Orthotopic and metastatic tumour models in preclinical cancer research

Stephen M. Stribbling [a,*], Callum Beach [b], Anderson J. Ryan [b,c,**]

[a] *Department of Chemistry, University College London, Gower Street, London WC1E 6BT, UK*
[b] *Department of Oncology, University of Oxford, ORCRB, Roosevelt Drive, Oxford OX3 7DQ, UK*
[c] *Fast Biopharma, Aston Rowant, Oxfordshire, OX49 5SW, UK*

ARTICLE INFO

ABSTRACT

Mouse models of disease play a pivotal role at all stages of cancer drug development. Cell-line derived subcutaneous tumour models are predominant in early drug discovery, but there is growing recognition of the importance of the more complex orthotopic and metastatic tumour models for understanding both target biology in the correct tissue context, and the impact of the tumour microenvironment and the immune system in responses to treatment. The aim of this review is to highlight the value that orthotopic and metastatic models bring to the study of tumour biology and drug development while pointing out those models that are most likely to be encountered in the literature. Important developments in orthotopic models, such as the increasing use of early passage patient material (PDXs, organoids) and humanised mouse models are discussed, as these approaches have the potential to increase the predictive value of preclinical studies, and ultimately improve the success rate of anticancer drugs in clinical trials.

Contents

1. Introduction

While significant progress has been made in cancer treatment over recent decades (Howlader et al., 2021; Scott et al., 2023), novel approaches to the development of new drugs remains crucial to address continuing unmet clinical needs (Cui et al., 2020; Kunnumakkara et al., 2019; Schlander, Hernandez-Villafuerte, Cheng, Mestre-Ferrandiz, & Baumann, 2021; Sonawane, Wagh, Dhumane, & Deore, 2019). Several major (Belluomini et al., 2022; Bupathi, Kaseb, Meric-Bernstam, & Naing, 2015; Krishnan, 2023; Moss, Beal, & Tabar, 2022) and rare cancer types (Wang et al., 2023) have limited or no effective treatment options for advanced disease; patients develop resistance to existing treatments (Cree & Charlton, 2017; Nussinov, Tsai, & Jang, 2021) leading to treatment failure and disease progression, and drugs that target metastatic processes, such as tumour cell migration, invasion, and colonization, are needed to prevent and treat metastatic disease (Gomez-Cuadrado, Tracey, Ma, Qian, & Brunton, 2017).

In vivo tumour models provide a critical bridge between preclinical research and clinical trials in anti-cancer drug development (Fiebig, Maier, & Burger, 2004; Ireson, Alavijeh, Palmer, Fowler, & Jones, 2019; Ruggeri, Camp, & Miknyoczki, 2014; Sausville & Burger, 2006; Teicher, 2005; Teicher, 2006; Teicher, 2009; Workman et al., 2010). These models are used to evaluate drug pharmacology, pharmacokinetics, pharmacodynamics, efficacy, toxicity, and safety profiles, as well as facilitating biomarker development and patient selection strategies (Teicher, 2005; Teicher, 2006; Teicher, 2009). In vivo tumour models also play an essential role in lead optimization before candidate drugs are selected and advanced into GLP toxicology studies prior to human trials (Ireson et al., 2019; Teicher, 2005; Teicher, 2006; Teicher, 2009).

Subcutaneous tumours are the most widely used in vivo model in preclinical cancer research because of the practical advantages they offer (Gengenbacher, Singhal, & Augustin, 2017). Subcutaneous tumours are generally straightforward to establish and monitor, and they grow rapidly and reliably, making them convenient models for screening the effects of new molecules on tumour growth, regression, or response to treatment thereby providing valuable data to guide the future design and prioritization of potential drug candidates (Morton & Houghton, 2007; Stribbling & Ryan, 2022). Nonetheless, subcutaneous tumours lack the complex microenvironment and interactions found in the original organ/tissue, potentially limiting the translatability of results to clinical settings (Gengenbacher et al., 2017). Therefore, additional models, such as orthotopic and metastatic models, are employed to complement the findings from subcutaneous models and provide a better understanding of cancer biology in response to therapy.

Orthotopic and metastatic tumour models allow drugs to be evaluated in more clinically relevant biological contexts. By considering target expression, drug distribution and the interactions between tumour cells, non-tumour stromal components, blood vessels and the host immune system, these models provide a more comprehensive assessment of treatment responses. Data generated in orthotopic models may more closely resemble the clinical disease and may be a more accurate guide to biomarker development and decision-making in clinical trials thereby improving the predictive value of preclinical findings (Antonello & Nucera, 2014; Bibby, 2004; Cook, Jodrell, & Tuveson, 2012). However, the use of orthotopic and metastatic tumour models for drug evaluation poses some practical difficulties. For example, the surgical procedures, post-operative care, and monitoring of tumour growth at specific anatomical sites all add complexity and can increase overall experimental timelines (Cook et al., 2012). Additionally, orthotopic tumour models generally have higher experimental variability compared to subcutaneous models (Flatmark, Maelandsmo, Martinsen, Rasmussen, & Fodstad, 2004; Lv et al., 2020) meaning larger group sizes may be required to reliably assess drug effects.

The aim of this review is to review the use of orthotopic and metastatic tumour models in preclinical cancer research, outlining some of their main advantages and limitations, and highlighting considerations associated with the use of orthotopic and metastatic tumour models as part of anti-cancer drug development.

2. Orthotopic tumour models

Orthotopic tumour models aim to replicate the clinical setting of tumour growth and progression by implanting tumour cells or tissues at their anatomically correct or appropriate location within the body of an experimental animal (Bibby, 2004; Hiroshima et al., 2016; Killion, Radinsky, & Fidler, 1998a; Talmadge, Singh, Fidler, & Raz, 2007). The term "orthotopic" comes from the Greek words "*ortho*," meaning correct or proper, and "*topos*," meaning pertaining to a place, and it can be defined as "*located in the proper anatomical position*". A goal of orthotopic tumour models is to recreate the natural microenvironment of the tumour site, including tissue-specific architecture, cell-cell interactions, and vasculature, to better mimic the complex interactions and behaviour of tumours in the human body (Bibby, 2004; Hiroshima et al., 2016; Killion et al., 1998a).

Unlike subcutaneous models, which involve the ectopic ("*out of place*" or "*abnormal place or position*") implantation of tumour cells or tissue fragments beneath the skin, orthotopic models reproduce the primary tumour location by, for example, injecting cells or fragments of glioblastoma (Joo et al., 2013; Zhao et al., 2012), prostate cancer (Cifuentes, Valenzuela, Contreras, & Castellon, 2015; Hughes, Simons, & Hurley, 2017; Saar et al., 2015; Wang et al., 2005) or non-small cell lung cancer (Justilien & Fields, 2013; Shibuya et al., 2007; Takahashi et al., 2012a; Wang, Fu, Kubota, & Hoffman, 1992) into the brain, prostate or lung, respectively.

