Manufacturing Exosomes: A Promising Therapeutic Platform

Ivano Luigi Colao[1], Randolph Corteling[2], Daniel Bracewell[1]*, Ivan Wall[1,3,4]*

[1]Department of Biochemical Engineering, University College London, Gower St, London WC1E 6BT, United Kingdom

[2]ReNeuron, Pencoed Business Park, Pencoed, Bridgend, CF35 5HY, United Kingdom

[3]Aston Medical Research Institute, School of Life and Health Sciences, Aston University, Aston Triangle, Birmingham B4 7ET, United Kingdom

[4] Department of Nanobiomedical Science, BK21+ NBM Global Research Center for Regenerative Medicine & Institute of Tissue Regeneration Engineering (ITREN), Dankook University, Cheonan, Republic of Korea.

* Authors for correspondence: Ivan Wall, i.wall@aston.ac.uk; Daniel Bracewell, d.bracewell@ucl.ac.uk

Keywords: Exosomes, Regenerative Medicine, Process Development, Commercial Manufacturing

Extracellular vesicles, and in particular, the sub-class exosomes, are rapidly emerging as a novel therapeutic platform. However, currently very few clinical validation studies and no clearly defined manufacturing process exist. As exosomes progress towards the clinic for treatment of a vast array of diseases, it is important to define the engineering basis for their manufacture early in the development cycle to ensure they can be produced cost-effectively at the appropriate scale. We hypothesize that transitioning to defined manufacturing platforms will increase consistency of the exosome product and improve their clinical advancement as a new therapeutic tool. We present manufacturing technologies and strategies that are being implemented and consider their application for the transition from bench-scale to clinical production of exosomes.

Extracellular Vesicles: Biogenesis, Inherited Function and Clinical Relevance

Living cells release vesicles into the local environment and research into the potential therapeutic benefits of different **extracellular vesicle** (EV) types has led to exciting discoveries leading to the possibility of adopting EVs as new candidate therapeutic agents.

EV biogenesis occurs via several mechanisms [1]–[5] resulting in vesicles of different size and architecture. Broadly speaking, there are three main sub-classes of EVs: microvesicles that are shed directly from the cell membrane and have a size range of 50-1000nm diameter; apoptotic blebs derived from dying cells, typically 50-4000nm; and **exosomes** which are smaller, with an approximate size range of 20-150nm -- although this range is variable between research groups [5]–[11]. Exosomes are released from multivesicular bodies (MVBs) rather than directly from the cell membrane via exocytosis -- a feature which distinguishes these vesicles from other sub-classes [4], [12], [13]. During this process, exosomes are loaded with various types of bioactive cargo (Figure 1), comprised of protein and RNA molecules (including messenger RNAs (mRNA) and microRNAs (miRNA) [5].

A growing body of research into stem cell therapy has revealed that the mode of action underlying the therapeutic effects of stem cells occurs largely via paracrine signaling [14]–[17]. This understanding has evolved based on the fact that implanted cells do not often engraft or persist long-term, but rather, generate paracrine effects, which can be mediated by exosomes transmitting information into resident tissue cells. Indeed, post-injury tissue regeneration studies have revealed that the regenerative effect of exosomes can be as potent as that of parent cells in promoting regeneration and functional recovery in experimental models including stroke [14], traumatic brain injury [15], pulmonary hypertension [16] and wound healing [17].

In this way, exosomes are effective communication vehicles that transfer bioactive proteins and genetic material between cells [18]–[20]. The exosome cargo ensures continued therapeutic effects long after the implanted cells have perished or migrated away from the target site (Figure 2).

The Biologic and Clinical Basis for EVs as Therapeutic Agents

There is widespread consensus that EVs have a biologic signature that reflects the phenotype of the cells that produced them [21]. For this reason, the potential applications of EVs in a clinical context are diverse.

On the one hand, EVs have been proposed as diagnostic biomarkers of disease in cancers as diverse as ovarian cancer [22], [23], glioblastoma [19], melanoma [24] prostate cancer [25] and colon cancer [26], based on unique miRNA profiles and other cargo that is transmitted with pathological effect. Similarly, they might be used as biomarkers of infectious disease, based on that fact that they transmit infection-specific elements. For example, exosomes isolated from Huh 7.5 cell lines infected with Hepatitis C virus have been reported to infect primary human hepatocytes [27].

On the other hand, they can also act as potent mediators of cell signaling, which might be exploited for medicinal purposes. For example, they are able to transfer RNA and protein instructional cues from producing cells to other cells in the surrounding milieu [18]. This can have striking effects, as evidenced from experiments where EVs derived from mouse embryonic stem cells promoted the survival and expansion of mouse hematopoietic stem cells *in vitro*, while also upregulating transcription factors associated with pluripotency in recipient cells [28]. These findings also suggest that exosomes can be potentially harvested, purified and potentially used as a biologic to control undesired or pathophysiologic conditions.

This concept is further supported by *in vivo* studies. For example, exosomes isolated from indoleamine 2,3-dioxygenase-positive dendritic cells were found to reduce inflammation in a mouse model of collagen-induced arthritis [29]. The exosomes, isolated using differential centrifugation, were <100 nm in size (as assessed from electron microscopy) and expressed typical exosome markers such as CD81, hsc70 and CD80/86, as shown from Western blotting and Fluorescence-Activated Cell Sorting (FACS) [29].

Other studies have suggested the potential therapeutic application of exosomes in cardiovascular disease. For instance, two mouse models of cardiac ischemia/reperfusion injury (*in vivo* myocardial infarction and *ex vivo* Langendorff heart) showed that mesenchymal

stem cell (MSC)-derived exosomes with a size range of 55–65 nm resulted in a 50% reduction in infarct size, measured as a percentage of the area at risk, when compared to saline controls [30].

Recently, EVs were found to promote regeneration after stroke injury in both rat [31] and mouse [14]. In both models, functional recovery was accompanied by cellular and molecular evidence of neurogenic and angiogenic regeneration. For example, in the mouse model, MSC-derived EVs of undisclosed size were able to support neuronal survival and neurogenesis in the post-ischemic tissue to a level similar to that of parent MSCs, as measured from co-expression of markers of cell division and identity [14]. This also translated into improved motor coordination function in the animals.

With growing evidence that EVs such as exosomes might stimulate regeneration or modulate pathologic conditions, there is a good rationale for pursuing the development of EVs as new potential therapeutic agents.

However, exosomes are yet to be clinically validated as only a handful of studies have been undertaken, or are currently ongoing. These include the use of autologous, modified dendritic-derived EVs for maintenance immunotherapy [32], [33], allogeneic MSC-derived EVs for the treatment of chronic kidney disease [34], type I diabetes mellitus (clinical trial NCT02138331), acute ischemic stroke (clinical trial NCT03384433), and autologous plasma-derived EVs for cutaneous wound repair (clinical trial NCT02565264). In addition, a single patient with graft versus host disease was treated with allogeneic MSC-EVs [35]. Existing data from these trials indicate that exosomes may have potential therapeutic value in a number of indications without having necessarily met the primary trial endpoint. However, it should be noted that across these small number of studies, a variety of purification methods have been utilized, including filtration, ultracentrifugation and PEG precipitation, which may well impact the consistency of the final products. For example, reported that across 32 preparations of exosomes generated for clinical use and purified using ultrafiltration/diafiltration followed ultracentrifugation, final exosomal protein quantity ranged from 99 – 26,648 μg [33].

Therefore, we hypothesise that only when manufacturing challenges have been addressed will it be possible to create greater consistency in the final product to advance these therapies

into the clinic; the sooner these manufacturing challenges are addressed in the product development cycle, the faster patients may have access to them.

