Journal of Transplantation Technologies & Research

Denner, J Transplant Technol Res 2014, 4:2
DOI: 10.4172/2161-0991.1000133

Review Article Open Access

Xenotransplantation-Progress and Problems: A Review

Joachim Denner*

Centre for HIV and Retrovirology, Robert Koch Institute, Berlin, Germany

***Corresponding author:** Joachim Denner, Centre for HIV and Retrovirology, Robert Koch Institute, Berlin, Germany, Tel: +4930187542800; E-mail: DennerJ@rki.de

Rec date: May 30, 2014, **Acc date:** Jul 23, 2014, **Pub date:** Jul 25, 2014

Abstract

Xenotransplantation using pig cells, tissues or organs is considered to be a solution to the shortage of human allotransplants. Pigs have been selected as optimal donor for several reasons, among them physiological and economical. Before xenotransplantation will be applied broadly in the clinic three hurdles need to be overcome: (i) rejection due to immune reactions and coagulation dysfunction, (ii) physiological incompatibility and (iii) microbiological risk. Although some clinical trials have been performed in the past and some are ongoing, most experience is gained from pig-to-non human primate experiments. To overcome immune rejection, numerous multitransgenic and knock-down animals were produced or are in preparation. The physiological compatibility is still badly studied, mainly due to the short survival time of the recipient animals. Last not least, xenotransplantation may be associated with the risk of transmission of porcine microorganisms. Most of them can be eliminated by designated pathogen free breeding of the animals; however, porcine endogenous retroviruses (PERVs) represent a special risk. PERVs are integrated as proviruses in the genome of all pigs, they can be released as viral particles and infect human cells. An extensive screening program and selection of donor animals with a low expression of PERV accompanied by the development of different strategies to prevent PERV transmission is therefore requested. Finally, a broad discussion within the scientific community and the society concerning ethical aspects of xenotransplantation had been taken place.

Keywords: Xenotransplantation; Diabetes; Organ transplantation; Porcine endogenous retroviruses

Introduction

Transplantation is a way to treat severe organ and tissue failures. Organ transplantation has been one of the preeminent successes in the field of medicine. An experimental procedure 40 years ago, organ allotransplantation is meanwhile so successful, that there is a shortage of human organs suitable for transplantation. In Germany for example, at present 11,000 persons are on the waiting list for a donor organ, among them 8000 for a kidney, approximately 25% of them will die being on this list [1]. With the increase in age of the human population, the need of different types of transplantations is increasing. For example, pancreas transplantations are applied to treat diabetes, the failure of the isle T-cells in the pancreas to produce insulin. Unfortunately, suitable human donor organs are very rare. For several reasons diabetes has become an epidemic, with the number of affected people in 2010 of 285 million (6.4% of the world population) and 382 Million in 2013 [2]. According to the International Diabetes Federation this number is expected to increase to 439 million by 2030 and 592 million by 2035 [2]. Moreover, because of the many long-term complications of diabetes, such as kidney and heart disease, impotence, limb amputations and blindness, treatment for diabetes accounts for 10% of health-care expenditure in Europe (€25 billion per annum) [3].

When discussing alternatives to allotransplantation, strategies to prevent the organ failure are usually neglected. However, prevention of organ failure is the best and least expensive way to prevent transplantation and should be enforced. In the case prevention failed, alternatives to allotransplantation are (i) mechanical devices, which are under development mainly for the treatment of heart failure, (ii) tissue engineering and (iii) the stem cell technology. Although mechanical heart devices have been improved with considerable good results, they are still expensive and cumbersome [4]. Tissue engineering and stem cell research are far from producing functioning differentiated tissues or even vascularized organs composed of different T-cell types [5]. Therefore, at present xenotransplantation is considered to be an optimal solution. Pigs have been selected as donors due to the physiological similarity, the low reproduction time, the high number of progeny, the possibility to produce cloned and transgenic pigs as well as the low costs (for details see [6]). Although non-human primates are immunologically closer to humans, the size of the organs from monkeys is too small and apes with a suitable organ size represent endangered species, they have very long gestation times and a small number of offspring [6]. The selection of the donor species is also influenced by the potential microbiological risk. It is a subject of discussion whether the transmission of microorganisms from a related species (non-human primates) using a closely related receptor is more effective than the transmission from an unrelated species (pigs) [7]. The transmission of the human T-cell lymphotropic viruses (HTLV) and the human immunodeficiency viruses (HIV) from non-human primates to humans was extremely successful for the viruses, partially due to the presence of the suitable receptors and a similar metabolism in the infected cells [8,9]. HTLV induces lymphomas and immunodeficiency, HIV the acquired immunodeficiency syndrome (AIDS) [10,11]. This does not exclude that transmission from an unrelated species may be also successful, especially when the receptor is highly ubiquitous. A well-studied example is the transmission of a gammaretrovirus closely related to PERV, the Koala retrovirus (KoRV), which most likely was transmitted from rodents [12,13] or from bats [14,15] to the koalas in Australia. The KoRV infection is spreading nation-wide, the infected animals suffer from lymphomas and chlamydia infection based on a severe immunodeficiency [16-18].

To summarize, three hurdles need to be overcome before xenotransplantation can be applied in the clinic: (i) rejection due to different immune reactions, (ii) physiological incompatibility of the cells, tissues and organs and (iii) the microbiological risk.

Figure 1: Genetically modified pigs for xenotransplantation.

Overview of the genetically modified pigs for xenotransplantation (hCD46-human membrane cofactor protein, MCP; hCD55-human decay-accelerating factor, DAF; hCD59-human protectin; H-transferase, competing for the substrates needed by the alpha-1,3-galactosyltranferase; hCTLA4-Ig-human cytotoxic T-murine lymphocyte antigen 4 fused with Ig heavy chains, as a surrogate ligand used to block CD28/CTLA4 T-cell costimulation; hTM-human thrombomodulin, anticoagulation, activates protein C; hA20-tumor necrosis factor-alpha-(TNF-alpha)-inducible gene, may control the AVR; HLA-E/beta-microglobulin-protection against human natural killer cell cytotoxicity, TRAIL-tumor necrosis factor related apoptosis inducing ligand, induces apoptosis; hHO-1, human heme oxygenase-1, anti-apoptotic, cell protective, Fas-L-Fas ligand, belongs to the tumor necrosis factor (TNF) family, its binding with its receptor induces apoptosis, GnT-III-β-1,4-N acetylglucosaminyltransferase III, catalyzes the formation of a bisecting GlcNAc structure in N-glycans, GalTKO-knock-out of the gene for the alpha-1,3-galactosyltranferase, shRNA PERV-PERV-specific short hairpin RNA, inhibits PERV expression by RNA interference (for details see [6] and the original references cited there).

Rejection

Various mechanisms of rejection are associated with xenotransplantation, the first and most destructive is the hyperacute rejection (HAR), which is absent in allotransplantation. It is characterized by an immediate loss of the function of the transplant and is associated with haemorrhage, thrombosis and infiltration of neutrophils [19]. HAR is the consequence of the binding of preformed antibodies to a sugar epitope, the Gal epitope (galactose-alpha-1,3-galactose), which is present on the cell surface of all bacteria and mammals with exception of humans, apes and Old world monkeys. The loss of the Gal epitope was certainly an enormous evolutionary advantage since it allowed effective protection from microorganisms and cells from other species. The pre-existing anti-Gal antibodies destroy together with the complement T-cells carrying the Gal epitope [20]. Since depletion of anti-Gal antibodies using affinity columns bearing Gal, depletion of complement by cobra venom factor, or inhibition of the complement cascade by soluble complement receptor 1 (CR1) or anti-C5 antibodies are not very effective [21,22]{Cascalho, 2001 #152}, genetically modified pigs have been created (Table 1).

