Humanized Monoclonal Antibody Rescues Rhesus macaques from Aerosolized Ricin Toxin Exposure

Chad J. Roy[1,*], Dylan J. Ehrbar[2], Natasha Bohorova[3], Ognian Bohorov[3], Do Kim[3], Michael Pauly[3], Kevin Whaley[3], Yinghui Rong[2], Fernando J Torres-Velez[2], Ellen S Vitetta[4], Peter J. Didier[1], Lara Doyle-Meyers[1], Larry Zeitlin[3,*], and Nicholas J. Mantis[2,*]

[1]Tulane National Primate Research Center, Covington, Louisiana USA; [2]Division of Infectious Disease, Wadsworth Center, New York State Department of Health, Albany, NY 12208; [3]Mapp Biopharmaceutical, Inc. San Diego, CA 92121; [4]Department of Immunology and Cancer Immunobiology Center, University of Texas Southwestern Medical Center, Dallas, TX 75390

Running title: Rescue from ricin aerosol exposure

Keywords: antibody, toxin, biodefense, therapeutic

*Corresponding authors: Chad J. Roy, Tulane National Primate Research Center, Microbiology Division, 18703 Three Rivers Road, Covington, LA 70433; Tel 985-871-6417, email: croy@tulane.edu; *Larry Zeitlin, Mapp Biopharmaceutical, Inc. San Diego, CA 92121; Phone: 858-625-0335; email: larry.zeitlin@mappbio.com;*Nicholas Mantis, Division of Infectious Disease, Wadsworth Center, 120 New Scotland Avenue, Albany, NY 12208. Phone: 518-473-7487. email: nicholas.mantis@health.ny.gov

Abstract

Ricin toxin ranks at the top of the list of potential bioweapons of concern to civilian and military personnel alike due to the high potential for morbidity and mortality after inhalation. In non-human primates, aerosolized ricin triggers a severe acute respiratory distress characterized by perivascular and alveolar edema, neutrophilic infiltration, and severe necrotizing bronchiolitis and alveolitis. Despite heightened public health and military concerns, there are currently no approved countermeasures for ricin. In this report, we demonstrate the therapeutic potential of huPB10, a toxin-neutralizing humanized monoclonal antibody (MAb) against an immunodominant epitope on ricin's enzymatic subunit. Five rhesus macaques that received intravenous huPB10 (10 mg/kg) four hours after lethal dose ricin aerosol exposure all survived the toxin challenge, as compared to control animals, which succumbed to ricin intoxication within 30 h. Antibody treatment at 12 h post-ricin exposure resulted in the survival of only one of five monkeys, signifying that, in the majority of animals, ricin intoxication and local tissue damage had progressed beyond the point where huPB10 intervention was beneficial. Principle coordinate analysis of fold change in pro-inflammatory cytokine/chemokines levels in bronchial alveolar lavage fluids before and after toxin challenge successfully clustered monkeys based on survival, as well as treatment group. IL-6 was the most apparent marker of ricin intoxication. This study represents the first demonstration in nonhuman primates that the lethal effects of inhalational ricin exposure can be negated by a drug candidate and opens up a path forward for product development.

52
Introduction

Ricin toxin is considered a high priority biothreat agent by the Centers for

Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), the US Department of Defense (DOD), and

NATO due to it's accessibility, stability, and high toxicity especially by the aerosol route.

(1, 2). In nonhuman primates (NHPs), inhalational ricin exposure elicits the clinical

equivalent of acute respiratory distress syndrome (ARDS), characterized by widespread

apoptosis of alveolar macrophages, intra-alveolar edema, neutrophilic infiltration,

accumulation of pro-inflammatory cytokines, and fibrinous exudate (3). Similar effects

are observed in experimental models of aerosol or intranasal ricin challenge conducted

in mice, rats and swine (4-8). Ricin toxin, derived from castor beans (*Ricinus*

communis), is a 65 kDa heterodimeric glycoprotein consisting of two subunits, RTA and

RTB, joined via a single disulfide bond. RTB binds to glycoproteins and glycolipids on

mammalian cells and facilitates ricin's retrograde transport to the endoplasmic reticulum

(ER). In the ER, RTA is liberated from RTB and then retrotranslocated into the

cytoplasm via the Sec61 complex (9). RTA is an RNA N-glycosidase that catalyzes the

hydrolysis of a conserved adenine residue within the sarcin/ricin loop of 28S rRNA,

resulting in protein synthesis arrest (10, 11) and activation of programmed cell death

(12). Alveolar macrophages are particularly sensitive to the cytotoxic effects and secrete

an array of pro-inflammatory cytokines before undergoing programmed cell death (6, 7,

13).

In this report we investigated the potential of humanized monoclonal antibody

(mAb) huPB10 to serve as a therapeutic in an established Rhesus macaques model of

inhalational ricin challenge (3, 14). PB10 was first described as a murine mAb with

potent-toxin neutralizing activity *in vitro* and *in vivo* (15). PB10 recognizes an

immunodominant epitope situated at the apex of RTA, relative to RTB (16, 17).

Chimeric (cPB10) and fully humanized (huPB10) versions of PB10 retain *in vitro* toxin-

neutralizing activity and have been shown to passively protect mice against lethal dose

ricin toxin administered by injection or inhalation (18, 19). It was also demonstrated that

huPB10 can rescue mice from ricin intoxication if administered 4-6 h post toxin

exposure (19). Based on these preliminary findings, we now sought to assess the

therapeutic potential of huPB10 in a well-established nonhuman primate (NHP) model

of ricin aerosol challenge (14). The NHP is believed to be the model most

representative of human ricin aerosol exposure; as such, it would likely be the primary

efficacy model for approval of an anti-ricin drug by the Food and Drug Administration.

