Novel analytical approaches for the characterization of cell-based medicinal products and their formulation

Rösch, A.

CHAPTER 6

Reducing dimethyl sulfoxide content in Jurkat cell formulations suitable for cryopreservation

Alexandra Roesch[1,2], Roland Windisch[3], Christian Wichmann[3], Willem F. Wolkers[4,5], Gideon Kersten[1,2], Tim Menzen[1*]

[1] Coriolis Pharma, Fraunhoferstr. 18 b, 82152 Martinsried, Germany

[2] Leiden Academic Centre for Drug Research (LACDR), Leiden University, PO Box 9502, 2300, RA, Leiden, The Netherlands

[3] Division of Transfusion Medicine, Cell Therapeutics and Haemostaseology, University Hospital, LMU Munich, Munich, Germany

[4] Unit for Reproductive Medicine – Clinic for Horses, University of Veterinary Medicine Hannover, Hannover, Germany

[5] Biostabilization laboratory – Lower Saxony Centre for Biomedical Engineering, Implant Research and Development, University of Veterinary Medicine Hannover, Hannover, Germany

* Corresponding author.

E-mail address: Tim.Menzen@coriolis-pharma.com

The chapter was published in the journal *Cryobiology: Cryobiology 2025;119:105238*.

Abstract

Cell-based medicinal products (CBMPs) are usually cryopreserved in formulations containing up to 10% dimethyl sulfoxide (DMSO) at temperatures below -145 °C. Although DMSO effectively protects cells during the freezing process, it can be damaging to cells at ambient temperatures and lead to side effects in patients. The aim of this study was to reduce the amount of DMSO in cryopreservation formulations for an immortalized T cell line (Jurkat cells).

A design of experiment (DoE) approach was applied for formulation development using seven different excipients. Subsequently a stability study was performed with promising lead candidates over three months at storage temperatures of -145 °C, -80 °C, -40 °C. Three benchmark solutions were used, i.e., Cryostor CS10, CryoSOfree as well as 10% DMSO in Roswell Park Memorial Institute Medium (RPMI).

The excipient affecting the post-thaw viability of Jurkat cells the most was, as expected, DMSO, which led to increased viabilities at higher concentrations. Most formulations resulted in similar viabilities for cells stored at -145 °C and -80 °C, whereas samples stored at -40 °C did not survive. In general, benchmark formulations resulted in slightly higher viabilities than the tested formulations. Furthermore, cell samples stored at -80 °C were recultivated in cell culture and the viability was assessed after 24 h. The cell viability after 24 h was much lower compared to the cells analyzed directly post-thaw, indicating that freeze-thaw damages continue to unfold after thawing.

In summary, several promising excipients and combinations thereof were identified for the cryopreservation of Jurkat cells with reduced concentrations of DMSO or DMSO-free cryopreservation. Additionally, storage at -80 °C is possible for the developed formulations.

Introduction

Cell-based medicinal products (CBMPs) and gene therapy products are a rapidly growing field within the biopharmaceutical industry offering treatment options for severe illnesses such as cancer or genetic diseases [1]. CBMPs can be either stored frozen or liquid at ambient or refrigerated temperatures [2], whereas liquid storage of CBMPs is limiting their shelf-life to several hours to days [3–5]. Therefore, to enable long-term storage of CBMPs cryopreservation is commonly used. The most standard cryoprotective agent (CPA) is dimethyl sulfoxide (DMSO), which has been introduced by Lovelock and Bishop in the 1950s [6]. DMSO is a cell membrane permeable CPA and protects against freezing damage by reducing intracellular ice formation [7, 8]. Commonly used cryopreservation media for CBMPs in clinical trials contain 5 to 10% DMSO [9]. Despite being used successfully in academia and in approved CBMPs, alternatives to DMSO are needed as adverse effects in patients such as gastrointestinal, cardiovascular and neurological complications can occur after infusion of DMSO containing products [10–12]. DMSO is also damaging to cells at ambient temperatures, which limits the handling and processing time of cells during manufacturing [13]. Furthermore, attention must be given to the choice of primary packaging as well as infusion tubing as DMSO can promote the release of leachables and extractables from plastic materials [14, 15], which requires additional testing for in-use stability [16, 17]. Cryopreservation storage is commonly done at temperatures below -140 °C, which is below the glass transition temperature of water [18]. Also, 10% DMSO in phosphate buffered saline (PBS) has a very low glass transition temperature (T_g') with an onset of T_g' at ~ -120 °C [19]. For storage of cryopreserved samples below -140 °C either liquid nitrogen cooling or ultra-low freezers are required.

Various alternatives to DMSO as CPA from small molecules to polymers have been evaluated over the last decades[20, 21]. Usually, combinations of different CPAs are needed to successfully cryopreserve cells with reduced DMSO concentrations or in DMSO-free formulations [22]. Disaccharides such as trehalose are cell-membrane impermeable CPAs, which are thought to be cell membrane stabilizing [23], as well as increasing the glass transition temperature [24]. Similarly, sugar alcohols such as mannitol or sorbitol were previously evaluated for the cryopreservation of cells in combination with sugars and amino acids [22, 25]. A commonly used amino acid is proline, which is cell membrane stabilizing similar to trehalose [23]. Furthermore, substances or mechanisms occurring in nature, i.e., in organisms or plants surviving extreme conditions, can be used as a promising approach for cryopreservation[26]. Ectoine, which was isolated from a halophilic bacterium (*Ectothiorhodospira)*, is an example of a natural occurring osmolyte, protecting the organism against high salt concentration [27]. It has been shown that combinations of ectoine with poly-l-lysine and dextran can cryoprotect natural killer cells equally well as 10% DMSO [28]. Lastly, polymers such as polyvinylpyrrolidone 40 (PVP) or poloxamer 188 (P188) can be used for the cryopreservation of cells [20].

Two aims were defined for this study: (i) the reduction or elimination of DMSO within cryopreservation formulations as well as (ii) evaluating the storage of cells at elevated subzero temperatures such as -80 °C. A design of experiment (DoE) approach was used to screen different formulations followed by one-factor-at-a-time (OFAT) optimization. Subsequently, the lead candidates were further tested in a three-month stability study at different storage temperatures. As benchmark formulations Cryostor CS10 (CS10), containing 10% DMSO, as well as CryoSOfree, a DMSO-free cryopreservation medium, were used as commercially available cryopreservation solutions. Additionally, 10% DMSO in Roswell Park Memorial Institute 1640 (RPMI 1640) was used. Post-thaw viabilities were measured either directly after thawing or after 24h of cell recultivation. Several promising formulation candidates were identified. However, further process optimization is needed to improve post-thaw viability as well as the recovery of cells after 24 h.

Material & Methods

Cell culture

Jurkat cells, an immortalized cell line as model for T cells, were purchased from CLS GmbH (Eppelheim, Germany). Roswell Park Memorial Institute (RPMI) 1640 medium supplemented with 10% fetal calf serum (FCS, Bio&Sell GmbH) was used as culture medium and cell densities were kept between 0.5 x 10^6 and 3 x 10^6 cells/ml.

Materials

Trehalose dihydrate and poloxamer 188 (P188) were obtained from Merck. Ectoine, polyvinyl pyrrolidone 40 (PVP40), CryoSOfree DMSO free cryopreservation medium, Cryostor CS10, CalceinAM, DMSO Hybri-Max and RPMI 1640 were purchased from Sigma Aldrich. Sorbitol and L-proline were purchased from PanReac AppliChem, ITW Reagents. PBS pH 7.4, RPMI 1640 with 4-(2-hydroxyethyl)-1-piperazineethanesulfonic acid (HEPES), fetal calf serum (FCS), Annexin V-FITC dead cell apoptosis kit with Annexin V-FITC and propidium iodide (PI), 0.5 M HEPES with pH 7.4 as well as cryovials (Nunc) were obtained from ThermoFisher Scientific. Ringer's acetate was obtained from Deltamedica.