Broadly, these challenges may include i) a detailed characterization of exosome material to define target product attributes, including discrimination of non-exosomal artifacts and even exosome sub-populations; ii) scalable cell culture methods for upstream production of exosomes; and iii) scalable downstream processing for isolation and purification of exosomes.

Limitations of Cell Culture:

Exosomes are secreted products of cells; thus their manufacture is dependent on the ability to produce large quantities of cells in ways that do not alter the cell phenotype. Presumably, cellular changes due to transitioning from conventional bench-scale cell culture using planar t-flasks to scalable cell culture platforms might likely alter the composition and function of its exosomes. Large scale stem cell cultures are still a rate-limiting step for delivering stable and potent products at phase III and market scale due to high development costs and regulatory and market uncertainty [36]–[41]. Accordingly, the opportunities for producing large quantities of stem cell-conditioned medium with which to undertake meaningful scale-up studies on exosome production are limited [42]. This was evident in the worldwide survey conducted by Gardiner et al. who show that that 77% of respondents used less than 100mL of starting material despite 83% of researchers using material generated from cell culture [43].

The research efforts into scaling up cell culture have focused on technologies to maximize surface area, such as micro-carriers in stirred bioreactors [44], [45] or **hollow-fiber bioreactors** [46], which offer greater process control (Figure 3). The main technical limitation of these technologies, is the need for control of environmental parameters within the reactors such that the phenotype of the cell (and derivative exosomes) does not change. When moving from static, planar cultures to dynamic, well-mixed 3D environments with high force generation (**impellers**, cavitation of bubbles from **oxygen sparging**), the risk of phenotypic alterations at the cellular level due to shear stress is still an issue that needs to be addressed. For example, T-cell expansion was reduced when agitated at 180 rpm in bioreactors as a

consequence of rapid downregulation of interleukin-2 receptor [47]. In the case of MSCs, a prominent candidate cell type for the production of candidate therapeutic exosomes, **shear stress** was found to induce mechanotransduction pathways involving p38 mitogen-activated protein kinase and extracellular signal-related kinase, that could lead to osteogenic differentiation [48]; these outcomes would likely change the exosome product, although this remains to be directly demonstrated.

At the extremes of an operating window, limiting cell death in these high-shear systems to minimize impurities derived from apoptotic blebs is of paramount importance. Apoptotic blebs overlap in size and might increase heterogeneity, as well as reduce the potency of exosome products [49], [50]; an example of this heterogeneity was shown in a study conducted on between dendritic cell derived apoptotic vesicles and exosomes, that exosomal fractions had their own unique molecular composition and properties [51]. They might even induce undesirable cell signaling events, although this warrants further investigation.

As cells produce and secrete exosomes naturally, perfusion-based cultures (for example using hollow-fiber and **packed bed technologies)**, should also be considered with the aim of providing adequate **mass transfer** in the cell culture. A key practical benefit in this approach is that these reactor systems can be designed and optimized to retain the exosome product within the culture compartment to yield a more concentrated conditioned medium, thereby reducing liquid handling requirements further downstream [52]. Here, there have been developments using novel **flask "bioreactors"** such as the Integra CELLine systems [53] which can concentrate exosomes within a membrane compartment which allows for media component transfer over a prolonged period of time in culture. A limitation is that these flasks are still limited to being a scale-out approach and the harvest window is time-limited because cells can undergo contact inhibition and changes in behaviour at high densities, as revealed in one particular study where that mouse adipose mesenchymal stem cells plated at high seeding densities (90%) had altered gene expression within 48 hours [54]. However, if exosomes are harvested before cultures are over-confluent, they might better conserve product parameters as they provide a similar mode of culture to planar t-flasks, unlike **dynamic bioreactor systems**.

An additional limitation for scaling up cell cultures to produce exosomes is the continued heavy reliance on animal serum for optimal cell growth. For example, fetal bovine serum (FBS) is high in endogenous exosomes [55], and if not removed prior to cell culture, these process-related impurities may make their way into the final drug product, which from a regulatory standpoint for an injectable, is completely unfavorable. Therefore, xeno-free culture media components are desired, provided they conserve comparable cell characteristics and exosome product attributes that are expected to be therapeutic. However, this task is not trivial. At the very least, exosome-depleted FBS should be characterized as a means of confirming it is truly the stem cell-derived exosomes that confer the functional properties ascribed to them.

A recent study on exosome production further highlighted the importance of culture reagents, notably FBS-containing versus serum-free medium. Specifically, both human and mouse neuroblastoma lines showed that switching from FBS-containing to serum-free medium left the resultant exosomes from both species unchanged in terms of biophysical and size characteristics [35]. However, the number of exosomes generated was increased when using serum-free reagents. While this may appear promising, further proteomic analysis showed that the serum-free exosomes contained reactive oxygen species and stress related proteins, whereas exosomes derived from cells cultured in serum-containing medium promoted higher levels of production of RNA processing proteins. As a result, the switch from FBS-containing medium to serum-free appeared to cause a shift in exosomal biology, presumably reflecting stress-induced phenotypic changes in culture [56]. These data illustrate how important culture conditions are in the manufacturing process, as changes can significantly modify the exosome product profile, which might in turn result in failure at the regulatory/clinical levels.

One significant advantage of generating exosomes as products, rather than using parent cells is that the exosome-rich conditioned medium can be separated with ease from producer cells, where the cells are adherent. This overcomes one of the main challenges for adherent cell products, which need to be enzymatically detached from microcarriers, where harvesting and recovery are achieved with limited efficiency due to the need to conserve the cells for application whilst ensuring damage from extended enzyme exposure is limited [57]. Furthermore, with the advances in cell engineering and medical research, one may hopefully

expect more economically viable, exosome dedicated cell-lines which might provide high expression of tailor-made exosomes in the future.

Downstream Processing for Efficient Purification

There are also significant **downstream processing** challenges to manufacturing exosomes. First, methods currently employed to enrich exosomes from cell culture media are grandfathered in from the early viral purification industry which operate via physical discrimination of target material from impurities. Here, four main isolation methods are used: size exclusion (based on typical exosomal diameters); sedimentation force or flotation density; [non-specific] precipitation based methods; and affinity based capture.

The most commonly used method has historically been ultracentrifugation [43], [58]. Two main variations of ultracentrifugation are used. The first uses a combination of different centrifugal forces to reduce contamination by cell debris/fragments (3000-10,000g), then organelles and non-exosomal vesicles (10,000-20,000g), before a final pellet of the exosomes is produced (100,000-120,000g). The second discriminates exosomes from other vesicles via flotation using density gradients made from deuterium oxide (D_2O)/sucrose cushions or commercially available reagents such as iodixanol [59]. In spite of these protocols however, co-isolation of non-exosomal vesicles and other particulate debris that share similar size and density is still observed.

From a manufacturing perspective, while it has been used to purify vaccines at commercial scales [60], ultracentrifugation has many limitations which have seen a reduction in usage for alternate methods such as filtration or chromatographic separation [61]. The reasons for this -- which may be applied directly to the future of exosome processing-- are largely due to the high level of skill and manual labor (gradient generation, sample balancing and pellet resuspension, all of which must be performed to high levels of precision), the time-intensive nature of the processes, the associated costs of reagents and equipment, and the observations of losses in potency of labile products.

There are also significant limitations in interpreting process efficiency between different laboratories using different centrifuges. Indeed, exosome pelleting efficiency is dependent on

several parameters defined by the centrifuges themselves (e.g. *k*-factor, rotor type), meaning that processes are only readily transferable if identical equipment and protocols are used [62], [63]. When coupled with processing times that can extend to 72 hours for routine small scale operation, it is understandable that alternative process options have phased out ultracentrifugation in the viral/vaccine industries whenever possible.