Results

A total of 12 rhesus macaques (~7 kg; range 3.8-10.2 kg) bred at Tulane National

Primate Research Center (TNPRC) were randomly assigned to three experimental

groups and then challenged with ricin by small particle aerosol at a target dose of 18

µg/kg (**Table 1; Figure 1**). Group 1 (n=2) received intravenous administration of saline

4 h post challenge. Animals in groups 2 and 3 received huPB10 at 4 h or 12 h post

challenge, respectively (**Table 1**). huPB10 was administered intravenously at a final

dose of 10 mg/kg (**Table S1**). The macaques were subjected to whole body

plethysmography and radiotelemetry over the course of the study. Animals surviving on

day 14 post challenge were euthanized and subjected to complete necropsy and

histopathological analysis, as done for the other animals in the study. Serum and BAL

fluids were collected from the animals before and 24 h post ricin exposure.

Control animals (n=2) succumbed to ricin toxicosis within 36 hours of ricin

exposure (**Table 1; Figure 1**). The clinical progression of ricin-induced intoxication of

the control animals mimicked previous studies (3). Approximately 12-16 hours after

exposure, animals displayed reduced activity and signs consistent with fever (**Figure 2**).

Clinical examination conducted 24 h post exposure revealed respiratory complications,

including bilateral congestion and crackles, with dyspnea and tachypnea. Arterial

oxygen ranged from 75-85%. The clinical state of the animals continued to decline over

the subsequent several hours, manifested by a marked drop in normal activity and

mucous membranes appearing cyanotic.

In contrast, all five of the Rhesus macaques that received huPB10 at 4 h post-

ricin challenge time point survived (*P<0.01* compared to controls) and remained

otherwise normal for the duration of the three week post-exposure observation period

(**Table 1: Figure 1**). Compared to the control animals, the five macaques in Group 2

presented with only minimal signs of distress: mild dyspnea, minimal tachypnea and

increased lung sounds upon physical examination at 24 h post-exposure.

Finally, only one of the five animals in Group 3 that received huPB10 at 12 h

survived ricin challenge (**Table 1; Figure 1;** *P<0.01* and *P<0.05* compared to controls

and +4 h group, respectively). The remaining four animals succumbed to ricin

intoxication between 44 and 72 h post challenge and followed a clinical course similar to

the control animals. HuPB10 was detected in the sera and BAL fluids collected at 24 h

post ricin challenge, indicating that biodistribution of huPB10 was similar between

groups 2 and 3.

Gross examination of the sham-treated control animal lungs showed coalescing

hemorrhage with frothy exudate marked by fibrin in lung parenchyma (**Figure S1**). The

lungs of control animals were grossly described as fibrinosuppurative bronchointerstitial

pneumonia with pulmonary edema and bronchial epithelial necrosis, with severe

fibrinosuppurative lymphadenitis in the bronchial lymph nodes. The wet weights of

control animal lungs were >150 grams in contrast to a normal wet lung weight of ~30-40

grams in naïve animals of approximately the same body weight. Histologically, the lungs

of sham-treated animals showed hallmark inflammation consistent with ricin-induced

injury, characterized by marked edema, corresponding hemorrhage, and numerous

infiltrates. The pathological outcome of the four animals in Group 3 that succumbed to

ricin intoxication resembled that of the control animals. There was extensive pulmonary

congestion, edema, inflammation with infiltrates, and punctate hemorrhage evident.

Gross lung weights were similar to ricin-challenged control animals (>140 g) with clear

signs of hemorrhage.

Pathological analysis of the lung tissues collected at the time of euthanasia (day 21

post challenge) from the five survivors in Group 2 that had been treated with huPB10 at

4 h and the single animal in Group 3 (DR61) revealed evidence of chronic inflammation

and a distinctive fibrosis proximal to the respiratory bronicholes, reminiscent of past

studies in which animals had received sub-lethal exposures to ricin toxin (20).

Sera and BAL fluids collected before (day -7) and 24 h post ricin challenge were

subjected to analysis with a 29-plex cytokine/chemokine/growth factor Luminex array as

a means to assess the impact of huPB10 on local and systemic inflammatory

responses. In the sera of the two control animals, there were 12 cytokines/chemokines
that were significantly different in serum post- versus pre-challenge; 11 cytokines were
increased, while one (IL-8) was decreased (**Figure 3A; S2**). Most notable were IL-6
(~500-fold increase) and IL-1RA (~256-fold increase). VEGF was also elevated,
possibly reflecting response to pulmonary insult. Analysis of sera from animals that
received huPB10 at 4 h post challenge indicated that only four cytokine/chemokines
were significantly different from pre-challenge levels (3 up;1 down), including a ~4-fold
increase in IL-6. IL-1RA and VEGF levels were unchanged. In animals that received
huPB10 at 12 h post challenge, a total of six cytokines/chemokines changed relative to
pre-challenge levels, although the magnitude of these changes was less compared to
the control animals, possibly reflecting a dampening of the inflammatory response as a
consequence of huPB10 intervention. Principle component analysis (PCA) of fold-
change in cytokine/chemokine levels from serum samples from all 12 monkeys did not
reveal any clustering by experimental group or survival (**Figure S3A-C**), signifying that
serum inflammatory responses are not indicative of experimental outcome.
The impact of huPB10 intervention was much more apparent in BAL fluids than in
sera (**Figure 3B**). Within group 2, a total of 21 cytokines/chemokines were significantly
elevated following ricin challenge (as compared to pre-challenge levels), with IL-6 being
the most pronounced. In group 3, there were 25 cytokines/chemokines that were
significantly elevated compared to pre-challenge levels. Seven cytokines/chemokines
differed between the groups 2 and 3 with the most notable being IL-6, which was 32-fold
elevated in group 2 and 181-fold elevated in group 3. PCA successfully clustered
animals by both group and survival status, demonstrating that the localized cytokine
responses in the BAL are more closely tied to survival than the systemic responses
(**Figure S3D-E**). The relative contributions of the different cytokines/chemokines
responsible for segregating the animals into clusters are shown in **Figure S3F**.
170
Discussion
The results of this study constitute a major advance in longstanding efforts to
develop effective medical countermeasures against ricin toxin (2, 21). Foremost, it is the
first demonstration in NHPs that a drug candidate can rescue animals from the lethal

effects of aerosolized ricin toxin exposure. This is significant considering that licensure

of anti-ricin products for human will need to adhere to the Food and Drug

Administration's Animal Rule; human challenge studies with ricin are obviously unethical

