DCVax-L and DCVax-Direct in the FDA Rare Disease Framework

Rare diseases beginning with rare cancers

Andrew Caravello, DO | Physician and independent patient advocate
October 29, 2026 | Docket FDA-2026-N-12214

I write in my personal capacity as a physician and patient advocate. I am not affiliated with Northwest Biotherapeutics and do not speak for the company. The interpretations, recommendations and proposed studies are my own. Published findings and company disclosures are identified by citations.

The decision

I advocate advancing DCVax-L and DCVax-Direct as personalized cellular immunotherapies for rare cancers. These are the only therapies I advocate in this proposal. I request a public development example under the Rare Disease Framework connecting three plans: evidence, specimen and manufacturing, and treatment and supply. The Center for Biologics Evaluation and Research (CBER) should work with the Oncology Center of Excellence (OCE), statistical and manufacturing reviewers, disease experts and patients. The purpose is a clear, evidence-based path for both DCVax programs. [1] [2]

Why I recommend this platform

Both are therapeutic cancer vaccines that use the patient's own dendritic cells to present tumor antigens to the immune system. [3] DCVax-L supplies a substantial human survival, safety and manufacturing record. Its external-control and propensity-score analyses must be assessed alongside the unmet original primary endpoint and extensive crossover. DCVax-Direct supplies earlier human experience across diverse solid tumors and a different method of acquiring tumor antigens. Licensed dendritic-cell technologies and Flaskworks make the manufacturing questions concrete. Their clinical record, biological approach and manufacturing technologies are the basis for my recommendation. I ask FDA to clarify what that record supports and the remaining requirements for each program and proposed indication. [4] [5] [6] [7] [8]

Why the path matters

One public account I have followed concerns an American teenager receiving DCVax-L in London. In an October 22 update, her mother described a nineteen-year-old in college and the cost of the next treatment: approximately $30,600. The family was still approximately $7,740 short on that date. This is a dated account of continuing care, travel and fundraising, not a treatment-effect estimate. [9]

A patient needs the evidence, the material required to manufacture treatment, and a route to receive and continue it. The three outputs are specified on page 2; the seven bottlenecks and responsible parties are mapped on page 3.

What FDA should do next

I recommend that FDA identify a coordinating office and publish a workplan within 90 days after the comment period closes, followed by a draft example and evidence-plan template within six months. These are requested milestones. Begin with rare cancers; use the supporting appendices to evaluate future DCVax research beyond cancer. Those studies need not delay this DCVax-focused policy work.

FDA could use the public DCVax record or an illustrative case with the same product characteristics; confidential product-specific decisions remain in the sponsor's regulatory process. Families should inherit a usable path while they still have time to benefit.

Guide to this proposal: decision brief pages 1 to 3; Appendix A implementation detail page 4; Appendix B clinical evidence page 9; Appendix C platform technologies page 12; Appendix D future DCVax research page 14; sources page 19.

The three outputs requested

Develop these three outputs for DCVax-L and DCVax-Direct, with each unresolved question assigned to the party able to answer it.

1 A written evidence plan

State what the complete clinical and manufacturing record supports, what prior knowledge can carry forward, and the smallest adequate next study or analysis. Connect mechanistic reasoning, external comparisons and prespecified Bayesian methods without counting repeated analyses as independent evidence. Address foreseeable crossover and treatment switching at the design stage. Keep DCVax-L and Direct decisions product-specific. [10] [11] [12] Record treatment history and changes in tumor and immune state so that evidence reuse remains appropriate over time.

2 A specimen and manufacturing plan

Show how institutions can arrange consent, diagnostic allocation and suitable tumor preservation before surgery when feasible, including decisions made before final pathology or eligibility is known. Define responsibilities for validated freezing, storage, transport and identity controls. Apply justified manufacturing knowledge to process and site changes. Tumor tissue, lysate, leukapheresis material and finished cells require distinct specifications. [13] [14] [15] [16]

3 A treatment and supply plan

Explain the appropriate U.S. expanded-access and supply routes, including requirements for authorized overseas manufacture, qualified treatment sites and repeated treatment. Distinguish expanded access from federal Right to Try. Identify who controls supply, clinical delivery and financing; FDA authorization and insurance coverage are separate decisions. Record patients unable to start or continue care. [17] [18] [19] [20]

Responsibility and progress

The next page assigns the seven bottlenecks to the responsible parties. Success should be measured by time to a coordinated plan, justified evidence reuse, clarity of remaining requirements and patients' ability to start and continue treatment.

In the map, CMC means chemistry, manufacturing and controls; IRB is an institutional review board; and CMS is the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services.

A diagnosis should come with a path that can be explained. Families deserve to know what has been learned, what remains to be shown, who is responsible for the next answer and how that answer can change their care. The broader scientific agenda supports this immediate request; it does not postpone it.

This map identifies barriers for the worked example to resolve, not confidential FDA objections to DCVax. Its recommended changes and next steps are my proposals, not commitments by the parties listed. Product-specific decisions still require the appropriate sponsor records.

Bottlenecks responsibilities and next decisions

Bottleneck to resolve	Responsible parties	Change or next decision needed
Evidence for the intended use	FDA review team and product sponsor	Define the evidence for the intended use, the remaining uncertainty and the smallest adequate next study or analysis. Where crossover or treatment switching is foreseeable, prespecify its effect on the comparison and analysis. [21] [10]
Function with variable patient inputs	FDA CMC reviewers and manufacturer	Define controlled process attributes and appropriate potency evidence while allowing intended antigen variation. Show which changes require new comparability evidence. [13] [14]
Qualified manufacturing and supply	Manufacturer, quality teams and FDA	Apply justified prior knowledge under current CMC guidance; qualify changed processes and sites and establish actual production capacity. Technology transfer alone does not establish available clinical supply. [15]
Suitable tissue and reliable handoffs	Treating institutions and teams, biobanks, manufacturer and applicable oversight bodies	Agree institutional procedures, consent and ethics/privacy review as applicable. Arrange specimen allocation and validated preservation, storage, transport and identity controls. FDA can coordinate the public example. [16]
A treatment route patients can use	Sponsor, treating sites, IRB and FDA as applicable	Identify eligibility, supply, the appropriate access submission and repeated-treatment plan. For overseas manufacture, resolve import and shipping requirements. [17] [18]
Treatment-site readiness	Treating institutions, collection/processing services, sponsor and FDA as applicable	Qualify each site for its assigned collection, receipt, storage or administration role. Establish trained staff, reliable handoffs and geographic access; each site need not perform every function.
Affordability and continuity	Payers including CMS where applicable, institutions, sponsor and assistance programs	Plan coverage, payment and patient costs separately from regulatory authorization. CMS coverage criteria for sipuleucel-T illustrate this distinct decision. Track inability to start or continue care. [19]

Appendix A Implementation detail

This appendix supports the three requested outputs for DCVax-L and DCVax-Direct. Their clinical record is in Appendix B; supporting technologies are in Appendix C; future research beyond cancer is in Appendix D. Other cited therapies and experimental preparations supply evidence or comparators. I am not recommending them as treatments or asking FDA to advance them through this submission.

The patient should not have to build the pathway

The coordination problem extends from the first collection to continuing care. Families must be able to reach treatment repeatedly when the regimen requires it. Tissue preservation, cell collection, manufacture and clinical care require institutions to work together. Travel, cost and continuity determine whether the route remains usable. Counting first doses does not measure continuity of care.

