV/MeV-F^{311} as well as plasmids encoding a anti-
CD19-CAR-GFP transgene. Donor Pan T cells were cultured and stimulated with Dynabeads™
Human T-Activator CD3/CD28 beads (Gibco™ 11131D) for 24 hours. Dynabeads were then
removed from solution via magnets, and Pan T cells were washed following Dynabead
manufacturer's instructions. CD19+ NALM6 cells and activated Pan-T cells were then plated in
various effector-target ratios and 10uL of 100-fold concentrated re-targeted LV was added to
corresponding wells. 3 days and 6 days post-plating, aliquots from each well were taken, stained
with aCD19 (Biolegend HIB19) antibody to determine NALM6 populations and analyzed by flow
cytometry.
676
Surface expression
For surface expression 1E6 number of HEK293s were seeded and the next day 1ug of
envelope plasmid was transfected with BLANK. For HA tagged proteins 24 after transfections
cells were stained with anti HA antibody (BioLegend, clone: 16B12) for 1 hour. For surface of
untagged MeV-H and MeV-F 10ug/mL of primary mouse anti-MeV-H (CL55) and mouse anti-
MeV-F (Y503) were incubated for 2 hours at 4°C followed by a wash with cold MACS buffers then
incubated with anti-mouse IgG (Biolegend, clone: Poly4053) antibody for 1 hour.
684
Serum Neutralization Assay
Serum donor samples were received from the Mass General Brigham BioBank and stored
at -80°C. Samples were quantified for human IgG against MeV using a MeV IgG ELISA kit
(Abcam: ab108750). Seropositivity was determined using a cut-off control well following the
manufacturer's instructions.
Re-targeted LV was prepared as previously described, in brief: unmodified HEK293T
producer cells were transfected with env plasmids encoding different env protein variants as well
as a transgene plasmid encoding aCD19-CAR-GFP. Supernatant was collected as previously
described. Human serum samples of known MeV IgG titer were thawed and heat inactivated for

20 minutes at 56°C. Following heat inactivation, stepwise 10-fold dilutions were made of the
serum samples with pre-warmed DMEM (formulated as previously described) in a 96well plate.
Retargeted LV was then plated into the serum dilutions and left to incubate on ice for 1 hour.
Following incubation, A20 lymphoma cells were plated in the wells. 48 hours later aliquots of each
well were collected and analyzed by flow cytometry. "Remaining transduction" was calculated by
dividing the %GFP+ cells for a well of a given LV and serum dilution by the %GFP+ cells for that
LV in the control well containing no serum.
701
Multiplex Immunofluorescence Staining, Imaging, and Analysis
After mice were sacrificed, tissues were harvested and fixed in neutral buffered formalin
for 20 hours. Tissus were then embedded in paraffin, and sectioned at 4-5 µm. Tissues were
deparaffinized and hydrated by baking at 65°C for 15 minutes followed by a xylene and an ethanol
gradient. Antigen retrieval was performed with a citrate-based buffer (Vector Labs) for 45 minutes
at 100°C. Following antigen retrieval, cyclic immunofluorescence staining and imaging was
performed using a Lunaphore Comet with primary antibodies targeting human CD3 (CD3-12,
Abcam) mouse F4/80 (D2S9R, Cell Signalling), mouse Arginase-1(D4E3M, Cell Signaling), and
GFP (600-101-215, Rockland). Secondary staining was performed with Donkey Anti-Rabbit IgG
AlexaFluor 647+, Donkey Anti-Rabbit IgG AlexaFluor 555+, or Donkey anti-Goat IgG AlexaFluor
647+ (Life Technologies). Background subtraction was performed with Horizon Viewer
(Lunaphore). Corrected images were then analyzed using Qupath[78].
Areas of tissue folding or large tissue artifacts were excluded from analysis. On analyzable
tissue, cell segmentation was performed using Instaseg utilizing signal outputs from all fluorescent
parameters except for GFP[79]. Cell classifiers were then trained to classify segmented cells based
upon their staining for DAPI, CD3, F4/80, and Arginase-1 (CD3+,F4/80-, Arginase-1-;
CD3+,F4/80+, Arginase-1-; CD3-,F4/80+,Arginase-1-; CD3-,F4/80-,Arginase-1+; CD3-, F4/80-
,Arginase-1-, Debris/RBCs, Annuclear cells) with an average of 130 annotation per sample.
Annotations were made blinded to GFP signal. A Random trees classifier was utilized with
consideration of all available fluorescent and geometric parameters except for those directly
related to GFP signal. Model classification was manually reviewed to ensure accuracy.
GFP-positivity was defined using a threshold of up to 3.5 standard deviations above the
mean background fluorescence of the analyzed area of the image (as this would yield < 5 false
positive cells per 150,000 cell section due to background alone). Following thresholding, manual
review was of all cells in all categories above the threshold. Mis-classified cells were reclassified
appropriately. Cells with GFP staining that were wholly discordant with cellular staining or not
associated with true cells were excluded as staining/imaging artifacts. CD3+, F4/80+, Arginase-
1- cells (likely representing macrophage-lymphocyte pairs or phagocytosed T cells) were
excluded from this analysis. Annotations with cell area <12 µm2 were excluded from final analysis
as these were primarily cell fragments and debris.