Gene	Effect	References
1,3 Gal (alpha-1,3-galactosytransferase) knock out (GalTKO)	Reduced Galalpha-1,3-Gal (Gal) expression, reduced hyperacute rejection	[23,24]
hCD46 (hMCP, human membrane cofactor)	Human complement regulation	[24,25]
hCD46+GalTKO	Human complement regulation +Reduced Gal expression	[26]
hCD55 (hDAF, human decay accelerating factor)	Human complement regulation	[27,28]
hCD55+endo-beta-galactosidase C	Human complement regulation +Reduced Gal expression	[29]
hCD59	Human complement regulation	[30-32]
hCD55+hCD59	Human complement regulation	[33,34]
hCD46+hCD55+hCD59	Human complement regulation	[35-37]
H-transferase (alpha-1,2-fucosyltransferase)	Reduced Gal expression	[38]
hCD59+H-transferase (alpha-1,2-fucosyltransferase)	Human complement regulation +reduced Gal expression	[39]
hCTLA4-Ig (cytotoxic T lymphocyte-associated antigen)	Inhibits T-cell activity	[40]
hTM (human thrombomodulin)	Activate human anticoagulant protein C	[41]
hA20 (humanA20, tumor necrosis factor-alpha inducible gene)	Controls acute vascular rejection	[42]
HLA-E/ (human leukocyte antigen-E)+human beta2-microglobulin	Protection from NK cell-mediated cytotoxicity	[43]
TRAIL (tumor necrosis factor-alpha-related apoptosis-inducing ligand)	Reduced posthyperacute cellular rejection	[44]
GnT-III (beta-d-mannoside beta-1,4-N-acetylglucosaminyltransferase III)	Reduced antigenicity to human natural antibodies	[45]
hHO-1 (human heme oxygenase-1)	Antiapoptosis	[46]
Fas ligand (Fas L)	Antiapoptosis	[47]
GalTKO+CD55+CD59	Control of instant blood-mediated unflammatory reaction (IBMIR) when transplanting neonatal isle T-cell clusters	[48]
GalTKO+CD55+CD59+H-transferase	Reduced xenoantibody response to isle T-cells from transgenic animals	[49]
GalTKO+H-transferase	Reduced expression of alpha Gal antigen	[50]

Soluble TNFRI-Fc-hHO	Protection against oxidative and inflammatory injury	[51]
Optimized hTM	Overcome coagulation incompatibilities in pig-to-primate xenotransplantation.	[52]
GalTKO+CD46	Suppress in vitro human anti-pig cellular responses	[53]
HLA-E	Suppression of inflammatory macrophage-mediated cytotoxicity and proinflammatory cytokine production	[54]
CD55 CD59+H-transferase genes	Enhanced protective response to human serum-mediated cytolysis	[55]

Table 1: Strategies to overcome rejection and physiological incompatibility: Genetically modified pigs.

There are three strategies to overcome HAR by genetic modification of the pigs: (i) expression of the human complement regulatory proteins such as hCD59 (protectin), human decay-accelerating factor (DAF, hCD55) and membrane cofactor protein (MCP, hCD46), (ii) overexpression of enzymes such as H-transferase, competing for the substrates needed by the alpha-1,3-galactosyltranferase, which is responsible for the Gal epitope, and (iii) knock-out of the gene for the alpha-1,3-galactosyltranferase (GalTKO), these animals are unable to express the Gal epitope [23,56] (Figure 1). Using multitransgenic pigs and antibody depletion, HAR, once considered the most vexing problem for xenotransplantation, was thought to be overcome. However, meanwhile new carbohydrate non-Gal epitopes have been identified, which may play a role in HAR [57]. Nevertheless, when genetically modified pig hearts were transplanted heterotopically in baboons, a significantly reduced HAR and a survival of up to 8 months was observed. It is important to note that in contrast orthotopic life supporting heart transplantation has not extended beyond 57 days. Similar differences between ortho- and heterotopical-transplantations were observed when kidneys were transplanted (for review see [58]).

Concerning the next steps of rejection, there is still uncertainty, both in understanding the mechanisms as well as in naming the processes: acute vascular rejection (AVR) thought to be similar to AVR of allotransplants [59], delayed xenograft rejection (DXR) [60], or acute humoral xenograft rejection (AHXR) [61], a delayed form of antibody mediated rejection. Endothelial cells and antibodies are involved in this type of rejection. Finally, the classical cellular rejection has been described [58]. Rejection on this stage is based on the genetic differences between humans and pigs and may be controlled by immunosuppressive regimens more intense than the one used in allotransplantation. Transgenic pigs expressing CTLA4-Ig to provide a local immunosuppressive effect or a mutant MHC class II transactivator (CIITA) knocking down SLA expression in the endothelium, may be useful (for details see [58]).

Now it becomes clear that coagulation dysfunction between recipient and donor as well as inflammation contribute significantly to the loss of the transplant [62]. The induced thrombotic microangiopathy causes ischemic injury to the myocardium during heart transplantations and finally results in consumptive coagulopathy [63,64]. It is still unclear which part is contributed by the immune activation of the pig vascular endothelial cells or whether the presence of these cells is sufficient to activate primate/human platelets and PBMCs alone [65]. The expression of both the pig tissue factor and the primate tissue factor is increased [65,66]. In the regulation of the immune response, activating and inhibitory receptors and ligands are involved and it should be possible in future to knock out certain of these factors and to develop in vitro assays predicting whether the recipient is at high or low risk for rejection [67].

Liver and kidney transplantations showed a lower survival time compared with heart and kidney transplantations (see above). Cellular transplants, e.g, isle T-cells, function much better than organ transplants [68,69]. Transplanting pig isle T-cells, either an immunosuppressive regimen was applied, or the pig isle T-cells were encapsulated [70,71]. One report indicates that pig isle T-cells survived up to 9.5 year in the human recipient [72]. Other cell transplantations include pig neuronal cell xenotransplantation for the treatment of neurological diseases including Parkinson´s disease [73], and pig corneal transplantation (for review see [74]).

Physiological Compatibility

Assuming that the immune and physiological mechanisms of rejection are under control and that the tissues or organs were not rejected, additional physiological incompatibilities in the function and regulation can be expected [75]. These incompatibilities are not well studied and will become evident only when the xenotransplants survive for a longer time. The differences between pig and human organs include their size, their position and orientation in the body, and the mechanism of regulation of their function by hormones and other soluble factors. On the other hand there are common physiological processes, e.g., pig insulin has been used for the treatment of diabetes in humans for decades. Under discussion is the compatibility of pig erythropoietin produced in the kidney [76]. In the case it is not compatible, either transgenic pigs producing human erythropoietin have to be produced or human erythropoietin has to be injected after kidney transplantation. The liver produces more than 2000 factors including albumin and it seems unlikely that a pig liver will be functioning for a long period. In addition, ex vivo treatment of human blood with pig liver cells have resulted in unsatisfying results [77]. However, when livers from of genetically modified pigs (CD55 or GalTKO plus CD46) were transplanted into non-human primates, survival times up to 7 days were observed with near-normal function of the organ, except hypoalbuminemia, suggesting application as a bridge to allotransplantation [77].