Formulation prescreening based on DoE

A design of experiment (DoE) approach with the software Modde Pro 13 (Sartorius) was used for an initial formulation development of cryopreservation media. A DoE based on seven factors, i.e., excipients, at two concentrations (0 and ´high´) and two responses was generated. An overview of the initial concentration range for each excipient can be found in Table 1. A fractional factorial design with a resolution of IV was used. As responses a high post-thaw viability as well as a high T_g' of the formulation were selected. Ringer's acetate supplemented with 20 mM HEPES was used as base

medium (RiAc-HEPES) for all subsequent formulation preparation after preparation from 0.5 M HEPES buffer pH 7.0 (AlfaAesar, ThermoFisher Scientific) and pH adjustment to pH 7.4 with a 1 M sodium hydroxide (NaOH) solution (VWR chemicals).

Table 1: Concentration range of excipients used in the initial design of experiment using a fractional factorial design (Resolution IV).

Excipient	Low concentration	High concentration
DMSO [%]	0	5
Trehalose [mM]	0	150
Sorbitol [mM]	0	150
Proline [mM]	0	100
Ectoine [mM]	0	100
P188 [%]	0	1
PVP40 [%]	0	5

Based on the results of the initial fractional factorial design a fold-over was performed using the Modde software. Subsequently, additional formulations were tested based on promising formulations to evaluate the possibility to reduce DMSO by increasing the concentration of the other excipients. For these additional formulations the upper concentration limit for trehalose and sorbitol was changed to 300 mM and the limits for proline and ectoine were increased to 200 mM, whereas DMSO was reduced to 2.5% or 0. For each excipient, except DMSO, stock solutions were prepared by dissolving in RiAc-HEPES. Formulation preparation was performed by mixing the required amount of stock solutions with RiAc-HEPES to into conical tubes to reach 125% of the intended concentration for each excipient. Subsequently, the 1.25-fold concentrated formulations were used for cryopreservation of Jurkat cells by diluting the buffer with cell suspension to 1x.

Cryopreservation for the prescreening was performed by preparing cells in formulation within cryovials, i.e., cryovials with 200 µl of cells at a concentration of $5x10^6$ cells/ml were prepared and 800 µl of the respective 1.25-fold formulation were added dropwise to the cells to reach the final formulation concentration and a cell concentration of $1x10^6$ cells/ml. Duplicate samples were prepared.

Stability study of the lead candidates

Subsequently, a stability study was conducted with Jurkat cells over a period of three months. Seven promising formulations from the prescreening were included. The generated DoE model was used to optimize the formulations, whereas the upper limit of DMSO was limited to a concentration of 2.5%. The predicted optimum was 2.5% DMSO, 300 mM trehalose and 5% PVP, which correlates to the already tested DF61 from the prescreening. Additionally, five new formulations were included based

on a rational design of what was previously observed throughout the prescreening, i.e., combinations of trehalose and PVP were tested with or without additional promising excipients. All formulations were prepared by dissolving the excipients in the base medium RiAc-HEPES at a 1.25-fold concentration. The pH was adjusted to pH 7.4, where required with 1 M NaOH (VWR chemicals). For comparison three different benchmark media were included, namely Cryostor CS10 and CryoSOfree, both commercially available cryopreservation solutions, as well as 10% DMSO in RPMI. An overview of the formulations and media included in the stability study can be found in Table 2. The pH was measured for all cryopreservation formulations using a pH-meter (Mettler Toledo). Additionally, the osmolality was determined by freezing-point depression using a Gonotec Osmomat 3000 (Gonotec). Jurkat cells were formulated and stored for three months at -145 °C, -80 °C and -40 °C until thawing and subsequent analysis. For each formulation three biological replicates were frozen.

Cell samples for the stability study were prepared in 50-ml conical tubes. In total 15 ml of cell solution were prepared for each formulation. First, a cell stock was prepared by centrifugation of freshly harvested Jurkat cells (400 g, 5 min) followed by resuspension in RiAc-HEPES to a cell concentration of $5x10^6$ cells/ml. A volume of 3 ml cell stock was aliquoted into 50-ml conical tubes and subsequently 12 ml of the respective cryopreservation formulation were slowly added. Similarly, cells were prepared with 12.5% DMSO in RPMI resulting in a final concentration of 10% DMSO. Benchmark samples were prepared by centrifugation of freshly harvested cells (400 g, 5 min) and direct resuspension in Cryostor CS10 and CryoSOfree, respectively. All cell samples were aliquoted into 1.8-ml cryovials to a sample volume of 1 ml cell suspension.

Table 2: Overview of formulations tested within a three-month stability study. DF: design of experiment formulations; F: additional new formulations based on rational design. CS10: Cryostor CS10; CSO: CryoSOfree; 10%: 10% DMSO in RPMI; DMSO: dimethyl sulfoxide; P188: poloxamer 188; PVP40: polyvinyl pyrrolidone 40.

Formulation		DMSO [v/v %]	Trehalose [mM]	Proline [mM]	Ectoine [mM]	P188 [w/v %]	PVP40 [w/v %]
Prescreening	DF_4	5	150	0	0	1	5
	DF_56	0	300	100	0	0	5
	DF_60	2.5	0	0	100	0	5
	DF_61	2.5	300	0	0	0	5
	DF_67	0	300	50	50	0	5
	DF_72	2.5	300	50	50	0	0
	DF_73	2.5	300	50	50	0	5
New formulations	F1	0	300	0	0	0	5
	F2	2.5	300	0	100	0	5
	F3	0	300	25	100	0	5
	F4	2.5	300	25	100	0	5
	F5	2.5	200	0	0	0	5
Benchmarks	CS 10	10			not disclosed		
	CSO	0			not disclosed		
	10%	10	0	0	0	0	0

Cryopreservation process

The cryovials were frozen in an isopropanol filled Mr. Frosty device (18 cryovials with 1-2 ml fill volume, ThermoFisher Scientific) resulting in a freezing rate of approx. 1 °C/min in a -80 °C freezer. Samples for the prescreening were transferred to a -145 °C freezer after 5h and stored overnight. Cell stability samples were either left at -80 °C or transferred to -145 °C or -40 °C after 5 h. Stability samples were stored for at least three months prior thawing.

Following storage cryovials were thawed by putting them into a water bath at 37 °C for approximately 3 minutes. To avoid long-standing times at room temperature only two samples were thawed in parallel. Thawed cell samples were diluted by slowly adding 1 ml of RPMI 1640 and subsequently transferred into a 15-ml conical tube. RPMI 1640 was slowly pipetted into the conical tubes until a final volume of 10 ml was reached. The diluted cells were centrifuged (400 g, 5 min) and resuspended in 1 ml of RPMI 1640. Cell samples intended for recultivation were only resuspended in 900 µl of RPMI 1640 and 100 µl of FCS was added to complete the cell growth medium. After resuspension cells were either directly analyzed (T-FT) or transferred into a 24-well plate (Costar, Corning) for recultivation for 24h (T-Rec).

Viable cell counting and viability determination based on Trypan blue staining

Trypan blue staining (Carl Roth) was used to count viable cells within a sample by preparing 10-fold dilutions for fresh cells and 2-fold dilutions following cryopreservation. A hemocytometry Neubauer

counting chamber (Karl Hecht GmbH & Co KG) was used and the number of viable and dead cells within 4 quadrants was counted. Viable cell recovery was calculated as follows:

$$viable\ cell\ recovery\ [\%] = \frac{viable\ cells\ (T-X)}{viable\ cells\ (T0)},$$

where T-X is referring to measurement time points after cryopreservation and T0 is referring to viable cell numbers after the final preparation in cryopreservation formulations. For benchmark formulations a theoretical cell number of $1x10^6$ cells was assumed at T0. Viability was calculated based on:

$$viability\ [\%] = \frac{viable\ cells\ (T-X)}{all\ cells\ (live\ and\ dead\ )\ (T-X)},$$

where T-X is referring to the respective measurement time point, comparing the viability of cells within a sample.