Many anatomical sites have been used to set up orthotopic tumour models in mice reflecting the wide variety of human cancers being studied. As well as the four most commonly diagnosed cancers – breast, prostate, lung and colon (Cifuentes et al., 2015; Fu, Besterman, Monosov, & Hoffman, 1991; Fu, Le, & Hoffman, 1993; Okano et al., 2020; Saar et al., 2015; Wang et al., 2005; Wang, Fu, Kubota, & Hoffman, 1992) - there are significant proportions of patients with newly diagnosed cancers at other anatomical sites including pancreas, bladder, ovary and liver, and each anatomical site represents an important disease for orthotopic cancer models (Decio & Giavazzi, 2016; Erstad et al., 2018; Fu, Guadagni, & Hoffman, 1992; Fu & Hoffman, 1993; Naito, Higuchi, Shimada, & Kakinuma, 2020; Wang, Luan, Goz, Burakoff, & Hiotis, 2011).

Human tumour cell-line derived xenografts (CDXs) (from "*xeno-*" foreign; graft from one species to an unlike species) are the most widely used subcutaneous tumour model (Gengenbacher et al., 2017; Oliveira, Abrantes, Tralhao, & Botelho, 2020) and they are also a widely used orthotopic tumour model system (Table 1a). For xenograft models such as these, tumour cells/fragments are injected/implanted into immune-deficient mice, many strains of which are now available (Table 2) (Chulpanova, Kitaeva, Rutland, Rizvanov, & Solovyeva, 2020; Olson, Li, Lin, Liu, & Patnaik, 2018; Puchalapalli et al., 2016; Stribbling & Ryan, 2022). In contrast, murine tumour cell lines (Table 1b) can be grown in genetically matched (syngeneic) fully immune-competent mice, using widely available inbred strains such as C57BL/6 and BALB/c (Chulpanova et al., 2020; Li, Feuer, Ouyang, & An, 2017; Nolan et al., 2020; Potter, 1985).

Syngeneic and CDX tumour models are usually set up using immortalised tumour cell lines that have been sub-cultured/passaged over many years either in vitro (in growth-factor rich tissue culture medium), grown adhered to tissue culture plates and dissociated with trypsin/EDTA or alternatively in vivo, as subcutaneous tumours, which are excised and cut into fragments or disaggregated before re-implantation. These culturing methods select for rapid tumour growth and survival (either on plastic or subcutaneously) and can cause substantial and irreversible changes to cell biology (Daniel et al., 2009; Gillet et al., 2011; Hausser & Brenner, 2005), such that these cell line models may have limited predictive value (Johnson et al., 2001).

Table 1
Examples of human xenograft and mouse syngeneic orthotopic tumour models.

(a) Human cell line derived orthotopic xenograft tumour models

Cancer type	Cell line	Injection site	Refs.
Breast	T-47D	mammary fat pad (s.c.)	Abu Quora et al. (2021)
	BT-549	mammary fat pad (s.c.)	Abu Quora et al. (2021)
	MDA-MB-231-mCherry	lactiferous duct	Malin, Chen, Schiller, Koblinski, and Cryns (2011)
Prostate	PC-3luc	dorsal lobe	McGovern et al. (2021)
	LNCaP-luc	dorsal lobe	McGovern et al. (2021)
	PC-3	right anterior lobe	Cifuentes et al. (2015)
	LNCaP	left or right dorsal lobe	Liu, Zhu, Ye, Zhu, and Wang (2022)
Lung	Calu-6-luc	left lateral thorax	Willoughby et al. (2020)
	H1299-GFP-luc	middle/upper lobe, right lung	Sosa Iglesias et al. (2019)
	A549-luc	left lung	Mordant et al. (2011)
	H441	left lung	Wu et al. (2007)
	H460	left lung	Takahashi et al. (2012b)
Colon	HCT-116-luc	caecal wall	Ravoori et al. (2019)
	HT-29	caecal wall	Georges et al. (2019)
	RKO	caecal wall	Georges et al. (2019)
Pancreas	Panc-1	tail of pancreas	Chen et al. (2022a)
	MIAPaca-2	pancreas	Huynh et al. (2011)
	L3.6pl	pancreas	Kleespies et al. (2005)
Ovarian	SKOV3-luc	ovarian bursa	Guo et al. (2017)
	IGROV-1	under ovarian bursa	Decio and Giavazzi (2016)
Stomach	TMK-1	wall of mid-stomach	McCarty et al. (2004)
	AGS-GFP-luc	serous side of stomach	Busuttil et al. (2018)
Liver	Huh7-Luci	median lobe surface	Qiu et al. (2021)
	PL5-luc	left hepatic lobe	Lu et al. (2007)
Kidney	Caki-2	left renal capsule	Linxweiler et al. (2017)
	786-O-luc	kidney	Cho et al. (2016)
Head & Neck	UM-SCC-1	floor of mouth	Simon et al. (1998)
	MDA1986	tongue	Myers, Holsinger, Jasser, Bekele, and Fidler (2002)
	ACC3, ACCM	parotid gland	Choi et al. (2008)
Oesophagus	TE-4	wall of oesophagus	Ohara et al. (2010)
	TE-8-luc	abdominal oesophagus	Kuroda et al. (2014)
Skin (melanoma)	A375	intradermal	Rozenberg, Monahan, Torrice, Bear, and Sharpless (2010)
Brain	U-87-MG	cortex/striatum junction	Bianco et al. (2017)
	U-87 MG	right brain	Sun et al. (2020)
Mesothelioma	EHMES-1, −10	thoracic cavity	Ogino et al. (2008)
Colon (liver metastases)	LS174T	intrasplenic	Kalber, Waterton, Griffiths, Ryan, and Robinson (2008)