The published materials from the October 28 meeting include Huntington's disease, ALS and other rare conditions. Their biological causes differ. Their families face a common regulatory question: how can evidence become sufficiently informative, sufficiently early, to change what happens next? Losing speech, movement, independence or time with family is not an abstract statistical cost. The framework should account for those losses when deciding which evidence is attainable, which uncertainty matters and which additional requirement is worth the time it takes. [22]

The October 28 FDA opening materials identify workstreams for a tailored approach, external engagement, chemistry, manufacturing and controls, and framework engagement. I ask FDA to use those workstreams and the planned sector-specific roundtables to develop the worked example specified on page 2. Public stakeholder proposals in the meeting deck are contributions to that discussion, not adopted FDA policy. [22]

Current barriers in the United States

The United States already has a regulatory route for autologous cellular immunotherapy. FDA's licensed PROVENGE product provides a concrete example for a defined prostate-cancer indication. Its authorization does not transfer to another product, but it establishes that the barrier is not a blanket prohibition on treatment made from a patient's own cells. A developer must establish the evidence and manufacturing basis for its product and intended use, or meet the conditions of an appropriate investigational-access route. [23] [21]

For rare diseases, the policy challenge is to make that route proportionate, consistent and usable. The responsibility map on page 3 identifies barriers the worked example should resolve and the parties who control the next action. It is not a list of confidential FDA objections to DCVax. An independent advocate cannot establish those from public records.

Northwest's June 2026 filing makes parts of this discussion concrete. It reports completed U.S. DCVax-L technology transfer and basic engineering runs and validation, while describing further Direct trial preparations as resource-dependent. Those are useful milestones, not evidence that every site, product version or U.S. access arrangement is ready. The sponsor's actual records determine the remaining product-specific steps. [24]

The loss of suitable tissue at an operation can be irreversible for that specimen, making early preservation planning especially urgent. It does not follow that every later procedure or treatment option is foreclosed.

The required change is therefore a coordinated, written path through these decisions. FDA can clarify evidence requirements, apply existing flexibilities consistently and explain lawful access routes. Manufacturers must establish product quality and supply; hospitals must provide appropriate collection and care; and financing requires the parties able to fund it. The Framework Initiative

should make these responsibilities work together without requiring a family to discover each barrier after the previous one has been cleared.

Focus area 1 Define what evidence can carry forward

For the DCVax platform, I recommend an evidence structure with a common core and separate modules for each product, disease population and treatment setting. The common core should describe the cell source, controlled process, product characterization, relevant mechanism, quality system and applicable human experience. A new module should identify exactly what changes and what evidence is needed to support that change.

Evidence should be shared only when its relevance is explained. Each reuse should identify the source, the permission to rely on it and the material differences from the proposed use. A new antigen source, maturation program, route, dose, tissue environment or patient population may change the questions. I ask reviewers and sponsors to agree in writing what a characterized platform need not repeat and what the specific product and indication still must demonstrate. Researcher Miro Pastrnak's public-comment slide calls for that same distinction. FDA should publish worked examples that make the reasoning predictable. [22]

FDA's October 2026 draft on individualized genome-editing products expressly excludes individualized products that are not genome-editing products. Within its defined scope, it describes how product variants for monogenic conditions could share one biologics license application, supported by clinical evidence and specified safety, activity and manufacturing controls. I ask FDA to develop a corresponding worked example for DCVax-L and DCVax-Direct, defining which patient-specific variation belongs within a controlled product and which changes require additional evidence. Evidence for a new disease indication remains a separate question. [25]

The framework should support scientifically justified cohorts organized by shared biological features, while retaining the disease-specific results. An organ label, mutation or histology may remain essential to interpretation. It should not be the only possible organizing principle when a product acts through a shared function. FDA's tissue-agnostic oncology and small-population cell-therapy materials already provide foundations for these discussions. [26] [27]

Choose the design that best answers the question. Use a randomized comparison when feasible, ethical and appropriate; other options include adaptive or basket designs, carefully constructed external controls, prospective natural-history data, or structured within-person observations. Prespecify population, outcomes, time origin, analysis and cohort-entry or stopping rules. [27] [10] [11] Nasha Fitter, a parent and cofounder of FOXG1 Research Foundation and Citizen Health, asks for source-verifiable medical records, audit trails and severity matching. Mary Anne Meskis of the Dravet Syndrome Foundation asks when a natural-history dataset is unsuitable as a comparator. I recommend a published checklist covering those questions, missingness, selection and subsequent treatments, with examples of both acceptable and rejected comparisons. That would make the propensity-score discussion operational without implying that matching resolves unmeasured confounding. [22] [10]

The Plausible Mechanism Framework should have a clear connection to this process. Its current draft focuses on individualized therapies for specific genetic conditions with known biological causes and recognizes that general concepts may apply to other individualized therapies. Within that scope, the draft expressly includes interventions directed at a defined molecular or cellular abnormality, a nearby disease pathway, or a characterized downstream or compensatory mechanism. I ask FDA for a DCVax development example connecting a disease-relevant abnormality, a corrective or compensatory function, demonstrated biological engagement and patient benefit. [12]

For this worked example, mechanistic evidence should justify which populations and product functions belong in the same development question. A prespecified Bayesian analysis can then determine how relevant prior information contributes alongside new observations. For a future DCVax-Direct rare-cancer basket study, a hierarchical model could permit partial information sharing

between justified cohorts, with less borrowing when their outcomes differ. The plan should prespecify prior distributions, cohort-entry rules, success and stopping criteria, simulations and sensitivity analyses, including analyses without borrowing. Shared mechanism helps justify borrowing, but comparability also depends on product, patient population and treatment context. Model checks must test the proposed grouping and reduce or stop borrowing when it is unsupported. DCVax-L and Direct require separate justifications; a shared platform name does not make their clinical evidence interchangeable. [11]

Propensity matching and Bayesian borrowing solve different problems. Matching addresses measured differences between comparison groups; borrowing determines the influence of relevant external information on the new analysis. Reanalyses of the same patients must not be counted as independent new observations. The worked example should show how mechanism, comparator construction, prior information and prospective outcomes lead to one interpretable decision. [10] [11]

Focus area 2 Produce a coordinated written decision

I ask FDA to develop a concise written evidence-plan template for DCVax-L and DCVax-Direct in rare cancers. It should identify the proposed use, the existing evidence that can be relied on, each material unresolved question, the work needed to answer it and the decision that work is intended to support. It should name the responsible review contact and document how clinical, statistical, manufacturing and disease-specific expertise contributed.

When FDA advice changes, the reason and its consequences should be recorded. A sponsor should be able to distinguish a new scientific concern, a changed product or population, and a different interpretation of evidence already provided. That distinction matters when a small patient population has contributed scarce samples and time.

Use DCVax-L's more developed record and DCVax-Direct's earlier clinical experience to test the template. Identify justified evidence reuse and the new comparisons each program requires. Potential DCVax applications beyond cancer belong in later research, supported by their own biological and clinical evidence.

FDA should also publish a navigation guide connecting these evidence plans with existing meeting routes, appropriate expedited programs, prior-knowledge reuse and access guidance. It should identify eligibility, the responsible office and the next action for the question being asked.

This work can proceed alongside existing product-specific advice and lawful access mechanisms. A public policy comment is a contribution to the framework. Confidential product records and requests for a particular regulatory decision continue through their appropriate channels.