(22). The well-established aerosolized ricin challenge model in Rhesus macaques was

a prerequisite for the therapeutic study conducted herein (3, 14, 23). Comparative

models in mice (4, 6, 24) and swine (8) may also be important for therapeutic

development under Animal Rule guidelines.

The fact that all five animals in group 2 (+4 h huPB10 intervention), and one animal

in group 3 (+12 h huPB10 intervention), survived toxin exposure indicates that a

significant proportion of ricin remains accessible to huPB0 in the alveolar space and/or

interstitial fluids for hours after inhalational exposure. This finding is remarkably

consistent with what has been reported in mice with huPB10 and other anti-ricin mAbs

(4, 5, 19, 25), but surprising all the same considering the rate that ricin can gain entry

into mammalian cells (26) and the extraordinary sensitivity of the lung mucosa to the

effects of toxin exposure. We postulate high dose intravenous delivery of huPB10

results in the accumulation of huPB10 within the lung mucosa and alveolar space where

it can engage free (soluble) or receptor-bound ricin. Whether transudation or active

transport of antibodies from serum into the lung mucosa is triggered by ricin exposure

itself has not been evaluated (27). Nonetheless, once in the lung mucosa, huPB10

presumably limits toxin uptake into target cells (e.g., macrophages and airway epithelial

cells) and/or interferes with ricin intracellular transport in the event that endocytosis of

ricin-antibody complexes should occur (28, 29). Work by Magun and colleagues made

it clear more than a decade ago that protecting alveolar macrophages is paramount in

limiting toxin-induced lung damage (7, 30).

It is worth underscoring the value of the 29-plex monkey cytokine/chemokine/growth

factor array in not only identifying local inflammatory markers like IL-6 that arise

following ricin exposure but also enabling through PCA the unbiased clustering of

specific animals based on survival or experimental group. Identifying an inflammatory

"fingerprint" associated with ricin exposure has obvious applications in diagnostics,

especially in the context of biodefense where early clinical symptoms following

exposure to different toxins and pathogens may in fact be indistinguishable (31). As

noted above, IL-6 levels were particularly elevated following ricin exposure, which is
consistent with what has been observed in mice (32). IL-6 is a particularly potent driver
of pulmonary inflammation and could very well be a major contributor to ricin-induced
pathology (33). In fact, we have observed that human lung epithelial cell lines
preferentially secrete IL-6 following ricin exposure, particularly in conjunction with co-
stimulatory molecules like TRAIL (Y. Rong, J. Westfall, D. Ehrbar, T. LaRocca, and N.
Mantis, *manuscript in revision*). The possibility that the huPB10 therapeutic window
might be extended with anti-inflammatory agents is worth investigating (25).
214
Methods
Ricin toxin and huPB10. Purified ricin toxin derived from castor beans (*Ricinus*
communis) was produced at the University of Texas Southwestern and was procured
from BEI resources (14). huPB10 was expressed using a *Nicotiana benthamiana*-based
manufacturing platform. The properties of huPB10 used in this study are shown in
Table S1.
221
Animal care and use. Rhesus macaques were born and housed at the Tulane
National Primate Research Center (Covington, LA), which is US Department of
Agriculture-licensed and fully accredited by the Association for Assessment and
Accreditation of Laboratory Animal Care (AAALAC). Aerosolization, dosing and delivery
of ricin were performed as described (14). The LD_{50} of ricin is 5.8 µg/kg body weight
and the target dose for this experiment was set at the equivalent of three LD_{50}s ($\approx$18
µg/kg). The mean inhaled dose of ricin across all animals was 4.4 ± 1.4 LD_{50}s.
At 4 h or 12 hours post-exposure, designated animal groups received a single
intravenous administration of huPB10 by slow infusion at an individualized unit dose of
10 mg/kg. Sham-treated animals were administered saline for injection at the 4h time
point. Treated animals were observed for signs of adverse reactions to the antibody
during administration and throughout anesthesia recovery period. Animals were bled
just before and 24 h following aerosol challenge. Blood was also collected when the
animals either succumbed to intoxication or 21 d after challenge, when the experiment
was terminated. Animals determined to be in respiratory distress and those that

survived for 21 d after exposure to ricin were euthanized by an overdose of sodium

pentobarbital, consistent with the recommendation of the American Veterinary Medical

Association's Panel on Euthanasia, and submitted for necropsy. All methods were

approved by the Tulane Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee (IACUC). After

gross necropsy, tissues were collected in neutral buffered zinc-formalin solution (Z-Fix

Concentrate, Anatach). Tissues were processed, sectioned, and stained as previously

described (3).

Statistics. Statistical analysis was carried out with GraphPad Prism 6 (GraphPad

Software, La Jolla California USA). The difference in outcomes between groups was

determined by Fisher's exact test (two-tailed) and the mean survival times after

exposure to ricin were compared by log-rank analysis of Kaplan–Meier survival curves.