(b) Murine cell line derived orthotopic syngeneic tumour models

Cancer type	Cell line injected	Injection site	Refs.
Breast	4 T1	second mammary fat pad	Carrillo et al. (2023)
	4 T1-luc	fifth left breast	Dos Santos et al. (2018)
	EMT6-luc	mammary fat pad	Piranlioglu et al. (2019)
	EMT6	mammary fat pad	Amini et al. (2019)
Prostate	TRAMP-C2-luc	prostate	Lardizabal, Ding, Delwar, Rennie, and Jia (2018)
	Myc-CaP	anterior prostate lobe	Anker, Mok, Naseem, Thumbikat, and Abdulkadir (2018); Hughes et al. (2017)
Lung	LLC1-luc	left lung	Liu, Zhao, Senovilla, Kepp, and Kroemer (2021)
	LLC1	left lung	Hung et al. (2020)
	KLN205	lung parenchyma	Porrello et al. (2018)
Colon	MC38	caecal wall	Greenlee and King (2022)
	MC38-luc	rectal wall	Uccello et al. (2022)
	CT-26	caecal wall	Kruse et al. (2013)
	CT26-luc	caecum	Evans et al. (2019)
Bladder	MB49	bladder wall	Cai et al. (2022)
	MBT-2	intravesical space	Chan et al. (2009)
Pancreas	Panc02	head of pancreas	Partecke et al. (2011)
	Pan02-CAG-luc2	tail of pancreas	Luheshi et al. (2016)
Ovary	ID8-F3mCherryluc	intra-peritoneal	Gonzalez-Pastor et al. (2019)
	ID-8 GFP-luc	intra-bursal	Lin, Sun, Wu, and Wang (2017)
Liver	Hepa1–6	beneath Glissons capsule	Wang et al. (2011)
	Hepa1–6 GFP	portal vein	Limani et al. (2016)
	TIB-75 GFP	portal vein	Limani et al. (2016)
Kidney	Renca	renal subcapsule	Matin et al. (2010)
	Renca-luc	kidney parenchyma/capsule	Ding, Wang, and Chang (2018)
Skin (melanoma)	B16F10	intra-dermal (flank)	Rossi et al. (2019)
	B16F10	intra-dermal (left pinna)	Fowlkes et al. (2019)
Brain	GL261	right cerebral hemisphere	Lumniczky et al. (2002)
	GL261-GFP-Fluc	right hemisphere	Khalsa et al. (2020)

(c) Human patient-derived orthotopic xenograft (PDOX) tumour models

Cancer type	Material engrafted	Engraftment site	Refs.
Breast	tumour fragments	mammary fat pad (s.c.)	Sommaggio et al. (2020)
	tumour fragments	mammary fat pad (s.c.)	Okano et al. (2020)

Table 1 (continued)

(c) Human patient-derived orthotopic xenograft (PDOX) tumour models			
Cancer type	Material engrafted	Engraftment site	Refs.
	tumour cell suspension	intra-ductal	Behbod et al. (2009)
	tumour fragments	mammary fat pad (s.c.)	Fu et al. (1993)
Prostate	tumour fragments	sub-renal capsule	Salem et al. (2020)
	tumour fragments	sub-renal capsule	Wang et al. (2005)
	tumour fragments	dorsal prostate lobe	Saar et al. (2015)
Colon	tumour cell suspension	wall of colon	Puig et al. (2013)
	tumour cell suspension	wall of colon	De Angelis et al. (2022)
	tumour fragments	surface of intestine	Fu et al. (1991)
Lung	tumour fragments	left lung	Wang, Fu, and Hoffman (1992)
	tumour fragments	parietal pleura	Astoul, Wang, Colt, Boutin, and Hoffman (1996)
Ovary	tumour fragments	beneath ovarian capsule	Fu and Hoffman (1993)
Pancreas	tumour fragments	surface of pancreas	Fu et al. (1992)
Stomach	tumour fragments	stomach serosa	Furukawa, Kubota, Watanabe, Kitajima, and Hoffman (1993)

The problem can be overcome to a certain extent by using patient-derived xenograft (PDX) models (Abdolahi et al., 2022; Hidalgo et al., 2014). Fresh tumour tissue derived from treatment-naïve primary or metastatic tumours is obtained during surgery or from biopsies (or occasionally, from ascites) (Abdolahi et al., 2022; Calles, Rubio-Viqueira, & Hidalgo, 2013; Kim et al., 2009; Whittle, Lewis, Lindeman, & Visvader, 2015). Typically, the tumour is cut into small (~1–2 mm³) pieces or disaggregated enzymically or mechanically to give a cell suspension, and then engrafted or injected ectopically into immune-deficient mice, with a number of potential sites being available, including subcutaneously in the flank, in the anterior compartment of the eye, under the renal capsule, or into the intracapsular fat pad (Abdolahi et al., 2022). More recently, PDX models have also been established from patient-derived circulating tumour cells (CTCs) rather than the tumour itself (Ramani et al., 2019; Tayoun et al., 2019). PDX tumours can also be engrafted orthotopically into the same organ as the original tumour and grown as patient-derived orthotopic xenografts (PDOXs). PDX and PDOX tumours maintain much of the structure and composition of the parent tumour and more accurately recapitulate the human disease (Day, Merlino, & Van Dyke, 2015; DeRose et al., 2011; Pompili, Porru, Caruso, Biroccio, & Leonetti, 2016; Rubio-Viqueira et al., 2006; Talmadge et al., 2007; Tentler et al., 2012; Zhao et al., 2012). As a result, the response of patients to certain types of therapy may be more accurately predicted (Garrido-Laguna et al., 2011; Pompili et al., 2016; Rosfjord, Lucas, Li, & Gerber, 2014; Talmadge et al., 2007). Importantly, PDOX models better mimic clinical metastases than subcutaneous PDX models, suggesting they have greater biological and clinical relevance (Hoffman, 2015). Examples of PDOX models set up using fresh human tumour tissue are given in Table 1c.

PDX tumours are routinely grown and expanded subcutaneously, where human stromal tissue initially present is replaced by mouse stroma over a small number of passages (Chao et al., 2017; Invrea et al., 2020), and later passages may favour genetic drift or tumour cells that grow and survive better in the subcutaneous setting of the mouse (Zhuo et al., 2020). Because of this, PDX and PDOX studies are often conducted using low passage tumours due to the possibility that

each passage to a new host may dilute the features present in the original patient tumour (Chao et al., 2017; Rosfjord et al., 2014; Shi, Li, Jia, & Fan, 2020).

Orthotopic tumour models have both advantages and disadvantages (Bibby, 2004) (Table 3), with the site of tumour growth itself being something of a double-edged sword: it makes it possible to recapitulate and accurately model human disease; but it also makes model preparation and the subsequent determination of tumour growth and metastasis more difficult than with subcutaneous models. In addition, there are important ethical concerns when considering the use of orthotopic models. Because the implantation of cancer cells to create an orthotopic model is an invasive procedure, sometimes requiring complex surgery, researchers have to consider the overall well-being of the animals and ensure that procedures are performed with the utmost care to minimize discomfort, pain, and distress. Ethical guidelines typically require the use of anaesthesia, proper analgesia, and other measures to ensure humane treatment. For example, careful consideration is required to accurately determine both the extent and position of tumour growth so that animal welfare is not significantly negatively impacted during a study (Workman et al., 2010). Because of the potential welfare issues a strong justification for the use of orthotopic models based on the scientific necessity and relevance of the model to the research question is required in order to balance the potential benefits to human health or scientific knowledge and the potential harm to the animals. Most countries have established strict regulatory and reporting guidelines to ensure ethical and humane treatment of animals in research, for example the Animals (Scientific Procedures) Act 1996 [UK], the Animal Welfare Act [USA], and Directive 2010/63/EU on the Protection of Animals Used for Scientific Purposes [EU] (Workman et al., 2010).