As with any form of biologics manufacturing, any reagents added during the process need to be removed from the final product and so additional considerations must be given for adequate clearance of substances used such as D_2O or sucrose cushions. This leads to a requirement for additional pelleting steps, which increases operating costs, purification times and product losses due to process inefficiencies and aggregation [64], not to mention losses in biological activity [65]. To address manufacturing and regulatory uncertainty here, further advancements are needed.

Non-specific precipitation, typically using polyethylene glycol (PEG)-based solutions, is an alternative method to sediment exosomes without the need for expensive ultracentrifuges. This method can sediment exosomes at lower centrifugal forces (around 20,000g), which can then be loaded into size-exclusion columns, though currently these columns are only commercially available as manually operated kits. However, these technologies may not be appropriate for larger scales. By way of illustration, the large pore sizes of the resins used will likely present challenges related to pressure limitations and compression at larger scales. Moreover, the added need to remove PEG from the end product, especially for injectables [42], may lead to a need for further processing and therefore, ultimately, product losses. One study showed that it was possible to make columns rather than rely on kits, and as similar levels of purification are achieved, the convenience of the kits far surpassed that of the columns [66].

Another concern with these sedimentation processes is the co-isolation of non-exosomal vesicles which can overlap in characteristics, must be identified and be sufficiently depleted in a therapeutic, so as to minimize safety risks to patients. Critically, one may also wish to enrich an exosome sub-population to increase the efficacy of a therapeutic which, with current technologies, is not possible using non-specific precipitation and sedimentation alone.

Recently, there has been an increase in the use of **tangential-flow filtration** to concentrate exosomes from cell-culture media based on their size [42], [67]–[69] . This process is more promising than the sedimentation methods listed above, due to tight and reproducible size distributions and the ease with which processes can be scaled and can facilitate product washes and buffer exchanges [52]. This makes tangential flow filtration extremely attractive as a primary recovery method. Moreover hollow fiber ultrafiltration coupled with microfiltration is a relatively gentle process that retains structural and functional integrity of exosomes while enabling the removal of large particles and cell-culture derived proteins [61].

However, there are some issues, as ultrafilters are expensive and the co-isolation of material such as serum proteins and DNA from cell culture continues to be problematic. Excessive fouling leading to elevated pressure in the system, and consequent associated shear forces, could also be detrimental to the final preparation and must be carefully monitored.

All of the above downstream processing techniques are based on physical parameters and none have a way of completely discriminating exosomes beyond either size or density. This often leads to co-isolation of non-exosomal vesicles or organelles with overlapping physical characteristics, resulting in insufficiently pure exosome preparations. This was revealed when comparing density gradient and standard ultracentrifugation to an immuno-affinity capture method, as the latter increased exosome associated proteins by at least 2-fold over the ultracentrifugation options [70]. This can become particularly troublesome if large scale culture systems that lead to higher rates of cell death are employed in the future. A remedy to this potential burden would be the development of scalable processes which use methods of purification orthogonal to the current physical methods, i.e. which use the biochemical and biophysical characteristics of exosomes to discriminate from impurities via more precise processes. This need for reproducible and standardized platform technologies in the industry become apparent when literature searches for exosome purification yield varied and almost conflicting results with regards to which protocol is the most promising. Taking ultracentrifugation as an example, huge differences in efficiency of exosome recovery are reported across research groups [70]–[72] when compared to commercial kits and affinity-base purification methods. In one such study, lab scale commercial kits processing human serum samples up to a volume of 5 mL isolated an 80-300 fold higher yield of exosomes than ultracentrifugation [51].

Of the reported methodologies for exosome purification, immuno-affinity methods are perhaps the most promising but least reported to date in the literature [43]. The method often cited is based on antibody-conjugated magnetic beads, which can be used to pull out exosome populations from crude material. A study comparing exosome recovery from human colon cancer cell line LIM1863 [70] revealed that exosomes captured via immuno-affinity were superior in terms of expression levels of known exosomal markers, compared with ultracentrifugation and differential centrifugation. Moreover, the vesicles were much more homogeneous (40-60 nm diameter) compared with those from ultracentrifugation (40-100 nm) and differential centrifugation (50-100 nm). Moreover, immuno-affinity isolation enabled the identification of novel molecules, ESCRT-III component VPS32C/CHMP4C, and the SNARE synaptobrevin 2 (VAMP2), in exosomes for the first time [70]. This shows powerful potential in terms of product characterization and isolation.

However, there are limitations when using beads. In the current format, scaling up becomes increasingly burdensome because mixing, mass transfer and removal of beads via magnetic separation is achieved with limited efficiency at the larger scales and also requires specialist equipment [73]. However, the use of these beads at laboratory scale suggest that they could have potential in large scale processing if the issues surrounding introduction of process impurities are successfully overcome.

Realistically, the use of affinity methods is likely to be more economical and simpler to facilitate if antibodies are immobilized onto stationary phases, because with a stationary phase there is less opportunity for particulate impurities typically seen with beads. As such, further development of chromatographic steps which facilitate the specific capture of exosomes (or their subtypes) may likely be important.

Another chromatographic method shown to be effective in separating exosomes from other process impurities based on their characteristic negative charge is ion-exchange chromatography. A recent study demonstrated the applicability of chromatographic purification by use of a quaternary amine (QA) anion exchange column (AEx column) against sucrose density gradient separation of amniotic fluid derived exosomes [74]. The results indicated that the quality of the exosomes was superior from anion exchange purification

over the more classical ultracentrifugation technique, in terms of soluble impurity removal and the separation of CD marker positive and negative exosomes [74].

However, optimization of process conditions on a case by case basis is necessary as ion-exchange chromatography may still co-elute host cell DNA and albumin if improperly implemented, and likely masked by the broad elution peaks of heterogeneous exosomes.

A potentially beneficial advancement for chromatography would be to shift from traditional packed bed systems, which may not be appropriate for such particulate heavy feeds, to membrane or monolithic technologies with more open-pore structures that can accommodate exosome material while retaining separation power and increasing throughput. Increased throughput may be possible because higher flow rates can be used; this approach has already been adopted in the virus industry [75].

Currently used methods for purifying exosomes ideally need to be replaced with advanced platforms (Figure 4) and an ideal process for exosome purification should include a sequence of steps that comprises filtration-based recovery followed by chromatography-based purification; filtration-based recovery and concentration will deliver a product of defined size distribution and reduce the vast quantities of conditioned medium into a lower volume that is easier to process. Tangential flow filtration is a good candidate and concentrated MSC-secreted exosomes up to 125-fold [30]. Further evidence for this shift in technologies is supported by a study where ultrafiltration and liquid chromatography (UF-LC) steps (in this case size exclusion chromatography using Sephacryl columns) were tested against differential ultracentrifugation [69]. The results showed significantly higher yields from the UF-LC method relative to differential ultracentrifugation without compromising the proteomic identity of EVs, while also showing that the biophysical properties were preserved. The authors also observed an improved bio-distribution of the EVs when injected into mice: fewer EVs accumulated in the lungs, likely due to the reduction of aggregation and damage to the exosomes during the UF-LC steps compared to ultracentrifugation[69].

Ideally, sequential filtration followed by affinity-based chromatography that targets EV-specific surface proteins (e.g. CD81) may offer the best chance of success in clinical development; the chromatographic steps should deplete non-EV DNA and culture medium-

derived proteins, and finally via the buffer exchange steps, allow washing and concentration of the product prior to formulation and secondary manufacture.