The statistical significance of the effects of ricin challenge and huPB10 intervention on

cytokine levels were analyzed with two-way repeated measures ANOVAs in both serum

and BAL, with the repeated measures being pre- and post-exposure status, and

treatment group as the independent measure. Resulting p-values were corrected with

the Benjamini, Krieger, and Yekutieli method to control false discovery rate. All

analyses were performed on $\log^2$ transformed raw fluorescent intensity values to avoid

the need to censor values. PCA analysis was performed using singular value

decomposition with the R package FactoMineR (34). Heatmap construction using raw

fold change values was done using GraphPad Prism 6. Hierarchical clustering and

scaled heatmap construction was completed with the R package pheatmap (35).

Author contributions. NB, OB, DK, MP, KW and ESV generated reagents; PJD, LDM,

YR, and CJR conducted animal studies and animal tissue/sample analysis; DJE

performed statistical analysis; CJR, NJM and LZ are responsible for experimental

design and manuscript preparation.

Conflicts of interest. NB, OB, DK, MP are Mapp Biopharmaceutical employees and

shareholders. KW and LZ are employees, shareholders, and co-owners of Mapp

Biopharmaceutical. The remaining authors declare no conflicts of interest.

Acknowledgements. This work was supported by R01AI098774 to LZ and Contract

No. HHSN272201400021C to NJM from the National Institutes of Allergy and Infectious

Diseases, National Institutes of Health (NIH), as well as the National Center for

Research Resources and the Office of Research Infrastructure Programs (ORIP) of the

NIH through grant OD011104 at the Tulane National Primate Research Center to CJR.

The content is solely the responsibility of the authors and does not necessarily

represent the official views of the National Institutes of Health. The funders had no role

in study design, data collection and analysis, decision to publish, or preparation of the

manuscript.

References

1. Cieslak TJ, Kortepeter MG, Wojtyk RJ, Jansen HJ, Reyes RA, Smith JO, et al.

Beyond the Dirty Dozen: A Proposed Methodology for Assessing Future Bioweapon

Threats. *Mil Med.* 2018;183(1-2):e59-e65.

2. Wolfe DN, Florence W, and Bryant P. Current biodefense vaccine programs and

challenges. *Human vaccines & immunotherapeutics.* 2013;9(7):1591-7.

3. Pincus SH, Bhaskaran M, Brey RN, 3rd, Didier PJ, Doyle-Meyers LA, and Roy CJ.

Clinical and Pathological Findings Associated with Aerosol Exposure of Macaques to

Ricin Toxin. *Toxins (Basel).* 2015;7(6):2121-33.

4. Poli MA, Rivera VR, Pitt ML, and Vogel P. Aerosolized specific antibody protects

mice from lung injury associated with aerosolized ricin exposure. *Toxicon.*

1996;34(9):1037-44.

5. Pratt TS, Pincus SH, Hale ML, Moreira AL, Roy CJ, and Tchou-Wong KM.

Oropharyngeal aspiration of ricin as a lung challenge model for evaluation of the

therapeutic index of antibodies against ricin A-chain for post-exposure treatment.

Exp Lung Res. 2007;33(8-9):459-81.

6. Wong J, Korcheva V, Jacoby DB, and Magun B. Intrapulmonary delivery of ricin at

high dosage triggers a systemic inflammatory response and glomerular damage. *Am

J Pathol.* 2007;170(5):1497-510.

7. Lindauer ML, Wong J, Iwakura Y, and Magun BE. Pulmonary inflammation triggered
by ricin toxin requires macrophages and IL-1 signaling. *J Immunol.*
2009;183(2):1419-26.
8. Katalan S, Falach R, Rosner A, Goldvaser M, Brosh-Nissimov T, Dvir A, et al. A
novel swine model of ricin-induced acute respiratory distress syndrome. *Dis Model*
Mech. 2017;10(2):173-83.
9. Spooner RA, and Lord JM. How Ricin and Shiga Toxin Reach the Cytosol of Target
Cells: Retrotranslocation from the Endoplasmic Reticulum. *Curr Top Microbiol*
Immunol. 2012;357:19-40.
10. Endo Y, Mitsui K, Motizuki M, and Tsurugi K. The mechanism of action of ricin and
related toxic lectins on eukaryotic ribosomes. The site and the characteristics of the
modification in 28 S ribosomal RNA caused by the toxins. *J Biol Chem.*
1987;262(12):5908-12.
11. Endo Y, and Tsurugi K. RNA N-glycosidase activity of ricin A-chain. Mechanism of
action of the toxic lectin ricin on eukaryotic ribosomes. *J Biol Chem.*
1987;262(17):8128-30.
12. Tesh VL. The induction of apoptosis by Shiga toxins and ricin. *Curr Top Microbiol*
Immunol. 2012;357:137-78.
13. Brown RF, and White DE. Ultrastructure of rat lung following inhalation of ricin
aerosol. *Int J Exp Pathol.* 1997;78(4):267-76.
14. Roy CJ, Brey RN, Mantis NJ, Mapes K, Pop IV, Pop LM, et al. Thermostable ricin
vaccine protects rhesus macaques against aerosolized ricin: Epitope-specific
neutralizing antibodies correlate with protection. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A.*
2015;112(12):3782-7.
15. O'Hara JM, Neal LM, McCarthy EA, Kasten-Jolly JA, Brey RN, 3rd, and Mantis NJ.
Folding domains within the ricin toxin A subunit as targets of protective antibodies.
Vaccine. 2010;28:7035-46.
16. Toth Rt, Angalakurthi SK, Van Slyke G, Vance DJ, Hickey JM, Joshi SB, et al. High-
Definition Mapping of Four Spatially Distinct Neutralizing Epitope Clusters on RiVax,
a Candidate Ricin Toxin Subunit Vaccine. *Clin Vaccine Immunol.* 2017.