Focus area 3 Give patients a role in the decision and the route to care

Patient input should shape the program before its principal decisions are fixed. Families should help define meaningful benefit, acceptable burden, relevant uncertainty and feasible follow-up. Survival can be central in a lethal cancer; speech, breathing, mobility, swallowing, cognition, independence, relapse prevention or time at home may matter in other diseases. Measures must suit the population and detect change that matters. Mackenzie Liebowitz and Hillary Savoie's public-comment slides ask how patient input changes decisions. I recommend a brief record at each milestone: what patients asked for, what changed, and why any recommendation was not adopted. Publish aggregate lessons while protecting privacy. [22]

Rare diseases often cross institutional boundaries. A patient can become an adult during treatment, move between specialists or live far from a qualified center. The framework should encourage explicit planning for those transitions, including the reasons for age limits and the evidence needed to support broader eligibility when appropriate.

Access should be measured from referral through continued care. With consent and appropriate privacy controls, programs should document who was considered, who was eligible, who reached

collection and manufacture, who received treatment, and who continued or stopped. Reasons for delay or nonreceipt belong in the record. This makes treatment outcomes more interpretable and identifies practical barriers that can be addressed.

For patients who cannot enter a trial, expanded access can be evaluated through the existing requirements for clinical eligibility, sponsor supply, regulatory and ethics review, and treating clinicians. Plans should address repeated treatment when relevant, not only an initial dose. Sponsors and treatment centers should explain the next decision, the responsible person and expected follow-up, while disclosing patient costs before commitments are made. [17]

FDA, sponsors, institutions and payers have different responsibilities. The framework should make those responsibilities understandable to a family. FDA can clarify evidence and regulatory permissions; sponsors and sites must establish supply and care; coverage and financial support require the parties able to provide them. A clear pathway should connect those decisions without transferring the coordination burden to the sickest person in the room.

Address the access problem raised by Stephen Moore

Stephen Moore's October 20 commentary calls for mechanism-informed access, simpler compassionate use and access to treatments approved abroad. I share his concern about the time, travel and money patients lose while seeking treatment. This proposal turns that concern into a concrete FDA request: include a treatment and supply plan within the worked development example, with a route for continuing treatment in the United States when its requirements can be met. [28]

Federal Right to Try and expanded access are separate routes. FDA does not review individual Right to Try requests; eligibility applies to both the patient and the investigational product, and manufacturer participation is voluntary. My request to FDA concerns the routes it reviews: expanded access and the associated supply requirements. [20]

FDA's April 2026 expanded-access guidance addresses repeated courses and extended treatment. It also distinguishes a new expanded-access IND from certain protocols under an existing active IND. For individual-patient or intermediate-size protocols, the guidance describes commencement after submission and required IRB approval, with the applicable requirements and FDA's authority to impose a clinical hold intact. The worked example should identify the appropriate category, sponsor supply, responsible clinicians, consent, monitoring and continuity plan. These are routes to assess now; the public Framework Initiative need not finish before an eligible sponsor seeks advice. [17]

A separate supply question is whether appropriately authorized overseas manufacture could serve qualified U.S. treatment sites while domestic capacity develops. FDA's import requirements include an effective IND, an eligible consignee and appropriate labeling. The product-specific plan must address quality, shipping stability and traceability, including any export of starting material. Overseas access, a manufacturing license and marketing approval are different facts; none should be presented as automatic U.S. authorization. I ask FDA to explain the available route and remaining requirements in writing. [18]

The treatment and supply plan should also identify costs and responsibilities, assess effects on trial recruitment and limited supply, and record patients who cannot start or continue treatment. It should give a family a named next contact and a defined next decision. Collection of access outcomes should complement, rather than replace, an appropriate clinical evidence plan.

Focus area 4 Review manufacturing and function together

For living products, manufacture is part of the mechanism. FDA's active-immunotherapy potency draft already discusses tumor lysates containing many or unidentified antigens. I ask FDA to connect that technical foundation with the evidence plans for DCVax-L and DCVax-Direct. [13] Collection, differentiation, antigen loading or retained acquisition capacity, maturation, storage and delivery affect what the cells can do. Patient-specific inputs should be characterized as intended variables

within a controlled process, with acceptance criteria and a defined response when material falls outside the supported range.

The quality strategy should combine identity, purity, viability, sterility and appropriate potency assessment. Functional characterization during development may be broader than the assays suitable for routine release. FDA should clarify how those measurements support one another and how an assay strategy can mature as the evidence grows. The relevant function differs between activating, tolerogenic and restorative products. [15] [13]

The related alphaDC1-plus-dasatinib study also sharpens the potency question. Conventional dendritic-cell markers and measured IL-12p70 output did not distinguish immune or clinical responders, even though antigen-specific responses and epitope spreading were observed. Together, these findings motivate a functional assay strategy connecting the prepared cells, their response to appropriate stimulation and the recipient's immune response. A potency assay measures a specified product function; clinical benefit also depends on the recipient and tumor. A candidate assay, including CD40-stimulated IL-12p70 output, needs validation for its intended use. No single cytokine is thereby established as a universal release criterion or a validated surrogate for benefit. [29]

Apply existing flexibility to appropriate prior knowledge. Process history, analytical methods, stability and comparability evidence should be evaluated for their relevance before additional work is requested. For a site transfer, reagent change or automation step, agree the attributes at risk, the comparison needed and when nonclinical or clinical bridging is justified. [15] [14]

I recommend reusable process information paired with site-specific responsibilities. Records should connect the patient, starting material, manufacturing version, batch, release results, transport, administration and outcomes. Automation should be qualified by its effect on product quality and function. Capacity planning should include collection and clinical delivery as well as the factory.

Within the worked development example, functional assessment should connect antigen acquisition or loading, presentation, appropriate costimulation, inducible cytokine output and the resulting effector response. Measure intended target activity alongside healthy-cell and tissue effects. CD40-stimulated IL-12p70 is a candidate measure for a type-1 product; the intended mechanism determines whether it belongs in the assay strategy and what other tests it requires. It is not a universal requirement or a validated surrogate for survival. [13]

Preserve treatment options from the first operation

For DCVax-L, the first manufacturing decision can arise before surgery. I ask FDA to work with pathology, surgical, biobanking and manufacturing experts on a preoperative coordination example. It should preserve tissue required for diagnosis and clinical care, establish appropriate consent, and arrange material intended for possible therapeutic manufacture against the manufacturer's acceptance criteria. Preservation may need arranging before final pathology or treatment eligibility is known. Consent should address that uncertainty and the later disposition of unused material. A formalin-fixed diagnostic archive should not be assumed interchangeable with material preserved for that manufacturing process. [16]

The example should specify responsibility for collection and processing times, relevant tissue quality, validated preservation or freezing, storage duration, permitted thawing, packaging and temperature-monitored transport. Patient identity and chain of custody must follow every handoff. Storage alarms, backup capacity, shipping-delay plans, retrieval arrangements and review of temperature excursions belong in the same record. NCI's biospecimen practices supply a foundation; a research-biobank procedure does not establish suitability for therapeutic manufacture. [16]

Tumor tissue, prepared lysate, leukapheresis material and the finished dendritic-cell product require distinct specifications. Each should have evidence supporting its stability, handling and intended function; this proposal does not prescribe a universal freezing temperature or a common viability

requirement. DCVax-Direct acquires antigen within a tumor, so its collection pathway differs, while its manufactured cells still require controlled storage and delivery. The patient's care team should be able to confirm what is stored, who holds it, what use it supports and how it can be released. [5] [15]

A first action that does not require a new clinical program

I can contribute this proposal directly to the public docket as an independent advocate and ask the Rare Disease Innovation Hub to route it to the relevant FDA reviewers and discussions. Attendance at the October 28 meeting is not required to submit a written comment. The contribution does not depend on company sponsorship. A comment informs policy development; it does not reserve product eligibility, guarantee an invitation or establish that a product has met approval requirements. [1]

That limited first step matters because examples help define the questions the eventual framework answers. If personalized cell manufacture, multi-antigen preparations and evidence reuse across rare cancers are represented during its development, FDA can address their practical requirements directly. This public-evidence contribution can inform the discussion while product-specific records and commitments remain with the parties authorized to provide them. The broader research agenda in this proposal does not have to be completed before this conversation begins.