The Analytics Challenge

Without doubt, advances in upstream cell culture and downstream processing will advance exosomes towards routine manufacture. However, equally critical, and underpinning these advances, is the capacity to measure and characterize the exosome product better than currently achieved. It will be easier to address the process development and scale up of exosome product if the process is guided by a robust, regulatory accepted definition of what it is. The exosome community has already taken significant steps to provide a broad definition for exosomes and provide criteria for their identification. The International Society of Extracellular Vesicles (ISEV) has established a set of criteria for proteomic identification of exosomes with a minimal list of requirements [76], namely, exosomes should i) possess transmembrane proteins to provide evidence of a membrane (e.g. tetraspanins such as CD63, CD81 and CD9) [65], [77]; ii) possess cytosolic proteins to provide evidence of membrane or receptor binding capacity (e.g. TSG101, Rab proteins or annexins); iii) be free of protein impurities from intracellular compartments not associated with the plasma membranes or endosomes (e.g. endoplasmic reticulum, Golgi, mitochondria, nucleus); and iv) be free of co-isolating extracellular proteins such cytokines and serum components.

These, in combination with physical observations via electron microscopy and particle size distribution analysis, create a useful baseline. However, ultimately more detailed characterization must be undertaken to describe exosomes in terms of functional capacity by mechanistically defining the action of key nucleic acid and protein signals on target cells, and by understanding exosome heterogeneity. In addition, if possible, mapping exosome sub-populations to define those harboring higher potency and/or defining unique components not present in other exosomes would be ideal. For example, a larger exosome may contain larger quantities of certain RNAs or proteins, or a smaller exosome may have a higher density of surface markers). Furthermore, assays need to be developed that detect exosomes with higher reliability and accuracy than at present. Examples of such steps have already been seen in the literature, for example using flow-cytometry, which can enable detection and semi-quantitative analysis of specific markers [78], as well as microfluidic tools allowing rapid

sensing of exosomes using immunomagnetic capture targeting exosome markers such as CD63 [58]. This microfluidic approach even offers potential for development of in-line measurement technologies that can monitor exosome production during cell culture as a label-free surrogate measurement of the cells, and using exosome identity as a surrogate for cell identity and state. It might even be possible to isolate exosomes themselves using label-free tools. For example, microfluidic devices have been developed that utilize **transmission surface plasmon resonance** [59] or acoustic waves [60] to isolate exosomes from other vesicles and cells. While these tools may not fulfill the requirement of a large scale purification platform, they might offer potential as label-free methods to isolate exosomes that can be subsequently characterized, (e.g. via arrays of antibodies for on-chip profiling of exosome surface proteins) [59].

Finally, *in vitro* potency assays need to truly predict outcomes *in vivo*, which in turn will feed back to evolving product specifications to enable development of exosomes as potential therapeutic agents.

Viral Co-Isolation: A New Challenge on the Horizon?

In terms of product safety, as a therapy which is derived from mammalian cells, there also is the risk of co-isolating endogenous viruses. Naturally, if the live cells are being used as a therapy in their own right and the exosomal product is a secondary product, the screening of adventitious agents such as viruses would be a pre-requisite and would lower risks of high titers entering the final product. Conversely, there is a risk that what is passably low, unobservable or unscreened in a cell, could be highly concentrated by downstream processing steps, many of which would be similar to those used for viral vaccine production (filtration, ultracentrifugation, precipitation/size exclusion, and even chromatographic technology if less-specific methods are used), due to the similarities in size and physical properties between viruses and exosomes. Furthermore, if, for example, dedicated cell lines for the production of exosomes for drug delivery or gene editing are created, mimicking recombinant protein and antibody production systems, one may find proof of viral removal is absolutely necessary. At this point, one must scrutinize the current technologies available and find methods where an exosome may be separated from any viruses which may be present.

Issues surrounding this are fairly apparent as exosomal and viral identity are highly similar: the size ranges often overlap (thereby making viral filtration an unamenable option) and, as both entities essentially consist of functional genetic material and surface proteins, chemical inactivation could damage the exosome as much as the virus in terms of disruption to functional surface proteins [79]. A common method of inactivation is that of exposure to low pH (3), typically during a chromatographic step: however, this method risks damaging exosomal surface proteins, or, if not strongly bound to the column, eluting the product altogether. Similarly, other techniques such as ultraviolet (UV) inactivation, which aim to disrupt the nucleic acid sequences for viral attenuation, could also irreparably damage the exosome product. This poses a further challenge on the analytical spectrum because even if exosomes could be shown to be up-taken in using *in vitro* quality control assays (due to the lack of damage to surface proteins), any damage to the internal genetic material may cause them to perform with limited or null activity biologically which reinforces the need for suitable potency assays.

More complex procedures such as heat treatment options including pasteurisation, dry heat and vapor heat, can also be used for viral inactivation; however, while a single protein could be protected sufficiently by a protein stabilizer (presumably also slightly protecting the virus) due to the size and make-up of exosomes, finding a way to maximize exosomal function while sufficiently removing virus might also be difficult to achieve, especially when taking into account the relatively complex optimization and implementation of these processes compared to UV or pH inactivation [80].

Concluding Remarks

Exosomes are promising new candidate therapies and the recent explosion in research into exosome biology and function has caused global excitement. With several prominent pre-clinical studies showing potent effects of exosomes, and some early clinical data are emerging, it is timely to address the bioprocessing challenges that underpin manufacture of exosomes and other EVs. While phenomenal progress has been made in understanding the biological properties of exosome cargo, research must also focus on challenges related to achieving regulatory approval and potential translational into the clinical setting.

The most promising manufacturing approach to make in the first instance may be adoption of an advanced purification platform based on a two-step filtration-chromatography approach that can enable scalable and pure exosome products to be created. There are still many unanswered questions and hurdles to overcome, (see Outstanding Questions and Box 1), in order to deliver exosomes as a new putative therapeutic tools for healthcare. These challenges will come in many forms: from scheduling and batch reproducibility, to process robustness and economic feasibility, along with thoroughly defining meaningful critical quality attributes for the product itself. It is vital that these issues are investigated fully in parallel with clinical validation studies in order to contemplate delivering exosomes to the clinic and to the patients who might benefit.

Figure List

Figure 1: Exosome biogenesis. Exosome biogenesis (**left**) begins when multi-vesicular bodies (MVBs) (1) bud inwards to form intraluminal vesicles (ILVs) that are loaded with genetic material and proteins (2). Next, MVBs fuse either with lysosomes (3A) which results in proteolytic degradation of exosomal contents, or with the plasma membrane (3B), resulting in the release of ILVs, now referred to as exosomes, into the extracellular environment. Non-exosomal vesicles bud directly from the cell membrane (4). Exosomes are typically in the size range of 20-150nm and their structure (**right**) is complex. Tetraspanins (e.g. CD81, CD63, CD9) and other transmembrane proteins such as adhesion receptors are present at the surface, while internally, the cargo comprises an array of proteins (cytosolic, cytoskeletal, growth factors) and miRNAs that convey specific functional cues.

Figure 2: Exosomes and stem cell transplantation. Diagrammatic representation of exosome function after in vivo stem cell transplantation. Implanted stem cells synthesize exosomes that convey functional characteristics of parental cells (a). Exosomes are then released by stem cells into the surrounding environment (b) and induce functional responses in adjacent resident tissue cells (c) that can modify the behavior of target cells, even resulting in sustained regenerative responses (d) after the stem cell has perished or exited the injury site.

Figure 3: Upstream processing of stem cells. Schematic showing the current laboratory scale methods used for **upstream processing** of stem cells (**top**). Cells are retrieved from the patient or from a working cell bank (WCB) and expanded predominantly using a T-flask platform. This leads to a number of significant pitfalls associated with current technologies. Development of new upstream processing is necessary (**bottom**) in order to scale up the production of large quantities of cells from the WCB and therefore large quantities of exosome product that can be made in a closed bioreactor system and with greater process control.