Microbiological Safety

Xenotransplantation using pig cells, tissues or organs may be associated with the transmission of numerous porcine microorganisms and several strategies have been developed to increase the microbiological safety (Table 2). Long lists have been published with the names of pig parasites, fungi, bacteria, and viruses, representing a potential risk for the transplant recipient, especially when strong pharmaceutical immunosuppression is applied [78]. However, at present it is unknown which microorganism represent a real risk, inducing, when transmitted, a disease (zoonosis or xenozoonosis or xenosis). Breeding the animals under designated pathogen free (dpf) conditions will prevent at least the transmission of known zoonotic microorganisms such as circoviruses, herpesviruses and others [79]. Porcine cytomegalovirus (PCMV), porcine lymphotropic herpesvirus (PLHV), and porcine circovirus (PCV) are the main viruses screened for in the ongoing New Zealand clinical trial [80,81].

Strategy	Result	Reference
Designated pathogen free breeding	Defined microorganisms absent in the donor pigs	[82-86]
Selection of pigs with low expression of PERV-A and PERV-B and absence of PERV-C in the genome	Prevent PERV-A/C recombination, low expression, possibly no particle release	[87,88]
RNA interference: Expression of PERV-specific siRNA	Low expression, possibly no particle release	[89-92]
Zinc finger nucleases (ZFN)	Attempt to eliminate all PERV	[93]
Vaccine	Prevent transmission of PERV	[94-98]
Antiretroviral drugs	Prevention/therapy	[99,100]

Table 2: Strategies to increase microbiological safety.

In contrast to these microorganisms transmission of porcine endogenous retroviruses (PERVs) cannot be prevented by dpf breeding since they are integrated as DNA copy in the genome of all pigs [101]. PERVs can be released as infectious particles and infect human cells [102,103]. Retroviruses are able-using the enzyme reverse transcriptase which is unique for retroviruses-to transcribe their RNA genome into DNA and integrate the DNA copy into the genome of the infected host T-cell. In the case oocytes, sperms or their progenitors were infected, the integrated DNA copy, also called provirus, will be present in the fertilized oocyte and eventually in all cells of the developing organism and will be inherited like a cellular gene. Gamma- and betaretroviruses were found in the genome of all pigs [104,105]. The copy number ranges in dependence of the pig strain from 30 to 150 [105]. Two types of gamma retroviruses, PERV-A and PERV-B, are present in all pigs, a third, PERVs-C, is present in many, but not all pigs. PERV-A and -B infect human cells, PERVs-C infect only pig cells [102]. Retroviruses may induce in the infected host severe immunosuppression (example: HIV-1 and the feline leukaemia virus, FeLV), and/or leukemias, lymphomas or solid tumors (example: HTLV, FeLV) [8-10]. In rare cases retroviral infections are apathogenic (example: feline and primate foamy viruses) [106]. Transspecies transmissions of retroviruses are well known (for review see [18]) and the AIDS pandemic is the most disastrous example of a transmission of a zoonotic retrovirus to humans [10]. PERV is also the result of a transspecies transmission, probably from rodents [12,13]. PERV-A and PERV-B integrated 8 mio years ago, PERVs-C is younger and integrated 3 mio years ago [13,107]. Recombinant PERVs-A/C proviruses were detected in pigs in some tissues, but not in the germ line (for review see [108]). These viruses have a high replication rate, they infect human cells and can adapt to them with an increased titer [109,110].

To detect PERV and to prevent transmission, (i) sensitive and specific detection methods based on PCR or other molecular biological methods as well as indirect detection methods measuring PERV-specific antibody responses, and (ii) strategies how to screen donor animals and how to follow the recipient have been developed in the last years [80,81,87,88,99,101,102,105,107-114]. There are recommendations of the International Xenotransplantion Association (IXA), the European Medicines Agency (EMA) and the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) how to screen the donor pigs and how the recipient of the xenotransplant [82-86,115]. In addition, strategies how to minimize PERV transmission are under development. These strategies include the selection of PERV-C free animals (in order to prevent the generation of high titer PERV-A/C) [88,111], the selection of pigs with low expression of PERV-A and -B [111,116], the treatment with antiretrovirals [99,100], the development of a vaccine [94-98] and the generation of transgenic pigs expressing a short hairpin RNA in order to suppress the expression of PERV by RNA interference [89-92] (Figure 1).



Figure 2: Examples of xenotransplantation.

Overview of clinically applied or planned xenotransplantations in order to treat different diseases. Cells or organs were directly transplanted into the human organism or pig cells or organs were used ex vivo to interact with human blood.

First Preclinical and Clinical Trials

Preclinical trials mainly using non-human primates have been performed in order to evaluate the efficacy and safety of xenotransplantation (Table 3).

In addition, in the past years more than 200 individuals had undergone xenotransplantation, mostly ex vivo perfusions with pig liver and spleen cells and some transplantations of pig islet and neuronal cells (for a detailed review see [6,83]) (Figure 2) (Table 4). Organs (heart, liver) were transplanted in two cases with a survival time of less than 34 hrs (for an overview of the history of xenotransplantation see [6]). PERVs or other porcine microorganisms have not been found transmitted until now.

Pig isle T-cells have been transplanted to diabetic individuals in several trials. In one trial performed in Russia, in two of eight persons a 100% insulin dose reduction was achieved after the first transplant [135]. A second trial was performed in New Zealand and in both trials no transmission of PERV was observed [81,114]. When pig cells or organs were transplanted into non-human primates (for review see [83]) or when high doses of infectious PERV were inoculated into non-human primates [85], no transmission of PERV was observed despite strong pharmaceutical immunosuppression in most cases.

Xenotransplantation: Strategy and treatment	Modification of the pigs	Recipients (number of animals)	Results after Tx	References
Cells and heart PAEC (1x107) iv one animal also pig heart, Cyp	None	15 baboons	No PERV transmission and no microchimerism 1 year after treatment, 12-24 months	[117]
Heart, skin, encapsulated islets, some CsA, MMF, Ster	None	23 (6 baboons, 6 bonnet macaques, 9 STZ rhesus, 2 STZ capuchins	No PERV transmission, 11-31 months	[118]
Kidney, Cyp, CsA, MMF, Ster	hCD59	6 cynomolgus monkey	No PERV transmission, 1-19 days	[119]
Kidney		12 cynomolgus monkey	No PERV transmission, transplant removed days 2-15, up to day 287	[120]
Encapsulated isleT-cells, no immunosuppression	None	12 STZ cynomolgus monkey	No transmission of PERV and other viruses, 3-8 months	[80]
Kidney (13) or heart (14) GAS914, Cyp, CsA, MPA	hDAF	27 baboons	No PERV transmission, 6-50 days	[121]
Liver perfusion 13-24 hours without immunosuppression	hDAF	6 baboons	No PERV transmission, 6-12 months	[122]
Pig neonatal isle T-cell clusters with immunosuppression	GalTKO +CD55+CD59+H-transferase	3 baboons	Reduced xenoantibody response to isle T-cells from transgenic animals	[49]
Pig neonatal isle T-cell clusters with immunosuppression	GalTKO +CD55+CD59+H-transferase	5 non-diabetic baboons	No coagulation incompatibilities, no thrombosis	[51]

Abbreviations: C1inh, complement C1 inhibitor; CsA, Cyclosporine A; CyP, cyclophosphamide; EC, endothelial cells; FTBI, fractionated total body irradiation; GAS914, a soluble, polymeric form of a Gal alpha-(1,3)Gal trisaccharide, hDAF, human decay-accelerating factor; MPA, mycophenolic acid; PAEC, primary aortic endothelial cells; Ster, steroids; STZ, streptocotozin (induced diabetes), Tx, transplantation.

Table 3: Summary of preclinical pig-to-non human primate xenotransplantations.