Imaging flow cytometry for viability assessment

An Amnis FlowSight instrument (Luminex) was used to assess cell viability with two different fluorescence assays. To differentiate between viable and dead cells CalceinAM, which is hydrolyzed to fluorescent Calcein by viable cells, and PI, which only permeates into dead cells, were used. Cell samples were centrifuged and resuspended in PBS prior addition of CalceinAM and PI. The cells were stained for 20 minutes in the dark and measured with a 488-nm fluorescence excitation laser. Additionally, a double staining to differentiate dead and apoptotic cells from viable cells were used as well: Annexin V-FITC is staining apoptotic cells and PI is staining dead cells. Viable cells were unstained in this assay. Cells were prepared by two washing steps, first into PBS and secondly into Annexin V binding buffer. The cells were stained for 15 minutes in the dark and subsequently measured with a 488-nm fluorescence excitation laser. The software IDEAS 6.2.183 was used to analyze the data.

Quantification of cell-sized particles by flow imaging microscopy (FIM)

To determine the total number of cell-sized particles as well as for cell sizing a FlowCam 8100 (Fluid Imaging Technologies) system was used. The instrument is equipped with a high-resolution CMOS camera (1920x1200 pixels) and an objective resulting in a 20x magnification was used. Imaging was performed with 27 frames per second and intensity thresholds of 12 for light and dark pixels were applied to detect particles within the sample. A 1% [w/v] Terg-a-zyme enzyme detergent solution and highly purified water was used to clean the instrument between measurements. Samples were measured after 5-fold dilution with PBS. The dilution factor was taken into account for all subsequent particle/ml concentrations. Particles with a diameter between 8 and 25 µm were considered a cell. Absolute cell-sized particle recovery was calculated by the following equation:

$$cell-sized\ particle\ recovery\ [\%] = \frac{cells\ (T-X)}{cells\ (T0)}\ x\ 100,$$

whereas T-X is referring to the measurement time point and T0 refers to the number for cells measured from cell stock solution in RiAc-HEPES after 5-fold dilution to the target concentration (same sample preparation as cryopreservation formulations).

Glass transition temperature determination by differential scanning calorimetry (DSC)

To determine the glass transition temperature of the maximally freeze-concentrated solution (T_g') differential scanning calorimetry (DSC) was used. A Mettler Toledo DSC 1 instrument was used to measure T_g'. For each measurement, 30 µl of the final formulation were pipetted into aluminum crucibles (Mettler Toledo) and crimped. Subsequently, the measurements were performed by cooling to -95 °C, holding for 10 minutes at -95 °C and rewarming to 20 °C. The cooling and warming rate was 10 °C/min. During the heating scan the T_g' can be determined as the midpoint of the endothermic shift of the baseline. Furthermore, selected formulations containing DMSO at 5% or 2.5% were additionally measured by using a Netzsch instrument with a liquid nitrogen cooler. Similarly, formulations were analyzed using a crimped aluminum crucible. The samples were cooled to -150 °C and reheated to 20 °C with a scanning rate of 10 °C/min. Formulations containing 5% DMSO or 2.5% DMSO with low concentrations of trehalose or no trehalose were measured with the Netzsch instrument to a cooling temperature of -150 °C, whereas formulations containing 2.5% DMSO with high concentrations of trehalose or DMSO-free formulations were measured with the Mettler Toledo instrument with a minimum temperature of -95 °C. The T_g' for samples measured with the Netzsch instrument were similarly determined to the Mettler Toledo measurements.

Statistical analysis

Statistical analysis was performed by using Graphpad Prism 9.5. Results are reported as mean values ± standard deviation. To compare mean values of all formulations one-way ANOVA followed by Tukey's test was performed. For the comparison of selected formulations, e.g., DMSO-containing and corresponding DMSO-free formulation, one-way ANOVA followed by Bonferroni multiple comparison test was used. Results were considered significant, when $p < 0.05$.

Results

Formulation prescreening based on DoE

An initial fractional factorial design of experiment with a resolution of IV was used based on 7 excipients at two concentrations (Table 1), resulting in 17 different formulations. Two response factors, i.e., post-thaw viability based on CalceinAM and T_g', were measured. The composition of the formulations within the initial DoE can be found in Table 3. An overview of the obtained viabilities and T_g' can be found in Figure 1.

Table 3: Overview of the formulation composition within the initial DoE experiment based on a fractional factorial design (resolution IV) DMSO: dimethyl sulfoxide; P188: poloxamer 188; PVP40: polyvinyl pyrrolidone 40.

	DMSO [v/v %]	Trehalose [mM]	Sorbitol [mM]	Proline [mM]	Ectoine [mM]	P188 [w/v %]	PVP40 [w/v %]
DF_1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
DF_2	5	0	0	0	100	0	5
DF_3	0	150	0	0	100	1	0
DF_4	5	150	0	0	0	1	5
DF_5	0	0	150	0	100	1	5
DF_6	5	0	150	0	0	1	0
DF_7	0	150	150	0	0	0	5
DF_8	5	150	150	0	100	0	0
DF_9	0	0	0	100	0	1	5
DF_10	5	0	0	100	100	1	0
DF_11	0	150	0	100	100	0	5
DF_12	5	150	0	100	0	0	0
DF_13	0	0	150	100	100	0	0
DF_14	5	0	150	100	0	0	5
DF_15	0	150	150	100	0	1	0
DF_16	5	150	150	100	100	1	5
DF_17	2.5	75	75	50	50	0.5	2.5



Figure 1: Viabilities of Jurkat cells after overnight storage at -145 °C based on CalceinAM staining (A) and T_g' of the respective formulations (B). DoE formulations were used based on a fractional factorial design with 7 different factors, i.e., excipients. Even numbered formulations contain 5% DMSO, whereas odd numbered formulations do not contain DMSO. For the viability the average of duplicate measurements and standard deviation is shown.

A clear correlation between post-thaw viability and presence of DMSO can be found with formulations containing DMSO resulting in viabilities ranging from approximately 40 to 80%, whereas formulations without DMSO did not result in viable cells. On the other hand, DMSO containing formulations showed lower T_g' values as determined by DSC measurements with values ranging from -95 °C to -79 °C. Subsequently, the Modde software was used to complement the DoE with additional experiments to further understand the impact of the excipients. The composition of the additional formulations

including the resulting viabilities can be found in Table S 1 (DF18 to DF45). Similar to the previous experiments the impact of DMSO on the post-thaw viability of Jurkat cells was predominant. To further test the protective effect of single excipients at higher concentrations additional experiments were performed, in which the concentrations of trehalose and sorbitol were increased to 300 mM and the concentration of proline as well as ectoine was increased to 200 mM (DF46 to DF49). Compared to the low concentration single excipients (DF19, DF21, DF25, DF32) a very small increase of 1-4% in viability was observed, indicating that the optimal concentration range of excipients was not yet included. In a last set of experiments, additional formulations were tested, based on promising formulations tested so far by reducing the amount of DMSO to 0 or 2.5% and increasing the concentration of the other excipients. The composition of these formulations and their resulting viabilities can be found in Table S 1 (DF51 to DF80).

Subsequently, a DoE model based on all tested formulations (DF1 to DF80) was generated. Figure 2 shows the resulting sweet spot plot highlighting the design space, where both response criteria were met, i.e., post-thaw viability above 45% and a T_g' above -65 °C. Regarding the post-thaw viability the most dominant factor was DMSO, which is further highlighted in a response contour plot in Figure S 1. However, DMSO is also the excipient lowering T_g' the most, which can be seen in the response contour plot for T_g' in Figure S 2. Due to the positive dominant effect of DMSO on the post-thaw viability as well as the negative dominant effect of DMSO on the T_g' the design space for formulation development is rather limited and additional excipients are needed to balance the negative T_g´ effect of DMSO or to improve post-thaw viability similarly as DMSO. The combination of trehalose and at least 5% PVP40 seems to be crucial to meet both response criteria as indicated by Figure 2. In summary, a reasonable model was generated for T_g' with a high R^2 (0.89) and Q^2 (0.87) as well as a good model validity (0.85) as shown in the supplementary (Figure S3). However, the model for viability showed a lower R^2 (0.70) and Q^2 (0.67) and very low model validity (-0.2) (Figure S3).