Figure 4: Downstream processing of stem cells. Diagrammatic representation of the current laboratory scale methods used for **downstream processing** of stem cell-derived exosomes (**top**). Crude conditioned media concentration is achieved using filtration and then ultracentrifugation methods are used to isolate exosomes on the basis of size and density. Future processing needs to be scalable and so tangential flow filtration (TFF), followed by

affinity capture and final polishing steps are most promising to deliver high purity exosome therapies (**bottom**).

References

[1] F. Collino, M. C. Deregibus, S. Bruno, L. Sterpone, G. Aghemo, L. Viltono, C. Tetta, and G. Camussi, "Microvesicles derived from adult human bone marrow and tissue specific mesenchymal stem cells shuttle selected pattern of miRNAs.," *PLoS One*, vol. 5, no. 7, p. e11803, Jan. 2010.

[2] B. H. F. G. Heijnen, A. E. Schiel, R. Fijnheer, H. J. Geuze, and J. J. Sixma, "Activated Platelets Release Two Types of Membrane Vesicles :," *Blood*, vol. 94, no. 11, pp. 3791–3800, 1999.

[3] C. Raiborg and H. Stenmark, "The ESCRT machinery in endosomal sorting of ubiquitylated membrane proteins.," *Nature*, vol. 458, no. 7237, pp. 445–52, Mar. 2009.

[4] K. Trajkovic, C. Hsu, S. Chiantia, L. Rajendran, D. Wenzel, F. Wieland, P. Schwille, B. Brügger, and M. Simons, "Ceramide triggers budding of exosome vesicles into multivesicular endosomes.," *Science*, vol. 319, no. 5867, pp. 1244–7, Feb. 2008.

[5] A. V Vlassov, S. Magdaleno, R. Setterquist, and R. Conrad, "Exosomes: current knowledge of their composition, biological functions, and diagnostic and therapeutic potentials.," *Biochim. Biophys. Acta*, vol. 1820, no. 7, pp. 940–8, Jul. 2012.

[6] J. Schageman, E. Zeringer, M. Li, T. Barta, K. Lea, J. Gu, S. Magdaleno, R. Setterquist, and A. V Vlassov, "The complete exosome workflow solution: from isolation to characterization of RNA cargo.," *Biomed Res. Int.*, vol. 2013, p. 253957, Jan. 2013.

[7] J. Conde-Vancells, E. Suarez-Rodriguez, N. Embade, D. Gil, R. Matthiesen, M. Valle, F. Elortza, S. C. Lu, J. M. Mato, and J. M. Falcon-Perez, "Characterization and comprehensive proteome profiling of exosomes secreted by hepatocytes," *J. proteome …*, vol. 7, pp. 5157–5166, 2008.

[8] X. Yu, S. L. Harris, and A. J. Levine, "The regulation of exosome secretion: a novel function of the p53 protein.," *Cancer Res.*, vol. 66, no. 9, pp. 4795–801, May 2006.

[9] M. a Lopez-Verrilli and F. a Court, "Exosomes: mediators of communication in eukaryotes.," *Biol. Res.*, vol. 46, no. 1, pp. 5–11, Jan. 2013.

[10] K. Koga, K. Matsumoto, T. Akiyoshi, M. Kubo, N. Yamanaka, K. Tasaki, H. Nakashima, M. Nakamura, S. Kuroki, M. Tanaka, and M. Katano, "Purification, characterization and biological significance of tumor-derived exosomes," *Anticancer …*, vol. 25, pp. 3703–3708, 2005.

[11] R. Mears, R. A. Craven, S. Hanrahan, N. Totty, C. Upton, S. L. Young, P. Patel, P. J. Selby, and R. E. Banks, “Proteomic analysis of melanoma-derived exosomes by two-dimensional polyacrylamide gel electrophoresis and mass spectrometry.,” *Proteomics*, vol. 4, no. 12, pp. 4019–31, Dec. 2004.

[12] R. M. Johnstone, M. Adam, J. R. Hammonds, L. Orr, and C. Turbide, “Vesicle Formation during Reticulocyte Maturation,” *J. Biol. Chem.*, vol. 262, no. 1, pp. 9412–9420, 1987.

[13] G. Raposo and W. Stoorvogel, “Extracellular vesicles: exosomes, microvesicles, and friends.,” *J. Cell Biol.*, vol. 200, no. 4, pp. 373–83, Feb. 2013.

[14] T. R. Doeppner, J. Herz, A. Görgens, J. Schletchter, A.-K. Ludwig, S. Radtke, K. de Miroscedji, P. A. Horn, B. Giebel, and D. M. Hermann, “Extracellular Vesicles Improve Post-Stroke Neuroregeneration and Prevent Postischemic Immunosuppression,” *Stem Cells Transl. Med.*, no. 4, pp. 1131–1143, 2015.

[15] D. Kim, H. Nishida, S. Y. An, A. K. Shetty, T. J. Bartosh, and D. J. Prockop, “Chromatographically isolated CD63+CD81+ extracellular vesicles from mesenchymal stromal cells rescue cognitive impairments after TBI,” *PNAS*, vol. 113, no. 1, pp. 1–6, 2015.

[16] C. Lee, S. A. Mitsialis, M. Aslam, S. H. Vitali, E. Vergadi, G. Konstantinou, K. Sdrimas, A. Fernandez-Gonzalez, and S. Kourembas, “Exosomes Mediate the Cytoprotective Action of Mesenchymal Stromal Cells on Hypoxia-Induced Pulmonary Hypertension,” *Circulation*, vol. 126, pp. 2601–2611, 2012.

[17] J. Zhang, J. Guan, X. Niu, G. Hu, S. Guo, Q. Li, Z. Xie, C. Zhang, and Y. Wang, “Exosomes released from human induced pluripotent stem cells-derived MSCs facilitate cutaneous wound healing by promoting collagen synthesis and angiogenesis,” *Jounral Tranlational Med.*, vol. 13, no. 49, pp. 1–14, 2015.

[18] H. Valadi, K. Ekström, A. Bossios, M. Sjöstrand, J. J. Lee, and J. O. Lötvall, “Exosome-mediated transfer of mRNAs and microRNAs is a novel mechanism of genetic exchange between cells.,” *Nat. Cell Biol.*, vol. 9, no. 6, pp. 654–9, Jun. 2007.

[19] J. Skog, T. Würdinger, S. van Rijn, D. H. Meijer, L. Gainche, M. Sena-Esteves, W. T. Curry, B. S. Carter, A. M. Krichevsky, and X. O. Breakefield, “Glioblastoma microvesicles transport RNA and proteins that promote tumour growth and provide diagnostic biomarkers.,” *Nat. Cell Biol.*, vol. 10, no. 12, pp. 1470–6, Dec. 2008.

[20] Y. Lee, S. El Andaloussi, and M. J. a Wood, “Exosomes and microvesicles: extracellular vesicles for genetic information transfer and gene therapy.,” *Hum. Mol. Genet.*, vol. 21, no. R1, pp. R125–34, Oct. 2012.

[21] M. Yanez-Mo, P. R.-M. Iljander, Z. Andreu, A. B. Zavec, F. E. Borras, E. I. Buzas, K. Buzas, E. Casal, F. Cappello, J. Carvalho, E. Colas, A. Cordeiro-da Silva, S. Fais, J. M. Falcon-Perez, I. Ghobrial, B. Giebel, M. Gimona, M. Graner, I. Gursel, M. Gursel, N. H.