Strategy of xenotransplantation	Pig xenotransplant	Immunosuppression	Time after Tx	Number of patients	Result	References
Acute liver failure	Bioartificial liver device, 90-100 g wet weight	None	6 hrs pre/post	6	No PERV transmission	[123]
	Cryopreserved hepatocytes	N=2 for liver-tx after procedure	3 months – 5 yrs post treatment	28	No PERV transmission	[124]
	AMC-BAL		Before, 0 days to 2 yrs after	14	No PERV transmission	[125,126]
	Plasma perfusion though bioreactor Followed by liver Tx + immunosuppression	Exposure 8-46 hrs	Up to 2-5 yrs	8	No PERV transmission	[127]
Fulminant liver failure	Extracorporeal liver perfusion, tg-liver	Exposure 6-10hr		2	No PERV transmission	[128]
Chronic glomerulonephritis Renal dialysis	Extracorporeal kidney perfusion		6 hrs – 36 months	2	No PERV transmission	[129]
Neurological conditions (Parkinson, Huntington, focal epilepsy)	Fetal pig mesencephalon, lateral ganglionic eminence cells	CsA (n=11), graft pretreated with Abs	2-24 months post-Tx	11 PD 12 HD 1 FE	No PERV transmission	[130]

Diabetes	Encapsulated islets	No IS (n=1) CsA, AZA, pred (n=1) for kidney Tx	19 months	2	No PERV transmission	[131]
	Porcine fetal islets, 4x108 – 2x109 cells Porcine c-peptide up to 450d post-Tx (n=4)	CsA, pred, AZA maintenance	32-86 months post-Tx Mitochondrial DNA detectable 3d-1yr (n=1), d3 (n=6): all had Abs within 1wk post-Tx	10	No PERV transmission	[132]
	Beginning in 2009 treated with one of four different dosages of alginate-encapsulated porcine islets ranging from 5,000 - 20,000 IEQ/kg delivered in a single dose	No IS	1, 4, 12, 24, 52 weeks after Tx	14 with severe unaware hypoglycemia	No PERV transmission, reduction of hypoglycemia	[81]
Acute liver failure	Cryopreserved hepatocytes	Exposure 2 – 30 hours	No PERV transmission	28	No PERV transmission	[133,134]
	Extracorporeal liver perfusion	Exposure 4.25 hours, IS after subsequent liver Tx	No PERV transmission	28		
Burns	Skin	Exposure 10 days	36-150 months	15		
Chronic glomerulonephritis Renal dialysis	Extracorporeal kidney perfusion	Exposure 35, 65 min	32-36 months	2		
Various indications	Extracorporeal splenic perfusion	Exposure 50-60 min	0-102 months	100		
Diabetes	Islets		19-93 months	14		
Abbreviations: Abs, antibodies; AMC-BAL, Academic Center in Amsterdam, BAL, bio-artificial liver; CsA, cyclosporine; AZA, azathioprine; IS, immunosuppression; PBMC, peripheral blood mononuclear cells; pred, prednisolone; Ster, steroids; Tx, transplantation; PD, Parkinson´s disease; HD, Huntington´s disease; FE, focal epilepsy						

Table 4: Clinical xenotransplantations.

Ethical Aspects and Regulatory Requirements

Xenotransplantation is on the way from the lab to the clinic [135]. The ethical discussion came to the conclusion that this new technology should be applied if it is safe and effective [115]. The regulatory issues (informed consent, criteria for patient enrollment, the rights and obligations of third parties, the ethical management of safety measures, and the use of animals) remain central and the public health risk represents a major concern. After it was documented that PERVs infect human cells, it was perceived-mainly based on the knowledge that the infection of humans with HIV and the AIDS pandemic were the result of a trans-species transmission of this retrovirus-xenotransplantation might create a new epidemic infectious disease. Meanwhile the ethical concerns are minimal as (i) no transmission of PERVs was observed in the first clinical xenotransplantations, (ii) no transmission of PERV was observed in experimental settings and (iii) pigs are a major source of animal protein throughout the world. The International Xenotransplantation Association (IXA) [83,84,115], the European Medicines Agency (EMA) [85], and the US Food and Drug Administration (FDA) [86] developed appropriate guidelines how to perform clinical xenotransplantations.

Conclusion

Xenotransplantation may have several advantages compared with allotransplantation. It may overcome the shortage of organs, the transplantations can be planned, the organs are in a good status and well characterized, the microbiological risk may be low (note that HIV, rabies virus, Epstein-Barr virus, cytomegalovirus and other viruses had been transmitted repeatedly during allotransplantations) [136,137]. In the first clinical trials, isle T-cells from Auckland island pigs were used which were well defined concerning the microorganisms they carry [80,81,87]. Meanwhile the Göttingen minipigs are also well characterized [93], although additional tests for some relevant microorganisms have to be performed [138]. Due to their small size these animals are not suitable for organ transplantations, but certainly for isle T-cell transplantations for the treatment of diabetes.

On the other hand there is still a long way to go to solve the problems concerning rejection, physiological compatibility and microbiological safety. Looking back to the origins of allotransplantation 40 years ago, it would be interesting to see how far xenotransplantation will be advanced in 40 years from now.