Milestones and accountability

I ask FDA to publish a workplan for the worked development example within 90 days after this comment period closes, naming the coordinating office and the questions to resolve. Within six months, FDA should convene the relevant patient, disease-expert and developer discussions and publish a draft example and evidence-plan template. A voluntary pilot could then test these plans against the two DCVax programs and their proposed indications. These are proposed milestones for consideration, not dates FDA has already promised.

Success should be visible. Useful measures include time to a coordinated evidence plan, the proportion of requested work tied to a stated uncertainty, the handling of justified evidence reuse, the timeliness of advice when a program changes, and the ability of participants to start and continue treatment. Publish aggregate lessons while protecting personal and confidential information.

Appendix B Clinical and mechanistic evidence

Personalized immunotherapy and durable control

The word vaccine makes us think of a disease that never arrives. In cancer treatment, the disease has already arrived. The immediate task is to destroy malignant cells; the lasting task is to recognize what survives or returns. DCVax puts the patient's own antigen-presenting cells inside that effort. DCVax-L and DCVax-Direct are personalized cellular immunotherapies, often called therapeutic cancer vaccines. Here, the preventive aim is to stop cancer from returning after treatment. [4] [5] [3]

The platform's larger promise is an immune response that recruits partners, encounters new tumor material and carries the lesson forward. The development objective I propose joins treatment of existing disease, prevention of recurrence and durable immune control. The evidence plan should connect those functions to survival, duration of benefit and recurrence, so that durability describes the patient's course as well as the immune response.

Clinical evidence for both DCVax programs

DCVax-L and DCVax-Direct illustrate a regulatory question that will recur as cellular medicine advances. The patient supplies biological information that varies by design. With L, removed tumor material is used to load dendritic cells during manufacture. Direct is designed to acquire tumor

material after prepared cells are injected into an accessible lesion. The work is organized around a cellular function, while each product has its own preparation, route and clinical evidence. [4] [5]

The DCVax-L program supplies a clinical record that deserves assessment in full. Its original primary endpoint was not met, and the published survival analyses used external controls after extensive crossover. The results and that design history belong together. Vaccination was studied alongside standard care; checkpoint blockade and poly-ICLC were not protocol-mandated components of the original regimen. The published analysis reported median overall survival of 19.3 versus 16.5 months in newly diagnosed glioblastoma and estimated five-year survival of 13.0% versus 5.7% against external controls. The July 2026 presentation added individual-patient matching and weighting. All five displayed matched comparisons favored L, with median survival differences of 3.4 to 6.3 months. These are reasons for a complete, coordinated assessment of the record, including the trial's design and analysis history, comparator construction and manufacturing evidence. [4] [6]

Propensity-score matching strengthens an external comparison by reducing measured baseline differences between groups. Its contribution should be judged from covariate balance, overlap between eligible patients, compatible time origins and sensitivity to remaining bias. It does not remove unmeasured confounding or turn an external comparison into randomized evidence. FDA should assess the July 2026 matching analyses as additional sponsor-presented evidence, alongside the published survival analysis and the original study record. [6] [10]

The trial also reported five serious adverse events at least possibly related to treatment across 2,151 doses, with no autoimmune reactions or cytokine storm reported. That defined safety record should inform the assessment of the product and its proposed use. [4]

The INSIGhT reanalysis provides a separate methodological contribution. In that study, external comparisons recovered the negative overall-survival conclusions already known from three randomized glioblastoma treatment comparisons. It informs how external controls can be evaluated in this setting; the DCVax-L analyses supply their own treatment-specific results. These different contributions should be assessed for the questions they actually answer. [6] [30]

DCVax-Direct supplies a different architecture: unloaded, partially activated cells placed into an accessible tumor so that antigen acquisition occurs in the patient. Its early clinical program included 40 enrolled patients with diverse advanced solid tumors, with 39 evaluable. The study reported changes in tumor immune infiltration and exploratory relationships between product cytokine output and outcomes. This makes antigen acquisition and local immune instruction practical development questions across tumor types. The association between product IL-12p40 output and survival is informative, but it must remain distinct from a validated IL-12p70 potency measure or surrogate endpoint. [5]

Tissue agnostic development and treatment order

The tissue-agnostic argument must follow the patient's changing biology. Kuburich, Subbiah and colleagues describe cancer plasticity as a route to treatment resistance. A tumor can retain a founding mutation while changing its lineage, target expression or dependence on the pathway that treatment originally blocked. Epigenetic and metabolic changes can alter its expressed state without a new mutation. A fixed diagnostic label or a repeated DNA result therefore cannot fully describe the cancer that treatment must now confront. [31]

These changes also affect the immune encounter. The review describes neuroendocrine-transformed tumors with fewer CD8 T cells, altered myeloid and stromal populations, and possible reductions in the molecular display needed for T-cell recognition. Liu and colleagues' tumor-agnostic immunotherapy review connects response to the biological state of the tumor, antigen presentation, immune-cell access, prior therapy and the host. Rare-cancer development should measure these conditions over time and retain lineage-specific results within biologically justified cohorts. Small populations make this coordinated learning especially valuable. Liu and colleagues also identify healthcare access requirements: appropriate testing, expert decision support, prospective registries

and treatment access must develop together. Those requirements reinforce this proposal's treatment and supply plan. [32] [31]

DCVax-L begins with tumor material collected for manufacture. A host immune response can broaden beyond a manufactured starting antigen set, as illustrated by the related study below. Direct adds acquisition of tumor material in the lesion at administration, with later administrations offering renewed encounters as the lesion changes. The proposed advantage is broad recognition that can expand beyond the starting antigen set. It should be tested by connecting antigen acquisition and presentation to the responding cells' ability to recognize and enter the tumor, and to lasting patient benefit. [4] [5] [29]

Epitope spreading supplies a concrete biological basis for that question. A pilot study in advanced melanoma had 13 evaluable patients, including patients with checkpoint-refractory disease. It used a related alphaDC1 vaccine loaded with defined tumor blood-vessel peptides and combined with dasatinib. It detected T-cell responses to additional, non-vaccine antigens. The study associated that broader recognition with favorable outcomes. It supports investigating an expanding host response after either DCVax route, while keeping the distinct products and combination regimens separate. [29]

The evidence plan should preserve baseline tissue and treatment history, use serial tumor and antigen-specific immune measurements when feasible, and record changes in lineage, antigen display and immune access. Paired specimens and clonality analysis can distinguish transformation from selection of an existing minor clone or earlier undersampling. A shared platform can support studies across organs while these measurements establish whether its relevant function persists as the cancer changes. This is a development question that a fixed diagnostic label alone cannot answer. [5] [32] [31]

The biological argument also reaches beyond the presence of a target. Kalinski laboratory studies show that immune instruction can strengthen recognition when antigen signals are weak. Dong and colleagues demonstrated improved antigen-specific recognition through DNAM-1 and NKG2D signals in experimental systems. Braun and colleagues showed IL-12 sensitization and a separate DNAM-1-dependent killing route in human-cell experiments. These findings make recognition, selectivity and the responding cell's functional state measurable development questions. They do not require an assumption that every tumor presents the same antigen. [33] [34]