H. Heegaard, A. Hendrix, P. Kieruff, K. Kokubun, M. Kosanovic, V. Kralj-Iglic, E.-M. Kramer-Albers, S. Laitinen, C. Lasser, T. Lener, L. Erzsebet, A. Line, G. Lipps, A. Llorente, J. Lotvall, M. Mancek-Keber, A. Marcilla, M. Mittelbrunn, I. Nazarenko, E. N. M. Nolte-t' Hoen, T. A. Nyman, L. O'Driscoll, M. Olivan, C. Oliveira, E. Pallinger, H. A. del Portillo, J. Reventos, M. Rigau, E. Rohde, M. Sammar, F. Sanchez-Madrid, N. Santarem, K. Schallmoser, M. Ostenfield, W. Stoorvogel, R. Stukelj, S. G. Van der Grein, M. H. Vasconcelos, M. H. M. Wauben, and O. De Wever, "Biological properties of extracellular vesicles and their physiological functions," *J. Extracell. vesicles*, vol. 1, pp. 1–60, 2015.

[22] D. D. Taylor and C. Gercel-Taylor, "Tumour-derived exosomes and their role in cancer-associated T-cell signalling defects," *Br. J. Cancer*, vol. 92, no. January, pp. 305–311, 2005.

[23] D. D. Taylor and C. Gercel-Taylor, "MicroRNA signatures of tumor-derived exosomes as diagnostic biomarkers of ovarian cancer.," *Gynecol. Oncol.*, vol. 110, no. 1, pp. 13–21, Jul. 2008.

[24] M. Logozzi, A. De Milito, L. Lugini, M. Borghi, L. Calabro, M. Spada, M. Perdicchio, M. L. Marino, C. Federici, E. Iessi, D. Brambilla, G. Venturi, F. Lozupone, M. Santinami, V. Huber, M. Maio, L. Rivoltini, and S. Fais, "High Levels of Exosomes Expressing CD63 and Caveolin- 1 in Plasma of Melanoma Patients," *PLoS One*, vol. 4, no. 4, 2009.

[25] M. Logozzi, D. F. Angelini, E. Iessi, D. Mizzoni, R. Di Raimo, C. Federici, L. Lugini, G. Borsellino, A. Gentilucci, F. Pierella, V. Marzio, A. Sciarra, L. Battistini, S. Fais, and V. R. Elena, "Increased PSA expression on prostate cancer exosomes in in vitro condition and in cancer patients," *Cancer Lett.*, vol. 403, pp. 318–329, 2017.

[26] V. Huber, S. Fais, M. Iero, L. Lugini, P. Canese, P. Squarcina, A. Zaccheddu, M. Colone, G. Arancia, M. Gentile, E. Seregni, R. Valenti, G. Ballabio, F. Belli, E. Leo, G. Parmiani, and L. Rivoltini, "Human Colorectal Cancer Cells Induce T-Cell Death Through," *Gastroenterology*, vol. 128, no. 7, pp. 1796–1804, 2005.

[27] T. N. Bukong, F. Momen-heravi, K. Kodys, S. Bala, and G. Szabo, "Exosomes from Hepatitis C Infected Patients Transmit HCV Infection and Contain Replication Competent Viral RNA in Complex with Ago2-miR122-HSP90," *PLoS Pathog.*, vol. 10, no. 10, 2014.

[28] J. Ratajczak, K. Miekus, M. Kucia, J. Zhang, R. Reca, P. Dvorak, and M. Z. Ratajczak, "Embryonic stem cell-derived microvesicles reprogram hematopoietic progenitors: evidence for horizontal transfer of mRNA and protein delivery.," *Leukemia*, vol. 20, no. 5, pp. 847–56, May 2006.

[29] N. R. Bianco, S. H. Kim, M. a Ruffner, and P. D. Robbins, "Therapeutic effect of exosomes from indoleamine 2,3-dioxygenase-positive dendritic cells in collagen-induced arthritis and delayed-type hypersensitivity disease models.," *Arthritis Rheum.*, vol. 60, no. 2, pp. 380–9, Feb. 2009.

[30] R. C. Lai, F. Arslan, M. M. Lee, N. S. K. Sze, A. Choo, T. S. Chen, M. Salto-Tellez, L. Timmers, C. N. Lee, R. M. El Oakley, G. Pasterkamp, D. P. V de Kleijn, and S. K. Lim, "Exosome secreted by MSC reduces myocardial ischemia/reperfusion injury.," *Stem Cell Res.*, vol. 4, no. 3, pp. 214–22, May 2010.

[31] H. Xin, Y. Li, Y. Cui, J. J. Yang, Z. G. Zhang, and M. Chopp, "Systemic administration of exosomes released from mesenchymal stromal cells promote functional recovery and neurovascular plasticity after stroke in rats.," *J. Cereb. Blood Flow Metab.*, vol. 33, no. 11, pp. 1711–5, Nov. 2013.

[32] S. Viaud, S. Ploix, V. Lapierre, C. Théry, P.-H. Commere, D. Tramalloni, K. Gorrichon, P. Virault-Rocroy, T. Tursz, O. Lantz, L. Zitvogel, and N. Chaput, "Updated technology to produce highly immunogenic dendritic cell-derived exosomes of clinical grade: a critical role of interferon-γ.," *J. Immunother.*, vol. 34, no. 1, pp. 65–75, Jan. 2011.

[33] B. Besse, M. Charrier, V. Lapierre, E. Dansin, O. Lantz, D. Planchard, T. Le Chevalier, A. Livartoski, F. Barlesi, A. Laplanche, S. Ploix, N. Vimond, I. Peguillet, C. Thery, L. Lacroix, I. Zoernig, K. Dhodapkar, M. Dhodapkar, S. Rusakiewicz, A. Eggermont, J. M. Pitt, L. Zitvogel, and N. Chaput, "Dendritic cell-derived exosomes as maintenance immunotherapy after fi rst line chemotherapy in NSCLC," *Oncoimmunology*, vol. 5, no. 4, 2016.

[34] W. Nassar, M. El-ansary, D. Sabry, M. A. Mostafa, T. Fayad, E. Kotb, M. Temraz, A. Saad, W. Essa, and H. Adel, "Umbilical cord mesenchymal stem cells derived extracellular vesicles can safely ameliorate the progression of chronic kidney diseases," *Biomater. Res.*, pp. 1–11, 2016.

[35] L. Kordelas, V. Rebmann, a-K. Ludwig, S. Radtke, J. Ruesing, T. R. Doeppner, M. Epple, P. a Horn, D. W. Beelen, and B. Giebel, "MSC-derived exosomes: a novel tool to treat therapy-refractory graft-versus-host disease.," *Leukemia*, vol. 28, no. 4, pp. 970–3, Apr. 2014.

[36] D. C. Kirouac and P. W. Zandstra, "The Systematic Production of Cells for Cell Therapies," *Cell Stem Cell*, vol. 3, pp. 369–381, 2008.

[37] L. Ahrlund-Richter, M. De Luca, D. R. Marshak, M. Munsie, A. Veiga, and M. Rao, "Perspective Isolation and Production of Cells Suitable for Human Therapy : Challenges Ahead," *Cell Stem Cell*, vol. 4, pp. 20–26, 2008.

[38] K. Bergman and G. D. Graff, "The global stem cell patent landscape : implications for efficient technology transfer and commercial development," *Nat. Biotechnol.*, vol. 25, no. 4, pp. 419–424, 2007.

[39] D. Lau, U. Ogbogu, B. Taylor, T. Stafinski, D. Menon, and T. Caulfield, "Correspondence Stem Cell Clinics Online : The Direct-to-Consumer Portrayal of Stem Cell Medicine," *Cell Stem Cell*, vol. 3, pp. 591–594, 2008.