References

1. Deutsche Stiftung Organtransplantation.
2. International Diabetes Federation. Facts and Figure.
3. Cohen P (2006) The twentieth century struggle to decipher insulin signalling. See comment in PubMed Commons below Nat Rev Mol Cell Biol 7: 867-873.
4. Parker MS, Fahrner LJ, Deuell BP, Olsen KM, Kasirajan V, et al. (2014) Total artificial heart implantation: clinical indications, expected postoperative imaging findings, and recognition of complications. AJR Am J Roentgenol 202: W191-W201.
5. Chen TH (2014) Tissue Regeneration: from Synthetic Scaffold to Self-Organizing Morphogenesis. See comment in PubMed Commons below Curr Stem Cell Res Ther .
6. Denner J, Tönjes RR (2012) Infection barriers to successful xenotransplantation focusing on porcine endogenous retroviruses. See comment in PubMed Commons below Clin Microbiol Rev 25: 318-343.
7. Fishman JA, Patience C (2004) Xenotransplantation: infectious risk revisited. See comment in PubMed Commons below Am J Transplant 4: 1383-1390.
8. Gao F, Bailes E, Robertson DL, Chen Y, Rodenburg CM, et al. (1999) Origin of HIV-1 in the chimpanzee Pan troglodytes troglodytes. See comment in PubMed Commons below Nature 397: 436-441.
9. Koralnik IJ, Boeri E, Saxinger WC, Monico AL, Fullen J, et al. (1994) Phylogenetic associations of human and simian T-cell leukemia/lymphotropic virus type I strains: evidence for interspecies transmission. See comment in PubMed Commons below J Virol 68: 2693-2707.
10. Hahn BH, Shaw GM, De Cock KM, Sharp PM (2000) AIDS as a zoonosis: scientific and public health implications. See comment in PubMed Commons below Science 287: 607-614.
11. Yamagishi M, Watanabe T (2012) Molecular hallmarks of adult T-cell leukemia. See comment in PubMed Commons below Front Microbiol 3: 334.
12. Martin J, Herniou E, Cook J, O'Neill RW, Tristem M (1999) Interclass transmission and phyletic host tracking in murine leukemia virus-related retroviruses. See comment in PubMed Commons below J Virol 73: 2442-2449.
13. Lieber MM, Sherr CJ, Todaro GJ, Benveniste RE, Callahan R, et al. (1975) Isolation from the asian mouse Mus caroli of an endogenous type C virus related to infectious primate type C viruses. See comment in PubMed Commons below Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A 72: 2315-2319.
14. Cui J, Tachedjian G, Tachedjian M, Holmes EC, Zhang S, et al. (2012) Identification of diverse groups of endogenous gammaretroviruses in mega- and microbats. See comment in PubMed Commons below J Gen Virol 93: 2037-2045.
15. Cui J, Tachedjian M, Wang L, Tachedjian G, Wang LF, et al. (2012) Discovery of retroviral homologs in bats: implications for the origin of mammalian gammaretroviruses. See comment in PubMed Commons below J Virol 86: 4288-4293.
16. Denner J, Young PR (2013) Koala retroviruses: characterization and impact on the life of koalas. See comment in PubMed Commons below Retrovirology 10: 108.
17. Tarlinton RE, Meers J, Young PR (2006) Retroviral invasion of the koala genome. See comment in PubMed Commons below Nature 442: 79-81.
18. Denner J (2007) Transspecies transmissions of retroviruses: new cases. See comment in PubMed Commons below Virology 369: 229-233.
19. Platt JL (2001) The immunological hurdles to cardiac xenotransplantation. See comment in PubMed Commons below J Card Surg 16: 439-447.
20. Yang YG, Sykes M (2007) Xenotransplantation: current status and a perspective on the future. See comment in PubMed Commons below Nat Rev Immunol 7: 519-531.
21. Cascalho M, Platt JL (2001) The immunological barrier to xenotransplantation. Immunity 14: 437-446.
22. Lai L, Kolber-Simonds D, Park KW, Cheong HT, Greenstein JL, et al. (2002) Production of alpha-1, 3-galactosyltransferase knockout pigs by nuclear transfer cloning. Science 295: 1089-1092.
23. Phelps CJ, Koike C, Vaught TD, Boone J, Wells KD, et al. (2003) Production of alpha 1,3-galactosyltransferase-deficient pigs. See comment in PubMed Commons below Science 299: 411-414.
24. Diamond LE, Quinn CM, Martin MJ, Lawson J, Platt JL, et al. (2001) A human CD46 transgenic pig model system for the study of discordant xenotransplantation. See comment in PubMed Commons below Transplantation 71: 132-142.
25. Langford GA, Galbraith D, Whittam AJ, McEwan P, Fernández-Suárez XM, et al. (2001) In vivo analysis of porcine endogenous retrovirus expression in transgenic pigs. See comment in PubMed Commons below Transplantation 72: 1996-2000.
26. Hara H, Koike N, Long C, Piluek J, Roh DS, et al. (2011) Initial in vitro investigation of the human immune response to corneal cells from genetically engineered pigs. See comment in PubMed Commons below Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci 52: 5278-5286.
27. Cozzi E, White DJ (1995) The generation of transgenic pigs as potential organ donors for humans. See comment in PubMed Commons below Nat Med 1: 964-966.
28. Rosengard AM, Cary N, Horsley J, Belcher C, Langford GA, et al. (1995) Endothelial expression of human decay accelerating factor in transgenic pig tissue: a potential approach for human complement inactivation in discordant xenografts. Transplant Proc 27: 326-327.
29. Yazaki S, Iwamoto M, Onishi A, Miwa Y, Suzuki S, et al. (2009) Successful cross-breeding of cloned pigs expressing endo-beta-galactosidase C and human decay accelerating factor. See comment in PubMed Commons below Xenotransplantation 16: 511-521.
30. Diamond LE, McCurry KR, Martin MJ, McClellan SB, Oldham ER, et al. (1996) Characterization of transgenic pigs expressing functionally active human CD59 on cardiac endothelium. See comment in PubMed Commons below Transplantation 61: 1241-1249.
31. Fodor WL, Williams BL, Matis LA, Madri JA, Rollins SA, et al. (1994) Expression of a functional human complement inhibitor in a transgenic pig as a model for the prevention of xenogeneic hyperacute organ rejection. See comment in PubMed Commons below Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A 91: 11153-11157.
32. Niemann H, Verhoeyen E, Wonigeit K, Lorenz R, Hecker J, et al. (2001) Cytomegalovirus early promoter induced expression of hCD59 in porcine organs provides protection against hyperacute rejection. Transplantation 72: 1898-1906.
33. Byrne G, McCurry K, Martin M, Platt J, Logan J (1996) Development and analysis of transgenic pigs expressing the human complement regulatory protein CD59 and DAF. See comment in PubMed Commons below Transplant Proc 28: 759.
34. Chen RH, Naficy S, Logan JS, Diamond LE, Adams DH (1999) Hearts from transgenic pigs constructed with CD59/DAF genomic clones demonstrate improved survival in primates. See comment in PubMed Commons below Xenotransplantation 6: 194-200.
35. Cowan PJ, Aminian A, Barlow H, Brown AA, Chen CG, et al. (2000) Renal xenografts from triple-transgenic pigs are not hyperacutely rejected but cause coagulopathy in non-immunosuppressed baboons. See comment in PubMed Commons below Transplantation 69: 2504-2515.
36. Cowan PJ, Shinkel TA, Fisicaro N, Godwin JW, Bernabéu C, et al. (2003) Targeting gene expression to endothelium in transgenic animals: a comparison of the human ICAM-2, PECAM-1 and endoglin promoters. See comment in PubMed Commons below Xenotransplantation 10: 223-231.
37. Zhou CY, McInnes E, Copeman L, Langford GA, Parsons N, et al. (2005) Transgenic pigs expressing human CD59, in combination with human membrane cofactor protein and human decay-accelerating factor. Xenotransplantation 12: 142-148.
38. Costa C, Zhao L, Burton WV, Bondioli K R, Williams BL, et al. (1999) Expression of the human alpha-1,2-fucosyltransferase in transgenic pigs

modifies the cell surface carbohydrate phenotype and confers resistance to human serum-mediated cytolysis. FASEB J 13: 1762-1773.