17. Vance DJ, and Mantis NJ. Resolution of two overlapping neutralizing B cell epitopes
within a solvent exposed, immunodominant alpha-helix in ricin toxin's enzymatic
subunit. *Toxicon.* 2012;60(5):874-7.

18. Sully EK, Whaley K, Bohorova N, Bohorov O, Goodman C, Kim D, et al. A tripartite
cocktail of chimeric monoclonal antibodies passively protects mice against ricin,
staphylococcal enterotoxin B and Clostridium perfringens epsilon toxin. *Toxicon.*
2014;92:36-41.

19. Van Slyke G, Sully EK, Bohorova N, Bohorov O, Kim D, Pauly MH, et al. Humanized
Monoclonal Antibody That Passively Protects Mice against Systemic and Intranasal
Ricin Toxin Challenge. *Clin Vaccine Immunol.* 2016;23(9):795-9.

20. Bhaskaran M, Didier PJ, Sivasubramani SK, Doyle LA, Holley J, and Roy CJ.
Pathology of lethal and sublethal doses of aerosolized ricin in rhesus macaques.
Toxicol Pathol. 2014;42(3):573-81.

21. Reisler RB, and Smith LA. The need for continued development of ricin
countermeasures. *Adv Prev Med.* 2012;2012:149737.

22. .

23. Roy CJ, Song K, Sivasubramani SK, Gardner DJ, and Pincus SH. Animal Models of
Ricin Toxicosis. *Curr Top Microbiol Immunol.* 2012.

24. Wong J, Korcheva V, Jacoby DB, and Magun BE. Proinflammatory responses of
human airway cells to ricin involve stress-activated protein kinases and NF-kappaB.
Am J Physiol Lung Cell Mol Physiol. 2007;293(6):L1385-94.

25. Gal Y, Mazor O, Falach R, Sapoznikov A, Kronman C, and Sabo T. Treatments for
Pulmonary Ricin Intoxication: Current Aspects and Future Prospects. *Toxins (Basel).*
2017;9(10).

26. van Deurs B, Hansen SH, Petersen OW, Melby EL, and Sandvig K. Endocytosis,
intracellular transport and transcytosis of the toxic protein ricin by a polarized
epithelium. *EurJCell Biol.* 1990;51(1):96-109.

27. Spiekermann GM, Finn PW, Ward ES, Dumont J, Dickinson BL, Blumberg RS, et al.
Receptor-mediated immunoglobulin G transport across mucosal barriers in adult life:
functional expression of FcRn in the mammalian lung. *J Exp Med.* 2002;196(3):303-
10.

28. O'Hara JM, and Mantis NJ. Neutralizing monoclonal antibodies against ricin's
enzymatic subunit interfere with protein disulfide isomerase-mediated reduction of
ricin holotoxin in vitro. *J Immunol Methods.* 2013;395(1-2):71-8.
29. Yermakova A, Klokk TI, O'Hara JM, Cole R, Sandvig K, and Mantis NJ. Neutralizing
Monoclonal Antibodies against Disparate Epitopes on Ricin Toxin's Enzymatic
Subunit Interfere with Intracellular Toxin Transport. *Sci Rep.* 2016;6:22721.
30. Wong J, Magun BE, and Wood LJ. Lung inflammation caused by inhaled toxicants: a
review. *Int J Chron Obstruct Pulmon Dis.* 2016;11:1391-401.
31. Lipscomb MF, Hutt J, Lovchik J, Wu T, and Lyons CR. The pathogenesis of acute
pulmonary viral and bacterial infections: investigations in animal models. *Annu Rev*
Pathol. 2010;5:223-52.
32. Sabo T, Gal Y, Elhanany E, Sapoznikov A, Falach R, Mazor O, et al. Antibody
treatment against pulmonary exposure to abrin confers significantly higher levels of
protection than treatment against ricin intoxication. *Toxicol Lett.* 2015;237(2):72-8.
33. Rubini A. Interleukin-6 and lung inflammation: evidence for a causative role in
inducing respiratory system resistance increments. *Inflamm Allergy Drug Targets.*
2013;12(5):315-21.
34. Lê S, Josse J, and Husson F. FactoMineR: An R Package for Multivariate Analysis.
Journal of Statistical Software. 2008;25(1):1-18.
35. Kolde R. pheatmap: Pretty Heatmaps. https://cran.r-
project.org/web/packages/pheatmap/index.html. Updated 2018-05-19.
380
381

Figure Legends

Figure 1. Ricin aerosol challenge and effect of treatment and macaque survival. A. Animals were aerosol challenged with ricin aerosols and the individual ricin doses, expressed in μg/kg inhaled, and clustered by treatment group, show minimal variation in dosing, bars represent group mean ± standard deviation; the aerosol target dose of 18 μg/kg represented by segmented line. B. Macaque survival is represented by survival curve. The two control animals succumbed to intoxication by day 2; treatment with huPB10 at 4 h post ricin challenge resulted in 5/5 survival, while treatment with huPB10 at 12 h resulted in only 1/5 survivors.

Figure 2. Physiological response to ricin. A. Radiotelemetry of core temperature of rhesus macaques treated with huPB10 either at 4 h or 12 h post-exposure to ricin aerosol. Continuous monitoring showed significant differences ($P<0.005$) between the initiation and tempo of pyrexia that was dependent on the time to treat. B. Fever intensity showed differences between the relative change (increase) based upon time to treat. Respiratory function measured by whole-body plethysmography. Respiratory function was measured via head-out conductance plethysmography prior to and at timed intervals post challenge. C. Significant changes ($P<0.05$) in post-exposure group tidal volume was observed among animals rescued from ricin intoxication, (D) although compensatory changes in frequency resulted in minimal observable changes in minute volume, with some animals producing increased minute volumes +24 h post-exposure to ricin.