Treatment order is another measurable question. UCLA investigators reported a vaccine-first median overall-survival comparison of 555 versus 271 days in a 35-patient IDH-wildtype analysis from a recurrent-glioblastoma trial. The academic ATL-DC/poly-ICLC preparation, protocol amendment and comparison groups belong in the interpretation. The result makes sequencing worth testing prospectively; it is not interchangeable with the commercial DCVax-L trial. [35]

The proposed failure of immune instruction

My research proposes a specific failure of immune instruction. In this model, persistent inflammatory signals activate STAT3 in hematopoietic progenitors; STAT3 recruits DNMT1 and EZH2 to the IRF8 locus; DNA methylation and repressive histone marks hold IRF8 in a silenced state; and type-1 instruction, including bioactive IL-12p70, fails. The proposed switch is bistable, with no stable intermediate between its on and off states. Reinforcing mechanisms can therefore hold the failure in place after one inflammatory input is reduced. This is the rationale for testing a cell prepared outside that environment as a way to supply the missing function. The component evidence and the integrated hypothesis are set out in my published work. For this submission, the intended tests concern defined rare diseases and clinically meaningful outcomes. [36]

The consequence in this model is a coupled failure: harmful targets escape clearance while poorly controlled immune activity continues to injure tissue. The restoration I propose is bidirectional. It must recover useful clearance together with the controls that keep that response within its proper target and duration. A low cell count or a high inflammatory marker cannot describe that combination adequately. The relevant question is whether the cells perform the required task in the affected

compartment, at the required time, with the recognition and feedback mechanisms that govern their response.

Manufacturing outside the suppressive environment offers a way to supply a defined function when the patient's own cells cannot provide it reliably. Antigen presentation, costimulation and a regulated type-1 signal can be brought together in a cellular product. Recipient T cells can also return signals that reinforce dendritic-cell activity. This reciprocal interaction is central to my proposed correction. Its extension into durable restoration of the patient's own immune system remains a hypothesis to test. [36]

Two distinctions are essential to the experiment. First, a monocyte-derived alpha-type-1 polarized dendritic cell, or alphaDC1, is a proposed functional substitute for relevant cDC1 activities; it is not the same developmental cell lineage. Second, manufacturing controls subsequent exposure and maturation, but the starting monocytes can retain donor-specific limitations. Product function and the receiving environment therefore both belong in the evidence plan. [36]

The development objective is governed clearance: removing the intended pathological target while preserving healthy tissue. A cancer-directed product and a preparation intended to regulate damaging immunity need different functional specifications. The broader hypothesis concerns restoration of appropriate immune decisions. It does not make current cancer products interchangeable with proposed neurological or autoimmune products.

The safety rationale also depends on delivery and timing. Early systemic recombinant IL-12 studies demonstrated severe, schedule-dependent toxicity. Experimental DC-NK-cell studies showed that dendritic cells can polarize IL-12 secretion toward an interacting cell at a functional synapse. [37] [38] The architecture I propose couples instructional output to cellular contacts and activation signals, including CD40 ligation. Its assessment should measure basal and stimulated release, the distinction between output per cell and systemic exposure, and the duration and termination of the response. These are testable features of the design. They do not establish the cause of DCVax-L's observed safety record or guarantee safety in a different product or disease.

Appendix C Technologies supporting DCVax development

The licensed Pittsburgh and Roswell Park portfolios add methods for enhanced dendritic-cell function, conditioning and modification of the tumor microenvironment. Northwest has also disclosed development plans involving both manufactured cells and in vivo mobilization of endogenous dendritic cells. These disclosures provide technological context for DCVax. Their separate therapeutic approaches are not programs I advocate in this submission, and their products and evidence must be identified precisely. [39] [7]

In my assessment, Northwest's next-generation laboratory work strengthens this connection. Its June 2025 presentation reported that combinations of booster agents increased TNF-alpha and IL-12p70 production by one to two orders of magnitude and converted low-producing preparations into higher producers. The presentation also described complementary and antagonistic effects among combinations. These are product-development findings that justify measuring a coordinated functional profile; they do not establish clinical benefit from an enhanced product. [40]

For DCVax development, I recommend assessing antigen acquisition and presentation, the intended instructional state, and retention of function through manufacture, storage and delivery. Related alphaDC1 studies inform those questions. They remain distinct experimental preparations; their findings must be evaluated for relevance to each DCVax product rather than treated as interchangeable product evidence.

DCVax programs and supporting capabilities

Capability	Biological or operational job	Development question
DCVax-L	Present the patient's tumor material through an autologous cellular preparation.	How does the complete clinical and manufacturing record support the intended use?
DCVax-Direct	Acquire antigen in an accessible lesion and initiate a local immune response.	Does the defined product retain antigen handling and the intended function in each proposed setting?
Licensed DC technologies and boosters	Modify polarization, instructional output, conditioning or immune-cell recruitment.	Which changes to a DCVax preparation would improve its function while maintaining acceptable safety?
Flaskworks culture systems	Control culture conditions and support disclosed DC and T-cell manufacturing architectures.	What functional and comparability evidence supports each specific process and product?
Advent and NHSBT services	Connect collection, processing and specialized manufacture.	Which sites, capacity, traceability and delivery controls are needed for dependable access?

Process control as part of product function

Flaskworks contributes more than a proposal to reduce manual labor. Its patent description includes perfused dendritic-cell culture, DC-mediated T-cell stimulation and movement between chambers for additional stimulation with fresh antigen-presenting cells. Those engineering concepts provide a starting point for studying how controlled culture and DC-mediated T-cell stimulation could inform future DCVax process development. The patent is evidence of a disclosed design, not proof that the specific combined product has been manufactured, clinically validated or commercially qualified. [8]

Controlled culture provides a way to study how medium exchange, accumulated metabolites, maturation timing and donor variation affect the function being delivered. The useful comparison is between processes making a defined product, measured with suitable functional assays. The comparison should establish what changes in antigen handling, cytokine responses, effector instruction and unwanted activity. Increased cell yield alone does not answer those questions. In a published immature-DC culture study, MicroDEN-generated cells induced stronger allogeneic T-cell proliferation within the tested seeding-density range, despite lower normalized DC yields at the lower densities. That is a functional process comparison, not a clinical efficacy result. [41]

The alphaDC1 and gamma-delta T-cell circuit discussed in my research is a separate experimental architecture. It raises questions about reciprocal stimulation, effector survival, target recognition and sustained function that could inform future DCVax research. It has not been established as a Northwest clinical product. I am not asking FDA to advance that separate cell combination in this submission.

Advent and the NHS Blood and Transplant collaboration add the delivery side. NHSBT describes collection and processing support, initially in Leeds and Oxford, with phased expansion being explored. These operating relationships show how specialized services can be connected. Additional sites and automated processes still require the applicable qualification and comparability work. [7] [42] The ALS Treg study offers a separate example of centralized manufacture,

cryopreservation and shipment to treatment sites. These experiences can inform proposed networks while each product and site meets its own requirements. [43]

Use available samples to answer the next question

Where relevant banked material and consent are available, a prospectively specified analysis of stored product and donor samples could connect measured function with observed outcomes. Establish sample availability, assay stability, missingness and confounding first. Such work could provide supportive evidence without reopening patient recruitment, but the existence or suitability of those samples must not be assumed. The evidence plan should state which result would inform a potency strategy, process comparison or subsequent prospective study. [15]

Appendix D Future DCVax research beyond cancer

This appendix examines supporting biology for possible future DCVax research beyond cancer. It does not advocate additional therapies. A future DCVax application must establish a disease-relevant failure of immune instruction or clearance and show that the proposed product addresses it. Cancer, chronic infection, neurodegeneration and selected immune-mediated conditions offer different settings in which to test that question. A shared diagnosis is not required for a shared pathological mechanism, and a shared inflammatory marker is not sufficient to establish one. [36]

Nor should a genetic diagnosis end the inquiry. A primary mutation can coexist with secondary inflammatory injury, impaired clearance or altered repair. The contribution of each must be established in that disease. The question for future DCVax research is whether its relevant dendritic-cell functions could address a demonstrated contributor to that disease. Each candidate extension should identify the target cells, intended response, delivery route, recipient requirements and clinically meaningful outcome.