[40] R. Isasi, V. Rahimzadeh, and K. Charlebois, “Uncertainty and innovation : Understanding the role of cell-based manufacturing facilities in shaping regulatory and commercialization environments,” *Appl. Transl. Genomics*, vol. 11, pp. 27–39, 2016.

[41] M. D. Li, H. Atkins, and T. Bubela, “The global landscape of stem cell clinical trials.,” *Regen. Med.*, vol. 9, no. 1, pp. 27–39, Jan. 2014.

[42] I. Vishnubhatla, R. Corteling, L. Stevanato, C. Hicks, and J. Sinden, “The Development of Stem Cell-derived Exosomes as a Cell-free Regenerative Medicine,” *J. Circ. Biomarkers*, p. 1, 2014.

[43] C. Gardiner, D. Di Vizio, S. Sahoo, C. Thery, K. W. Witwer, M. Wauben, and A. F. Hill, “Techniques used for the isolation and characterization of extracellular vesicles: results of a worldwide survey ´,” *J. Extracell. Vesicles*, vol. 5, pp. 1–6, 2016.

[44] A. K. Chen, X. Chen, A. Boon, H. Choo, S. Reuveny, S. Kah, and W. Oh, “Critical microcarrier properties affecting the expansion of undifferentiated human embryonic stem cells,” *Stem Cell Res.*, vol. 7, pp. 97–111, 2011.

[45] A. M. Fernandes, T. G. Fernandes, M. M. Diogo, C. Lobato, D. Henrique, and J. M. S. Cabral, “Mouse embryonic stem cell expansion in a microcarrier-based stirred culture system,” *J. Biotechnol.*, vol. 132, pp. 227–236, 2007.

[46] C. Gerlach, D. Ph, Y. Lin, D. Ph, C. A. Brayfield, D. Ph, D. M. Minteer, H. Li, J. P. Rubin, K. G. Marra, and D. Ph, “Adipogenesis of Human Adipose-Derived Stem Cells,” *Tissue Eng. Part C Methods*, vol. 18, no. 1, pp. 54–61, 2012.

[47] K. S. Carswell and E. T. Papouysakis, “Culture of human T cells in stirred bioreactors for cellular immunotherapy applications: Shear, proliferation, and the IL-2 receptor,” *Biotechnol. Bioeng.*, vol. 68, no. 3, 2000.

[48] D. Brindley, K. Moorthy, J. Lee, C. Mason, H. Kim, and I. Wall, “Bioprocess Forces and Their Impact on Cell Behavior : Implications for Bone Regeneration Therapy,” *J. Tissue Eng.*, vol. 2011, 2011.

[49] S. Bollini, C. Gentili, R. Tasso, and R. Cancedda, “The Regenerative Role of the Fetal and Adult Stem Cell Secretome,” *J. Clin. Med.*, vol. 2, no. 4, pp. 302–327, Dec. 2013.

[50] R. Crescitelli, C. Lasser, T. G. Szabo, A. Kittel, M. Eldh, I. Dianzani, E. I. Buzas, and J. Lotvall, “Distinct RNA profiles in subpopulations of extracellular vesicles: apoptotic bodies, microvesicles and exosomes ´ 3 ,” *J. Extracell. vesicles*, vol. 2, pp. 1–10, 2013.

[51] C. Théry, M. Boussac, P. Véron, P. Ricciardi-Castagnoli, G. Raposo, J. Garin, and S. Amigorena, “Proteomic analysis of dendritic cell-derived exosomes: a secreted subcellular compartment distinct from apoptotic vesicles.,” *J. Immunol.*, vol. 166, no. 12, pp. 7309–18, Jun. 2001.

[52] Y. Wen, Y. Chang, L. Lin, and P. Liao, “Collection of in vivo-like liver cell secretome with alternative sample enrichment method using a hollow fiber bioreactor culture system combined with tangential flow filtration for secretomics analysis,” *Anal. Chim. Acta*, vol. 684, pp. 2010–2011, 2011.

[53] J. P. Mitchell, J. Court, M. D. Mason, Z. Tabi, and A. Clayton, “Increased exosome production from tumour cell cultures using the Integra CELLine Culture System.,” *J. Immunol. Methods*, vol. 335, no. 1–2, pp. 98–105, Jun. 2008.

[54] Y. Jeon, M. S. Lee, and Y. Cheon, “Decreased Contact Inhibition in Mouse Adipose Mesenchymal Stem Cells,” *Dev. Reprod.*, vol. 16, no. 4, pp. 329–338, 2012.

[55] G. V. Shelke, C. Lasser, Y. S. Gho, and J. Lotvall, “Importance of exosome depletion protocols to eliminate functional and RNA-containing extracellular vesicles from fetal bovine serum,” *J. Extracell. vesicles*, vol. 1, pp. 1–8, 2014.

[56] J. Li, Y. Lee, H. J. Johansson, I. Mager, P. Vader, J. Z. Nordin, O. P. B. Wiklander, J. Lehtio, M. J. A. Wood, and S. E. L. Andaloussi, “Serum-free culture alters the quantity and protein composition of neuroblastoma-derived extracellular vesicles,” *J. Extracell. vesicles*, vol. 1, pp. 1–12, 2015.

[57] B. A. C. Schnitzler, S. Rigby, M. Aysola, and J. Murrell, “Harvest of Human Mesenchymal Stem Cells from Microcarriers,” *BioPharm International*, 2018. [Online]. Available: http://www.biopharminternational.com/harvest-human-mesenchymal-stem-cells-microcarriers. [Accessed: 16-Jan-2018].

[58] P. Li, M. Kaslan, S. H. Lee, J. Yao, and Z. Gao, “Progress in Exosome Isolation Techniques,” *Theranostics*, vol. 7, no. 3, pp. 789–804, 2017.

[59] C. Théry, A. Clayton, S. Amigorena, and G. Raposo, “Isolation and Characterization of Exosomes from Cell Culture Supernatants,” in *Current Protocols in Cell Biology*, vol. Chapter 3, 2006, pp. 1–29.

[60] C. B. Reimer, R. S. Baker, R. M. VanFrank, T. E. Newlin, G. B. Cline, and N. G. Anderson, “Purification of Large Quantities of Influenza Virus by Density Gradient Centrifugation,” *J. Virol.*, vol. 1, no. 6, pp. 1207–1216, 1967.

[61] R. Morenweiser, “Downstream processing of viral vectors and vaccines,” *Gene Ther.*, vol. 12, no. 12, 2005.

[62] A. Cvjetkovic, J. Lötvall, and C. Lässer, “The influence of rotor type and centrifugation time on the yield and purity of extracellular vesicles,” *J. Extracell. vesicles*, vol. 3, pp. 1–11, 2014.

[63] K. W. Witwer, E. I. Buzás, L. T. Bemis, A. Bora, C. Lässer, J. Lötvall, E. N. Nolte-’t Hoen, M. G. Piper, S. Sivaraman, J. Skog, C. Théry, M. H. Wauben, and F. Hochberg, “Standardization of sample collection, isolation and analysis methods in extracellular vesicle research.,” *J. Extracell. vesicles*, vol. 2, pp. 1–25, Jan. 2013.

[64] R. Linares, S. Tan, C. Gounou, N. Arraud, and A. R. Brisson, “High-speed centrifugation induces aggregation of extracellular vesicles ´,” *J. Extracell. Vesicles*, vol. 4, pp. 1–7, 2015.

[65] E. van der Pol, A. N. Böing, E. L. GOOL, and R. Nieuwland, “Recent developments in the nomenclature , presence , isolation , detection and clinical impact of extracellular vesicles,” *J. Thromb. Haemost.*, vol. 14, no. October 2015, pp. 48–56, 2015.

[66] J. Welton, J. Webber, and L. Botos, “Ready-made chromatography columns for extracellular vesicle isolation from plasma,” *J. Extracell. …*, vol. 1, pp. 1–9, 2015.