39. Costa C, Zhao L, Burton WV, Rosas C, Bondioli KR, et al. (2002) Transgenic pigs designed to express human CD59 and H-transferase to avoid humoral xenograft rejection. See comment in PubMed Commons below Xenotransplantation 9: 45-57.
40. Phelps CJ, Ball SF, Vaught TD, Vance AM, Mendicino M, et al. (2009) Production and characterization of transgenic pigs expressing porcine CTLA4-Ig. See comment in PubMed Commons below Xenotransplantation 16: 477-485.
41. Petersen B, Ramackers W, Tiede A, Lucas-Hahn A, Herrmann D, et al. (2009) Pigs transgenic for human thrombomodulin have elevated production of activated protein C. See comment in PubMed Commons below Xenotransplantation 16: 486-495.
42. Oropeza M, Petersen B, Carnwath JW, Lucas-Hahn A, Lemme E, et al. (2009) Transgenic expression of the human A20 gene in cloned pigs provides protection against apoptotic and inflammatory stimuli. See comment in PubMed Commons below Xenotransplantation 16: 522-534.
43. Weiss EH, Lilienfeld BG, Müller S, Müller E, Herbach N, et al. (2009) HLA-E/human beta2-microglobulin transgenic pigs: protection against xenogeneic human anti-pig natural killer cell cytotoxicity. Transplantation 87: 35-43.
44. Klose R, Kemter E, Bedke T, Bittmann I, Kelsser B, et al. (2005) Expression of biologically active human TRAIL in transgenic pigs. See comment in PubMed Commons below Transplantation 80: 222-230.
45. Miyagawa S, Murakami H, Takahagi Y, Nakai R, Yamada M, et al. (2001) Remodeling of the major pig xenoantigen by N-acetylglucosaminyltransferase III in transgenic pig. See comment in PubMed Commons below J Biol Chem 276: 39310-39319.
46. Petersen B, Lucas-Hahn A, Lemme E, et al. (2010) Generation and characterization of pigs transgenic for human hemeoxygenase-1 (hHO-1). Xenotransplantation 17: 102-103.
47. Choi KM, Jin DI, Hong SP, Yeon Yoo J , Hyun S, et al. (2010) Production of transgenic cloned miniature pigs with membrane-bound human Fas ligand (FasL) by somatic cell nuclear transfer. Biology of Reproduction 83: 701.
48. Hawthorne WJ, Salvaris EJ, Phillips P, Hawkes J, Liuwantara D, et al. (2014) Control of IBMIR in neonatal porcine islet xenotransplantation in baboons. See comment in PubMed Commons below Am J Transplant 14: 1300-1309.
49. Chen Y, Stewart JM, Gunthart M, Hawthorne WJ, Salvaris EJ, et al. (Epub 2014) Xenoantibody response to porcine isleT-cell transplantation using GTKO, CD55, CD59, and fucosyltransferase multiple transgenic donors. Xenotransplantation 21: 244-253.
50. Zeyland J, WoÅºniak A, GawroÅ„ska B, Juzwa W, Jura J, et al. (2014) Double Transgenic Pigs with Combined Expression of Human Î±1,2-Fucosyltransferase and Î±-Galactosidase Designed to Avoid Hyperacute Xenograft Rejection. See comment in PubMed Commons below Arch Immunol Ther Exp (Warsz) .
51. Park SJ, Cho B, Koo OJ, Kim H, Kang JT, et al. (Epub 2014) Production and characterization of soluble human TNFRI-Fc and human HO-1(HMOX1) transgenic pigs by using the F2A peptide. Transgenic Res 23: 407-419.
52. Wuensch A, Baehr A, Bongoni AK, Kemter E, Blutke A, et al. (2014) Regulatory sequences of the porcine THBD gene facilitate endothelial-specific expression of bioactive human thrombomodulin in single- and multitransgenic pigs. Transplantation 97: 138-147.
53. Li J, Andreyev O, Chen M, Marco M, Iwase H, et al. (2013) Human T-cells upregulate CD69 after coculture with xenogeneic genetically-modified pig mesenchymal stromal cells. See comment in PubMed Commons below Cell Immunol 285: 23-30.
54. Maeda A, Kawamura T, Ueno T, Usui N, Eguchi H, et al. (2013) The suppression of inflammatory macrophage-mediated cytotoxicity and proinflammatory cytokine production by transgenic expression of HLA-E. Transpl Immunol 29: 76-81.
55. Jeong YH, Park CH, Jang GH, Jeong YI, Hwang IS, et al. (2013) Production of multiple transgenic Yucatan miniature pigs expressing human complement regulatory factors, human CD55, CD59, and H-transferase genes. PLoS One 8: e63241.
56. Petersen B, Carnwath JW, Niemann H (2009) The perspectives for porcine-to-human xenografts. See comment in PubMed Commons below Comp Immunol Microbiol Infect Dis 32: 91-105.
57. Byrne GW, Stalboerger PG, Davila E, Heppelmann CJ, Gazi MH, et al. (2008) Proteomic identification of non-Gal antibody targets after pig-to-primate cardiac xenotransplantation. Xenotransplantation 15: 268-276.
58. Ekser B, Ezzelarab M, Hara H, van der Windt DJ, Wijkstrom M, et al. (2012) Clinical xenotransplantation: the next medical revolution? See comment in PubMed Commons below Lancet 379: 672-683.
59. Samstein B, Platt JL (2001) Physiologic and immunologic hurdles to xenotransplantation. See comment in PubMed Commons below J Am Soc Nephrol 12: 182-193.
60. Lambrigts D, Sachs DH, Cooper DK (1998) Discordant organ xenotransplantation in primates: world experience and current status. See comment in PubMed Commons below Transplantation 66: 547-561.
61. Shimizu A, Meehan SM, Kozlowski T, Sablinski T, Ierino FL, et al. (2000) Acute humoral xenograft rejection: destruction of the microvascular capillary endothelium in pig-to-nonhuman primate renal grafts. Lab Invest 80: 815-830.
62. Ramackers W, Friedrich L, Tiede A, Bergmann S, Schuettler W, et al. (2008) Effects of pharmacological intervention on coagulopathy and organ function in xenoperfused kidneys. See comment in PubMed Commons below Xenotransplantation 15: 46-55.
63. Ierino FL, Kozlowski T, Siegel JB, Shimizu A, Colvin RB, et al. (1998) Disseminated intravascular coagulation in association with the delayed rejection of pig-to-baboon renal xenografts. See comment in PubMed Commons below Transplantation 66: 1439-1450.
64. Bühler L, Basker M, Alwayn IP, Goepfert C, Kitamura H, et al. (2000) Coagulation and thrombotic disorders associated with pig organ and hematopoietic cell transplantation in nonhuman primates. See comment in PubMed Commons below Transplantation 70: 1323-1331.
65. Lin CC, Chen D, McVey JH, Cooper DK, Dorling A (2008) Expression of tissue factor and initiation of clotting by human platelets and monocytes after incubation with porcine endothelial cells. See comment in PubMed Commons below Transplantation 86: 702-709.
66. Chu AJ (2006) Role of tissue factor in thrombosis. Coagulation-inflammation-thrombosis circuit. See comment in PubMed Commons below Front Biosci 11: 256-271.
67. Plege A, Schwinzer R (2010) Stimulatory and inhibitory receptor interactions in xenotransplantation. See comment in PubMed Commons below Curr Opin Organ Transplant 15: 219-223.
68. Hering BJ, Wijkstrom M, Graham ML, Hårdstedt M, Aasheim TC, et al. (2006) Prolonged diabetes reversal after intraportal xenotransplantation of wild-type porcine islets in immunosuppressed nonhuman primates. See comment in PubMed Commons below Nat Med 12: 301-303.
69. Cardona K, Korbutt GS, Milas Z, Lyon J, Cano J, et al. (2006) Long-term survival of neonatal porcine islets in nonhuman primates by targeting costimulation pathways. See comment in PubMed Commons below Nat Med 12: 304-306.
70. Dufrane D, Goebbels RM, Gianello P (2010) Alginate macroencapsulation of pig islets allows correction of streptozotocin-induced diabetes in primates up to 6 months without immunosuppression. Transplantation 90: 1054-1062.
71. Elliott RB, Escobar L, Tan PL, Garkavenko O, Calafiore R, et al. (2005) Intraperitoneal alginate-encapsulated neonatal porcine islets in a placebo-controlled study with 16 diabetic cynomolgus primates. Transplant Proc 37: 3505-3508.
72. Elliott RB, Escobar L, Tan PL, Muzina M, Zwain S, et al. (2007) Live encapsulated porcine islets from a type 1 diabetic patient 9.5 yr after xenotransplantation. See comment in PubMed Commons below Xenotransplantation 14: 157-161.