The October 28 public-comment slides show why this structure matters across diseases. Industry regulatory contributor Timothy Kline requests explicit rare-cancer inclusion and Oncology Center of Excellence involvement; patient-organization leader Amanda Moore of Appendicure identifies organ-based trial exclusion in appendix cancer. Nanoscope Therapeutics' president and chief scientific officer, Samarendra Mohanty, proposes gene-agnostic retinal development around surviving cells and shared function across genotypes. HPDL work illustrates a downstream metabolic bypass. These are stakeholder contributions, not FDA decisions. I recommend that the worked example address rare-cancer eligibility and justified mechanism-based cohorts. These examples do not transfer another developer's technology or efficacy evidence into Northwest's portfolio. [22]

ALS and protective immune function

A human ALS study expanded patients' regulatory T cells, cryopreserved and shipped them, and administered them with low-dose IL-2. Seven participants entered its randomized phase and eight its open-label extension. The study supports manufacturing feasibility, tolerability and biological activity; its size did not permit a meaningful clinical-efficacy conclusion. It demonstrates that a patient's immune cells can be collected, functionally characterized, manufactured and returned across clinical sites. [43]

The larger MIROCALS trial adds an essential design lesson. Its unadjusted survival analysis gave a hazard ratio of 0.81 (95% confidence interval 0.54-1.22; p=0.33). The prespecified covariate-adjusted analysis gave a hazard ratio of 0.32 (0.14-0.73; p=0.007), with an interaction involving baseline cerebrospinal-fluid phosphorylated neurofilament heavy chain. I give both results because their interpretation depends on the population and analysis model. Future programs should prespecify biological heterogeneity and test whether changes in immune function translate into meaningful patient benefit. [44]

A test of possible DCVax relevance in ALS

Before proposing a DCVax application in ALS, research must answer a narrow causal question: does correcting a defined defect in immune instruction protect motor neurons in a disease-relevant model? The proposed study would use consented patient-derived samples and a paired design, comparing a candidate preparation with the same donor's appropriate process control, alongside reference donors. Define disease stage, genotype where relevant, treatment exposure and the recipient immune-cell context before interpreting differences. Donors, rather than repeated wells from one donor, are the independent units of evidence. The proposed laboratory test uses alphaDC1 cells as an experimental model, not either DCVax product. A positive result would require confirmation with a defined DCVax preparation before supporting a DCVax application.

Establish the proposed defect in relevant human ALS material as part of the study, including defined myeloid populations and, where available with appropriate consent, banked affected tissue. Interpret stage, treatment and sampling conditions; a peripheral-blood finding does not establish the state of spinal-cord cells. If the defect is not established in the compartment required by the hypothesis, do not advance on that restoration rationale.

Measure the defect and its correction in the same defined cell population. For the IRF8 model, connect expression and chromatin-state measurements with antigen presentation, costimulation and stimulus-responsive function. These are development measurements to validate, not proposed universal release tests for every cell therapy. If alphaDC1 supplies a missing function without repairing endogenous IRF8 regulation, record that result as functional compensation. It would support a compensatory strategy without demonstrating reversal of the proposed lesion. A cell called a dendritic cell is not evidence that the required function has been restored.

Next, test the resulting immune response in a human motor-neuron and glial model that represents the intended disease setting. Prespecify a neuronal survival or injury measure as the principal functional readout, alongside target handling, inflammatory injury and regulatory-cell function. Include controls that distinguish an effect of the prepared cells from an effect of accompanying soluble agents. Test whether the effect persists after exposure to disease-relevant conditions. Higher IL-12p70 output, a favorable cell count or a shift in one marker cannot substitute for neuronal protection.

The decisive comparator should match viability, costimulatory expression and antigen handling while lacking the specific instructional function under test. Verify that the comparison isolates that function rather than another material difference between the preparations. If both preparations protect neurons equally, the result does not establish the instruction-specific mechanism. If a selective comparator cannot be validated, report that limitation instead of claiming the mechanism has been isolated. Define these interpretations before seeing the results.

Before the experiment, set thresholds against assay variability, blind outcome assessment, and specify how the result will be reproduced across independent donors. Advance only if the preparation reproducibly changes the intended function and improves the neuronal outcome without unacceptable healthy-cell injury. If cytokines rise while neurons fare worse, stop that preparation. If function improves without neuronal benefit, reassess the causal link. A positive laboratory result would justify the next translational and safety studies; the clinical route, dose, delivery and patient benefit would still need to be established.

This proposed experiment tests whether the biological rationale could be relevant to future DCVax development. It is not a recommendation for an ALS treatment, a claim that DCVax already treats ALS, or a statement that Northwest has committed to such a program. This research does not delay the immediate request for FDA to address the two DCVax programs in rare cancers.

Huntington disease and a correctable cellular phenotype

Huntington's disease provides a distinct mechanistic example. Trager and colleagues studied monocytes and macrophages from affected individuals and demonstrated excessive inflammatory responses linked to mutant huntingtin. Lowering huntingtin in those cells ex vivo reduced abnormal cytokine production and reversed selected transcriptional changes. This is evidence of a modifiable cellular phenotype in human disease, rather than evidence of clinical benefit from a dendritic-cell vaccine. [45]

Any future DCVax research in Huntington's disease must begin with that distinction. It should determine which immune abnormality contributes to disease, how the proposed product corrects it, whether the correction persists and how it affects neuronal injury and patient function. Because the mutation remains in the patient's cells, a manufacturing program must address the intrinsic defect as well as the environment around the cells. Cell replacement, gene correction and immune-state modification are distinct interventions. They are discussed here to clarify the biological problem, not to recommend those therapies.

Huntington's also offers a prospective research opportunity. TRACK-HD and PREDICT-HD followed genetically identified participants before clinical motor diagnosis and characterized biological and functional change over time. These cohorts provide a foundation for staging, natural-history comparisons and prespecified outcome measurement. An earlier intervention becomes a study question that can be planned against an observed disease course, with timing and benefit tested rather than assumed. [46] [47]

Rare autoimmune disease and inherited immune defects

A phase 1b trial treated 12 people, including four with aquaporin-4-positive neuromyelitis optica spectrum disorder, with peptide-loaded tolerogenic dendritic cells. It reported feasibility, a favorable short-term safety experience and immune-response observations. It was not powered to establish clinical efficacy. The manufactured cells were intended to promote tolerance, with a functional profile different from a cancer vaccine. [48]

This tolerogenic-cell study is a functional and manufacturing comparator for the DCVax discussion, not another therapy I am advocating. Collection and handling experience may be informative, while its intended immune function differs from the cancer-directed purpose of DCVax-L and DCVax-Direct. Any proposed DCVax extension must demonstrate the function required for its intended use.