Although haematological tumours (e.g. lymphoma (Michel, Rosario, Andrews, Goldenberg, & Mattes, 2005), leukemia (Griessinger et al., 2018), myeloma (Lwin, Edwards, & Silbermann, 2016)) can be grown ectopically in non-physiological locations (e.g. as subcutaneous tumour or ascites), they can also be grown orthotopically as syngeneic, CDX or PDX/PDOX models (Kohnken, Porcu, & Mishra, 2017). For PDX studies,

Table 2

Immune-deficient mouse strains commonly used for orthotopic and experimental metastasis models (Adigbli et al., 2020; Chen et al., 2022b; Nagatani et al., 2019; Shultz et al., 2014).

Name	Strain	B cells	T cells	Dendritic cells	Macrophages	NK cells	Complement	Spontaneous tumours	Leaky
Nude	$Foxn1^{nu}$	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No
SCID	$Prkdc^{scid}$	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
NOD SCID	NOD. $Prkdc^{scid}$	No	No	Yes	Defective	Defective	Defective	Yes	Yes
NSG	NOD. $Prkdc^{scid}$ $Il2rg^{tm1Wjl}$	No	No	Defective	Defective	No	Defective	No	No
NOG*	NOD. $Prkdc^{scid}$ $Il2rg^{tm1Sug}$	No	No	Defective	Defective	No	Defective	No	No

* NOG mice have an $Il2rg$ mutation producing a protein that will bind cytokines but not signal. NSG mice have a null mutation whereby no $Il2rg$ is expressed and cytokines cannot bind.

Table 3
Advantages and disadvantages of orthotopic tumour models.

Advantages	Refs.
• Cell-derived and patient-derived tumours grow in their tissue of origin, preserving many biological characteristics of the original tumour. This results in a more accurate recapitulation of the human disease, enhancing the predictive value of the models and the clinical significance of the results obtained.	Bibby (2004); DeRose et al. (2011); Fiebig et al. (2004); Hiroshima et al. (2016); Manzotti, Audisio, and Pratesi (1993); Mattie et al. (2013); Ruggeri et al. (2014); Teicher (2006); Tentler et al. (2012); Walters et al. (2013); Waters, Janovitz, and Chan (1995); Whiteford et al. (2007); Zhao et al. (2012)
• A variety of human and murine tumour cell lines are available for orthotopic injection, and increasingly these have been stably transfected to enable the production of a bioluminescent signal.	ATCC (2023); ECACC (2023); PerkinElmer (2023); RIKEN (2023); Teicher (2006)
• Tumour cells stably expressing luciferase enables solid tumour growth, metastasis and any therapeutic response (s) to be measured by bioluminescence (BLI, a method of choice) in a high-throughput, non-invasive manner.	Alsawaftah, Farooq, Dhou, and Majdalawieh (2021); Edinger et al. (2002); Jenkins et al. (2003); Liu, Su, Lin, and Ronald (2021); Sekar and Paulmurugan (2014); Weissleder (2002)
• Some tumour cell lines will only form solid tumours in vivo if injected orthotopically.	Kung (2007); Stephenson et al. (1992)
• Different strains of immune-competent and immune-deficient mice are commercially available to support the growth of orthotopic tumours.	Charles_River (2023); INOTIV (2023); Teicher (2006); The_Jackson_Laboratory (2023)

Disadvantages	Refs.
• The establishment of orthotopic tumour models often requires surgery, which can be technically challenging, expensive and time-consuming; as a result, low numbers of mice may be used per study reducing the statistical power of the experiments.	Bibby (2004); Loi et al. (2011); Richmond and Su (2008); Ruggeri et al. (2014); Smith, Merritt, Barr, and Thorley-Lawson (2011); Teicher (2006)
• The majority of orthotopic models are established in immune-deficient mice, making any study of the role of the immune system in tumour biology or therapy very difficult.	Herter-Sprie, Kung, and Wong (2013); Talmadge et al. (2007)
• Orthotopic tumours (except skin and mammary fat pad tumours) are not visible to the naked eye. Expensive, specialised non-invasive imaging techniques such as BLI, PET, CT, MRI and US are required to follow tumour growth and metastasis.	Kaijzel, van der Pluijm, and Lowik (2007); Liu, Su, et al. (2021); Lyons (2005); Sahai (2007); Sekar and Paulmurugan (2014); Serkova et al. (2021); van der Horst, Buijs, and van der Pluijm (2015); Weissleder (2002)
• The complexity of orthotopic models increases animal welfare considerations; the accurate determination of humane experimental end-points is challenging; the take rate for PDOX models is variable; and, tumour latency can be as long as 12 months.	Bibby (2004); Pompili et al. (2016); Ruggeri et al. (2014); Workman et al. (2010)
• A fresh tumour specimen is required to establish a patient-derived orthotopic model; ethical review processes together with obtaining the appropriate patient consents and permissions for future work can be time-consuming.	UK_Research_and_Innovation_(UKRI) (2023)

a distinct advantage of haematological tumours is that the source material is more readily available and easier to access than for solid tumours. Multiple patient samples can be obtained throughout the course of disease to model disease progression, and engraftment can recapitulate orthotopic systemic/disseminated disease (by i.v. injection) or orthotopic primary site disease (by intra-tibial or intra-femoral injection) (Griessinger et al., 2018; Richter et al., 2022).

