Murine models for triple-negative breast cancer with differential responsiveness to immunotherapy

Thomas J Kalantzakos,[1] Yufan Zhou,[1] Xingyu Liu,[1] Joshua Proehl,[1] Cameron Durfee,[1] Ian Tamayo[1], Nuri Alpay Temiz,[2,3] Benjamin Troness,[1] Anusha Soni,[1] Harshita B Gupta,[1,#] Reuben S Harris[1,4,#]

[1] Department of Biochemistry and Structural Biology, Long School of Medicine, University of Texas Health San Antonio, San Antonio, Texas, USA 78229

[2] Institute for Health Informatics, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minnesota, USA, 55455

[3] Masonic Cancer Center, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minnesota, USA, 55455

[4] Howard Hughes Medical Institute, University of Texas Health San Antonio, San Antonio, Texas, USA 78229

[#]Correspondence: GuptaH@uthscsa.edu or rsh@uthscsa.edu

Manuscript contents: 251 word abstract, 5478 word main text (excluding abstract, references and legends), 5 main figures, 2 supplementary tables, and 4 supplementary figures

ABSTRACT

Background Breast cancer is the most common cancer diagnosis in women. Clinical studies with triple-negative breast cancer (TNBC) are encouraging for immunotherapy combined with chemotherapy (αPD-1 with paclitaxel and/or carboplatin). However, additional clinical advances may be accelerated by leveraging preclinical TNBC models including syngeneic mammary tumor cell lines. Here, we report two syngeneic mammary tumor cell lines that exhibit differential

responsiveness to immunotherapy *in vivo*.

Methods Spontaneous mammary tumors from C57BL/6J *MMTV-Cre Trp53*^{fl/+} animals were

passaged serially in cell culture and *in vivo* in the mammary fat pad of fully wildtype animals. The

resulting lines, MM001i and MM008i, lost *Trp53* and formed 1000 mm^3 tumors in the mammary

fat pad within 21-28 days. Tumors from each group were analyzed for their response to αPd-1

and αCtla-4 immunotherapy, infiltrating immune populations, and transcriptional profiles.

Results Despite originating from the same genetic background, these lines exhibit differential

responses to immunotherapy. For αPd-1 therapy, MM001i is poorly responsive and MM008i is

strongly responsive with near-complete tumor regression. In comparison, both MM001i and

MM008i respond rapidly to αCtla-4 therapy. Both models express unique tumor antigens as

evidenced by immunity to subsequent engraftments. Primary MM008i tumors exhibit greater T

cell infiltration, and CD8-positive T lymphocytes are required for αPd-1 responses. Cancer

epithelial cells within MM008i tumors demonstrate a greater abundance of Pd-l1 expressing cells,

correlating with observations in human TNBC where PD-L1 expression is a biomarker for αPD-1

response.

Conclusions These TNBC models are promising for further mechanistic studies and testing

future single and combinatorial therapies.

WHAT IS ALREADY KNOWN ON THIS TOPIC

Immunotherapies such as αPD-1 have demonstrated modest clinical benefit for triple negative

breast cancer (TNBC) patients with high PD-L1 expression. To improve therapy efficacy, there is

a critical need to better understand mechanisms of sensitivity and resistance. Syngeneic models

are a valuable tool for preclinical mechanistic studies of new therapeutics and immunotherapy *in*

vivo. However, these models are rare, and those that exist are poorly responsive to

immunotherapy and offer limited potential for mechanistic studies.

WHAT THIS STUDY ADDS

We generate two new syngeneic TNBC cell models derived from $Trp53^{fl/+}$ background in C57BL/6 mice. Despite a shared initial genotype and responsiveness to αCtla-4 therapy, these tumor lines are differentially responsive to αPd-1 therapy and demonstrate major differences in infiltrating immune populations.

HOW THIS STUDY MIGHT AFFECT RESEARCH, PRACTICE, OR POLICY

These new syngeneic model systems can be leveraged to better understand immunotherapy responses and immune microenvironments in a fully immune competent setting, enabling future mechanistic and therapeutic studies.

INTRODUCTION

Breast cancer is the most commonly diagnosed malignancy worldwide and a leading cause of cancer-related death in women.[1, 2] Clinically, breast cancer is characterized based on expression of estrogen receptor (ER), progesterone receptor (PR), and/or human epidermal growth factor receptor 2 (HER2). Triple negative breast cancer (TNBC) lacks expression of these three markers, accounts for 15-20% of breast cancer diagnoses, and is associated with poor clinical outcomes.[3] For example, 30-40% of TNBC patients exhibit tumor recurrence within 3-5 years of the initial diagnosis and treatment.[4, 5] The most common genetic defect in TNBC is mutation of *TP53* (hereafter *p53*) in 75-80% of cases,[6, 7] with most tumors incurring full loss-of-function alleles.[8] TNBC tumors are highly heterogeneous and often subdivided into six molecular clusters: basal-like 1, basal-like 2, immunomodulatory, mesenchymal, mesenchymal stem-like, and luminal androgen receptor subtypes.[9]

Several clinical trials have demonstrated the benefit of immunotherapy approaches in TNBC, particularly through monoclonal antibody (mAb) targeting of programmed cell death

protein 1 (PD-1) and cytotoxic T-lymphocyte antigen 4 (CTLA-4). The efficacy of immunotherapy,

particularly αPD-1, in combination with chemotherapy, is becoming established in both primary

and metastatic TNBC settings. In the KEYNOTE-522 clinical trial, adding αPD-1 to neoadjuvant

chemotherapy (paclitaxel and carboplatin followed by doxorubicin/epirubicin and

cyclophosphamide) in early TNBC improved pathological complete response from 51% to 65%.[10]

Further, the KEYNOTE-355 trial, conducted on advanced TNBC patients, demonstrated a robust

increase in overall survival when combining αPD-1 and chemotherapy in patients with high

programmed cell death-ligand 1 (PD-L1) expression.[11] Emerging studies are also evaluating

combination immunotherapy approaches. For example, the BELLINI trial is investigating dual

inhibition of αPD-1 and αCTLA-4, showing signs of efficacy in early-stage TNBC.[12] Additionally,

bi-specific antibodies targeting αPD-1 and αCTLA-4 combined with paclitaxel have shown

survival benefits for TNBC patients in the metastatic setting.[13] Additional trials are ongoing that

combine immunotherapies with radiation therapy and/or chemotherapy (*e.g.*, NCT04683679,

NCT05491226, NCT06472583). However, despite these recent advances, a large subset of

TNBC patients still suffers from disease progression, which warrants further mechanistic and

therapeutic studies.

Syngeneic murine models are useful for preclinical evaluation of candidate therapeutics

in vivo. To date, only a few murine syngeneic models for TNBC have been reported. The first,

E0771, was derived in 1955 from a spontaneously occurring breast adenocarcinoma in a C57BL/6

background.[14] Treatment of this model with αPd-1 leads to partial tumor regression[15] and

enhanced efficacy when combined with other agents.[16] αPd-1 and αCtla-4 therapies also

associate with increases in circulating Cd8$^+$ T lymphocytes in this model.[16, 17] However, it is an

older model and reports conflict on several key properties including genotype and hormone

receptor status.[18-20] Another commonly used line is 4T1, isolated from a metastatic tumor in a

BALB/c animal.[21] However, this line is poorly responsive to immunotherapy due at least in part to

a Th2-biased immune response.[22, 23] Other models, such as PyMT,[24] AT-3,[25] and WT145[26] are

additionally complicated by viral transgenes and/or chemical exposures.