Human IRF8 mutations provide causal evidence that a regulatory factor can alter monocyte and dendritic-cell development. The reported recessive and dominant defects produced different cellular and clinical phenotypes. The lesson for platform development is to identify the defect in the actual starting population. Restoring function may require different approaches when the limitation is genetic, acquired, developmental or imposed by the tissue environment. [49]

The receiving tissue determines the required response

Experimental neuroimmune findings illustrate why the receiving tissue and disease model matter. Andreadou and colleagues found a protective role for neuronal IL-12 sensing in an inflammatory mouse model. Eede and colleagues found that removing neuronal and oligodendroglial IL-12 signaling improved pathology in an Alzheimer-like mouse model. These are different experimental settings. They support testing the direction, compartment and duration of a response instead of treating a cytokine name as a universal therapeutic instruction. [50] [51]

Frakes and colleagues provide a further ALS example: changing NF-kappaB activity in microglia altered motor-neuron injury in experimental systems. The causal intervention was in a particular cell population and model. A clinical program must establish whether its own intervention changes the relevant function in its intended patients. [52]

Five questions for every proposed extension

First, is the proposed abnormality present in the relevant cells and tissue of the intended population, and does it distinguish an actionable defect from a normal developmental or protective process?

Second, does the manufactured product reliably perform the intended function, including after exposure to conditions relevant to the recipient? Cell identity and a single expression marker should be interpreted alongside functional tests.

Third, does the intervention reach or influence the relevant compartment? The location and duration of the response are part of the causal question.

Fourth, do biological changes connect to meaningful clinical outcomes? An informative biomarker is not automatically a validated surrogate for benefit.

Fifth, what result would change the plan? Failure to correct the function, unwanted self-directed activity, loss of function after administration, or biological activity without clinical benefit should trigger an explicit reassessment.

The broader immune-restoration hypothesis requires direct proof of concept before it can support a new DCVax application. The evidence supplies components, methods and disease-specific questions. Each extension must establish clinical effectiveness, acceptable risk, delivery and continued care for its intended use. That is the purpose of a reusable framework: preserve the value of earlier work while making each next decision explicit.

Supporting evidence and its relevance to DCVax

Example	Evidence available	Relevance to the DCVax case
Rare cancers and DCVax-L	Human externally controlled survival analyses, safety observations and additional matched comparisons. [4] [6]	Assess the complete record, comparator compatibility, analysis history and the connection between the studied and proposed manufactured product.
DCVax-Direct	Early human study across advanced solid tumors, with product-function and tissue observations. [5]	Define the current product, its relationship to the studied preparation, the intended function and the first informative rare-cancer cohorts.
ALS	Small autologous Treg plus IL-2 study supports feasibility and biological activity; clinical efficacy was not established. MIROCALS adds evidence about heterogeneity. [43] [44]	Use immune-state and heterogeneity findings to design a test of possible DCVax relevance. A DCVax application in ALS remains a separate hypothesis to test.
Huntington's disease	Human myeloid-cell experiments showed reversal of selected dysfunction after HTT lowering ex vivo. [45]	Use the correctable myeloid phenotype to assess a possible DCVax rationale, including the intrinsic mutation and disease-relevant outcomes.
Neuromyelitis optica	Four NMOSD participants were included in a 12-person early tolDC trial. It supports feasibility and further study, not established efficacy. [48]	Use the intended tolerogenic function as a contrast. These results do not establish DCVax efficacy or constitute a recommendation for the cited therapy.
Inherited IRF8 defects	Human genetic findings establish different monocyte and dendritic-cell phenotypes from different IRF8 variants. [49]	Identify the actual starting-cell defect before proposing a DCVax extension. Genetic deficiency and an acquired functional state pose different questions.

Sources

[1] FDA. Fit-for-Purpose Rare Disease Framework Initiative. Federal Register notice, October 16, 2026.
https://www.govinfo.gov/content/pkg/FR-2026-10-16/html/2026-21142.htm

[2] FDA. A New Framework for Rare Disease Review. October 2026 white paper.
https://www.fda.gov/media/195694/download

[3] National Cancer Institute. Cancer Treatment Vaccines. Accessed October 29, 2026.
https://www.cancer.gov/about-cancer/treatment/types/immunotherapy/cancer-treatment-vaccines

[4] Liau LM et al. Association of autologous tumor lysate-loaded dendritic cell vaccination with overall survival among patients with newly diagnosed and recurrent glioblastoma. JAMA Oncology, 2023; online 2022.
https://jamanetwork.com/journals/jamaoncology/fullarticle/2798847

[5] Subbiah V et al. Cytokines Produced by Dendritic Cells Administered Intratumorally Correlate with Clinical Outcome in Patients with Diverse Cancers. Clinical Cancer Research, 2018.
https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/30018119/

[6] Northwest Biotherapeutics. DCVax-L individual-patient matching and weighting analyses. BNOS presentation, July 3, 2026. Company conference presentation.
https://nwbio.com/wp-content/uploads/NWBT-BNOS-slides-7-3-26MB-LP-FINAL-v02.pdf

[7] Northwest Biotherapeutics. Form 10-K for the year ended December 31, 2025. Company programs, licensed technologies, manufacturing and development limitations.
https://www.sec.gov/Archives/edgar/data/1072379/000110465926043806/nwbo-20251231x10k.htm

[8] Kozbial A. Dendritic cell generating apparatus and method. US10647954B1. Original assignee Flaskworks LLC. Granted May 12, 2020. Patent disclosure, not clinical validation.
https://patents.google.com/patent/US10647954B1/en

[9] Amanda Hollensbe. Public family account of continued DCVax-L treatment, travel and fundraising. October 22, 2026. Dated patient-family report, not a treatment-effect estimate.
https://x.com/HollensbeAmanda/status/2113353624453578843

[10] FDA. Considerations for the Design and Conduct of Externally Controlled Trials for Drug and Biological Products. Draft guidance, February 2023.
https://www.fda.gov/media/164960/download

[11] FDA. Use of Bayesian Methodology in Clinical Trials of Drug and Biological Products. Draft guidance, January 2026.
https://www.fda.gov/media/190505/download

[12] FDA. Considerations for the Use of the Plausible Mechanism Framework to Develop Individualized Therapies that Target Specific Genetic Conditions with Known Biological Cause. Draft guidance, February 2026.
https://www.fda.gov/media/191247/download

[13] FDA. Potency Assessment of Active Immunotherapy Products. Draft guidance, August 2026.
https://www.fda.gov/media/194324/download

[14] FDA. Manufacturing Changes and Comparability for Human Cellular and Gene Therapy Products. Draft guidance, July 2023.
https://www.fda.gov/media/170198/download

[15] FDA. Chemistry, Manufacturing, and Controls Flexibilities for Developing Human Cellular and Gene Therapy Products for a Biologics License Application. May 2026.
https://www.fda.gov/media/192321/download

[16] National Cancer Institute. Best Practices for Biospecimen Resources. Fourth edition, 2026. Sections C.2.8, C.2.10 and C.3 address storage, shipping and quality management.
https://dctd.cancer.gov/data-tools-biospecimens/biospecimens-biobanks/resources/best-practices/biospecimen-resources/appendices/2026-4th-edition-best-practices.pdf

[17] FDA. Expanded Access to Investigational Drugs for Treatment Use. Questions and Answers. April 2026.
https://www.fda.gov/media/162793/download

[18] FDA. Importing Investigational New Drugs. Current agency requirements for investigational-drug importation.
https://www.fda.gov/drugs/human-drug-imports/importing-investigational-new-drugs

[19] Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services. National Coverage Determination 110.22 Autologous Cellular Immunotherapy Treatment. Sipuleucel-T coverage effective June 30, 2011.
https://www.cms.gov/medicare-coverage-database/view/ncd.aspx?ncdid=344&ncdver=1

[20] FDA. Right to Try. Patient and product eligibility, manufacturer participation and the agency role.
https://www.fda.gov/patients/learn-about-expanded-access-and-other-treatment-options/right-try