Figure 3. Cytokine profiles of serum and BAL in ricin challenged Rhesus macaques. Heatmaps present log_2-fold change of cytokines in (A) serum and (B) BAL, comparing samples collected 24 hours post-challenge to those collected 7 days pre-challenge. Animals are separated into groups for controls, 4-hour, and 12-hour huPB10 interventions. Increases in cytokine levels are shown in red, while decreases are shown in blue. Specific values for the fold changes are shown within each cell.

414 **Tables**

Table 1. Experimental groups and outcome of ricin challenge

Group	ID	kg	M/F[a]	RT[b]	huPB10 (μg/ml)[c] serum	BAL	TTD[d]	#/total
Control	DH27	9.7	M	14	-	-	28 h	
	JP56	8.4	M	26	-	-	30 h	0/2
+4 h huPB10	LJ80	4.4	M	31	157	2.8	+	
	LB98	4.9	M	29	177	2.7	+	
	EM61	9.5	M	31	207	2.5	+	
	IC70	5.9	F	26	225	3.6	+	
	IL40	6.1	F	33	147	3.2	+	5/5
+12 h huPB10	JM39	9.4	M	22	205	42.8	72 h	
	DR61	10.2	F	24	265	3.9	+	
	KP48	5.8	M	30	203	25.7	48 h	
	KR49	5.7	M	29	151	3.1	49 h	
	LB26	3.8	M	29	191	11.3	44 h	1/5

[a], sex of animal; [b], ricin toxin (RT) dose (μg/kg) received per animal; [c], huPB10 in serum and BAL from samples collected at 24 h post challenge. The average in serum was 182.6 μg/ml and 203 μg/ml for the +4 and +12 h groups, respectively. In the BAL, the was 3.04 μg/ml and 17.3 μg/ml, respectively. Times of huPB10 administration are approximate (~ 30 minutes of point estimate); the logistics of performing slow intravenous infusion of huPB10 in monkeys initiated and was times at 4 hours from each of the individual ricin aerosol challenge events and was performed in sequence; [d], time to death (TTD); +, indicates survival for 21 day duration of study.

Supplemental Material

<u>Supplemental Methods</u>

Animal Husbandry and Telemetry. Rhesus macaques were born and housed at the Tulane National Primate Research Center (Covington, LA), which is US Department of Agriculture-licensed and fully accredited by the Association for Assessment and Accreditation of Laboratory Animal Care. Subcutaneous radiotelemetry transmitters combined with sensors capable of detecting biopotential signals of an electrocardiogram as well as thermistor-type sensors capable of detecting temperature signals (T34G-8; Konigsberg Instruments) were surgically implanted under aseptic conditions in 8 of the 12 vaccinated macaques and both control macaques before the start of the study. Animals determined to be in respiratory distress and those that survived for 21 d after exposure to ricin were euthanized by an overdose of sodium pentobarbital, consistent with the recommendation of the American Veterinary Medical Association's Panel on Euthanasia, and submitted for necropsy. All methods were approved by the Tulane Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee (IACUC).

Treatment of Rhesus macaques. At 4 h or 12 hours postexposure, designated animal groups received a single intravenous administration of huPB10 by slow infusion at an individualized unit dose of 10 mg/kg. Sham-treated animals were administered saline for injection at the four-hour time point. Treated animals were observed for signs of adverse reactions to the antibody during administration and throughout anesthesia recovery period. Animals were bled just before and 24 h following aerosol challenge. Blood was also collected when the animals either succumbed to intoxication or 21 d after challenge, when the experiment was terminated.

Ricin aerosolization, dosing, and calculation. Aerosolization, dosing and delivery of ricin were performed as described (14). Inductive plethysmography that measures volume of air breathed by each individual animal per minute was performed just before the ricin exposure. Ricin was dissolved in 10 mL sterile phosphate buffer saline to the

desired concentration for each animal based on plethysmography data obtained 2 d

before the exposure. Aerosols were generated directly into a head-only chamber using

a Collision three jet-nebulizer (BGI) with fully automated management control system

(Biaera Technologies, Hagerstown, MD) all within a Class III biological safety cabinet

housed within the TNPRC high-containment (BSL-3) laboratories. The nebulizer

operated at 18 lb/inch^2 equating to a flow of 7.5 L/min and produced 3.0E+04 particles

per cc with a mass median aerodynamic diameter of ~1.4 µm. Each discrete aerosol

exposure lasted 10 minutes (per animal). Air samples were continuously obtained

during the exposure and the protein concentrations of these samples were determined

using a micro-BSA protein assay kit (Thermo Scientific). The aerosol concentrations

were determined and the inhaled dose of RT for each animal was calculated by

multiplying the empirically determined aerosol exposure concentration (µg/liter of air) in

the chamber by volume of air estimated to have been breathed by the animal (via

results of plethysmography just before exposure). The LD$_{50}$ of ricin is 5.8 µg/kg body

weight and the target dose for this experiment was set at the equivalent of three LD$_{50}$s

(≈18 µg/kg). The mean inhaled dose of ricin across all animals was 4.4 ± 1.4 LD$_{50}$s.

Statistics. Statistical analysis was carried out with GraphPad Prism 6 (GraphPad

Software, La Jolla California USA). The difference in outcomes between groups was

determined by Fisher's exact test (two-tailed) and the mean survival times after

exposure to ricin were compared by log-rank analysis of Kaplan–Meier survival curves.