Here, we report the development of two new cell lines, MM001-immunoconditioned

(MM001i) and MM008i, derived from mammary tumors that arose on C57BL/6J background.

Briefly, the primary mammary tissues were engineered to be heterozygous for *Trp53*, but the

second copy was lost during tumor development in both cell lines. Serial passage in culture and

in vivo resulted in MM001i and MM008i, which form 1000 mm^3 tumors approximately 21-28 days

after engraftment. Both lines are negative for Er, Pr, and Her2 (triple-negative) and provoke anti-

tumor immune responses, as evidenced by immune memory formation and acquired resistance

to additional challenge by the same tumor cell line. Both lines also respond to αCtla-4

immunotherapy, but only MM008i responds to αPd-1 immunotherapy. This differential

responsiveness is dependent on Cd8$^+$ T lymphocytes and may be attributable to improved

immune cell infiltration in MM008i tumors (Cd45$^+$ immune cells, Cd8$^+$ T lymphocytes). Taken

together, these syngeneic tumor lines constitute new models for TNBC and provide a foundation

for additional studies on molecular mechanisms and responsiveness of different

immunotherapies.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Mouse Care

All animal studies were approved by the University of Texas Health San Antonio (UT

Health) Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee (IACUC Protocol ID: 20220056AR) and

conducted in accordance with ARRIVE guidelines 2.0[27]. "Guide for the care and use of laboratory

animals" guidelines were followed, and the study adhered to the principles of 3Rs (Replace,

Reduce, and Refine). The Lab Animal Resources (LAR) facilities at UT Health are AAALAC

(accredited unit: #000341) and USDA (registration number: 74-R-0071) approved. 24/7/365 LAR

staff include veterinarians, facility staff, and animal technicians for services including complete

husbandry, routine monitoring, examination of mice health and supportive care. 3-5 animals per

cage were housed in specific pathogen-free conditions maintained at 22°C under a standard 12-

hour light/dark cycle and given food and water *ad libitum*. Initial breeder pairs for WT (Jax strain

000664) and NOD.Cg-Prkdc^{scid}Il2rg^{tm1Wj1}/SzJ (nonobese diabetic/severe combined

immunodeficiency (NOD/SCID)/IL2Rγ KO, NSG, Jax strain 005557) mice were purchased from

Jackson Laboratory (Bar Harbor, ME, USA), and then propagated in-house. NSG mice were

maintained under sterile conditions. 8-10 weeks-old mice were enrolled for tumor studies. All

immunocompetent mice were on C57BL/6J background, and only females were used for

mammary tumor experiments.

Mice were checked one day post-injection, and then twice a week for tumor growth,

morbidity, weight loss, and dehydration. Mice were euthanized if they were in distress, lost >20%

body weight, showed a body score <2, and/or reached experimental end points such as 1000

mm^3 tumor volumes. The signs of distress included but were not limited to dehydration, cachexia,

weakness, ruffled body fur, or hunched back. Euthanasia was done as recommended by the

American Veterinary Medical Association guidelines for the Euthanasia of Animals. Briefly, mice

were subjected to inhalation of 99% pure CO_2 with a fill rate of 30-70% chamber volume/minute

for 2 minutes followed by cervical dislocation. Anesthesia was not used for the experiments

performed for this study.

Tumor harvesting from mice

MMTV-Cre p53^{fl/+} mice were bred initially at the University of Minnesota and subsequently

at UT Health prior to the present studies. Genotypes were confirmed via PCR[28] using primers:

1F: 5'-TAACACTCTTGGGATGCTGAG-3', 10F: 5'-AAGGGGTATGAGGGACAAGG-3', and 10R: 5'-

GAAGACAGAAAAGGGGAGGG-3'. Spontaneously arising primary mammary tumors in these

mice were extracted under sterile conditions, and single-cell suspensions were made by tumor

dissection and mechanical dissociation. Cells were transferred to a cell culture flask in RPMI-

1640 (Thermo Fisher Scientific, Waltham, MA, USA) supplemented with 10% fetal bovine serum

(FBS, Thermo Fisher Scientific) and 1% penicillin-streptomycin (complete medium, Thermo

Fisher Scientific). Once the cells reached 80% confluence, cells were harvested by 0.05% trypsin-

EDTA (Gibco, Thermo Fisher Scientific) for injecting in mice. Freeze downs were made

simultaneously in 90% FBS/10% DMSO (Sigma-Aldrich, St. Louis, MO, USA).

Serial passage to develop conditioned cell lines

Cells were trypsinized, washed with endotoxin-free, sterile phosphate-buffered saline

(PBS) and combined at 1:1 ratio with Cultrex Basement Membrane Extract, PathClear (R&D

Systems, Minneapolis, MN, USA) for a final cell count as indicated (2.5 or 5 x 10^6 cells) in a final

volume of 100 µL per injection. Cells were injected subcutaneously or into the 4th inguinal

mammary fat pads of mice. Initial engraftments were conducted in both WT and NSG mice. As

tumors successfully engrafted in both strains, subsequent engraftments for serial passage were

conducted in WT mice alone. At day 7, tumors were measured using Vernier caliper (Thermo

Fisher Scientific) and then monitored twice a week until reaching a volume of 1000 mm^3 using the

equation V=0.5 x L x W^2.[29] Tumors reaching 1000 mm^3 were subsequently isolated post-humane

mouse euthanasia. The process was repeated for at least two rounds per cell line.

Flow cytometry

MM001i or MM008i cells were plated overnight in 6-well plates in complete medium (3 x

10^5 cells/well). Cells were then incubated with fresh complete medium supplemented with either

vehicle or interferon-gamma (Ifn-γ) (R&D Systems) for 24 hours. Cells were harvested and

counted using the Countess cell counter (Thermo Fisher Scientific). 2 x 10^6 cells per condition

were analyzed for subsequent steps. Cells were washed with PBS, stained for live/dead dye

(Zombie Yellow Fixable Viability dye) in PBS for 40 min at 4°C in the dark. Cells were washed in

1x PBS and incubated with anti-Cd16/32 (BioLegend, San Diego, CA, USA) in flow buffer (PBS

+ 2% FBS) to prevent non-specific antibody binding for 30 minutes at 4°C, followed by incubation

with anti-mouse Pd-l1 (PE, clone 10F.9G2), H2-Kb (Pacific Blue), or matched isotype controls

(BioLegend). Cells were fixed in 0.4% buffered formalin. Cells were acquired using BD

LSRFortessa (BD Biosciences, San Juan, CA, USA) and analyzed using FACSDiva and FlowJo

10.10.0 (BD Biosciences).

Immunotherapy experiments

2.5×10^6 MM001i or MM008i cells were suspended in 50 µL endotoxin-free PBS. An equal

volume of basement membrane was added to reach a final volume of 100 µL/injection. For all

immunotherapy experiments, mice were randomized manually to equalize numbers across

treatment groups. Mice with no palpable tumor by day 7 were excluded from study due to likely

failed injection. Each mouse received two injections (one per inguinal mammary fat pad). On day

7, an initial tumor measurement was taken as previously described. Tumors were monitored twice

a week, and the mice were euthanized when tumors reached 1000 mm^3, or when they displayed

signs of distress. 7 days post-injection, each mouse received an intraperitoneal (i.p.) injection of

100 µg of αPd-1 (catalog no. BE0146, clone RMP1-14, BioXCell NH, USA), αCtla-4 (catalog no.