3. Tumour organoid models

An organoid can be defined as a 3D structure grown from stem cells and consisting of organ-specific cell types that self-organizes through cell sorting and spatially restricted lineage commitment (Clevers, 2016). There has been growing interest in extending the concept of tissue organoids to encompass the use of patient-derived tumour organoids to create in vivo models (Bleijs, van de Wetering, Clevers, & Drost, 2019). To establish organoids, tumour cells can be derived from patient biopsies, surgically resected tumours, PDX tumours, or genetically engineered mouse models (Yoshida, 2020). Tumour cells are embedded in an extracellular matrix or scaffold that provides a three-dimensional structure for growth. Specific growth factors and nutrients are added to support the growth and survival of tumour cells and, over time, the tumour cells in 3D culture self-organise into organoids, forming tissue-like structures mimicking the cellular heterogeneity seen in the original tumour with expression of cell-specific markers and the development of differentiation-associated properties such as secretory functions in glandular tumours (Clevers, 2016; Jin et al., 2018; Porter, Murray, & McLean, 2020; Weeber, Ooft, Dijkstra, & Voest, 2017; Zhou, Cong, & Cong, 2021). Patient-derived tumour organoids have been established for a broad range of tumour types and have several practical advantages over patient-derived xenografts including a higher establishment success rate, more rapid establishment and the potential to generate matched normal control tissue (Nagle, Plukker, Muijs, van Luijk, & Coppes, 2018). Cancer cells can be converted between organoid culture and xenografts with high efficiency (Wang et al., 2022a) with the result that patient derived organoids have certain

benefits of both 2-D cultured cells (e.g. ease of growth, genetic manipulation, implantation success) and PDXs (e.g. orthotopic implantation and metastasis, disease-relevant tumour microenvironment/stroma) (Okazawa et al., 2018; Yoshida, 2020). Examples of the use of organoid-derived orthotopic models are shown in Table 4. Orthotopic implantation of tumours or tumour organoids is also finding an important role as an adjunct to genetically engineered mouse models where the technique provides better control of tumour position and growth than stochastic tumour development (Jackstadt et al., 2019). and also allows more simple and rapid genetic manipulation thereby curtailing the need for further in vivo model development (Fumagalli et al., 2017).

Organoids have some potential limitations, such as decreased cell diversity and heterogeneity compared with PDXs (Long, Xie, Shen, & Wen, 2022), and lack of accepted standardized methods for culture/propagation (Zhou et al., 2023a) but the benefits of these cells for establishing orthotopic/metastatic models and the ongoing development of disease-specific organoid biobanks (Andreatta et al., 2020; Beshiri, Agarwal, Yin, & Kelly, 2023; Betge & Jackstadt, 2023; Chang, Wu, Harnod, & Ding, 2022; Hollins & Parry, 2016; Jin et al., 2018; Kretzschmar, 2021; Lee et al., 2018; Li, Liu, & Chen, 2022; Low et al., 2021; Meijer, 2021; Ren, Chen, Yang, Li, & Xu, 2022; Seidlitz & Stange,

Table 4
Examples of organoid-derived orthotopic tumour models (Wang, Xiang, Zhang, & Wang, 2022).

Cancer type	Mouse strain	Injection site	Refs.
Breast	Nude	4th mammary fat pad	Sachs et al. (2018)
PDAC	Nude	Tail region of the pancreas	Boj et al. (2015); Boj et al. (2016)
GBM	NSG	Right cerebral cortex	Hubert et al. (2016); Jacob et al. (2020)
Rectum	NSG	Rectum (endoluminal)	Ganesh et al. (2019)
CRC	NSG	Colon lamina propria (mucosal)	Roper et al. (2017)
Ovary	NSG	Ovary (bursa)	Kopper et al. (2019)
Bladder	NOG	Bladder wall (submucosal)	Lee et al. (2018)

2021; Weeber et al., 2017; Yang, Wang, Wang, Zhang, & Wang, 2021; Yu et al., 2022; Zhou et al., 2021) suggest that they will find increased use in the future across a broader range of tumour types, including rare cancers (Li et al., 2022). Importantly, it has been shown that orthotopically implanted, patient-derived organoids have the potential to recapitulate patient responses in the clinic (Vlachogiannis et al., 2018).

4. Humanised mice

Human CDX, PDX and organoid orthotopic models require the use of immune-deficient mice with strains that exhibit severe immune deficiencies such as the NOD-SCID-IL2R gamma null (NSG) strain which is most often used for engraftment of primary human samples (Table 2) (Bresnahan, Lindblad, Ruiz de Galarreta, & Lujambio, 2020; Ito et al., 2002; Puchalapalli et al., 2016; Zhou, Facciponte, Jin, Shen, & Lin, 2014). The lack of an intact immune system is a significant limitation of orthotopic models grown in immune-deficient mice, but more recently NSG mice in particular have been used to establish humanised mouse models, where the defective mouse immune system is replaced ("humanised") with e.g. human peripheral blood mononuclear cells (PBMCs) or hematopoietic stem cells (HSCs) to recapitulate the human immune system. This approach has enabled the role of the immune system in cancer therapy to be investigated using xenografted human tumours rather than syngeneic mouse tumour models (Cogels et al., 2021; Theocharides, Rongvaux, Fritsch, Flavell, & Manz, 2016; Tian, Lyu, Yang, & Hu, 2020; Zitvogel, Pitt, Daillere, Smyth, & Kroemer, 2016). Although humanised mice have several advantages, there are several potential limitations: they do not fully recapitulate the human immune system (Chen, Liu, Liu, & Yang, 2023); the human-derived PBMCs or HSCs are not patient-matched to the tumour (Ma, Pilvankar, Wang, Giragossian, & Popel, 2021); and, development of graft-versus-host disease (Ehx et al., 2018; Poirier, Dilek, Mary, & Vanhove, 2012) due to the interaction of the humanised immune system with mouse tissues may occur. Approaches to address some of these shortcomings are being investigated. For example, an immune-deficient mouse model has been developed which expresses human HLA instead of mouse MHC where the immune-deficiency can be corrected by transferring functional HLA-matched PBMCs resulting in an immune-competent mouse with a more human-like immune system (Morillon 2nd, Sabzevari, Schlom, & Greiner, 2020; Zeng et al., 2017). However, the potential impact of a humanised immune system on orthotopic tumours has not been widely studied, although a humanised tumour microenvironment enhanced both prostate tumour growth and metastasis (McGovern et al., 2018; McGovern et al., 2021) suggesting that tumour biology and response to therapy could be significantly affected.

5. Metastatic models

Metastasis (*change, movement from one point to another*) is the spread of cancer cells from the primary site of disease to another part of the body and along with invasion represents a key hallmark and differentiating feature between benign and malignant tumour growth (Hanahan & Weinberg, 2000; Hanahan & Weinberg, 2011). The metastatic process is of great significance since the majority of cancer-related deaths are due to the establishment and growth of metastases rather than to the growth of the primary tumour itself (Dillekas, Rogers, & Straume, 2019; Mehlen & Puisieux, 2006; Riihimaki, Thomsen, Sundquist, Sundquist, & Hemminki, 2018).

Metastasis is a highly complex process that can be broken down into a series of discrete steps commonly referred to as the metastatic cascade. These have been described in detail elsewhere (Fares, Fares, Khachfe, Salhab, & Fares, 2020; Ganesh & Massague, 2021; Welch & Hurst, 2019) and are outlined in Table 5.