The statistical significance of the effects of ricin challenge and huPB10 intervention on

cytokine levels were analyzed with two-way repeated measures ANOVAs in both serum

and BAL, with the repeated measures being pre- and post-exposure status, and

treatment group as the independent measure. Resulting p-values were corrected with

the Benjamini, Krieger, and Yekutieli method to control false discovery rate. All

analyses were performed on log^2 transformed raw fluorescent intensity values to avoid

the need to censor values. PCA analysis was performed using singular value

decomposition with the R package FactoMineR (34). Heatmap construction using raw

fold change values was done using GraphPad Prism 6. Hierarchical clustering and

scaled heatmap construction was completed with the R package pheatmap (35).

Tissue Collection, Histological Analysis, and Special Stains. After gross necropsy,

tissues were collected in neutral buffered zinc-formalin solution (Z-Fix Concentrate,

Anatach). Tissues were processed, sectioned, and stained as previously described (3)

Supplemental Table

Table S1. Characteristics of huPB10 used in study		
Test Parameters	**Test Method**	**Result**
Concentration	UV Absorbance	19.7 mg/mL
Appearance	Visible	clear, liquid
Physical/chemical	pH Determination	5.6
Purity	SDS-PAGE	> 99%
Osmolality	Micro-Osmometer	412 mOS/kg
Bioburden	Bioburden Testing	0 CFU/mL
Aggregates	Size Exclusion HPLC	1.90%
Potency	ELISA	20.0 mg/mL
Safety	Endotoxin	0.2 EU/mg

Figure S1. Gross pathology associated with ricin exposure and huPB10 intervention. The lungs of sham-treated animals (Figure 3a) show hallmark inflammation, marked edema, corresponding hemorrhage, and numerous infiltrates; grossly, wet weight at 3x normal with coalescing hemorrhage. Animals treated with huPB10 at 4 h (Figure 3b & 3c) show remarkably little pulmonary damage, with occasional infiltrates; lung wet weights were essentially normal. Animals treated with huPB10 at 12 hours (Figure 3d) demonstrated mild to moderate inflammation with infiltrates, edema, and punctate hemorrhage evident; gross lung weight were approximately 2x with clear signs of hemorrhage. Original magnification at 10x

Fig. S2 Scaled heatmap and cluster analysis of log2-fold changes in cytokine levels in individual macaques following ricin challenge. Heatmaps visualizing log2-fold changes in cytokines in serum (A) and BAL (B). Both individual animals and cytokines are arranged by hierarchical clustering, represented by dendrograms on top and to the right of the heatmaps, respectively. Surviving animals are marked in white in the top bar above the heatmap, while dead animals are in black. In the bar below this, the 4-hour group of animals are marked in red, the 12-hour group in blue, and the control group in green. Fold change values are centered and scaled for each cytokine by first subtracting the mean fold change from each value and then dividing by the standard deviation of that cytokine.

Fig. S3 Principal component analysis of cytokine fold changes following ricin challenge. Scatter plots of first 2 principal components of log2-transformed cytokine fold changes in A-C) BAL and (D-F) serum from all animals included in the study, calculated used singular value decomposition. Each dot represents an individual monkey; red for those in the 4-hour group, black for the 12-hour group, and green for the control group. 95% confidence ellipses of the group means are represented in the color of the group they correspond to. Eigenvectors for (C) BAL and (F) and analyses are colored to show the percent contribution of each variable to the principal components.

A.

B.

Figure 2

A. Serum

Figure 3

	Control		4 hr intervention					12 hr intervention				
	DH27	JP56	LB98	IC70	IL40	LJ80	EM61	KP48	KR49	LB26	DR61	JM39
EGF	1.53	0.83	-0.17	0.73	0.28	-0.83	0.64	0.27	0.64	-0.67	0.79	1.42
Eotaxin	0.62	0.91	-0.01	0.48	0.31	0.28	0.40	-0.29	0.01	-0.05	-0.17	0.61
FGF-basic	0.38	1.49	0	0.33	-0.27	-0.32	0.40	0.25	0.28	-0.35	0.29	0.73
G-CSF	2.58	4.92	-0.07	0.05	-0.93	-0.22	-0.33	-0.14	-0.21	-0.33	-0.10	0.21
GM-CSF	1.58	2.16	-0.21	-0.05	0.08	-0.07	0.07	-0.03	0.04	-0.18	-0.07	0.26
HGF	0.33	0.68	-0.24	-0.10	-1.07	-0.22	0.04	-0.17	-0.16	-0.04	-0.15	0.23
IFN-g	0.53	0.74	-0.20	-0.05	-1.15	-0.22	0	-0.13	-0.21	0	-0.24	0.57
IL-1b	0.99	1.56	-0.15	-0.01	-0.33	-0.06	0.15	-0.06	-0.03	-0.07	-0.38	0.44
IL-1RA	7.17	8.47	0.09	0.04	0.12	-0.47	1.73	1.68	0.84	1.55	1.35	3.74
IL-2	1.04	1.64	-0.08	-0.10	0.10	0	0.07	-0.07	0.07	-0.03	-0.21	0.13
IL-4	0.23	0.35	-0.15	-0.08	-0.58	-0.12	-0.11	0	-0.07	0.08	-0.14	-0.07
IL-5	1.04	1.95	-0.21	0.26	-0.39	-0.97	0.18	-0.06	0.15	-0.20	-0.38	0.06
IL-6	8.65	9.64	1.41	1.94	2.23	2.14	2.61	2.30	0.64	2.49	2.24	4.18
IL-8	-0.85	-1.52	-1.74	-1.87	-1.83	-2.01	-0.84	-2.28	-2.80	-1.78	-3.56	-1.90
IL-10	0.60	0.85	-0.06	-0.03	-0.77	-0.03	0.06	-0.01	0.10	0.05	0	0.12
IL-12	-0.44	0.05	-0.13	-0.27	-0.82	-0.43	0.07	-0.32	-0.25	-0.10	-0.22	-0.55
IL-15	0.57	0.96	-0.18	0.05	-0.61	-0.16	0.27	-0.08	0.02	-0.45	-0.11	0.21
IL-17	0.05	-0.08	-0.10	-0.12	-0.23	-0.40	0.04	-0.21	-0.18	-0.42	-0.18	0.14
I-TAC	-0.32	-0.17	-0.57	-0.74	0.50	-0.56	0.50	-0.19	-0.81	-0.71	-0.36	0.18
MCP-1	3.05	4.02	-0.16	0.73	0.72	0.28	1.68	-0.22	0.30	0.26	-0.31	1.41
MDC	-0.25	0.19	-0.16	-0.28	-0.04	0.17	0.33	0	0.23	0.08	-0.42	-0.36
MIF	2.00	1.74	0.27	1.09	0.22	-0.67	0.78	0.62	0.67	-0.48	1.39	0.86
MIG	0.31	0.38	-0.26	-0.18	-0.94	-0.07	-0.04	0.10	-0.18	-0.17	-0.20	0.25
MIP-1a	0.71	0.77	-0.16	0	-1.04	0.13	0.10	-0.15	0.17	0	-0.18	0.24
MIP-1b	0.44	0.82	-0.17	-0.04	-0.77	-0.20	0.08	-0.10	-0.10	0.14	-0.06	0.42
RANTES	0.04	0.08	-0.02	-0.02	0.01	0.03	-0.04	-0.04	-0.01	-0.06	-0.07	-0.01
TNF-a	0.30	0.58	-0.19	-0.02	-1.34	-0.11	0	-0.32	0.11	-0.21	-0.12	0.15
VEGF	3.18	3.71	0.32	0.31	1.16	0.14	0.67	0.73	0.20	0.67	0.44	1.57
IP-10	0.33	0.71	-0.10	-0.23	-1.12	-0.07	-0.10	-0.15	0	-0.17	-0.03	0.13