BE0131, clone 9H10, BioXCell), a combination of the two, or their respective isotype controls

(catalog # BE0089 and BE0087, BioXCell). Mice injected with MM001i received two additional

treatments on days 12 and 19.

Memory response experiments

WT mice with complete tumor regression in response to immunotherapy were enrolled in

memory rechallenge experiments. 90 days after the last tumor evaluation, mice were reinjected

with 2.5 million cells of the initial cell line at the same inguinal mammary fat pad. No further

treatments were administered. Tumors were measured beginning 7 days post-injection and

monitored as above until the endpoint was reached. The control group consisted of age-matched,

naïve, previously unchallenged WT mice injected with the same tumor cell line as the rechallenge

group but not treated with any immunotherapy agent.

Immunohistochemistry

IHC was performed as previously described.[30] In brief, FFPE tissues and cell pellets were

sectioned at 4 μm and mounted on positively charged glass slides. The slides were deparaffinized

at 65°C for 20 minutes, rehydrated with three 5-minute washes in CitriSolv (Decon Labs,

Swedeland, Pennsylvania, USA) followed by 3-minute washes in graded ethanol to 80%, and

finished with a 5-minute wash in running water. Antigen retrieval was performed in 1x Reveal

Decloaker (Biocare Medical, Pacheco, California, USA) by steaming for 35 minutes and returned

to room temperature with 20 minutes off the steamer. The slides were washed for 5 minutes in

running water and then in tris-buffered saline with 0.1% tween (TBST, Thermo Fisher Scientific).

Endogenous peroxidase activity was suppressed by soaking slides in 3% H_2O_2 diluted in TBST

for 10 minutes, followed by a 5-minute wash in running water. The slides were soaked in

Background Sniper (Biocare Medical) for 15 minutes, immediately followed by overnight

incubation of primary antibody diluted using 10% Sniper in TBST at 4°C. The following primary

antibodies were used: αEr (Catalog no. AB32063, 1:2000, Abcam, Cambridge, UK), αPr (Catalog

no. 25871-AP-1, 1:10000, ProteinTech, Rosemont, Illinois, USA), αHer2 (Catalog no. CST2165S,

1:1000, Cell Signaling Technologies, Danvers, Massachusetts, USA), αCd3 (Catalog no.

AB135372, 1:250, Abcam), and αCd19 (Catalog no. AB317335, 1:600, Abcam). After overnight

incubation, the slides are brought to room temperature and washed in TBST for 5 minutes. Next,

they were incubated with Novolink Polymer (Lieca Biosystems, Deer Park, Illinois, USA) for 30

minutes and developed using Novolink DAB substrate kit (Lieca Biosystems) for 5 minutes. Slides

were immediately washed in running water to quench substrate development and counterstained

10 minutes using Mayer's hematoxylin solution (Electron Microscopy Sciences, Hatfield,

Pennsylvania, USA). Slides were then dehydrated in degraded alcohols and CitriSolv and then

cover-slipped using Permount mounting media (Fisher Scientific).

Immune cell infiltration analysis by IHC

MM001i and MM008i sections were used to assess the infiltration of T and B lymphocytes

in n=4-5 tumors. T cells and B cells were visualized using αCd3 and αCd19 antibodies

respectively, as described above. T cell and B cell densities were calculated using QuPath v0.5.1

bioimage analysis software using the positive cell detection algorithm. 5 random uniform regions

of interest (ROIs) were selected within each tumor section and cell density was averaged for all

ROIs per tumor.

Immune cell infiltration analysis by flow cytometry

Mice were euthanized, and tumors were harvested once the mean group volume reached

750 mm^3. Tumors were digested, and single-cell suspensions were made using 0.3 mg Liberase

(Thermo Fisher Scientific) and 0.2 mg DNase I (Sigma-Aldrich) per tumor in incomplete RPMI-

1640. Tumors were mechanically dissociated, minced and incubated with shaking at 37°C for 30

minutes. Cell suspensions were harvested, passed through 70 μM strainers, and counted. 5 x 10^6

cells were stained for surface markers as above. Cells were incubated with αCd16/32 to prevent

non-specific antibody binding as above, followed by staining with αCd45 (FITC), αCd3 (PE-Cy7),

αCd8 (APC-Cy7), αCd4 (Bv786), αCd62l (Bv711), αPd-1 (PerCP-Cy5), αCd44 (Pacific Blue),

αTim3 (APC), or αGr1 (Bv786), αCd86 (APC-Cy7), αCd11c (PE), αCd11b (PerCP-Cy5), αB220

(AF700), αNK1.1 (APC) post live/dead staining (Zombie Yellow Fixable Viability dye). All

antibodies and Zombie Yellow Fixable Viability dye were purchased from BioLegend. Cells were

washed, fixed in 0.4% buffered formalin, and analyzed as mentioned above.

CD8^{+} neutralization experiments

2.5 x 10^6 MM008i cells were injected into the mammary fat pads of immunocompetent WT

mice as previously described. On day 6, initial tumor measurements were taken, and mice were

randomized into groups. On days 6, 9, and 12, each mouse received an i.p. injection of 200 µg of

αCd8 antibody (catalog no. BE0004-1, clone 53-6.7, BioXCell) or its isotype control (catalog no.

BE0089, clone 2A3, BioXCell). On day 7, each mouse received a single i.p. injection of 100 µg of

αPd-1 or its isotype control, as previously described. Tumors were measured biweekly, and mice

were euthanized at day 25 or when tumor volumes reached 1000 mm^3. At day 13 and before

complete tumor regression, a small subset of tumors representing each treatment group were

isolated to assess immune infiltration of CD8^{+} T lymphocytes by immunohistochemistry.

Bulk RNA-sequencing of MM001i and MM008i cell lines and tumors

RNA from two biological replicates each of MM001i and MM008i grown in culture were

isolated using the Qiagen RNeasy Mini Kit (Qiagen, Hilden, Germany). Three biological replicates

of RNA from MM001i and MM008i tumors each were isolated using the Qiagen AllPrep DNA/RNA

Mini kit (Qiagen). Tumor tissues were mechanically homogenized in lysis buffer containing β-

mercaptoethanol using a glass Dounce homogenizer, followed by repeated aspiration through a

syringe for disruption. RNA quality was confirmed by Nanodrop spectrophotometer. Stranded

RNA-seq libraries were prepared in collaboration with the Genome Sequencing Facility at UT

Health for paired-end 100 bp sequencing. The sequencing raw reads were mapped to the mm10

Mus Musculus reference genome with HISAT2 v2.1.0[31], and gene counts were calculated with

htseq-count. Comprehensive gene expression for cultured cells and tumors of each cell line are

available in supplementary table 1. Enrichment of KEGG signaling was conducted using the top

1000 expressed genes of each cell line in each condition, with specific focus on immune

pathways, cancer cell pathways, and epithelial cell pathways. The input genes and enriched

pathways for MM001i and MM008i cultured cells and tumors are available in supplementary table

2. Differentially expressed genes in both datasets were identified with DEseq2 v1.40.2[32] by cutoff

of log2 fold change > 2 and adjusted P value < 0.01 for tumors and < 0.05 in culture.