The transport of tumour cells from the primary to distant sites occurs mainly via the circulatory and lymphatic systems (Sleeman, Nazarenko, & Thiele, 2011), in theory enabling viable circulating tumour cells

Table 5
Biological steps leading to tumour metastasis.

Step	Biological Process
1.	**Tumour initiation** (mutation, oncogene expression, loss of tumour suppressor genes)
2.	**Primary tumour formation and growth**
3.	**Local invasion** (metastatic cells from the primary tumour migrate into the basement membrane and penetrate the underlying stroma)
4.	**Intravasation** (detached metastatic cells enter the general circulation (lymph, blood vessels) as circulating tumour cells (CTCs))
5.	**Circulation** (CTCs transported away from the primary tumour to distant sites around the body)
6.	**Arrest** (CTCs arrest or adhere to vessel walls in distant favourable capillary beds; pre-metastatic niches)
7.	**Extravasation** (viable CTCs cells invade vessel walls and then into the new tissue site)
8.	**Initial growth** (the tumour cells grow, and establish a conducive microenvironment for the formation of micrometastases by stimulating processes essential for their survival such as angiogenesis)
9.	**Colonization** (secondary tumour growth; micrometastases grow into clinically detectable metastases)
10.	**Further metastasis** (metastasis can occur from the initial metastases: "metastases from metastases")

(CTCs) to spread and colonise almost any tissue in the body. However, in practice, for many primary tumours, the potential anatomical sites of secondary tumour growth are more restricted. Predating our current understanding, Paget in 1889 suggested that the outcome of metastasis depends upon interactions between the tumour cells and the host tissue, with the metastatic tumour cell ("seed") being able to grow into a secondary tumour only once it has reached a sustaining organ environment ("soil") (Fidler, 2003; Paget, 1989). Today, we can think of the seed in terms of e.g. cancer stem cells, progenitor cells or initiating cells, whereas the soil encompasses specific stromal and microenvironmental factors that together constitute an amenable pre-metastatic niche (Langley & Fidler, 2007; Talmadge & Fidler, 2010). In consequence, the site of formation of metastases can depend on specific interactions between the CTCs and the prospective host growth site leading to specific patterns of metastatic spread for specific cancer types, with the main organ sites of metastasis for the commonest cancers being liver, lung, bone and brain (Table 6).

The way in which in vivo models can recapitulate the different elements of the metastatic cascade depends on how they are set up. Although implantation of tumour cells orthotopically into the tissue site of origin can recapitulate the majority of the biological steps of metastasis (Table 5), the process is difficult to study experimentally (Hoffman, 1999). As a consequence, studying the spread and growth of tumours at clinically relevant sites of metastasis (rather than at the site of the

Table 6
Most common sites of metastases (in Patients with Metastatic Disease).

Primary site	Proportion (%) of patients with metastases at organ site*
Breast	Bone 55%, Liver 36%, Lung 30%, Brain 18%
Prostate	Bone 89%, Liver 10%, Lung 7%
Colon	Liver 69%, Lung 31%, Peritoneum 14%, Bone 8%
Lung	Brain 41%, Bone 34%, Liver 23%, Lung 11%
Kidney	Lung 55%, Bone 35%, Liver 22%, Brain 18%
Ovary	Peritoneum 62%, Liver 20%, Pleura 14%, Lung 13%
Pancreas	Liver 77%, Lung 17%, Peritoneum 15%
Bladder	Bone 40%, Lung 31%, Liver 30%
Stomach	Liver 51%, Peritoneum 26%, Lung 13%, Bone 10%
Oesophagus	Liver 50%, Lung 35%, Bone 19%, Brain 9%
Liver	Liver 66%, Lung 19%, Peritoneum 16%, Bone 10%
Melanoma	Brain 47%, Lung 40%, Liver 28%, Skin 19%, Bone 17%
All sites	Liver 38%, Lung 27%, Bone 22%, Brain 13%, Peritoneum 11%

Data recalculated from Riihimaki et al. (2018).

* Only most common sites shown. Totals may exceed 100% due to multiple sites of metastases in some patients.

primary tumour) has required the development of specialised metastasis models. In vivo models of metastasis can broadly be divided into two types: experimental and spontaneous, which can recapitulate different steps of the metastatic cascade or the entire cascade itself. Experimental models of metastasis are set up by the direct injection of tumour cells into the general circulation and depending upon the injection site used, metastases will subsequently develop at specific anatomical locations. The main injection routes used are:

- Intravenous (i.v., lateral tail vein): tumour cells become trapped in the lung microvasculature to recapitulate the formation of lung metastases;
- Intra-caudal (tail artery): tumour cells form metastases in the bones of (primarily) the hind limbs;
- Intracardiac (i.c., left ventricle): by bypassing the lung microvasculature the tumour cells disseminate more widely, promoting the formation of bone and liver metastases;
- Carotid artery: this takes tumour cells directly to the brain and is used for the formation of brain metastases;
- Intra-splenic/portal vein/mesenteric vein: these routes deliver tumour cells to the liver, which is a primary site of metastasis for several solid tumours such as colon cancer;
- Intra-iliac artery: this artery supplies blood to the legs, pelvis and pelvic organs and is primarily used for the formation of bone metastases;
- Intra-peritoneal (i.p): this route is used for the local dissemination of ovarian cancer cells and is also used to recapitulate orthotopic tumour formation in the peritoneal cavity;

- Intra-tibial (i.t.): tumour cell injection into this bone can be used to study the effects of metastases on bone structure and growth, especially osteolysis.

The tail vein, tail artery and i.p. routes of injection have the advantage that they do not require the mouse to be anaesthetised or undergo any surgical procedure and are thus relatively straightforward to perform. Other routes are technically more demanding, requiring both anaesthesia and surgery.

Table 7 gives examples of different tumour cell types injected via the routes described above to establish different experimental models of metastasis. It should be noted that injection of the same tumour cell line by different routes can be used to set up models that, when taken together, recapitulate the metastatic spread seen in the human disease. For example, if MDA-MB-231 human breast tumour cells are injected into the tail vein (i.v), metastases form primarily in the lungs, whereas metastases are seen primarily in the bone and liver if the intra-caudal route is used, and in the brain if the carotid artery route is used (Table 7a).

Experimental models of metastasis have a significant disadvantage in that they do not recapitulate the initial steps of the metastatic cascade such as growth at the primary tumour site, tissue invasion and/or intravasation (Gomez-Cuadrado et al., 2017). Spontaneous models of metastasis can recapitulate the entire metastatic cascade. A primary tumour can be established at subcutaneous or orthotopic sites and although metastasis is common in many orthotopic tumour models it is only very rarely seen in subcutaneous models, with some notable

Table 7
Examples of experimental and spontaneous in vivo models of metastasis.