References

References

1. Merten, O.-W., Hebben, M. & Bovolenta, C. Production of lentiviral vectors. *Mol Ther*

Methods Clin Dev **3**, 16017 (2016).

2. Raguram, A., Banskota, S. & Liu, D. R. Therapeutic in vivo delivery of gene editing agents.

Cell **185**, 2806–2827 (2022).

3. Milone, M. C. & O'Doherty, U. Clinical use of lentiviral vectors. *Leukemia* **32**, 1529–1541

(2018).

4. Sweeney, N. P. & Vink, C. A. The impact of lentiviral vector genome size and producer cell

genomic to gag-pol mRNA ratios on packaging efficiency and titre. *Mol Ther Methods Clin*

Dev **21**, 574–584 (2021).

5. Abordo-Adesida, E. *et al.* Stability of lentiviral vector-mediated transgene expression in the

brain in the presence of systemic antivector immune responses. *Hum. Gene Ther.* **16**, 741–

751 (2005).

6. Baekelandt, V., Eggermont, K., Michiels, M., Nuttin, B. & Debyser, Z. Optimized lentiviral

vector production and purification procedure prevents immune response after transduction

of mouse brain. *Gene Ther.* **10**, 1933–1940 (2003).

7. Argaw, T. *et al.* In vivo targeting of lentiviral vectors pseudotyped with the Tupaia

paramyxovirus H glycoprotein bearing a cell-specific ligand. *Mol Ther Methods Clin Dev* **21**,

670–680 (2021).

8. Frank, A. M. & Buchholz, C. J. Surface-Engineered Lentiviral Vectors for Selective Gene

Transfer into Subtypes of Lymphocytes. *Mol Ther Methods Clin Dev* **12**, 19–31 (2019).

9. Buchholz, C. J., Friedel, T. & Büning, H. Surface-Engineered Viral Vectors for Selective and

Cell Type-Specific Gene Delivery. *Trends Biotechnol.* **33**, 777–790 (2015).

10. Zhou, Q. *et al.* T-cell receptor gene transfer exclusively to human CD8(+) cells enhances

tumor cell killing. *Blood* **120**, 4334–4342 (2012).

11. Zhou, Q. *et al.* Exclusive Transduction of Human CD4+ T Cells upon Systemic Delivery of

CD4-Targeted Lentiviral Vectors. *J. Immunol.* **195**, 2493–2501 (2015).

12. Verhoeyen, E. *et al.* IL-7 surface-engineered lentiviral vectors promote survival and efficient

gene transfer in resting primary T lymphocytes. *Blood* **101**, 2167–2174 (2003).

13. Maurice, M. *et al.* Efficient gene transfer into human primary blood lymphocytes by surface-

engineered lentiviral vectors that display a T cell-activating polypeptide. *Blood* **99**, 2342–

2350 (2002).

14. Yang, L., Bailey, L., Baltimore, D. & Wang, P. Targeting lentiviral vectors to specific cell

types in vivo. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* **103**, 11479–11484 (2006).

15. Funke, S. *et al.* Pseudotyping lentiviral vectors with the wild-type measles virus

glycoproteins improves titer and selectivity. *Gene Ther.* **16**, 700–705 (2009).

16. Lévy, C. *et al.* Measles virus envelope pseudotyped lentiviral vectors transduce quiescent

human HSCs at an efficiency without precedent. *Blood Adv* **1**, 2088–2104 (2017).

17. Anliker, B. *et al.* Specific gene transfer to neurons, endothelial cells and hematopoietic

progenitors with lentiviral vectors. *Nat. Methods* **7**, 929–935 (2010).