Single-cell expression profiling

Three mammary tumors each of MM001i and MM008i were collected from six individual

mice. Single-cell suspensions were prepared for the 10X Genomics Chromium system using a

tumor dissociation kit (catalog no. 130-096-730, Miltenyi Biotec, San Diego, CA, USA) at a final

concentration of 1000 cells/uL. Single-cell RNA-seq protocol was performed in collaboration with

the Genome Sequencing Facility at UT Health according to the technical manual. Raw

sequencing reads were aligned to the mouse reference genome mm10 using 10x Genomics Cell

Ranger. Feature-barcode matrices were generated with Cell Ranger's count pipeline. Subsequent

analysis was performed in Seurat (v4.4.0)[33] using the following workflow: a Seurat object was

created with CreateSeuratObject using thresholds of min.cells = 3 (genes detected in ≥3 cells)

and min.features = 500 (cells expressing ≥500 genes). Cells with >30% mitochondrial transcript

content (percent.mt < 30) were excluded via subset. Clusters were identified using FindClusters

with a resolution parameter of 0.5. Cell types were identified manually with curated cell markers:

T cells: *Cd3g*, *Cd3d*, *Cd3e*, *Cd247*; B cells: *Cd19*, *B220*; Macrophages: *Cd74*, *Cd14*, *Csf1r*;

Endothelial cells: *Esam*, *Pecam1*; Stromal cells: *Fn1*, *Fap*, *Acta2*, *S100a4*; Basal cells: *Krt14*,

Krt5, *Krt17*; Epithelial cells: *Cdh1*, *Krt8*, *Krt18*, *Krt19*; Cancer cells: *Acta2*, *Aldh1a3*, *Cd24a*, *Cdh1*,

Cdh2, *Erbb2*, *Kit*, *Krt7*, *Mfge8*, *Myc*, *Pgr*, *Prlr*, *Tjp1*, *Top2a*, *Twist1*.

Statistical analysis

Calculations were done using Microsoft Excel software, and statistical analyses were

performed using GraphPad Prism software version 10.3.1 (GraphPad, La Jolla, CA, USA). Data

were plotted as means ± standard deviation. For tumor growth, Two-way analysis of variance

(ANOVA) was used to compare replicate means between multiple groups. Unpaired Student's *t*-

test was used to compare individual means. *P* < 0.05 was considered statistically significant.

RESULTS

Generation of murine mammary tumor cell lines MM001i and MM008i

Two spontaneously arising mammary tumors were harvested from independent C57BL/6J

MMTV-Cre p53$^{fl/+}$ mice, and cell lines were generated by serial passage in culture and *in vivo*

(supplementary figure 1A; Materials and Methods). Primary tumors were isolated under sterile

conditions and expanded in culture to obtain sufficient cells for cryopreservation and engraftment

studies. Five million cells were injected into the mammary fat pad or subcutaneously in severely

immunocompromised NSG mice, and tumor formation occurred rapidly within 14-21 days as

expected in most animals regardless of injection site (not shown). However, parallel engraftments

of 5 x 10^6 cells into the same anatomical locations in fully immunocompetent C57BL/6J (WT)

animals only led to tumor formation in the mammary fat pad (supplementary figure 1).

Representative tumors from the first mammary fat pad engraftment were expanded in culture and

used in a second mammary fat pad engraftment. After two (MM001i) or three (MM008i) rounds of

culturing and engraftment, these cell lines formed stable and reproducible mammary tumors

(supplementary figure 1D,H). For post-tertiary mammary fat pad engraftments in WT mice, 2.5

x10^6 cells were sufficient to form tumors in 21-28 days with at least 70% efficiency. Therefore, this

cell number was used for all subsequent experiments.

MM001i and MM008i tumors are potential models for human TNBC

As these tumor cell lines had been generated from mice with mammary-specific

heterozygosity for *p53*, PCR was used to determine the genotype of this locus (supplementary

Figure 2A; primers listed in methods).[28] Although both MM001i and MM008i expressed the *p53*

null allele (*i.e.*, *loxP*-to-*loxP* recombined) as anticipated, the WT allele could not be detected.

Taken together, these PCR results indicated that both MM001i and MM008i are functionally *p53*

homozygous null (likely through loss-of-heterozygosity early in tumor development).

Mammary tumor cell lines lacking functional p53 are typically also negative for the hormone

receptors, Er, Pr, and Her2.[34, 35] To visualize these cell surface markers, representative tumors

from both MM001i and MM008i were formalin-fixed and paraffin-embedded for

immunohistochemical staining. MM001i and MM008i are both triple-negative at the protein level,

lacking positive nuclear staining of Er[36] and Pr proteins[37] as well as cell surface staining of Her2

(supplementary figure 2B).[38]

Next, we used flow cytometry to quantify the surface expression of pro-tumorigenic,

immune co-signaling molecule Pd-l1 on our cell lines at a basal levels and following 24hrs

induction with interferon-gamma (Ifn-γ).[12, 29] MM008i showed higher expression of Pd-l1 at basal

levels as well as after Ifn-γ treatment compared to MM001i (supplementary figure 2C). However,

cell surface major histocompatibility complex-I (H-2kb) expression was similar between both cell

lines regardless of Ifn-γ treatment (supplementary figure 2D).

MM001i and MM008i respond differentially to αPD-1 but similarly to αCTLA-4

After establishing a robust mammary fat pad engraftment protocol, WT females were split

randomly into subgroups and treated with the two most commonly used immunotherapy agents,

αPd-1 and αCtla-4, to gauge therapy responsiveness. After engrafting on day 0 as above,

treatment with αPd-1, αCtla-4, or the combination began on day 7, once tumors were

approximately 200-300 mm^3. MM001i engrafted animals also received treatments on days 12 and

17 (figure 1A). These tumors responded poorly to αPd-1 but regressed completely with αCtla-4

monotherapy as well as with αPd-1 + αCtla-4 combination therapy (figure 1B). Non-

responsiveness was observed as expected in severely immunocompromised NSG mice (figure

1C), indicating that these immunotherapy outcomes are immune response-dependent.

MM008i tumors were treated with a single dose on day 7 (Figure 1d). Additional doses

were not necessary because tumors regressed rapidly following a single treatment. MM008i

tumors responded equally well to both αPd-1 and αCtla-4 monotherapies, ultimately leading to

complete tumor regression (figure 1E). The combination of both mAbs appeared to have no

additional benefit (figure 1E). The strong responsiveness to αPd-1 monotherapy clearly

distinguishes MM008i from MM001i. Moreover, neither tumor line appeared to be immune-cold

as evidenced by clear responses to αCtla-4 monotherapy. As for MM001i tumors above, no

therapeutic benefit was observed for MM008i in NSG mice in any immunotherapy treatment

group, further consistent with an immune response-dependent mechanism of tumor regression

(figure 1F).