Figure 2: Four-dimensional sweet spot plot highlighting the design space, where both response criteria, i.e., viability and T_g', are met in green. Blue: one criterion is met. White: no criterion is met. Ectoine, proline and poloxamer 188 (P188) did show little effect and were therefore not part of the predicted optimal design space (concentration was set to approximately 0).

Stability study of the lead candidates

Subsequently, a three-month stability study was conducted at either -145 °C, -80 °C or -40 °C. Seven promising formulations from the prescreening were included as well as five new formulations based on learnings obtained throughout the previous formulation screenings. As benchmark formulations commercially available Cryostor CS10, containing 10% DMSO, and CryoSOfree, a DMSO-free medium, were included. Additionally, 10% DMSO in RPMI was used as a benchmark. An overview of all tested formulations including their corresponding osmolality, pH and T_g' can be seen in Table 4. In general, formulations containing DMSO showed higher osmolalities (above 1000 mOsm/kg) in comparison to DMSO-free formulations. The T_g' for formulation DF4 and DF60 were around -80 °C, whereas the other formulations were in the range between -29 °C and -53 °C.

Table 4: Characterization of the used formulations and benchmarks for the cryopreservation of Jurkat cells including osmolality, pH and the glass transition temperature of the maximally freeze-concentrated solution (T_g'). 10%: 10% DMSO in RPMI; DMSO: dimethyl sulfoxide; P188: poloxamer 188; PVP40: polyvinyl pyrrolidone 40.

	DMSO [%]	Trehalose [mM]	Proline [mM]	Ectoine [mM]	P188 [%]	PVP40 [%]	Osmolality [mOsm/kg]	pH	T_g' [°C]
DF_4	5	150	0	0	1	5	1637 ± 16	7.36	-80
DF_56	0	300	100	0	0	5	857 ± 1	7.30	-30
DF_60	2.5	0	0	100	0	5	883 ± 2	7.38	-84
DF_61	2.5	300	0	0	0	5	1284 ± 9	7.31	-44
DF_67	0	300	50	50	0	5	856 ± 6	7.31	-31
DF_72	2.5	300	50	50	0	0	1254 ± 4	7.35	-53
DF_73	2.5	300	50	50	0	5	1475 ± 1	7.34	-45
F1	0	300	0	0	0	5	713 ± 1	7.35	-29
F2	2.5	300	0	100	0	5	1485 ± 3	7.33	-44
F3	0	300	25	100	0	5	896 ± 5	7.35	-31
F4	2.5	300	25	100	0	5	1520 ± 8	7.36	-44
F5	2.5	200	0	0	0	5	1064 ± 3	7.35	-48
CS 10	10	not disclosed					3282 ± 11	7.57	-111
CSO	0	not disclosed					2425 ± 20	6.65	-51
10%	10	0	0	0	0	0	2350 ± 20	7.64	-115

After thawing (T-FT) cells were directly analyzed based on Trypan blue, CalceinAM and Annexin V staining. For samples stored at -80 °C an additional vial was thawed to recultivate the cells for 24 h in cell culture and analyzed subsequently (T-Rec) with all three viability assays as mentioned above. In parallel to the viability assays FIM was performed to measure the total concentration of cell-sized particles within the samples. The cell-sized particle recovery based on FIM measurements considers all particles between 8 and 25 µm as cells and is normalized to the number of cells within the cell stock prior freezing. The total concentration of cell-size particles was compared to the viable cell recovery as determined by Trypan blue staining. Figure 3 shows the cell-sized particle recovery as well as the viable cell recovery for samples stored at -80 °C after T-FT (panel A and C) and after T-Rec (panel B and D). At T-FT most formulations led to cell-sized particle recoveries between 30 to 60% with no significant differences between the formulations (Figure 3 A). An exception is DF4, which resulted in significantly higher cell-sized particle recovery compared to the other samples with approximately 100% (one-way ANOVA). Cell-sized particle recoveries at T-Rec are slightly higher than at T-FT ranging from 40 to 75%. Similar to T-FT, cell-sized particle recovery for DF4 at T-Rec is significantly higher than most samples except for F2, F4, F5 and DF56 (Figure 3 B). Additionally, viable cell recovery was determined, which is lower than the obtained total cell-sized recovery indicating that many of the recovered cell-sized particles are dead cells. DF4 resulted in a significantly higher viable cell recovery of around 30% (except for CS10, 10% and F2), whereas for the other samples values ranging from 4 to 17% were obtained.

However, after 24 h of recultivation all samples led to a comparable low viable cell recovery between 4 to 16%.



Figure 3: Cell-sized particle recovery for Jurkat cells after three-month storage at -80 °C determined by FIM (A, B). All particles between 8 and 25 µm are considered cell-sized and numbers were normalized to the cell numbers prior freezing. Additionally, viable cell recovery was determined based on Trypan blue staining (C, D), where only viable cells were counted and normalized with the number of viable cells at T0. The left panel (A, C) shows the recoveries for cells directly after thawing (T-FT) and the right panel (B, D) shows the recoveries after 24 h of recultivation of cells (T-Rec). Statistically significant differences ($p \leq 0.5$) based on one-way ANOVA followed by Tukey's test are indicated by different letters. BM: benchmark formulations; DMSO: dimethyl sulfoxide. 10%: 10% DMSO in RPMI.

Moreover, Figure 4 shows the size distribution of exemplary cell samples measured with FIM prior freezing (T0), after T-FT and T-Rec. An overview of the size distribution for all samples can be found in the supplementary (Figure S 4). Based on the size distribution a cell loss between T0 and T-FT can be detected for most samples except DF4, where only a small increase in cell debris could be detected and the particles/ml for a diameter of 10 to 20 µm are comparable. However, a size shift can be observed towards smaller particles as well as increase in cell debris after T-Rec, indicating that the cells are dying over time in cell culture. For the other formulations a cell loss can be observed from T0 to T-FT as the particle concentration decreased in the diameter range from 10 to 20 µm. Furthermore, a

size shift towards smaller particles, i.e., cell debris can be seen for the tested formulations and CSO, but not for CS10 and only to a smaller extent for 10% DMSO in RPMI.



Figure 4: Comparison of the size distribution of cell samples after harvest in RiAc-HEPES (black line), directly after thawing (T-FT) and after 24h of recultivation (T-Rec). Exemplary size distributions are shown for CS10, DF4, DF72 and F1.

Additionally, the viability was determined by using three different assays, namely, Trypan blue, CalceinAM and Annexin V staining, and the results are shown in Figure 5. All assays used led to different viability results especially for higher viabilities as the assays are based on different measurement principles. All benchmark formulations showed high viabilities of 60 to 70% based on Trypan blue staining. However, in both fluorescence assays, CalceinAM and Annexin V, the viability values were lower with 40 to 50% for CS10 and 10% DMSO and only around 20% for CSO. The tested formulations showed minor differences between the viability assays. Based on Trypan blue staining CS10 and 10% DMSO led to slightly higher viability values with approximately 70% compared to the formulation samples, which were between 20% and 53% viability. Among the tested formulations DMSO-free DF67 (53% ± 17%) and DF4 (50% ± 9%) had the highest post-thaw viability using Trypan blue staining. Using the CalceinAM assay DF4 showed the best results with 58% ± 13% followed by 10% DMSO in RPMI (51% ± 9%). Based on Annexin V staining no significant differences between the viability of the samples were found.