[67] P. Li, M. Kaslan, S. H. Lee, J. Yao, and Z. Gao, “Progress in Exosome Isolation Techniques,” *Theranostics*, vol. 7, no. 3, pp. 789–804, 2017.

[68] S. S. Tan, Y. Yin, T. Lee, R. C. Lai, R. W. Y. Yeo, B. Zhang, A. Choo, and S. K. Lim, “Therapeutic MSC exosomes are derived from lipid raft microdomains in the plasma membrane.,” *J. Extracell. vesicles*, vol. 2, pp. 1–10, Jan. 2013.

[69] J. Z. Nordin, Y. Lee, P. Vader, I. Mäger, H. J. Johansson, W. Heusermann, O. P. B. Wiklander, M. Hällbrink, Y. Seow, J. J. Bultema, J. Gilthorpe, T. Davies, P. J. Fairchild, S. Gabrielsson, N. C. Meisner-kober, J. Lehtiö, C. I. E. Smith, M. J. A. Wood, and S. E. L. Andaloussi, “Ultrafiltration with size-exclusion liquid chromatography for high yield isolation of extracellular vesicles preserving intact biophysical and functional properties,” *Nanomedicine*, vol. 11, pp. 879–883, 2015.

[70] B. J. Tauro, D. W. Greening, R. a Mathias, H. Ji, S. Mathivanan, A. M. Scott, and R. J. Simpson, “Comparison of ultracentrifugation, density gradient separation, and immunoaffinity capture methods for isolating human colon cancer cell line LIM1863-derived exosomes.,” *Methods*, vol. 56, no. 2, pp. 293–304, Feb. 2012.

[71] J. Webber and A. Clayton, “How pure are your vesicles?,” *J. Extracell. vesicles*, vol. 2, no. 7, pp. 1–6, Jan. 2013.

[72] I. Helwa, J. Cai, M. D. Drewry, A. Zimmerman, B. Dinkins, M. L. Khaled, M. Seremwe, W. M. Dismuke, E. Bieberich, W. D. Stamer, M. W. Hamrick, and Y. Liu, “A Comparative Study of Serum Exosome Isolation Using Differential Ultracentrifugation and Three Commercial Reagents,” *PLoS One*, pp. 1–22, 2017.

[73] C. T. Yavuz, A. Prakash, J. T. Mayo, and V. L. Colvin, “Magnetic separations : From steel plants to biotechnology,” *Chem. Eng. Sci.*, vol. 64, pp. 2510–2521, 2009.

[74] M. Kosanovic, B. Milutinovic, S. Goc, N. Mitic, and M. Jankovic, “Ion-exchange chromatography purification of extracellular vesicles,” *Biotechniques*, vol. 63, no. 2, pp. 65–71, 2017.

[75] C. S. Burden, J. Jin, A. Podgornik, and D. G. Bracewell, “A monolith purification process for virus-like particles from yeast homogenate.,” *J. Chromatogr. B. Analyt. Technol. Biomed. Life Sci.*, vol. 880, no. 1, pp. 82–9, Jan. 2012.

[76] J. Lotvall, A. F. Hill, F. Hochberg, E. I. Buzas, D. Di Vizio, C. Gardiner, Y. S. Gho, I. Kurochkin, S. Mathivanan, P. Quesenberry, S. Sahoo, H. Tahara, M. H. Wauben, K. W. Witwer, and C. Théry, "Minimal experimental requirements for definition of extracellular vesicles and their functions: a position statement from the International Society for Extracellular Vesicles," *J. Extracell. Vesicles*, vol. 3, no. 26913, pp. 1–6, 2014.

[77] J. Kowal, G. Arras, M. Colombo, M. Jouve, J. Paul, B. Primdal-bengtson, F. Dingli, D. Loew, M. Tkach, and C. Théry, "Proteomic comparison defines novel markers to characterize heterogeneous populations of extracellular vesicle subtypes," *PNAS*, 2016.

[78] H. Suárez, A. Gámez-valero, R. Reyes, S. López-martín, M. Josefa, J. L. Carrascosa, C. Cabañas, F. E. Borràs, and M. Yáñez-mó, "A bead-assisted flow cytometry method for the semi-quantitative analysis of Extracellular Vesicles," *Sci. Rep.*, no. April, pp. 1–11, 2017.

[79] G. Sofer, D. C. Lister, and J. A. Boose, "Virus Inactivation in the 1990s — and into the 21st Century," *BioPharm*, vol. 15, no. 9, pp. 28–42, 2003.

[80] "Annex 4 Guidelines on viral inactivation and removal procedures intended to assure the viral safety of human blood plasma products," *WHO Technical Report*, 2004. [Online]. Available: http://apps.who.int/medicinedocs/en/d/Js19651en/.

Acknowledgments

IW is supported by the Priority Research Centers Program through the National Research Foundation of Korea (NRF) funded by the Ministry of Education, Science and Technology (grant No.2009-0093829). IC acknowledges support from the Engineering and Physical Science Research Council (EPSRC) Industrial Doctoral Training Centre in Bioprocess Engineering Leadership (EP/G034656/1)

Glossary terms

Downstream processing	The manufacturing steps after cell culture, that typically involve purification, washing, concentration and formulation of the product.
Dynamic bioreactor systems	Bioreactors that use a agitation to ensure adequate mixing and mass transfer when compared with static systems.
Exosome	An extracellular vesicle that is created in multi-vesicular bodies and then released from the cell into the extracellular environment via a process of exocytosis
Extracellular vesicle	Membrane-enclosed package of material that is generated via several distinct biologic pathways
Flask bioreactors	A modified form of cell culture flask with advanced functions, for example separation of the liquid and air phases or compartmentalisation to collect secreted product using membrane technology
Hollow-fiber bioreactors	A 3D bioreactor that uses parallel bundles of semi-permeable capillaries that allow transfer of nutrients and gases to the cells residing in the extra-capillary spaces
Impellers	A rotating blade or paddle in a bioreactor that agitates the culture medium to ensure even mixing and distribution of nutrients
Mass transfer	The net movement of mass from one place to another.
Packed bed technologies	Bioreactor technologies that use a tube filled with particles that act as a physical substrate for cell attachment and growth. They allow perfusion of culture media to distribute nutrients and oxygen bed
Oxygen sparging	Introducing oxygen bubbles into the bioreactor to dissolve oxygen in the culture medium
Shear stress	A force experienced by cells in a bioreactor due to the flow of culture medium parallel to their surface
Tangential-flow filtration	A method for separating and purifying biomolecules whereby the solution is passed tangentially across the filtration membrane rather than directly at it.

Transmission surface plasmon resonance	A technique commonly used in microfluidic applications that can detect adsorption of biologic material to metal surfaces

Box 1. Clinician's Corner

Exosomes are cell-secreted vesicles containing bioactive proteins and genetic material. Their specific cargo is reflective of the parent cell, and gives rise to their therapeutic effects.

- Stem-cell derived exosomes have potential for use as drug candidates for a wide host of indications. However, to achieve potential as therapeutics scalable manufacturing processes are needed, both upstream and downstream.
- Upstream processing needs to include scalable cell culture that can produce large quantities of secreted exosomes. Current bioreactor technology is designed for suspension-adapted cells that are used to make antibodies or recombinant proteins. They are typically not suitable for scalable expansion of adherent cells.
- Downstream processing needs to transition from traditional ultracentrifugation methods to combinations of filtration and chromatographic-based methods that can achieve consistent and reproducible purification at scale.
- Manufacturing science needs to be addressed early in the product development cycle so that exosomes can achieve status as routine therapies more quickly and cost-effectively.