Immunotherapy of MM001i and MM008i tumors generates immune memory

We next asked if immunotherapy treatment of MM001i and MM008i tumors triggers long-

lasting immune memory. Mice were engrafted with MM001i and MM008i and, beginning day 7,

treated as described above (workflows in figure 2A,C). Mice demonstrating complete tumor

regression following αPd-1 and/or αCtla-4 treatment were allowed to rest for 90 days and then

rechallenged through injection with the same tumor cell line and same site as in the primary

injection. Age-matched female WT mice, which had never been injected with tumor cells

previously, were engrafted with MM001i and MM008i as controls. As expected, control mice with

de novo injections developed mammary tumors in 21-28 days following MM001i or MM008i

engraftment (figure 2B,D). Conversely, all previously treated tumor-free mice rejected additional

engraftment attempts, thus indicating that both MM001i and MM008i are capable of provoking

long-term anti-tumor immune memory.

Cd3$^+$ T cells are distributed throughout MM008i unlike MM001i tumors

Although MM001i and MM008i originated from the same genetic background, these two mammary tumor cell lines exhibit starkly different responses to αPd-1 treatment (figure 1). To begin to investigate the underlying mechanism, immunohistochemistry was used to profile tumor-infiltrating immune populations including as B and T lymphocytes. Untreated MM001i and MM008i tumors were isolated after reaching the endpoint tumor volume of 1000 mm^3 and stained for Cd19 and Cd3 expression. Based on Cd19 staining, B cell infiltration was low in both MM001i and MM008i tumors (not shown). In contrast, both mammary tumors showed evidence for T cell infiltration with MM008i tumors exhibiting significantly more Cd3$^+$ T lymphocytes compared to MM001i tumors (figure 3A,B; positive control splenic Cd3$^+$ cell staining in supplementary figure 3A). Moreover, T cells were localized throughout MM008i tumors versus predominantly around the peripheral margins of MM001i tumors (figure 3A). Deeper T lymphocyte penetration is consistent with the possibility that this cell type may be responsible for the differential αPd-1 therapeutic outcomes of MM008i and MM001i tumors.

Infiltrating Cd8$^+$ T cells in MM008i tumors

To further profile tumor-associated immune cells, flow cytometry was used to assess specific immune cell subpopulations in treatment-naïve primary tumors. Following live cell gating, a significantly higher percentage of Cd45$^+$ immune cells was identified in MM008i tumors versus MM001i tumors (figure 3C; gating strategy in supplementary figure 3B). There was also a trend toward higher Cd3$^+$ T cells out of Cd45$^+$ immune cells (figure 3D) and, interestingly, a significantly higher percentage of Cd8$^+$Cd4$^-$ cytotoxic T cells in the Cd3$^+$ population of MM008i tumors (figure 3E). Additionally, activated, pre-exhausted Pd-1$^+$Tim3$^-$Cd8$^+$ T cells[12, 39] were significantly higher, though no difference was observed for exhausted Pd-1$^+$Tim3$^+$ T cells in MM008i compared to

MM001i tumors (figure 3F,G).[40, 41] No significant difference was observed for Cd11b$^+$ monocytes,

Cd11b$^+$Gr1$^+$ myeloid-derived suppressor cells, or B220$^+$ B cells (supplementary figure 3C,D,E). A

trend towards a higher percentage of Cd11b$^+$Cd11c$^+$ dendritic cells and Nk1.1$^+$ natural killer cells

was observed in MM001i tumors, though it was not statistically significant (supplementary figure

3F,G). These observations combine to indicate that the successful αPd-1 outcomes observed for

MM008i tumor-engrafted animals may be mediated through pre-exhausted Pd-1$^+$Tim3$^-$Cd8$^+$ T

cells.

Depletion of Cd8$^+$ cells abrogates αPd-1 treatment efficacy in MM008i

The aforedescribed results suggest that the αPd-1 responsiveness of MM008i may be due

to infiltrating anti-tumor Cd8$^+$ T cells. To test this possibility directly, experiments were performed

in which Cd8$^+$ T cells were immunodepleted from animals before and after MM008i tumor

treatment with αPd-1 (workflow in figure 4A). Tumors showed normal growth kinetics in WT

animals treated with isotype control mAbs or an αCd8 mAb (figure 4B). As above, αPd-1 treatment

alone resulted in near-complete tumor regression (figure 4B). However, three doses of αCd8 mAb

(one before and two after αPd-1 treatment) were sufficient to blunt the therapeutic responsiveness

of the αPd-1 therapy (Figure 4B). Immunohistochemistry confirmed depletion of Cd8$^+$ T

lymphocytes from MM008i tumors (not shown). These data combined to show that Cd8$^+$ T cells

are an integral cell population required for MM008i tumor regression in response to αPd-1 therapy

in WT mice.

RNA-sequencing of MM001i and MM008i cells

To identify tumor-intrinsic factors that contribute to the differential responsiveness to αPd-

1, bulk RNA sequencing was done for cultured asynchronous MM001i and MM008i cell

populations (2 independent cultures per line) and for untreated tumors from animals (3

independent tumors per line). A full list of expressed genes from cultured cells and untreated

tumors is provided in supplementary table 1. First, as expected from initial genotyping above, no

transcripts were detected for *p53* exons 2-10 confirming *p53* loss of function. Second, multiple

breast cancer-associated genes were expressed at similar levels in both cell lines (*Brca1, Brca2,*

Mki67, Myc, Pik3ca, *Pten*, *Rb1*) with no apparent disease mutations. Third, consistent with IHC

results above, *Esr1* transcripts were not detected in either cell line. Fourth, in contrast to the IHC

results above where Her2 was not detected, both lines appear to express similar levels of *Erbb2*

RNA. This inconsistency may be due to an intrinsic cellular defect prior to translation as this

protein was undetectable by IHC and likely not retained intracellularly. Finally, modest levels of *Ar*

and *Pgr* RNA were observed in MM001i cultured cells, and not in MM008i. Expression

comparisons were less clear in bulk RNA from tumors due to a multitude of normal infiltrating cell

types.

To evaluate broad expression differences between MM001i and MM008i cells and tumors,

we used principal component analysis (PCA) to compare the overall transcription profiles for

MM001i and MM008i in each growth condition (supplementary figure 4A). In general, cultured

cells clustered closely together as anticipated. In comparison, tumor cells clustered far away from

cultured cells and in more loosely associated groups consistent with differential immune

responses. We next analyzed specific gene expression differences between MM001i and

MM008i, identified based on a greater than 4-fold change and *P* values < 0.05 for cultured cells

and < 0.01 for untreated tumors (figure 5A; supplementary table 1). Among the highest

differentially expressed genes are immune related genes, such as *Il11*, *Cxcl2*, *Il7*, *Il1rap*, *Ifnlr1*,

and *Cxcl3* in tumors, *Tnf* and *Havcr2* (Tim-3) in cultured cells, and *Il1rl1*, *Nfgr*, and *Ptgs2* in both

sets, which could potentially relate to the observed differences in response to αPd-1 therapy and

in T lymphocyte infiltration.

To evaluate gene expression at the pathway level, we conducted KEGG signaling pathway

analysis on the top 1000 expressed genes in MM001i and MM008i cells and tumors, focusing

specifically on enriched pathways in immune signaling, cancer, and epithelial cell development (supplementary figure 4B; supplementary table 2). Overall, gene expression was very similar between MM001i and MM008i, particularly in epithelial cell signaling pathways. MM008i tumors were relatively enriched for immune related pathways such as antigen processing and presentation, and phagosome, with genes such as *H2-t23* and *B2m* being among the most strongly expressed. Conversely, MM001i tumors were relatively enriched for cancer related pathways such as extracellular matrix (ECM)-receptor interaction and Pi3k-Akt signaling. These gene expression insights highlight the many similarities between MM001i and MM008i mammary tumor cell models, and also point toward differences that may explain their differential responsiveness to immune therapy.