For samples measured after 24 h in cell culture the obtained cell viability was in general lower compared to the samples measured directly after thawing, showing that damages throughout

cryopreservation continue to unfold after thawing. For Trypan blue and Annexin V staining no significant differences were found between the samples, whereas CS10 resulted in a significantly higher viability of 51% ± 1% based on CalceinAM compared to the other samples. The overall viability range for Trypan blue staining was between 13% and 50%, whereas Annexin V was only between 4% and 15%. CalceinAM led to intermediate viability values (7-50%) compared to the other two assays. In summary, no clear trend could be observed regarding DMSO concentration directly post-thaw and after recultivation for samples stored at -80 °C.



Figure 5: Comparison of three different viability assays for cells stored at -80 °C for 3 months at T-FT (left column) and T-Rec (right column). Trypan blue viability staining (A, B), CalceinAM & propidium iodide (C, D) and Annexin V-FITC & propidium iodide (E, F) staining were used to determine cell viability. Trypan blue viability was based on the ratio of viable cells to all cells within each sample. Statistically significant differences ($p \leq 0.5$) based on one-way ANOVA followed by Tukey's test are indicated by different letters. BM: benchmark formulations; DMSO: dimethyl sulfoxide. 10%: 10% DMSO in RPMI.

Furthermore, samples stored at -145 °C were analyzed regarding cell recovery and cell viability. Figure 6 shows the viable cell recovery as well as the results for all three viability assays. In general, the results are comparable to the samples stored at -80 °C with an overall low viable cell recovery between 6 to 20% for most samples and around 40% for DF4 indicating again the protective effect of P188 during

the processing of cells. The benchmark formulations resulted in slightly higher viabilities (65-74%) compared to the tested formulations (21-72%) for Trypan blue staining. Similar to the samples stored at -80 °C the obtained viabilities for the benchmark formulations based on CalceinAM and Annexin V staining were lower compared to Trypan blue staining. Although the differences between the viabilities of the tested formulations are relatively small, the DMSO-containing formulations seem to perform slightly better for samples stored at -145 °C than DMSO-free formulations. The effect of DMSO was not visible for samples stored at -80 °C, which indicates the importance of ultralow storage temperature during cryopreservation. The measured T_g' for samples without DMSO were around -30 °C enabling a storage at -80 °C, whereas DMSO-containing formulations at 2.5 to 5% showed a T_g' ranging from -44 °C to -84 °C (Table 4). By comparing F3 (DMSO-free) and F4 (2.5% DMSO) the positive effect of DMSO for samples stored at -145 °C can be seen with approximately 3-fold higher viabilities for all assays for F4 (Figure 6). However, DMSO-free formulation DF67 results in a viability comparable to DF73 which contains 2.5% DMSO, further highlighting the possible positive effect of the combination of 50 mM proline and 50 mM ectoine. Among the DMSO-containing formulations DF72 (without PVP40) resulted in the lowest viability with CalceinAM (31% ± 16) and Annexin V (29% ± 15%) assays and second lowest viability for Trypan blue staining (39% ± 22%) further indicating the potentially beneficial effect of PVP40 on the cryopreservation outcome.

An additional comparison of all three storage temperatures can be found in the supplementary information for cell recovery (Figure S 5) and cell viability (Figure S 6).



Figure 6: Analysis of cells stored at -145 °C after 3 months. (A) viable cell recovery based on Trypan blue staining, (B) viability based on trypan blue staining, (C) viability based on CalceinAM & propidium iodide, (D) viability based on Annexin V-FITC & propidium iodide. Statistically significant differences ($p \leq 0.5$) based on one-way ANOVA followed by Tukey's test are indicated by different letters. BM: benchmark formulations; DMSO: dimethyl sulfoxide. 10%: 10% DMSO in RPMI.

Discussion

Cryopreservation of cells is essential for the storage of CBMPs and is usually achieved by a standard procedure using 10% DMSO with a freezing rate of 1 °C/min [9]. In this study we explored novel cryopreservation media using a DoE approach followed by subsequent OFAT optimization for formulation development. By reducing the amount of DMSO as well as using excipients, which increase the T_g', we aimed to test the storage of cells at elevated subzero temperatures such as -80 °C. The developed formulations were further evaluated in a three-month stability study, where the samples were stored at -145 °C, -80 °C and -40 °C.

A DoE based on a fractional factorial design with a resolution of IV was used. A fractional factorial design is a linear model, where a balanced set of experiments is used to build a linear model. The main factors contributing to the outcome can be identified by this. Generating a proper prediction model for post-thaw viability was not possible as DMSO was the predominant factor regarding post-thaw

viability. DMSO had a strong positive impact on the post-thaw viability, whereas trehalose and PVP40 had only a minor positive effect and the remaining excipients seemed to have a negative effect on the post-thaw viability. The combination of trehalose and proline as well as trehalose and ectoine had a very small positive impact on the viability, however as a fractional factorial design was chosen two-factor interactions are confounded.

Considering both response factors (cell viability and T_g') the resulting optimum was 2.5% DMSO, 300 mM trehalose and 5% PVP40, which was one of the formulations already included in the prescreening (DF61). The model predicted a viability of 47% and a T_g' -46 °C for this formulation. In the stability study the actual measured viability for cells stored at -145 °C was 49.9% ± 4.2% based on CalceinAM staining and the obtained T_g' of the formulation was -43.7 °C. The DoE model was based on viability values obtained by CalceinAM staining, therefore only the CalceinAM assay can be used to compare the predicted viability to the obtained values of the stability study. Both measured values are comparable to the predicted values, although the model for viability has a low validity. The established DoE approach focused on formulation development and process parameters were not included. However, as the formulation composition influences the cryopreservation process, process parameter should be considered as well to improve the DoE predictions. Within this study a standard cryopreservation process was used with a freezing rate of 1 °C/min. The freezing process most likely needs to be adapted depending on the composition of the formulation. Pollock et al. previously reported different optimal freezing rates for Jurkat cells and mesenchymal stem cells depending upon the used cryopreservation medium [29]. The study found that increasing the freezing rate to 10 °C/min, when using a formulation consisting of 300 mM trehalose, 10% glycerol and 0.01% ectoine, resulted in a higher viability for Jurkat cells compared to 10% DMSO at a freezing rate of 1 °C/min [29]. In pharmaceutical development DoE approaches are valuable to minimize the number of experiments in a formulation development study. However, during cryopreservation not only the composition of the formulation, but also the interactions between the excipients as well as the process impact the cryopreservation outcome. Therefore, the freezing rate could be included in the DoE as an additional parameter. Additionally, models could be used, which can determine non-linear relationships between factors as interactions between excipients can occur.

After the DoE, a stability study was conducted, where samples were analyzed directly after thawing as well as after recultivation. The cell recovery, including total cell-sized particle recovery as well as viable cell recovery, and cell viability were evaluated for cryopreserved samples. Both parameters are important to understand the cell damages that might occur during the cryopreservation process.

In general, a low viable cell recovery of 4% to 30% was obtained for samples stored at -80 °C as cells are damaged throughout the cryopreservation process. A viable cell recovery of 16% was previously

reported for 10% DMSO for Jurkat cells at freezing rate of 1 °C/min [29], which is comparable to the viable cell recovery for 10% DMSO in RPMI within this study. The comparison of cell-sized particle recovery to viable cell recovery showed that different factors can negatively affect Jurkat cells throughout cryopreservation. Although a very high cell-sized particle recovery of ~ 106% (normalized to cell stock, therefore dilution and measurement deviations can lead to values slightly higher than 100%) was obtained for cells in DF4, which contains 1% P188, the amount of viable cells recovered was only 30% for samples stored at -80 °C. P188 is a non-ionic surfactant, which has been previously shown to be a very effective shear protectant for cells [30, 31]. This protecting effect is also visible in our study as all cells remain particulate throughout the processing steps. The cells do not disintegrate. However, the low viable cell recovery indicates, that other stress factors than mechanical damage occurring during freezing and thawing are not prevented by DF4. Each processing step can negatively impact the stability of cells starting with the sample preparation. Benchmark samples CS10 and CSO were prepared by direct resuspension in the respective solution after centrifugation and removal of cell culture medium. The osmolalities of CS10 (3282 ± 11 mOsm/kg) and CSO (2425 ± 20 mOsm/kg) are very high and the changes in cell size due to fast changes in osmolality may have led to cell damages [32]. These damages throughout sample preparation may be prevented by slow addition of the cryopreservation medium as performed for the formulation samples in our study. The total cell-sized particle recovery for the tested formulations were slightly higher than the benchmark formulations. To formulate the cell formulations samples a stock solution of cells in RiAc-HEPES was prepared. Subsequently, the 1.25-fold concentration was slowly added to the cell stock and thereby preventing a high osmotic gradient. Additionally, the osmolality of the tested formulations was lower in comparison to the benchmarks reducing the cell volume excursion during formulation addition as well as removal.