18. Hashiguchi, T. *et al.* Structure of the measles virus hemagglutinin bound to its cellular

receptor SLAM. *Nat. Struct. Mol. Biol.* **18**, 135–141 (2011).

19. Navaratnarajah, C. K., Leonard, V. H. J. & Cattaneo, R. Measles virus glycoprotein

complex assembly, receptor attachment, and cell entry. *Curr Top Microbiol Immunol* **329**,

59–76 (2009).

20. White, J. M., Delos, S. E., Brecher, M. & Schornberg, K. Structures and mechanisms of

viral membrane fusion proteins: multiple variations on a common theme. *Crit. Rev.*

Biochem. Mol. Biol. **43**, 189–219 (2008).

21. Duvergé, A. & Negroni, M. Pseudotyping Lentiviral Vectors: When the Clothes Make the

Virus. *Viruses* **12**, (2020).

22. Ou, W. *et al.* Specific targeting of human interleukin (IL)-13 receptor α2-positive cells with

lentiviral vectors displaying IL-13. *Hum. Gene Ther. Methods* **23**, 137–147 (2012).

23. Frank, A. M. *et al.* CD8-Specific Designed Ankyrin Repeat Proteins Improve Selective Gene

Delivery into Human and Primate T Lymphocytes. *Hum. Gene Ther.* **31**, 679–691 (2020).

24. Münch, R. C. *et al.* DARPins: an efficient targeting domain for lentiviral vectors. *Mol. Ther.*

19, 686–693 (2011).

25. Friedel, T. *et al.* Receptor-targeted lentiviral vectors are exceptionally sensitive toward the

biophysical properties of the displayed single-chain Fv. *Protein Eng. Des. Sel.* **28**, 93–106

(2015).

26. Lech, P. J. *et al.* Antibody neutralization of retargeted measles viruses. *Virology* **454-455**,

237–246 (2014).

27. Bah, E. S., Nace, R. A., Peng, K. W., Muñoz-Alía, M. Á. & Russell, S. J. Retargeted and

Stealth-Modified Oncolytic Measles Viruses for Systemic Cancer Therapy in Measles

Immune Patients. *Mol Cancer Ther* **19**, 2057–2067 (2020).

28. Marino, M. P. *et al.* A scalable method to concentrate lentiviral vectors pseudotyped with

measles virus glycoproteins. *Gene Ther.* **22**, 280–285 (2015).

29. Chiu, M. L., Goulet, D. R., Teplyakov, A. & Gilliland, G. L. Antibody structure and function:

The basis for engineering therapeutics. *Antibodies (Basel)* **8**, 55 (2019).

30. Sun, W. *et al.* A combined strategy improves the solubility of aggregation-prone single-

chain variable fragment antibodies. *Protein Expr. Purif.* **83**, 21–29 (2012).

31. Ahmad, Z. A. *et al.* scFv antibody: principles and clinical application. *Clin. Dev. Immunol.*

2012, 980250 (2012).

32. Strebinger, D. *et al.* Cell type-specific delivery by modular envelope design. *Nat. Commun.*

14, 5141 (2023).

33. Dobson, C. S. *et al.* Antigen identification and high-throughput interaction mapping by

reprogramming viral entry. *Nat. Methods* **19**, 449–460 (2022).

34. Hamilton, J. R. *et al.* In vivo human T cell engineering with enveloped delivery vehicles.

Nat. Biotechnol. (2024) doi:10.1038/s41587-023-02085-z.

35. Nikolic, J. *et al.* Structural basis for the recognition of LDL-receptor family members by VSV

glycoprotein. *Nat Commun* **9**, 1029 (2018).

36. Sun, X., Yau, V. K., Briggs, B. J. & Whittaker, G. R. Role of clathrin-mediated endocytosis

during vesicular stomatitis virus entry into host cells. *Virology* **338**, 53–60 (2005).

37. Morizono, K. *et al.* The soluble serum protein Gas6 bridges virion envelope

phosphatidylserine to the TAM receptor tyrosine kinase Axl to mediate viral entry. *Cell Host*

Microbe **9**, 286–298 (2011).

38. Sommermeyer, D. *et al.* Chimeric antigen receptor-modified T cells derived from defined

CD8+ and CD4+ subsets confer superior antitumor reactivity in vivo. *Leukemia* **30**, 492–

500 (2016).

39. Russell, S. J. *et al.* Remission of disseminated cancer after systemic oncolytic virotherapy.

Mayo Clin. Proc. **89**, 926–933 (2014).