Single-cell profiling of MM001i and MM008i tumors

Single cell (sc)RNA-seq analysis of untreated MM001i and MM008i tumors freshly isolated from mice revealed additional intrinsic and extrinsic features of each tumor cell line. Unsupervised clustering (UMAP) identified major cell types, including normal and cancer epithelial cells, endothelial cells, stromal cells, basal cells, and immune populations (figure 5B,C). Epithelial cells in both MM001i and MM008i exhibited elevated expression of the oncogenes *Myc* and *Top2a*, indicating shared proliferative and malignant transcriptional programs (figure 5D). *Ctla-4* and *Pdcd1* (*Pd-1*) were highly expressed in T cells of both MM001i and MM008i, whereas the mRNA for the Ctla-4 ligand Cd86 showed no significant upregulation in either MM001i or MM008i (figure 5D). In contrast, *Cd274* (*Pd-l1*) was overexpressed specifically in epithelial cells of MM008i but not in epithelial cells of MM001i, implying specific immune evasion via the Pd-1/Pd-l1 axis in MM008i tumors (figure 5D).

DISCUSSION

We report the development of two syngeneic murine mammary tumor cell lines that,

despite originating from the same C57BL/6J genetic background, display differential *in vivo*

responsiveness to αPd-1 checkpoint blockade. Specifically, the mammary tumor cell line MM008i

tumors responds to αPd-1 therapy and MM001i does not. However, both lines are fully responsive

to αCtla-4 therapy, and tumor clearance associates with immunity to subsequent engraftment.

Moreover, comparative immune cell profiling of engrafted tumors showed higher percentages of

Cd8[+] cytotoxic T cells in MM008i tumors compared to MM001i tumors. These Cd8^{+} T lymphocytes

are required for response to αPd-1 in MM008i tumors, as depletion of this population abrogates

therapy response. Another key difference we identified was significantly higher expression of Pd-

l1 on MM008i epithelial cells compared to MM001i. This strongly indicates that the Pd-1/Pd-l1

axis is a major mediator of immune evasion in MM008i, which is reflective of αPD-1 clinical

observations in breast cancer where PD-L1 serves as a key biomarker for positive responses.[11,]

[42, 43] However, despite these clear phenotypic differences between tumors, MM001i and MM008i

are overall very similar at the gene expression level. We observed similar expression levels of

commonly dysregulated breast cancer genes such as *Brca1, Brca2, Mki67, Myc, Pik3ca*, *Pten*,

Rb1, and *Top2a*, and similarities in epithelial signaling pathways.

The mammary tumor models presented help fill an important gap in syngeneic systems

for preclinical immune therapy testing and mechanistic studies. Syngeneic mammary tumor

models are rare, with only a few described to date.[14, 18, 21, 24-26, 44] E0771, which has been around

for 70 years and with unknown passage number, has conflicting reports on Er hormone receptor

status.[18] Other lines, such as PyMT,[24] AT-3,[25] and WT145[26] rely on either transgene insertion or

chemical carcinogens to drive cancer formation, processes that do not reflect cancer development

in human patients. Further, it would be difficult to compare results across lines given substantial

differences between each in genetic background, growth kinetics, and immune phenotype, limiting

the potential for comparative analysis. To address some of these limitations, recent efforts have

focused on developing new models that better recapitulate the immunological characteristics of

human disease.[45] However, many of these models are poorly responsive to immunotherapy,

owing to low tumor mutational burdens, unless further modified by induced mutagenesis or *Brca1*

deficiency.[45] Our models, which exhibit clear responses to αCtla-4 and differential responses to

αPd-1, provide a unique platform to dissect mechanisms of immunotherapy resistance and test

additional therapies (alone and in combination).

In particular, we envision our mammary tumor models being used to test other therapies

in combination with αPd-1 for potential dosage de-escalation of MM008i and to potentially trigger

αPd-1 responsiveness to MM001i. Our TNBC models also may be used to dissect the tumor

microenvironment itself, particularly focusing on extracellular matrix signaling and immune

infiltration. Here, we demonstrate considerable differences in T cell infiltration between our

MM001i and MM008i tumors. However, we have not directly investigated the specific mechanisms

which permit greater immune infiltration in MM008i tumors than MM001i tumors. We anticipate

future studies looking more deeply into these two cell lines immunologically, particularly the factors

that influence whether a tumor is "immune hot" or "immune cold". By identifying some of these

determinants, we may be able to identify combination therapy approaches to make previously

resistant tumors sensitive to immunotherapies.

Acknowledgments

We thank Francesca Manara (Memorial Sloan Kettering Cancer Center), Josephine

Taverna (UT Health San Antonio), and Ratna Vadlamudi (UT Health San Antonio) for thoughtful

feedback, and Emily Law, Jordan Naumann, and Angel Dominguez for early contributions to this

project. We are also grateful to Zhao Lai at the UT Health San Antonio Genome Sequencing

Facility for assistance with library preparation and sequencing and to the South Texas Research

Histology Laboratory for help with mouse specimen processing.

Contributors

R.S.H. and H.B.G. conceptualized the project. T.K., H.B.G., C.D., A.S., and B.T. conducted *in vivo* experimentation. X.L., J.P., H.B.G., and I.T. performed immunohistochemistry. T.K., Y.Z., X.L., and N.A.T. contributed computational analyses. T.K. and H.B.G. performed cell-based experiments. T.K., H.B.G. and R.S.H, drafted the manuscript with all authors contributing to manuscript proofing and revision.

Funding

These studies were supported by NCI P50-CA247749, NCI P01-CA234228, and a Recruitment of Established Investigators Award from the Cancer Prevention and Research Institute of Texas (CPRIT RR220053). T.J.K. was supported in part by the STX-MSTP NIH training grants (T32GM113896 and T32GM145432), as well as the Translational Science Training T32 Award (T32TR004545). C.D. was supported in part by a CPRIT Research Training Award (RP 170345). I.T. was also supported in part by NIH T32GM145432. R.S.H. is an Investigator of the Howard Hughes Medical Institute, a CPRIT Scholar, and the Ewing Halsell President's Council Distinguished Chair at the UT Health San Antonio. The UT Health San Antonio Genome Sequencing Facility is supported by NCI P30-CA054174 (Mays Cancer Center at UT Health San Antonio) and NIH Shared Instrument grant S10-OD030311 (S10 grant to NovaSeq 6000 System), and CPRIT Core Facility Award (RP220662). The funders had no roles in study design, data collection and analysis, decision to publish, or preparation of the manuscript.

Competing interests

The authors have no conflicts of interest to declare.

Patient consent for publication

Not applicable

Provenance and peer review

Not commissioned; externally peer-reviewed

Data availability statement

Primary bulk and single-cell RNAseq data sets are available through GEO (GSE305800

and GSE305842, respectively). Additional data that support the findings of this study are available

from the corresponding author, R.S.H., upon reasonable request.