73. Leveque X, Cozzi E, Naveilhan P, Neveu I. (2011) Intracerebral xenotransplantation: recent findings and perspectives for local immunosuppression. Current opinion in organ transplantation 16: 190-194.
74. Hara H, Cooper DK (2011) Xenotransplantation--the future of corneal transplantation? See comment in PubMed Commons below Cornea 30: 371-378.
75. Ibrahim Z, Busch J, Awwad M, Wagner R, Wells K, et al. (2006) Selected physiologic compatibilities and incompatibilities between human and porcine organ systems. Xenotransplantation 13: 488-499.
76. Hammer C (1998) Physiological obstacles after xenotransplantation. See comment in PubMed Commons below Ann N Y Acad Sci 862: 19-27.
77. Ekser B, Gridelli B, Veroux M, Cooper DK (2011) Clinical pig liver xenotransplantation: how far do we have to go? See comment in PubMed Commons below Xenotransplantation 18: 158-167.
78. Tucker A, Belcher C, Moloo B, Bell J, Mazzulli T, et al. (2002) The production of transgenic pigs for potential use in clinical xenotransplantation: microbiological evaluation. Xenotransplantation 9: 191-202.
79. Fishman JA (2000) Infection in xenotransplantation. See comment in PubMed Commons below BMJ 321: 717-718.
80. Garkavenko O, Dieckhoff B, Wynyard S, Denner J, Elliott RB, et al. (2008) Absence of transmission of potentially xenotic viruses in a prospective pig to primate islet xenotransplantation study. See comment in PubMed Commons below J Med Virol 80: 2046-2052.
81. Wynyard S, Nathu D, Garkavenko O, Denner J, Elliott R (2014) Microbiological safety of the first clinical pig islet xenotransplantation trial in New Zealand. See comment in PubMed Commons below Xenotransplantation .
82. Schuurman HJ (2009) The International Xenotransplantation Association consensus statement on conditions for undertaking clinical trials of porcine islet products in type 1 diabetes--chapter 2: Source pigs. Xenotransplantation 16: 215-222.
83. Denner J, Schuurman HJ, Patience C (2009) The International Xenotransplantation Association consensus statement on conditions for undertaking clinical trials of porcine islet products in type 1 diabetes--chapter 5: Strategies to prevent transmission of porcine endogenous retroviruses. Xenotransplantation 16: 239 248.
84. Hering BJ, Cooper DK, Cozzi E, Schuurman HJ, Korbutt GS, et al. (2009) The International Xenotransplantation Association consensus statement on conditions for undertaking clinical trials of porcine islet products in type 1 diabetes-- executive summary. Xenotransplantation 16: 196-202.
85. Agency: EM. Guideline on Xenogeneic Cell-Based Medicinal Products. EMEA/CHMP/CPWP/83508/2009.
86. FDA/PHS. Guideline on Infectious Disease Issues in Xenotransplantation.
87. Kaulitz D, Mihica D, Dorna J, Costa MR, Petersen B, et al. (2011) Development of sensitive methods for detection of porcine endogenous retrovirus-C (PERV-C) in the genome of pigs. See comment in PubMed Commons below J Virol Methods 175: 60-65.
88. Kaulitz D, Mihica D, Adlhoch C, Semaan M, Denner J (2013) Improved pig donor screening including newly identified variants of porcine endogenous retrovirus-C (PERV-C). See comment in PubMed Commons below Arch Virol 158: 341-348.
89. Karlas A, Kurth R, Denner J (2004) Inhibition of porcine endogenous retroviruses by RNA interference: increasing the safety of xenotransplantation. See comment in PubMed Commons below Virology 325: 18-23.
90. Dieckhoff B, Petersen B, Kues WA, Kurth R, Niemann H, et al. (2008) Knockdown of porcine endogenous retrovirus (PERV) expression by PERV-specific shRNA in transgenic pigs. See comment in PubMed Commons below Xenotransplantation 15: 36-45.
91. Ramsoondar J, Vaught T, Ball S, Mendicino M, Monahan J, et al. (2009) Production of transgenic pigs that express porcine endogenous retrovirus small interfering RNAs. See comment in PubMed Commons below Xenotransplantation 16: 164-180.
92. Semaan M, Kaulitz D, Petersen B, Niemann H, Denner J (2012) Long-term effects of PERV-specific RNA interference in transgenic pigs. See comment in PubMed Commons below Xenotransplantation 19: 112-121.
93. Semaan M, Rotem A, Barkai U, Bornstein S, Denner J (2013) Screening pigs for xenotransplantation: prevalence and expression of porcine endogenous retroviruses in Göttingen minipigs. See comment in PubMed Commons below Xenotransplantation 20: 148-156.
94. Fiebig U, Stephan O, Kurth R, Denner J (2003) Neutralizing antibodies against conserved domains of p15E of porcine endogenous retroviruses: basis for a vaccine for xenotransplantation? Virology 307: 406 413.
95. Kaulitz D, Fiebig U, Eschricht M, Wurzbacher C, Kurth R, et al. (2011) Generation of neutralising antibodies against porcine endogenous retroviruses (PERVs). See comment in PubMed Commons below Virology 411: 78-86.
96. Waechter A, Denner J (2014) Novel neutralising antibodies targeting the N-terminal helical region of the transmembrane envelope protein p15E of the porcine endogenous retrovirus (PERV). Immunol Res 58: 9-19.
97. Waechter A, Eschricht M, Denner J (2013) Neutralization of porcine endogenous retrovirus by antibodies against the membrane-proximal external region of the transmembrane envelope protein. J Gen Virol 94: 643-651.
98. Denner J, Mihica D, Kaulitz D, Schmidt CM (2012) Increased titers of neutralizing antibodies after immunization with both envelope proteins of the porcine endogenous retroviruses (PERVs). Virol J 9: 260.
99. Stephan O, Schwendemann J, Specke V, Tacke SJ, Boller K, et al. (2001) Porcine endogenous retroviruses (PERVs): generation of specific antibodies, development of an immunoperoxidase assay (IPA) and inhibition by AZT. Xenotransplantation 8: 310-316.
100. Powell SK, Gates ME, Langford G, Gu ML, Lockey C, et al. (2000) Antiretroviral agents inhibit infection of human cells by porcine endogenous retroviruses. See comment in PubMed Commons below Antimicrob Agents Chemother 44: 3432-3433.
101. Le Tissier P, Stoye JP, Takeuchi Y, Patience C, Weiss RA (1997) Two sets of human-tropic pig retrovirus. See comment in PubMed Commons below Nature 389: 681-682.
102. Patience C, Takeuchi Y, Weiss RA (1997) Infection of human cells by an endogenous retrovirus of pigs. See comment in PubMed Commons below Nat Med 3: 282-286.
103. Specke V, Rubant S, Denner J (2001) Productive infection of human primary cells and cell lines with porcine endogenous retroviruses. See comment in PubMed Commons below Virology 285: 177-180.
104. Klymiuk N, Wolf E, Aigner B (2008) Concise classification of the genomic porcine endogenous retroviral gamma1 load to defined lineages. See comment in PubMed Commons below Virology 371: 175-184.
105. Patience C, Switzer WM, Takeuchi Y, Griffiths DJ, Goward ME, et al. (2001) Multiple groups of novel retroviral genomes in pigs and related species. See comment in PubMed Commons below J Virol 75: 2771-2775.
106. German AC, Harbour DA, Helps CR, Gruffydd-Jones TJ (2008) Is feline foamy virus really apathogenic? See comment in PubMed Commons below Vet Immunol Immunopathol 123: 114-118.
107. Tönjes RR, Niebert M (2003) Relative age of proviral porcine endogenous retrovirus sequences in Sus scrofa based on the molecular clock hypothesis. See comment in PubMed Commons below J Virol 77: 12363-12368.
108. Denner J (2008) Recombinant porcine endogenous retroviruses (PERV-A/C): a new risk for xenotransplantation? See comment in PubMed Commons below Arch Virol 153: 1421-1426.
109. Wilson CA, Wong S, VanBrocklin M, Federspiel MJ (2000) Extended analysis of the in vitro tropism of porcine endogenous retrovirus. See comment in PubMed Commons below J Virol 74: 49-56.
110. Denner J, Specke V, Thiesen U, Karlas A, Kurth R (2003) Genetic alterations of the long terminal repeat of an ecotropic porcine endogenous retrovirus during passage in human cells. Virology 314: 125-133.