40. Dispenzieri, A. *et al.* Phase I trial of systemic administration of Edmonston strain of measles

virus genetically engineered to express the sodium iodide symporter in patients with

recurrent or refractory multiple myeloma. *Leukemia* **31**, 2791–2798 (2017).

41. Lévy, C. *et al.* Lentiviral vectors displaying modified measles virus gp overcome pre-

existing immunity in in vivo-like transduction of human T and B cells. *Mol Ther* **20**, 1699–

1712 (2012).

42. Abramson, J. *et al.* Accurate structure prediction of biomolecular interactions with

AlphaFold 3. *Nature* **630**, 493–500 (2024).

43. Bouche, F. B., Ertl, O. T. & Muller, C. P. Neutralizing B cell response in measles. *Viral*

Immunol. **15**, 451–471 (2002).

44. de Swart, R. L., Yüksel, S., Langerijs, C. N., Muller, C. P. & Osterhaus, A. D. M. E.

Depletion of measles virus glycoprotein-specific antibodies from human sera reveals

genotype-specific neutralizing antibodies. *J. Gen. Virol.* **90**, 2982–2989 (2009).

45. de Swart, R. L., Yüksel, S. & Osterhaus, A. D. M. E. Relative contributions of measles virus

hemagglutinin- and fusion protein-specific serum antibodies to virus neutralization. *J. Virol.*

79, 11547–11551 (2005).

46. Bender, R. R. *et al.* Receptor-Targeted Nipah Virus Glycoproteins Improve Cell-Type

Selective Gene Delivery and Reveal a Preference for Membrane-Proximal Cell Attachment.

PLoS Pathog. **12**, e1005641 (2016).

47. Plattet, P. *et al.* Conserved leucine residue in the head region of morbillivirus fusion protein

regulates the large conformational change during fusion activity. *Biochemistry* **48**, 9112–

9121 (2009).

48. von Messling, V. & Cattaneo, R. Amino-terminal precursor sequence modulates canine

distemper virus fusion protein function. *J. Virol.* **76**, 4172–4180 (2002).

49. von Messling, V., Milosevic, D., Devaux, P. & Cattaneo, R. Canine distemper virus and

measles virus fusion glycoprotein trimers: partial membrane-proximal ectodomain cleavage

enhances function. *J. Virol.* **78**, 7894–7903 (2004).

50. Funke, S. *et al.* Targeted cell entry of lentiviral vectors. *Mol. Ther.* **16**, 1427–1436 (2008).

51. Muñoz-Alía, M. A. & Russell, S. J. Probing Morbillivirus Antisera Neutralization Using

Functional Chimerism between Measles Virus and Canine Distemper Virus Envelope

Glycoproteins. *Viruses* **11**, (2019).

52. Corey Elizabeth A. & Iorio Ronald M. Mutations in the Stalk of the Measles Virus

Hemagglutinin Protein Decrease Fusion but Do Not Interfere with Virus-Specific Interaction

with the Homologous Fusion Protein. *J. Virol.* **81**, 9900–9910 (2007).

53. Rust, B. J. *et al.* Envelope-Specific Adaptive Immunity following Transplantation of

Hematopoietic Stem Cells Modified with VSV-G Lentivirus. *Mol Ther Methods Clin Dev* **19**,

438–446 (2020).

54. DePolo, N. J. *et al.* VSV-G pseudotyped lentiviral vector particles produced in human cells

are inactivated by human serum. *Mol Ther* **2**, 218–222 (2000).

55. Baldauf, H.-M. *et al.* SAMHD1 restricts HIV-1 infection in resting CD4(+) T cells. *Nat. Med.*

18, 1682–1687 (2012).

56. Doitsh, G. *et al.* Abortive HIV infection mediates CD4 T cell depletion and inflammation in

human lymphoid tissue. *Cell* **143**, 789–801 (2010).

57. Zack, J. A. *et al.* HIV-1 entry into quiescent primary lymphocytes: molecular analysis

reveals a labile, latent viral structure. *Cell* **61**, 213–222 (1990).

58. Finkelshtein, D., Werman, A., Novick, D., Barak, S. & Rubinstein, M. LDL receptor and its

family members serve as the cellular receptors for vesicular stomatitis virus. *Proc. Natl.*

Acad. Sci. U. S. A. **110**, 7306–7311 (2013).