REFERENCES

1. Menon G, Alkabban FM, Ferguson T. Breast cancer. *StatPearls* Treasure Island (FL)2024.

2. Nolan E, Lindeman GJ, Visvader JE. Deciphering breast cancer: from biology to the clinic. *Cell*

2023;186(8):1708-28.

3. Almansour NM. Triple-negative breast cancer: a brief review about epidemiology, risk factors,

signaling pathways, treatment and role of artificial intelligence. *Front Mol Biosci*

2022;9:836417.

4. Dent R, Trudeau M, Pritchard KI, Hanna WM, Kahn HK, Sawka CA, et al. Triple-negative breast

cancer: clinical features and patterns of recurrence. *Clin Cancer Res* 2007;13(15 Pt

1):4429-34.

5. Liedtke C, Mazouni C, Hess KR, Andre F, Tordai A, Mejia JA, et al. Response to neoadjuvant

therapy and long-term survival in patients with triple-negative breast cancer. *J Clin Oncol*

2008;26(8):1275-81.

6. Darb-Esfahani S, Denkert C, Stenzinger A, Salat C, Sinn B, Schem C, et al. Role of TP53

mutations in triple negative and HER2-positive breast cancer treated with neoadjuvant

anthracycline/taxane-based chemotherapy. *Oncotarget* 2016;7(42):67686-98.

7. Cancer Genome Atlas N. Comprehensive molecular portraits of human breast tumours. *Nature*

2012;490(7418):61-70.

8. Bakhtiar H, Sharifi MN, Helzer KT, Shi Y, Bootsma ML, Shang TA, et al. A phenocopy signature

of TP53 loss predicts response to chemotherapy. *NPJ Precis Oncol* 2024;8(1):220.

9. Lehmann BD, Bauer JA, Chen X, Sanders ME, Chakravarthy AB, Shyr Y, et al. Identification of

human triple-negative breast cancer subtypes and preclinical models for selection of

targeted therapies. *J Clin Invest* 2011;121(7):2750-67.

10. Schmid P, Cortes J, Pusztai L, McArthur H, Kummel S, Bergh J, et al. Pembrolizumab for early

triple-negative breast cancer. *N Engl J Med* 2020;382(9):810-21.

11. Cortes J, Rugo HS, Cescon DW, Im SA, Yusof MM, Gallardo C, et al. Pembrolizumab plus

chemotherapy in advanced triple-negative breast cancer. *N Engl J Med* 2022;387(3):217-

26.

12. Nederlof I, Isaeva OI, de Graaf M, Gielen R, Bakker NAM, Rolfes AL, et al. Neoadjuvant

nivolumab or nivolumab plus ipilimumab in early-stage triple-negative breast cancer: a

phase 2 adaptive trial. *Nat Med* 2024;30(11):3223-35.

13. Li Q, Liu J, Zhang Q, Ouyang Q, Zhang Y, Liu Q, et al. The anti-PD-L1/CTLA-4 bispecific

antibody KN046 in combination with nab-paclitaxel in first-line treatment of metastatic

triple-negative breast cancer: a multicenter phase II trial. *Nat Commun* 2024;15(1):1015.

14. Goodson LH, Barvick L, Stone RG, Ibach M, Palmer J. Inhibition screening data using

sarcoma 180 and adenocarcinoma E0771. *Cancer Res* 1955;Suppl. 2:81-102.

15. Kasikara C, Davra V, Calianese D, Geng K, Spires TE, Quigley M, et al. Pan-TAM Tyrosine

Kinase Inhibitor BMS-777607 Enhances anti-PD-1 mAb efficacy in a murine model of

triple-negative breast cancer. *Cancer Res* 2019;79(10):2669-83.

16. Liu J, Blake SJ, Yong MC, Harjunpaa H, Ngiow SF, Takeda K, et al. Improved efficacy of

neoadjuvant compared to adjuvant immunotherapy to eradicate metastatic disease.

Cancer Discov 2016;6(12):1382-99.

17. Zheng X, Fang Z, Liu X, Deng S, Zhou P, Wang X, et al. Increased vessel perfusion predicts

the efficacy of immune checkpoint blockade. *J Clin Invest* 2018;128(5):2104-15.

18. Le Naour A, Rossary A, Vasson MP. EO771, is it a well-characterized cell line for mouse

mammary cancer model? Limit and uncertainty. *Cancer Med* 2020;9(21):8074-85.

19. Johnstone CN, Smith YE, Cao Y, Burrows AD, Cross RS, Ling X, et al. Functional and

molecular characterisation of EO771.LMB tumours, a new C57BL/6-mouse-derived model

of spontaneously metastatic mammary cancer. *Dis Model Mech* 2015;8(3):237-51.

20. Gu JW, Young E, Busby B, Covington J, Johnson JW. Oral administration of pyrrolidine

dithiocarbamate (PDTC) inhibits VEGF expression, tumor angiogenesis, and growth of

breast cancer in female mice. *Cancer Biol Ther* 2009;8(6):514-21.

21. Aslakson CJ, Miller FR. Selective events in the metastatic process defined by analysis of the

sequential dissemination of subpopulations of a mouse mammary tumor. *Cancer Res*

1992;52(6):1399-405.

22. Kim K, Skora AD, Li Z, Liu Q, Tam AJ, Blosser RL, et al. Eradication of metastatic mouse

cancers resistant to immune checkpoint blockade by suppression of myeloid-derived cells.

Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A 2014;111(32):11774-9.

23. Taylor MA, Hughes AM, Walton J, Coenen-Stass AML, Magiera L, Mooney L, et al.

Longitudinal immune characterization of syngeneic tumor models to enable model

selection for immune oncology drug discovery. *J Immunother Cancer* 2019;7(1):328.

24. Yan C, Yang J, Saleh N, Chen SC, Ayers GD, Abramson VG, et al. Inhibition of the PI3K/mTOR

pathway in breast cancer to enhance response to immune checkpoint inhibitors in breast

cancer. *Int J Mol Sci* 2021;22(10).

25. Stewart TJ, Abrams SI. Altered immune function during long-term host-tumor interactions can

be modulated to retard autochthonous neoplastic growth. *J Immunol* 2007;179(5):2851-9.

26. Zinser GM, McEleney K, Welsh J. Characterization of mammary tumor cell lines from wild

type and vitamin D3 receptor knockout mice. *Mol Cell Endocrinol* 2003;200(1-2):67-80.

27. Percie du Sert N, Hurst V, Ahluwalia A, Alam S, Avey MT, Baker M, et al. The ARRIVE

guidelines 2.0: updated guidelines for reporting animal research. *BMJ Open Sci*

2020;4(1):e100115.

28. Marino S, Vooijs M, van Der Gulden H, Jonkers J, Berns A. Induction of medulloblastomas in

p53-null mutant mice by somatic inactivation of Rb in the external granular layer cells of

the cerebellum. *Genes Dev* 2000;14(8):994-1004.

29. Gupta HB, Clark CA, Yuan B, Sareddy G, Pandeswara S, Padron AS, et al. Tumor cell-intrinsic

PD-L1 promotes tumor-initiating cell generation and functions in melanoma and ovarian

cancer. *Signal Transduct Target Ther* 2016;1:16030-.

30. Durfee C, Temiz NA, Levin-Klein R, Argyris PP, Alsoe L, Carracedo S, et al. Human

APOBEC3B promotes tumor development in vivo including signature mutations and

metastases. *Cell Rep Med* 2023;4(10):101211.