As expected, a positive impact of DMSO on the viability of Jurkat cells could be observed upon storage for three months. This effect was more pronounced for samples stored at -145 °C in comparison to -80 °C, where there was no difference between formulations with or without DMSO (Figure 5). These results further highlight the need for ultra-low storage for DMSO-containing samples. To enable storage at -80 °C a reduction of DMSO to 2.5% as well as addition of PVP40 and trehalose is needed. In this study, several important formulation aspects with regard to the possibility to reduce DMSO as well as storage at -80 °C were identified. The addition of 5% PVP40 is beneficial for the cryopreservation outcome at both -145 °C and -80 °C storage. PVP40, at 10% in DMEM, has been previously shown to result in comparable cryopreservation results to 10% DMSO and FCS for human adipose-tissue derived stem cells stored in liquid nitrogen [33]. Furthermore, the combination of 2.3% PVP40 and 10% DMSO led to a higher recovery for hepatocytes in comparison to cryopreservation with 10% DMSO after storage in liquid nitrogen [34]. Additionally, the combination of 50 mM proline and 50 mM ectoine did

positively impact the post-thaw viability of Jurkat cells in our study. The effect of proline and ectoine as cryopreservation excipients were previously evaluated on human endothelial cells stored at -150 °C and a beneficial effect on the recultivation of cells could be observed, when using 50 mM ectoine and 2.5% DMSO[35]. Additionally, the combination of 20 mM proline, 100 mM ectoine and 2.5% DMSO led to recultivation rates comparable to 10% DMSO (storage temperature -150 °C) [35]. Another approach to improve the cryopreservation outcome is to already culture cells with suitable excipients such as proline and/or ectoine prior cryopreservation, which can increase post-thaw cell recovery depending upon the used conditions [35, 36].

However, cell samples analyzed after 24h recultivation further decreased in cell viability, showing that damages described as cryopreservation induced delayed-onset of cell death [37] takes place. Therefore, the analysis directly after thawing can lead to an overestimation of cell viability and a combination of different parameters should be analyzed to fully understand the damaging effect of the cryopreservation process including formulation of cells prior freezing and processing of cells after thawing. Apart from measuring cell viability directly post-thaw a recultivation time point should be included. To avoid false positive results based on viability measurements, the cell viability and viable cell recovery should be measured to evaluate the cryopreservation outcome [38]. Additionally, measuring the viability and recovery after recultivation of cells can detect delayed cryopreservation damage [38]. Furthermore, in addition to viability also functionality, i.e., cell activity such as cytotoxicity for T cells, should be assessed, as viability assays measure specific cell parameters such as membrane integrity (Trypan blue and PI). It has been previously shown that a high post-thaw viability can be obtained based on membrane integrity staining human umbilical vein endothelial cells, although their functionality is not comparable to fresh cells as shown by a tube formation assay, which mimics angiogenesis [39]. This further highlights the need to establish a set of analytical tools to evaluate the cryopreservation outcome at several time points post-thaw.

In this study a commonly used standard procedure for cryopreservation was performed based on a passive cooling device with a 1 °C/min freezing rate [18]. However, as different formulation compositions and DMSO concentrations were tested the standard procedure might not be applicable. The cryopreservation damage in relation to the freezing rate is usually described by the “Two-factor hypothesis” by Mazur et al. [40]. A fast cooling rate can lead to intracellular ice formation, whereas a slow cooling rate induces osmotic stress throughout freezing. Therefore, an intermediate cooling rate has to be chosen to balance both factors. The cooling rate depends on the chosen CPAs and their concentration [41, 42]. In this study DMSO-free formulations contained 300 mM trehalose, which resulted in an osmolality of ~ 800 mOsm/kg, depending on the complete formulation composition. As no cell membrane permeating excipients were included in these formulations the cells directly shrink upon

resuspension in the respective formulations due to the osmotic pressure. This directly lowers the risk of intracellular ice formation because the water content in the cell is decreasing. Therefore, an increased cooling rate in comparison to 1 °C/min should further be evaluated to decrease the solute effect (osmotic stress) during freezing.

Conclusion

In this study formulations for the cryopreservation of Jurkat cells were screened. A special focus was put on the elimination or reduction of DMSO to minimize the potential risks and side effects associated with DMSO. Additionally, the storage of Jurkat cells at elevated subzero temperatures, i.e., -80 °C and -40 °C, were evaluated. A design of experiment approach was used, however due to the predominant effect of DMSO on post-thaw viability the prediction of a suitable formulation was more difficult. Several promising excipients and combinations thereof were identified for the cryopreservation of Jurkat cells with reduced concentrations of DMSO or DMSO-free formulations. However, the viabilities of formulations containing 2.5% DMSO were lower compared to the evaluated benchmarks containing 10% DMSO after three-month storage. Furthermore, the additional analysis of cells after recultivation showed that post-thaw cell viability further decreases over time highlighting the need to evaluate cells not only directly after thawing.

Acknowledgements

We thank Jonas Binder from Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität Munich for his support with DSC measurements on the Netzsch instrument.

References

1. Bak A, Friis KP, Wu Y, Ho RJY. Translating Cell and Gene Biopharmaceutical Products for Health and Market Impact. Product Scaling From Clinical to Marketplace: Lessons Learned and Future Outlook. *J Pharm Sci.* 2019;108(10):3169–3175.

2. Hoogendoorn KH, Crommelin DJA, Jiskoot W. Formulation of Cell-Based Medicinal Products: A Question of Life or Death? *J Pharm Sci.* 2021;110(5):1885–1894.

3. Ginis I, Grinblat B, Shirvan MH. Evaluation of bone marrow-derived mesenchymal stem cells after cryopreservation and hypothermic storage in clinically safe medium. *Tissue Eng Part C Methods.* 2012;18(6):453–463.

4. Correia C, Koshkin A, Carido M, et al. Effective Hypothermic Storage of Human Pluripotent Stem Cell-Derived Cardiomyocytes Compatible With Global Distribution of Cells for Clinical Applications and Toxicology Testing. *Stem Cells Transl Med.* 2016;5(5):658–669.

5. Kao GS, Kim HT, Daley H, et al. Validation of short-term handling and storage conditions for marrow and peripheral blood stem cell products. *Transfusion.* 2011;51(1):137–147.

6. Lovelock JE, Bishop MW. Prevention of freezing damage to living cells by dimethyl sulphoxide. *Nature.* 1959;183(4672):1394–1395.

7. Raju R, Bryant SJ, Wilkinson BL, Bryant G. The need for novel cryoprotectants and cryopreservation protocols: Insights into the importance of biophysical investigation and cell permeability. *Biochim Biophys Acta Gen Subj.* 2020;1865(1):129749.

8. Mandumpal JB, Kreck CA, Mancera RL. A molecular mechanism of solvent cryoprotection in aqueous DMSO solutions. *Phys Chem Chem Phys.* 2011;13(9):3839–3842.