111. Dieckhoff B, Kessler B, Jobst D, Kues W, Petersen B, et al. (2009) Distribution and expression of porcine endogenous retroviruses in multi-transgenic pigs generated for xenotransplantation. See comment in PubMed Commons below Xenotransplantation 16: 64-73.

112. Denner J (2011) Infectious risk in xenotransplantation--what post-transplant screening for the human recipient? See comment in PubMed Commons below Xenotransplantation 18: 151-157.

113. Bittmann I, Mihica D, Plesker R, Denner J (2012) Expression of porcine endogenous retroviruses (PERV) in different organs of a pig. See comment in PubMed Commons below Virology 433: 329-336.

114. Garkavenko O, Croxson MC, Irgang M, Karlas A, Denner J, et al. (2004) Monitoring for presence of potentially xenotic viruses in recipients of pig islet xenotransplantation. See comment in PubMed Commons below J Clin Microbiol 42: 5353-5356.

115. Cozzi E, Tallacchini M, Flanagan EB, Pierson RN 3rd, Sykes M, et al. (2009) The International Xenotransplantation Association consensus statement on conditions for undertaking clinical trials of porcine islet products in type 1 diabetes--chapter 1: Key ethical requirements and progress toward the definition of an international regulatory framework. Xenotransplantation 16: 203-214.

116. Hector RD, Meikle S, Grant L, Wilkinson RA, Fishman JA, et al. (2007) Pre-screening of miniature swine may reduce the risk of transmitting human tropic recombinant porcine endogenous retroviruses. Xenotransplantation 14: 222-226.

117. Martin U, Steinhoff G, Kiessig V, Chikobava M, Anssar M, et al. (1998) Porcine endogenous retrovirus (PERV) was not transmitted from transplanted porcine endothelial cells to baboons in vivo. See comment in PubMed Commons below Transpl Int 11: 247-251.

118. Switzer WM, Michler RE, Shanmugam V, Matthews A, Hussain AI, et al. (2001) Lack of cross-species transmission of porcine endogenous retrovirus infection to nonhuman primate recipients of porcine cells, tissues, or organs. See comment in PubMed Commons below Transplantation 71: 959-965.

119. Winkler ME, Winkler M, Burian R, Hecker J, Loss M, et al. (2005) Analysis of pig-to-human porcine endogenous retrovirus transmission in a triple-species kidney xenotransplantation model. Transpl Int 17: 848-858.

120. Loss M, Arends H, Winkler M, Przemeck M, Steinhoff G, et al. (2001) Analysis of potential porcine endogenous retrovirus (PERV) transmission in a whole-organ xenotransplantation model without interfering microchimerism. Transpl Int 14: 31-37.

121. Moscoso I, Hermida-Prieto M, Mañez R, Lopez-Pelaez E, Centeno A, et al. (2005) Lack of cross-species transmission of porcine endogenous retrovirus in pig-to-baboon xenotransplantation with sustained depletion of anti-alphagal antibodies. Transplantation 79: 777-782.

122. Nishitai R, Ikai I, Shiotani T, Katsura N, Matsushita T, et al. (2005) Absence of PERV infection in baboons after transgenic porcine liver perfusion. See comment in PubMed Commons below J Surg Res 124: 45-51.

123. Kuddus R, Patzer JF 2nd, Lopez R, Mazariegos GV, Meighen B, et al. (2002) Clinical and laboratory evaluation of the safety of a bioartificial liver assist device for potential transmission of porcine endogenous retrovirus. Transplantation 73: 420-429.

124. Pitkin Z, Mullon C (1999) Evidence of absence of porcine endogenous retrovirus (PERV) infection in patients treated with a bioartificial liver support system. See comment in PubMed Commons below Artif Organs 23: 829-833.

125. Di Nicuolo G, D'Alessandro A, Andria B, Scuderi V, Scognamiglio M, et al. (2010) Long-term absence of porcine endogenous retrovirus infection in chronically immunosuppressed patients after treatment with the porcine cell-based Academic Medical Center bioartificial liver. Xenotransplantation 17: 431- 439.

126. Di Nicuolo G, van de Kerkhove MP, Hoekstra R, Beld MG, Amoroso P, et al. (2005) No evidence of in vitro and in vivo porcine endogenous retrovirus infection after plasmapheresis through the AMC-bioartificial liver. Xenotransplantation 12: 286-292.

127. Sauer M, Kardassis D, Zeillinger K, Pascher A, Gruenwald A, et al. (2003) Clinical extracorporeal hybrid liver support phase I study with primary porcine liver cells. Xenotransplantation 10: 460-469.

128. Levy MF, Crippin J, Sutton S, Netto G, McCormack J, et al. (2000) Liver allotransplantation after extracorporeal hepatic support with transgenic (hCD55/hCD59) porcine livers: clinical results and lack of pig-to-human transmission of the porcine endogenous retrovirus. Transplantation 69: 272-280.

129. Patience C, Patton GS, Takeuchi Y, Weiss RA, McClure MO, et al. (1998) No evidence of pig DNA or retroviral infection in patients with short-term extracorporeal connection to pig kidneys. Lancet 352: 699-701.

130. Dinsmore JH, Manhart C, Raineri R, Jacoby DB, Moore A (2000) No evidence for infection of human cells with porcine endogenous retrovirus (PERV) after exposure to porcine fetal neuronal cells. See comment in PubMed Commons below Transplantation 70: 1382-1389.

131. Elliott RB, Escobar L, Garkavenko O, Croxson MC, Schroeder BA, et al. (2000) No evidence of infection with porcine endogenous retrovirus in recipients of encapsulated porcine islet xenografts. See comment in PubMed Commons below Cell Transplant 9: 895-901.

132. Heneine W, Tibell A, Switzer WM, Sandstrom P, Rosales GV, et al. (1998) No evidence of infection with porcine endogenous retrovirus in recipients of porcine islet-cell xenografts. See comment in PubMed Commons below Lancet 352: 695-699.

133. Paradis K, Langford G, Long Z, Heneine W, Sandstrom P, et al. (1999) Search for cross-species transmission of porcine endogenous retrovirus in patients treated with living pig tissue. The XEN 111 Study Group. See comment in PubMed Commons below Science 285: 1236-1241.

134. Tacke S, Bodusch K, Berg A, Denner J. (2001) Sensitive and specific detection methods for porcine endogenous retroviruses applicable to experimental and clinical xenotransplantation. Xenotransplantation 8: 125-135.

135. Schuurman HJ (2011) Xenotransplantation: from the lab to the clinic: Sunrise Symposium at the XXIII International Congress of the Transplantation Society, Vancouver, Canada, August 2010. See comment in PubMed Commons below Clin Transplant 25: E415-421.

136. Specke V, Plesker R, Wood J, Coulibaly C, Suling K, et al. (2009) No in vivo infection of triple immunosuppressed non-human primates after inoculation with high titers of porcine endogenous retroviruses. Xenotransplantation 16: 34-44.

137. Fishman JA (1998) Infection and xenotransplantation. Developing strategies to minimize risk. See comment in PubMed Commons below Ann N Y Acad Sci 862: 52-66.

138. Schuurman HJ, Patience C (2013) Screening pigs for xenotransplantation: prevalence and expression of porcine endogenous retroviruses in Göttingen minipigs. See comment in PubMed Commons below Xenotransplantation 20: 135-137.