(a) Experimental models

Tumour	Cell line	Model	Route of injection	Main site(s) of metastasis	Refs.
Breast	MDA-MB-231	xenograft	i.v. (lateral tail vein)	lung	Minn et al. (2005)
Breast	4 T1	syngeneic	i.v. (lateral tail vein)	lung	Pillar, Polsky, Weissglas-Volkov, and Shomron (2018)
Breast	MDA-MB-231	xenograft	i.c. (left ventricle)	bone	Dunn et al. (2009)
Prostate	RM1	syngeneic	i.c. (left ventricle)	bone	Jung et al. (2013)
Ovarian	A2780	xenograft	i.p.	mesentery	Shaw, Senterman, Dawson, Crane, and Vanderhyden (2004)
Ovarian	various	xenograft	i.p.	peritoneal cavity	De Haven Brandon et al. (2020)
Melanoma	K1735	syngeneic	intra-carotid	brain	Zhang, Lowery, and Yu (2017)
Breast	MDA-MB-231	xenograft	intra-carotid	brain	Zhang et al. (2017)
Prostate	various	xeno/syn	intra-splenic	liver	Simons, Dalrymple, Rosen, Zheng, and Brennen (2020)
Colon	LoVo	xenograft	intra-splenic	liver	Kim et al. (2020)
Colon	HT29	xenograft	intra-splenic	liver	Lavilla-Alonso et al. (2011)
Colon	various	syngeneic	intra-portal	liver	Limani et al. (2016)
Colon	HT-29	xenograft	intra-portal	liver	Thalheimer et al. (2009)
Colon	SW-620	xenograft	intra-portal	liver	Thalheimer et al. (2009)
Breast	various	syngeneic	intra-portal	liver	Goddard, Fischer, and Schedin (2016)
Breast	various	xenograft	intra-iliac	bone	Yu et al. (2016)
Prostate	various	xenograft	intra-iliac	bone	Nunez-Olle, Guiu, and Gomis (2021)
Breast	MDA-MB-231	xenograft	intra-tibial	bone	Peramuhendige et al. (2018)
Prostate	VCaP	xenograft	intra-tibial	bone	Eswaraka et al. (2014)
Various	various	xeno/syn	intra-caudal	bone	Kuchimaru et al. (2018)
Breast	MCF7	xenograft	intra-caudal	bone	Han et al. (2020)

(b) Spontaneous models

Tumour type	Cells or tissue	Model type	Site of engraftment	Main site (s) of metastases	Refs.
Breast	MDA-MB-231 cells	xenograft	MFP	lymph nodes, lungs	Sommaggio et al. (2020)
Breast	patient specimen	xenograft	MFP	lungs, lymph nodes	Sommaggio et al. (2020)
Breast	patient specimen	xenograft	MFP	lungs	Fu et al. (1993)
Prostate	tumour fragments	xenograft	prostate gland	lymph nodes, pancreas, testis, liver	Salem et al. (2020)
Prostate	patient specimen	xenograft	anterior prostate	lymph nodes, lungs, liver, bone, kidneys, spleen	Wang et al. (2005)
Colon	patient specimen	xenograft	caecum wall	liver, lung, abdominal cavity	Puig et al. (2013)
Colon	patient specimen	xenograft	colon wall	liver, lung	De Angelis et al. (2022)
Colon	patient specimen	xenograft	colocaecal	lymph nodes, liver, abdominal cavity	Fu et al. (1991)
Lung	patient sample	xenograft	left upper lung	left and right lung, lymph nodes, chest wall pericardium	Wang, Fu, and Hoffman (1992)
Lung	patient sample	xenograft	parietal pleura	pleural cavity, lymph nodes	Astoul et al. (1996)
Ovarian	patient sample	xenograft	under ovary capsule	parietal peritoneum, colon, omentum, ascites	Fu and Hoffman (1993)
Pancreatic	patient sample	xenograft	surface of pancreas	lymph nodes, liver diaphragm, adrenal glands, stomach, duodenum, abdominal wall	Fu et al. (1992)
Stomach	patient specimen	xenograft	stomach serosa	lymph nodes, liver, peritoneum	Furukawa et al. (1993)

examples being the murine B16 melanoma and Lewis lung carcinoma (LLC) cell lines (Bertram & Janik, 1980; Fidler, 1973; Fidler, 2006; Gomez-Cuadrado et al., 2017).

As was described above, tumours growing orthotopically interact with their tissue of origin and more accurately recapitulate the human disease which may affect the initial steps of the metastatic cascade, enhancing the formation of metastases (Fidler, 2006). In certain models, such as the mammary fat pad model, a primary tumour can be surgically resected and the survival of the mouse prolonged allowing time for CTCs derived from the primary to develop into established metastases (Munoz et al., 2006). Although orthotopic CDX models are more common, PDOX models are increasingly being used as models of metastasis as they retain many of the characteristics of the original tumour in the patient. Examples of spontaneous models of metastasis using fresh human tumour material and which show metastatic spread in vivo similar to the human disease are shown Table 7b.

6. Visualisation of orthotopic and metastatic models

Subcutaneous tumour models are both relatively simple to set up and easy to monitor. Due to the site of tumour growth, the condition of the tumour can be monitored visually and its size measured using callipers, as has been described elsewhere (Stribbling & Ryan, 2022; Tomayko & Reynolds, 1989). However, with the exception of tumours growing in the skin or in the mammary fat pad, more sophisticated methods are required to monitor tumours growing orthotopically. Several non-invasive methods exist to evaluate tumour burden, distribution and response to therapy (Table 3). Of these, bioluminescence imaging (BLI) is the most common (Shen et al., 2020). A disadvantage of BLI is that cells require genetic modification (e.g. to express firefly luciferase) prior to implantation. To detect tumour cells, mice are injected with luciferin. Tumour cells expressing luciferase in the presence of luciferin and oxygen will produce oxyluciferin, CO_2 and photons (540 nm) in an ATP-dependent reaction. The light produced can be imaged and quantified and can be obtained from the same mouse over a prolonged time period (weeks/months) and so the technique is suitable for following both tumour growth and metastasis. Although BLI has limitations, it is technically simple to perform (requiring an i.p. injection followed by brief anaesthesia while the image is obtained), the data is simple to acquire and the images are straightforward to interpret and understand. Alternative approaches such as fluorescence imaging have similar advantages/disadvantages requiring genetic modification, but are currently less well developed. Techniques such as ultrasound, CT, MRI, PET, and SPECT have all been used to image orthotopic tumour growth, but are limited by technical complexity and sensitivity and/or the need to use radiation or radiotracers which are less suitable for longitudinal studies (de Jong, Essers, & van Weerden, 2014; Lauber et al., 2017; Serkova et al., 2021). For some specialised tumour models such as orthotopic rectal/colorectal cancers, it is possible to use colonoscopy which can provide a detailed visual and quantitative assessment of the primary tumour, but it is not suitable for assessing metastatic spread (Kodani et al., 2013).