9. Li R, Johnson R, Yu G, McKenna DH, Hubel A. Preservation of cell-based immunotherapies for clinical trials. *Cytotherapy.* 2019;21(9):943–957.

10. Akkök CA, Holte MR, Tangen JM, Ostenstad B, Bruserud O. Hematopoietic engraftment of dimethyl sulfoxide-depleted autologous peripheral blood progenitor cells. *Transfusion.* 2009;49(2):354–361.

11. Shu Z, Heimfeld S, Gao D. Hematopoietic SCT with cryopreserved grafts: adverse reactions after transplantation and cryoprotectant removal before infusion. *Bone Marrow Transplant.* 2014;49(4):469–476.

12. Cruz CR, Hanley PJ, Liu H, et al. Adverse events following infusion of T cells for adoptive immunotherapy: a 10-year experience. *Cytotherapy.* 2010;12(6):743–749.

13. Fry LJ, Querol S, Gomez SG, McArdle S, Rees R, Madrigal JA. Assessing the toxic effects of DMSO on cord blood to determine exposure time limits and the optimum concentration for cryopreservation. *Vox sanguinis.* 2015;109(2):181–190.

14. Li J. Calculation of Relative Solubility of Semipolar Solvents by Abraham Solvation Parameter Model for Extractables and Leachables Analysis in Chemical Characterization of Medical Devices. *J Solution Chem.* 2022;51(7):816–837.

15. Dorey S, Pahl I, Uettwiller I, Priebe P, Hauk A. Theoretical and Practical Considerations When Selecting Solvents for Use in Extractables Studies of Polymeric Contact Materials in Single-Use Systems Applied in the Production of Biopharmaceuticals. *Ind Eng Chem Res.* 2018;57(21):7077–7089.

16. Budde D, Jurkiewicz E. Risk analysis of leachables in cell and gene therapy using a CAR-T model process. *Int J Pharm.* 2021;607:121015.

17. Arroyo A, Booij P, Woldemariam G, et al. Cell and Gene Therapies: Challenges in Designing Extractables and Leachables Studies and Conducting Safety Assessments. *J Pharm Sci.* 2024;113(3):513–522.

18. Baust JM, Campbell LH, Harbell JW. Best practices for cryopreserving, thawing, recovering, and assessing cells. *In Vitro Cell Dev Biol Anim.* 2017;53(10):855–871.

19. Sydykov B, Oldenhof H, Sieme H, Wolkers WF. Storage stability of liposomes stored at elevated subzero temperatures in DMSO/sucrose mixtures. *PLoS One.* 2018;13(7):e0199867.

20. Awan M, Buriak I, Fleck R, et al. Dimethyl sulfoxide: a central player since the dawn of cryobiology, is efficacy balanced by toxicity? *Regen Med.* 2020;15(3):1463–1491.

21. Elliott GD, Wang S, Fuller BJ. Cryoprotectants: A review of the actions and applications of cryoprotective solutes that modulate cell recovery from ultra-low temperatures. *Cryobiology.* 2017;76:74–91.

22. Pi C-H, Yu G, Dosa PI, Hubel A. Characterizing modes of action and interaction for multicomponent osmolyte solutions on Jurkat cells. *Biotechnol Bioeng.* 2019;116(3):631–643.

23. Rudolph AS, Crowe JH. Membrane stabilization during freezing: The role of two natural cryoprotectants, trehalose and proline. *Cryobiology.* 1985;22(4):367–377.

24. Eroglu A, Bailey SE, Toner M, Toth TL. Successful cryopreservation of mouse oocytes by using low concentrations of trehalose and dimethylsulfoxide. *Biol Reprod.* 2009;80(1):70–78.

25. Pollock K, Samsonraj RM, Dudakovic A, et al. Improved Post-Thaw Function and Epigenetic Changes in Mesenchymal Stromal Cells Cryopreserved Using Multicomponent Osmolyte Solutions. *Stem Cells Dev.* 2017;26(11):828–842.

26. Dou M, Lu C, Rao W. Bioinspired materials and technology for advanced cryopreservation. *Trends Biotechnol.* 2021.

27. Galinski EA, Pfeiffer HP, Trüper HG. 1,4,5,6-Tetrahydro-2-methyl-4-pyrimidinecarboxylic acid. A novel cyclic amino acid from halophilic phototrophic bacteria of the genus Ectothiorhodospira. *Eur J Biochem.* 1985;149(1):135–139.

28. Pasley S, Zylberberg C, Matosevic S. Natural killer-92 cells maintain cytotoxic activity after long-term cryopreservation in novel DMSO-free media. *Immunol Lett.* 2017;192:35–41.

29. Pollock K, Budenske JW, McKenna DH, Dosa PI, Hubel A. Algorithm-driven optimization of cryopreservation protocols for transfusion model cell types including Jurkat cells and mesenchymal stem cells. *J Tissue Eng Regen Med.* 2017;11(10):2806–2815.

30. Chang D, Fox R, Hicks E, et al. Investigation of interfacial properties of pure and mixed poloxamers for surfactant-mediated shear protection of mammalian cells. *Colloids Surf B Biointerfaces.* 2017;156:358–365.

31. Chen A, Leith M, Tu R, Tahim G, Sudra A, Bhargava S. Effects of diluents on cell culture viability measured by automated cell counter. *PloS One.* 2017;12(3):e0173375.

32. J.D. Benson. Mathematical Modeling and Optimization of Cryopreservation in Single Cells. In: Wolkers WF, Oldenhof H, eds. *Cryopreservation and Freeze-Drying Protocols,* New York, NY: Springer US; 2021:129-172.

33. Thirumala S, Wu X, Gimble JM, Devireddy RV. Evaluation of polyvinylpyrrolidone as a cryoprotectant for adipose tissue-derived adult stem cells. *Tissue Eng Part C Methods.* 2010;16(4):783–792.

34. Gómez-Lechón MJ, Lahoz A, Jiménez N, Vicente Castell J, Donato MT. Cryopreservation of rat, dog and human hepatocytes: influence of preculture and cryoprotectants on recovery, cytochrome P450 activities and induction upon thawing. *Xenobiotica.* 2006;36(6):457–472.

35. Sun H, Glasmacher B, Hofmann N. Compatible solutes improve cryopreservation of human endothelial cells. *CryoLetters*. 2012 Nov-Dec;33(6):485-93.

36. Murray A, Kilbride P, Gibson MI. Proline pre-conditioning of Jurkat cells improves recovery after cryopreservation. *RSC Med. Chem.* 2023;4:92.

37. Baust JG, Snyder KK, van Buskirk R, Baust JM. Integrating Molecular Control to Improve Cryopreservation Outcome. *Biopreserv Biobank.* 2017;15(2):134–141.

38. Murray KA, Gibson MI. Post-Thaw Culture and Measurement of Total Cell Recovery Is Crucial in the Evaluation of New Macromolecular Cryoprotectants. *Biomacromolecules.* 2020;21(7):2864–2873.

39. Marquez-Curtis LA, Sultani AB, McGann LE, Elliott JAW. Beyond membrane integrity: Assessing the functionality of human umbilical vein endothelial cells after cryopreservation. *Cryobiology.* 2016;72(3):183–190.

40. Mazur P, Leibo SP, Chu EHY. A two-factor hypothesis of freezing injury. *Exp Cell Res.* 1972;71(2):345–355.

41. Zhang M, Oldenhof H, Sieme H, Wolkers WF. Freezing-induced uptake of trehalose into mammalian cells facilitates cryopreservation. *Biochim Biophys Acta.* 2016;1858(6):1400–1409.

42. Oldenhof H, Bigalk J, Hettel C, et al. Stallion Sperm Cryopreservation Using Various Permeating Agents: Interplay Between Concentration and Cooling Rate. *Biopreserv Biobank.* 2017;15(5):422–431.