B. BAL

	Control	4 hr intervention					12 hr intervention				
	DH27	LB98	IC70	IL40	LJ80	EM61	KP48	KR49	LB26	DR61	JM39
EGF	0.10	0.07	0.12	0.26	-0.10	0.05	-0.02	0.19	0.22	0.22	0.29
Eotaxin	2.25	0.98	2.84	1.97	1.73	1.09	3.78	2.00	3.69	2.74	4.23
FGF-basic	0.62	0.41	0.13	0.14	-0.08	0.03	0.62	0.49	0.45	0.56	0.62
G-CSF	1.21	0.17	0.20	0.29	0.21	0.20	0.19	0.25	1.21	0.38	3.74
GM-CSF	1.02	0.26	0.50	0.64	0.80	0.57	1.00	1.23	1.29	1.11	1.65
HGF	0.21	0.09	0	0.29	0.13	0.05	0.42	0.37	0.52	0.23	1.02
IFN-g	-0.17	0.09	0.13	0	0.11	0	0.47	0.28	0.35	0.28	0.47
IL-1b	1.76	0.84	0.57	2.16	0.82	1.29	1.04	1.32	1.52	2.76	2.36
IL-1RA	2.28	0.10	0.98	2.09	1.10	1.52	2.25	2.81	1.75	3.72	3.41
IL-2	0.92	0.03	0.21	0.40	0.16	0.16	0.90	0.90	1.04	0.88	1.39
IL-4	0.22	0.15	0.08	0.03	0.12	0	0.35	0.14	0.22	0.29	0.51
IL-5	1.07	0.25	0.58	0.63	0.28	0.29	1.12	1.56	1.46	1.43	1.90
IL-6	6.25	3.79	5.20	5.40	4.16	4.53	6.79	5.27	7.74	7.96	7.79
IL-8	0.85	0.62	0.58	0.77	1.01	0.50	0.55	1.03	1.04	1.08	1.03
IL-10	0.08	0.04	0.08	0.06	0.03	0.01	0.27	0.73	0.34	0.23	0.53
IL-12	0.04	0.04	0.11	0.15	0.17	0.12	0.28	0.24	0.26	0.25	0.55
IL-15	-0.21	-0.02	0.09	0.16	-0.02	0.03	0.54	0.11	0.26	0.20	0.32
IL-17	0.20	0.07	0.17	0.58	0.16	0.03	0.74	0.69	1.52	0.22	0.69
I-TAC	-0.81	1.84	0.93	1.65	0.64	1.63	0.33	1.04	0.75	1.78	1.42
MCP-1	-0.89	2.69	2.02	3.02	3.78	3.51	3.83	3.71	5.19	1.97	4.65
MDC	-0.06	1.73	1.62	2.01	1.34	2.70	1.30	1.51	0.56	2.72	3.62
MIF	1.47	1.10	0.73	0.51	0.73	0.46	-0.48	1.11	0.07	-0.48	-0.86
MIG	0	0	-0.13	0.06	0.06	0.13	0.14	-0.21	0.16	0.29	0.20
MIP-1a	0.51	0.47	0.45	1.78	1.09	0.45	0.42	0.48	2.45	0.78	0.91
MIP-1b	0.64	0.06	0.13	0.27	0.13	0.07	0.72	0.49	1.42	0.46	0.81
RANTES	0.37	-0.22	-0.31	-0.39	-0.18	-0.09	-0.76	-0.08	-0.63	-0.58	-0.40
TNF-a	0.49	0.28	0.36	0.77	0.51	0.47	0.65	0.75	0.74	0.77	1.37
VEGF	-1.36	-0.24	0.50	-0.29	0.27	0.14	0.62	-0.30	1.34	2.02	0.39
IP-10	0.10	0.08	0.14	0.17	0.08	0.15	0.74	0.24	0.68	0.43	0.76

Supplemental Figures

Figure S1

A.

B.

C.

D.