31. Kim D, Paggi JM, Park C, Bennett C, Salzberg SL. Graph-based genome alignment and

genotyping with HISAT2 and HISAT-genotype. *Nat Biotechnol* 2019;37(8):907-15.

32. Love MI, Huber W, Anders S. Moderated estimation of fold change and dispersion for RNA-

seq data with DESeq2. *Genome Biol* 2014;15(12):550.

33. Hao Y, Hao S, Andersen-Nissen E, Mauck WM, 3rd, Zheng S, Butler A, et al. Integrated

analysis of multimodal single-cell data. *Cell* 2021;184(13):3573-87 e29.

34. Knight JF, Lesurf R, Zhao H, Pinnaduwage D, Davis RR, Saleh SM, et al. Met synergizes with

p53 loss to induce mammary tumors that possess features of claudin-low breast cancer.

Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A 2013;110(14):E1301-10.

35. Wang S, Liu JC, Kim D, Datti A, Zacksenhaus E. Targeted Pten deletion plus p53-R270H

mutation in mouse mammary epithelium induces aggressive claudin-low and basal-like

breast cancer. *Breast Cancer Res* 2016;18(1):9.

36. Bruner-Tran KL, Duleba AJ, Taylor HS, Osteen KG. Developmental toxicant exposure is

associated with transgenerational adenomyosis in a murine model. *Biol Reprod*

2016;95(4):73.

37. Zhao W, Wang Y, Liu J, Yang Q, Zhang S, Hu X, et al. Progesterone activates the histone

lactylation-Hif1alpha-glycolysis feedback loop to promote decidualization. *Endocrinology*

2023;165(1).

38. Choudhury S, Ghosh S, Chakraborty P, Pal S, Ghosh K, Saha S, et al. Epidermal growth

factor receptor (EGFR) and SMAD4 negatively correlated in the progression of gallbladder

cancer in Eastern Indian patients. BMC Gastroenterol 2024;24(1):446.

39. Kinget L, Naulaerts S, Govaerts J, Vanmeerbeek I, Sprooten J, Laureano RS, et al. A spatial

architecture-embedding HLA signature to predict clinical response to immunotherapy in

renal cell carcinoma. *Nat Med* 2024;30(6):1667-79.

40. Jin HT, Anderson AC, Tan WG, West EE, Ha SJ, Araki K, et al. Cooperation of Tim-3 and PD-

1 in CD8 T-cell exhaustion during chronic viral infection. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A*

2010;107(33):14733-8.

41. Sakuishi K, Apetoh L, Sullivan JM, Blazar BR, Kuchroo VK, Anderson AC. Targeting Tim-3

and PD-1 pathways to reverse T cell exhaustion and restore anti-tumor immunity. *J Exp*

Med 2010;207(10):2187-94.

42. James JL, Balko JM. Biomarker predictors for immunotherapy benefit in breast: beyond PD-

L1. *Curr Breast Cancer Rep* 2019;11(4):217-27.

43. Khan M, Du K, Ai M, Wang B, Lin J, Ren A, et al. PD-L1 expression as biomarker of efficacy

of PD-1/PD-L1 checkpoint inhibitors in metastatic triple negative breast cancer: A

systematic review and meta-analysis. *Front Immunol* 2023;14:1060308.

44. Perez-Lanzon M, Carbonnier V, Cordier P, De Palma FDE, Petrazzuolo A, Klein C, et al. New

hormone receptor-positive breast cancer mouse cell line mimicking the immune

microenvironment of anti-PD-1 resistant mammary carcinoma. *J Immunother Cancer*

2023;11(6).

45. Hollern DP, Xu N, Thennavan A, Glodowski C, Garcia-Recio S, Mott KR, et al. B cells and T

follicular helper cells mediate response to checkpoint inhibitors in high mutation burden

mouse models of breast cancer. *Cell* 2019;179(5):1191-206 e21.

Figure 1. MM001i and MM008i tumors exhibit differential immunotherapy responsiveness.

(**a**) Timeline of MM001i tumor injection and treatment with αPd-1 $\pm$ αCtla-4 or isotype controls. (**b-c**) Tumor growth curves of MM001i following injection into the mammary fat pads of WT or severely immunocompromised (NSG) female mice, respectively, in the indicated treatment groups. n=6 (WT) or 4 (NSG) animals per group with two tumors per mouse; *P*-values using two-way ANOVA.

(**d**) Timeline of MM008i tumor injection and treatment with αPd-1 $\pm$ αCtla-4 or isotype controls. (**e-f**) Tumor growth curves of MM001i following injection into the mammary fat pads of WT or NSG female mice, respectively, in the indicated treatment groups. n=6 (WT) or 4 (NSG) animals per group with two tumors per mouse; *P*-values using two-way ANOVA.

702
Figure 2. MM001i and MM008i tumors elicit durable immune memory response post-
immunotherapy treatments.

(**a**) Timeline of initial and subsequent MM001i tumor injections and treatment with αPd-1, αCtla-
4, or combination.

(**b**) Tumor growth curves of MM001i following second tumor engraftment into WT female mice.
n=4 animals per group (1 mouse for αPd-1) with two tumors per mouse; *P*-values using two-way
ANOVA.

(**c**) Timeline of initial and subsequent MM008i tumor injections and treatment with αPd-1, αCtla-
4, or combination.

(**d**) Tumor growth curves of MM008i following second tumor engraftment into WT female mice.
n=5 animals per group with two tumors per mouse; *P*-values using two-way ANOVA.

Figure 3. MM008i tumors are enriched with total T cells and pre-exhausted Pd-1$^+$Cd8$^+$ T cells
compared to MM001i tumors.

(**a**) Representative αCd3 IHC images of untreated MM001i and MM008i tumors.

(**b**) Quantification of Cd3$^+$ T cells/mm^3 in untreated MM001i and MM008i tumors using QuPath
bioimage analysis software (5 random uniform regions of interest per tumor; n=5 tumors for
MM001i, and 4 tumors for MM008i; *P* value by unpaired Student's *t*-test).

(**c-g**) Immune cell infiltrates with the indicated cell surface markers as estimated by flow
cytometry (n=4-5 tumors per group; *P* value by unpaired Student's *t*-test).

Figure 4. αCd8 neutralizing antibody abrogates αPd-1 response in MM008i tumors.

(**a**) Timeline of MM008i tumor injections and treatments with αPd-1 ± αCd8 or isotype controls.

(**b**) Tumor growth curves of MM008i following tumor injection in WT females in the indicated

treatment groups. n=5 animals per group with two tumors/mouse; *P*-values using two-way

ANOVA.

Figure 5. Gene expression profiling of MM001i and MM008i tumors.

(**a**) Volcano plot depicting differentially expressed genes between MM001i and MM008i cells in culture and tumors *in vivo* by RNA-seq (filtered by $\log_2$-fold change > 2 and adjusted *P*-value <0.05 for cultured cells and < 0.01 for tumors).

(**b-c**) UMAP clustering of MM001i and MM008i tumors, respectively, with cell type annotations by single-cell RNA-seq.

(**d**) Expression distributions for *Myc*, *Top2a*, *Ctla4*, *Cd86*, *Pdcd1*, and *Cd274* at the single cell level in MM001i and MM008i tumors overlaid upon respective UMAPs.