Supplementary information

Table S 1: Overview of all tested formulations within formulation prescreening. DF1 to DF17 were formulations from the initial fractional factorial DoE approach. A fold-over was performed resulting in DF18 to DF45. Selected single excipients were further tested with DF46 to DF50. Lastly, formulations DF51 to DF80 were based on modifications on previously tested promising formulations. MT: MettlerToledo instrument; N: Netzsch instrument.

Form.	DMSO [v/v %]	Tre [mM]	Sor [mM]	Pro [mM]	Ect [mM]	P188 [w/v %]	PVP40 [w/v %]	viability [%]	T_g' [°C] (MT)	T_g' [°C] (N)
DF_1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0 ± 0	-73	-
DF_2	5	0	0	0	100	0	5	76 ± 6	-	-92
DF_3	0	150	0	0	100	1	0	1 ± 1	-42	-
DF_4	5	150	0	0	0	1	5	74 ± 7	-	-80
DF_5	0	0	150	0	100	1	5	1 ± 0	-39	-
DF_6	5	0	150	0	0	1	0	58 ± 4	-	-96
DF_7	0	150	150	0	0	0	5	12 ± 7	-33	-
DF_8	5	150	150	0	100	0	0	33 ± 20	-	-86
DF_9	0	0	0	100	0	1	5	0 ± 0	-39	-
DF_10	5	0	0	100	100	1	0	43 ± 3	-	-94
DF_11	0	150	0	100	100	0	5	3 ± 1	-36	-
DF_12	5	150	0	100	0	0	0	70 ± 10	-	-89
DF_13	0	0	150	100	100	0	0	1 ± 1	-57	-
DF_14	5	0	150	100	0	0	5	60 ± 3	-	-89
DF_15	0	150	150	100	0	1	0	0 ± 0	-44	-
DF_16	5	150	150	100	100	1	5	1 ± 0	-	-78
DF_17	2.5	75	75	50	50	0.5	2.5	1 ± 0	-	-84
DF_18	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	69 ± 10	-	-110
DF_19	0	150	0	0	0	0	0	1 ± 1	-41	-
DF_20	5	150	0	0	0	0	0	74 ± 7	-	-92
DF_21	0	0	150	0	0	0	0	1 ± 0	-54	-
DF_22	5	0	150	0	0	0	0	69 ± 13	-	-102
DF_23	0	150	150	0	0	0	0	1 ± 1	-42	-
DF_24	5	150	150	0	0	0	0	49 ± 16	-	-84
DF_25	0	0	0	100	0	0	0	1 ± 1	-67	-
DF_26	5	0	0	100	0	0	0	73 ± 0	-	-104
DF_27	0	150	0	100	0	0	0	1 ± 1	-44	-
DF_28	0	0	150	100	0	0	0	0 ± 0	-55	-
DF_29	5	0	150	100	0	0	0	50 ± 23	-	-98
DF_30	0	150	150	100	0	0	0	2 ± 2	-43	-
DF_31	5	150	150	100	0	0	0	20 ± 20	-	-80
DF_32	0	0	0	0	100	0	0	1 ± 1	-65	-
DF_33	5	0	0	0	100	0	0	75 ± 5	-	-104
DF_34	0	150	0	0	100	0	0	0 ± 0	-42	-
DF_35	5	150	0	0	100	0	0	67 ± 10	-	-92
DF_36	0	0	150	0	100	0	0	0 ± 0	-53	-
DF_37	5	0	150	0	100	0	0	50 ± 15	-	-98
DF_38	0	150	150	0	100	0	0	4 ± 2	-42	-

DF_39	0	0	0	100	100	0	0	1 ± 1	-65	-
DF_40	5	0	0	100	100	0	0	63 ± 9	-	-100
DF_41	0	150	0	100	100	0	0	2 ± 1	-45	-
DF_42	5	150	0	100	100	0	0	46 ± 11	-	-88
DF_43	5	0	150	100	100	0	0	20 ± 5	-	-95
DF_44	0	150	150	100	100	0	0	2 ± 3	-44	-
DF_45	5	150	150	100	100	0	0	10 ± 4	-	-86
DF_46	0	300	0	0	0	0	0	5 ± 0	-35	-
DF_47	0	0	300	0	0	0	0	2 ± 1	-49	-
DF_48	0	0	0	200	0	0	0	1 ± 1	-62	-
DF_49	0	0	0	0	200	0	0	2 ± 1	-61	-
DF_50	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	18 ± 8	-38	-
DF_51	2.5	0	0	0	200	0	5	37 ± 4	-	-85
DF_52	2.5	300	0	0	0	0	0	31 ± 3	-52	-
DF_53	2.5	150	0	0	0	1	5	3 ± 2	-	-70
DF_54	2.5	300	0	100	0	0	0	29 ± 17	-53	-
DF_55	2.5	150	0	200	0	0	0	16 ± 4	-	-77
DF_56	0	300	0	100	0	0	5	32 ± 13	-30	-
DF_57	2.5	150	0	100	100	0	0	15 ± 8	-	-76
DF_58	2.5	150	150	50	50	0	0	11 ± 1	-	-72
DF_59	2.5	0	300	0	0	0	0	14 ± 0	-	-78
DF_60	2.5	0	0	0	100	0	5	59 ± 7	-	-84
DF_61	2.5	300	0	0	0	0	5	50 ± 14	-44	-
DF_62	0	150	150	0	0	1	5	0 ± 0	-33	-
DF_63	0	300	50	0	100	0	5	24 ± 17	-31	-
DF_64	2.5	300	50	0	0	0	5	51 ± 7	-43	-
DF_65	0	300	50	0	0	0	5	41 ± 14	-30	-
DF_67	0	300	0	50	50	0	5	44	-31	-
DF_68	0	300	0	100	100	0	0	24 ± 5	-39	-
DF_69	0	300	0	0	100	0	0	17 ± 6	-36	-
DF_70	2.5	0	300	100	0	0	0	18 ± 2	-	-75
DF_71	2.5	300	0	0	0	1	0	3 ± 1	-52	-
DF_72	2.5	300	0	50	50	0	0	44 ± 10	-53	-
DF_73	2.5	300	0	50	50	0	5	53 ± 6	-45	-
DF_74	0	300	50	50	50	0	5	39 ± 7	-31	-
DF_75	0	300	50	50	50	0	0	19 ± 1	-37	-
DF_76	2.5	50	0	0	100	0	5	60 ± 9	-	-78
DF_77	0	50	0	0	100	0	5	16 ± 3	-37	-
DF_78	0	300	0	200	0	0	0	13 ± 6	-39	-
DF_79	0	300	0	0	200	0	5	19 ± 13	-32	-
DF_80	2.5	0	0	100	100	0	5	52 ± 5	-	-84



Figure S1: 4-D response contour plot for the post-thaw viability of Jurkat cells stored at -145 °C measured with CalceinAM staining. The correlation between the most important factors, i.e., DMSO, PVP, trehalose and Proline, and their impact on viability are shown. Excipient concentrations for sorbitol, ectoine, P188 were 0.



Figure S 2: 4-D response contour plot for T_g' of the formulations measured via DSC. The correlation between the most important factors, i.e., DMSO, PVP, trehalose and Proline, and their impact on T_g' are shown. Excipient concentrations for sorbitol, ectoine, P188 were 0.



Figure S3: Model parameters for the viability and T_g' model generated by the Modde software. R2 represents model fit, Q2 estimates model predictability, model validity is a test for model problems and reproducibility is the variation of replicates compared to overall variability.



Figure S 4: Overview of the size distribution for all samples as measured with FIM after harvest (T0), after thawing (T-FT) and after 24h of recultivation (T-Rec).



Figure S 5: Cell-sized particle recovery measured via FIM (A) and viable cell recovery (B) based on Trypan blue staining compared for all three storage temperatures after three month storage.



Figure S 6: Cell viability measured via Trypan blue (A), CalceinAM & propidium iodide (B) and Annexin V-FITC & propidium iodide (C) compared for all three temperatures after three-month storage.