59. Amirache, F. *et al.* Mystery solved: VSV-G-LVs do not allow efficient gene transfer into

unstimulated T cells, B cells, and HSCs because they lack the LDL receptor. *Blood* **123**,

1422–1424 (2014).

60. Zhang, D. K. Y. *et al.* Enhancing CAR-T cell functionality in a patient-specific manner. *Nat.*

Commun. **14**, 1–13 (2023).

61. Mescher, M. F. *et al.* Signals required for programming effector and memory development

by CD8+ T cells. *Immunol. Rev.* **211**, 81–92 (2006).

62. Melenhorst, J. J. *et al.* Decade-long leukaemia remissions with persistence of CD4+ CAR T

cells. *Nature* **602**, 503–509 (2022).

63. van Til, N. P. *et al.* Kupffer cells and not liver sinusoidal endothelial cells prevent lentiviral

transduction of hepatocytes. *Mol. Ther.* **11**, 26–34 (2005).

64. Milani, M. *et al.* Phagocytosis-shielded lentiviral vectors improve liver gene therapy in

nonhuman primates. *Sci. Transl. Med.* **11**, (2019).

65. Morizono, K. *et al.* Redirecting lentiviral vectors pseudotyped with Sindbis virus-derived

envelope proteins to DC-SIGN by modification of N-linked glycans of envelope proteins. *J*

Virol **84**, 6923–6934 (2010).

66. Ziegler, L. *et al.* Targeting lentiviral vectors to antigen-specific immunoglobulins. *Hum.*

887 *Gene Ther.* **19**, 861–872 (2008).

888 67. Zhang, X.-Y. *et al.* Cell-specific targeting of lentiviral vectors mediated by fusion proteins

889 derived from Sindbis virus, vesicular stomatitis virus, or avian sarcoma/leukosis virus.

890 *Retrovirology* **7**, 3 (2010).

891 68. Aires da Silva, F., Costa, M. J. L., Corte-Real, S. & Goncalves, J. Cell type-specific

892 targeting with sindbis pseudotyped lentiviral vectors displaying anti-CCR5 single-chain

893 antibodies. *Hum. Gene Ther.* **16**, 223–234 (2005).

894 69. Muñoz-Alía, M. Á., Nace, R. A., Zhang, L. & Russell, S. J. Serotypic evolution of measles

895 virus is constrained by multiple co-dominant B cell epitopes on its surface glycoproteins.

896 *Cell Rep. Med.* **2**, 100225 (2021).

897 70. Aditi & Shariff, M. Nipah virus infection: A review. *Epidemiol. Infect.* **147**, e95 (2019).

898 71. Pallister, J. A. *et al.* Vaccination of ferrets with a recombinant G glycoprotein subunit

899 vaccine provides protection against Nipah virus disease for over 12 months. *Virol. J.* **10**,

900 237 (2013).

901 72. Nieba, L., Honegger, A., Krebber, C. & Plückthun, A. Disrupting the hydrophobic patches at

902 the antibody variable/constant domain interface: improved in vivo folding and physical

903 characterization of an engineered scFv fragment. *Protein Eng.* **10**, 435–444 (1997).

904 73. Xu, J. *et al.* Nanobodies from camelid mice and llamas neutralize SARS-CoV-2 variants.

905 *Nature* **595**, 278–282 (2021).

906 74. Ruffin, N. *et al.* Low SAMHD1 expression following T-cell activation and proliferation

907 renders CD4+ T cells susceptible to HIV-1. *AIDS* **29**, 519–530 (2015).

908 75. Uchida, N. *et al.* TRIM5α variation affects Lentiviral transduction efficiency for long-term

909 hematopoietic repopulating cells in a rhesus stem cell transplantation model. *Blood* **118**,

910 2056–2056 (2011).

911 76. Arcangeli, S. *et al.* CAR T cell manufacturing from naive/stem memory T lymphocytes

912 enhances antitumor responses while curtailing cytokine release syndrome. *J. Clin. Invest.*

913 **132**, (2022).

914 77. Weidner, T. *et al.* Genetic in vivo engineering of human T lymphocytes in mouse models.

915   *Nature Protocols* **16**, 3210–3240 (2021).

916 78. Bankhead, P. *et al.* QuPath: Open source software for digital pathology image analysis.

917   *Scientific Reports* **7**, 1–7 (2017).

918 79. Goldsborough, T. *et al.* A novel channel invariant architecture for the segmentation of cells

919   and nuclei in multiplexed images using InstanSeg. *Bioinformatics* (2024).