[21] FDA. Development and Approval Process CBER. Biological product development, INDs and licensing.
https://www.fda.gov/vaccines-blood-biologics/development-approval-process-cber

[22] FDA and Reagan-Udall Foundation. Rare Disease Framework Initiative meeting slide deck, October 28, 2026. FDA opening/process slides and separately identified public-comment slides.
https://reaganudall.org/sites/default/files/2026-10/Rare%20Disease%20Framework_Master%20Deck_0.pdf

[23] FDA. PROVENGE sipuleucel-T. Licensed product and indication.
https://www.fda.gov/vaccines-blood-biologics/cellular-gene-therapy-products/provenge-sipuleucel-t

[24] Northwest Biotherapeutics. Form 10-Q for the quarter ended June 30, 2026. Manufacturing transfer and resource-dependent development plans.
https://www.sec.gov/Archives/edgar/data/1072379/000110465926097188/nwbo-20260630x10q.htm

[25] FDA. Individualized Human Genome Editing Products: Considerations for BLA Submission and Postapproval Management. Draft guidance, October 2026.
https://www.fda.gov/media/195887/download

[26] FDA. Tissue Agnostic Drug Development in Oncology. Draft guidance, October 2022.
https://www.fda.gov/media/162346/download

[27] FDA. Innovative Designs for Clinical Trials of Cellular and Gene Therapy Products in Small Populations. Draft guidance, September 2025.
https://www.fda.gov/media/188892/download

[28] Moore S. The FDA Should Grant Americans the Right to Try New Cancer Treatments. October 20, 2026. Commentary, cited for the access-policy argument.
https://www.rasmussenreports.com/public_content/political_commentary/commentary_by_stephen_moore/the_fda_should_grant_americans_the_right_to_try_new_cancer_treatments

[29] Storkus WJ et al. Dendritic cell vaccines targeting tumor blood vessel antigens in combination with dasatinib induce therapeutic immune responses in patients with checkpoint-refractory advanced melanoma. Journal for ImmunoTherapy of Cancer, 2021;9:e003675.
https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC8593702/

[30] Rudra Gupta T et al. Treatment Effect Reanalysis of the Randomized Individual Screening Trial of Innovative Glioblastoma Therapy in Newly Diagnosed Glioblastoma With External Control Data. Journal of Clinical Oncology, 2026. DOI 10.1200/JCO-25-01586.
https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/42172567/

[31] Kuburich NA et al. Cancer plasticity and histological transformation as adaptive resistance mechanisms in precision oncology. Med, 2026.
https://doi.org/10.1016/j.medj.2026.101326

[32] Liu J et al. Tumour-agnostic immunotherapy: aligning biological rationale, biomarker precision, and real-world implementation. EClinicalMedicine, 2026.
https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eclinm.2026.104211

[33] Dong B et al. NK receptor signaling lowers TCR activation threshold, enhancing selective recognition of cancer cells by TAA-specific CTLs. Cancer Immunology Research, 2024.
https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC11706306/

[34] Braun M et al. IL12-mediated sensitizing of T-cell receptor-dependent and -independent tumor cell killing. Oncoimmunology, 2016.
https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC5006926/

[35] EANO 2026, abstract MO03.4.A, September 25, 2026. Prins RM et al. PD-1 blockade following DC vaccination, compared with before vaccination, enhances T cell responses and extends survival in patients with recurrent GBM. Conference abstract; program link provided below.
https://conpass.floq.live/kiosk/eano-2026/dailyprogramme?objectClass=timeslot&objectId=6a6c6c684f39a6939d454ddc&type=detail

[36] Caravello A, Blidy A. A proposed convergent molecular chain linking senescence, cancer, and chronic infection to a correctable failure of dendritic cell instruction. Frontiers in Immunology, 2026. Hypothesis and Theory article.
https://www.frontiersin.org/journals/immunology/articles/10.3389/fimmu.2026.1861044/full

[37] Leonard JP et al. Effects of single-dose interleukin-12 exposure on interleukin-12-associated toxicity and interferon-gamma production. Blood. 1997;90:2541-2548.
https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/9326219/

[38] Borg C et al. NK cell activation by dendritic cells requires the formation of a synapse leading to IL-12 polarization in DCs. Blood. 2004;104:3267-3275.
https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/15242871/

[39] Northwest Biotherapeutics. Exclusive in-license of a portfolio of dendritic-cell technology and intellectual property. June 17, 2024. Company disclosure.
https://nwbio.com/northwest-biotherapeutics-announces-exclusive-in-license-of-portfolio-of-dendritic-cell-technology-and-intellectual-property/

[40] Bosch ML, Bhandary L. Next Generation Dendritic Cell Treatments to Improve Anti-Tumor Responses. Northwest Biotherapeutics, June 2025. Laboratory development presentation.
https://nwbio.com/wp-content/uploads/NYAS-Slides-FINAL.pdf

[41] Kozbial A, Bhandary L, Murthy SK. Effect of monocyte seeding density on dendritic cell generation in an automated perfusion-based culture system. Biochemical Engineering Journal. 2019;150:107291.
https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/32831621/

[42] NHS Blood and Transplant. Specialist therapeutic apheresis and cell processing support for DCVax-L production. October 2026.
https://www.nhsbt.nhs.uk/news/nhs-blood-and-transplant-s-specialist-therapeutic-apheresis-and-cell-processing-capabilities-are-supporting-the-production-of-dcvax-l/

[43] Thonhoff JR et al. Combined regulatory T-lymphocyte and IL-2 treatment is safe, tolerable, and biologically active for 1 year in persons with amyotrophic lateral sclerosis. Neurology Neuroimmunology and Neuroinflammation, 2022.
https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC9423710/

[44] Bensimon G et al. Efficacy and safety of low-dose IL-2 as an add-on therapy to riluzole (MIROCALS). The Lancet, 2025. DOI 10.1016/S0140-6736(25)00262-4.
https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/40354799/

[45] Trager U et al. HTT-lowering reverses Huntington's disease immune dysfunction caused by NF-kappaB pathway dysregulation. Brain, 2014. DOI 10.1093/brain/awt355.
https://doi.org/10.1093/brain/awt355

[46] Tabrizi SJ et al. Predictors of phenotypic progression and disease onset in premanifest and early-stage Huntington's disease in the TRACK-HD study. Lancet Neurology, 2013. DOI 10.1016/S1474-4422(13)70088-7.
https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/23664844/

[47] Paulsen JS et al. Clinical and biomarker changes in premanifest Huntington disease show trial feasibility. A decade of the PREDICT-HD study. Frontiers in Aging Neuroscience, 2014.
https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/24795630/

[48] Zubizarreta I et al. Immune tolerance in multiple sclerosis and neuromyelitis optica with peptide-loaded tolerogenic dendritic cells in a phase 1b trial. PNAS, 2019.
https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC6486735/

[49] Hambleton S et al. IRF8 mutations and human dendritic-cell immunodeficiency. New England Journal of Medicine, 2011. DOI 10.1056/NEJMoa1100066.
https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/21524210/

[50] Andreadou M et al. IL-12 sensing in neurons induces neuroprotective CNS tissue adaptation and attenuates neuroinflammation in mice. Nature Neuroscience, 2023.
https://doi.org/10.1038/s41593-023-01435-z

[51] Eede P et al. Interleukin-12 signaling drives Alzheimer's disease pathology through disrupting neuronal and oligodendrocyte homeostasis. Nature Aging, 2025.
https://doi.org/10.1038/s43587-025-00816-2

[52] Frakes AE et al. Microglia induce motor neuron death via the classical NF-kappaB pathway in amyotrophic lateral sclerosis. Neuron, 2014.
https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuron.2014.01.013