7. Summary, challenges and future directions

In addition to advancing our understanding of the basic biological processes underlying cancer development, mouse models have played an essential role in the discovery and development of new anti-cancer medicines (Ruggeri et al., 2014), and these new drugs are now contributing to the significant decreases recently seen in cancer mortality rates (Siegel, Miller, Wagle, & Jemal, 2023), at least in some disease settings (Davis et al., 2017; MacEwan et al., 2020; Moreau Bachelard, Coquan, du Rusquec, Paoletti, & Le Tourneau, 2021). Within the context of both biology and drug development it seems likely that orthotopic, metastatic and PDX human tumour models in mice will play an increasing role in improving the success rate of translating preclinical data into improved clinical outcomes (Antonello & Nucera, 2014; Gao et al.,

2015a). Crucially, the source material (cell lines, organoids, PDXs) for orthotopic models can be selected to represent the full range of the stages of cancer from early establishment at the primary site to advanced metastases, and each approach has its advantages and disadvantages (Table 8) (Ireson et al., 2019). In addition, orthotopic models capture the key stages of cancer development from initial growth and invasion to growth at metastatic sites. Treatment of advanced disease can encounter intrinsic or acquired drug resistance – a major limitation to current therapies. Importantly, there is a high clinical concordance of drug resistance in PDOX models (Higuchi et al., 2023), reinforcing the clinical relevance of orthotopic models for identifying novel treatment options.

Compared with conventional small molecule or antibody-based anti-cancer drugs, targeted drug delivery systems such as nanoparticles are anticipated to have several advantages especially active tumour-targeting and limited normal tissue localisation (Liu et al., 2021). Importantly, orthotopic models, often combined with non-invasive imaging, have provided a key platform to confirm tumour targeting within a relevant tissue setting across a wide range of tumour sites and different targeting platforms (de Paiva et al., 2022; Elumalai, Srinivasan, & Shanmugam, 2024; Jing et al., 2022; Liu et al., 2022; Lu et al., 2013; Wang et al., 2022b). Nonetheless, few targeted drug delivery therapeutics have been approved as anti-cancer therapies (Liu et al., 2021), so it may be important for future studies to investigate whether tumour targeting is retained in more clinically relevant PDOX models in the context of a humanised immune system.

The increasing number of antibody-based therapies and drugs targeting the immune system in development has highlighted the need for the future development both of mouse models that more completely reflect the human immune system (Allen et al., 2019) and for genetically modified mouse models that express functional human versions of mouse proteins that can be targeted by human-specific antibody-directed therapies (Allen et al., 2019).

A limitation of most orthotopic human tumour models is the absence of human cell types in the tumour microenvironment in mice. Although some components of the human immune system can be included by transplantation of precursors into immune-deficient mice, other key stromal cell types such as endothelial cells and fibroblasts, which may be important in therapy response or establishing metastatic niches, are absent and maintaining a fully functioning humanised haematological system (neutrophils, erythrocytes, platelets, lymphatics) is not yet possible, although some significant advances have been made (Shultz, Brehm, Garcia-Martinez, & Greiner, 2012; Theocharides et al., 2016; Zhou et al., 2023b).

Monitoring tumour growth in orthotopic and metastatic tumour models remains a significant challenge (de Jong et al., 2014; Lauber et al., 2017). Whilst bioluminescence imaging is widely used and is generally considered a reliable method to assess tumour burden (Shen et al., 2020), it has technical and biological limitations (Baklaushev et al., 2017; Shen et al., 2020), including the need to genetically modify tumour cells to express luciferase which may affect immune responses (Podetz-Pedersen, Vezys, Somia, Russell, & McIvor, 2014). Alternative optical imaging approaches such as expression of fluorescent proteins are possible (Cool, Breyne, Meyer, De Smedt, & Sanders, 2013), but also require genetic modification and are additionally limited by tissue penetration by light, although this may be addressed by advances in tomography methods and use of near-infrared fluorophores (de Jong et al., 2014) but these approaches have yet to find widespread use.

Non-invasive imaging techniques such as MRI (Ravoori et al., 2019), CT (Myers et al., 2022), and US (Curiel-Garcia, Decker-Farrell, Sastra, & Olive, 2022) allow the detection and monitoring of non-genetically modified orthotopic tumours and may have an advantage over bioluminescence imaging because no genetic manipulation is required and they are more directly translatable to the clinic (de Jong et al., 2014). An important area for further investigation is multimodal imaging of tumours which can combine the benefits of both optical and non-invasive

Table 8
Advantages and Disadvantages of Different Orthotopic tumour models.

Orthotopic Model	Main Characteristics	Advantages	Disadvantages	Main application
Cell line derived xenograft (CDX) or syngeneic tumour	Xenograft: human tumour cells are injected into their tissue of origin in immune-deficient mice. Syngeneic: murine tumour cells are injected into their tissue of origin in immune-competent mice.	Very straightforward to set up. Many different well-characterised tumour cell lines are very widely available. Intact immune system (syngeneic only).	Cell lines may highly differ from original source tumour. Homogeneous tumour with poorly developed microenvironment. No intact immune system (xenograft).	Confirmation in a disease relevant setting of in vitro and in vivo findings (from subcutaneous models).
Patient-derived xenograft (PDX)	Fresh human tumour tissue from a biopsy or surgery is propagated subcutaneously and transplanted into its tissue of origin in immune-incompetent mice.	The tumour retains the original genetic and histological characteristics, 3D architecture and defined stromal structure. Results are more predictive of the human disease. Fresh tissue enables work with minimally manipulated tumour samples. Tissue obtained pretreatment, on-treatment and post-treatment allows study of various stages of therapy response.	Lengthy time required for tumour establishment and passaging. Low/variable take rate. Human stroma slowly replaced by murine stroma. No intact immune system.	Preclinical trials to predict patient responses in the clinic.
Patient-derived organoid xenograft	Organoids are derived from fresh human tumour tissue from a biopsy or surgery. They are propagated in vitro and transplanted into its tissue of origin in immune-deficient mice.	In vitro propagation is relatively simple. The tumour retains many (but not all) of the original heterogeneous genetic and histological characteristics, 3D architecture and defined stromal structure. Results may be predictive of responses in human disease.	Methods for the derivation and culture of organoids are not standardized. Tumour organoids may not fully capture the heterogeneity present in original tumours. In vitro cell culture propagation may lead to genetic and phenotypic drift. No intact immune system	A potentially more accessible and practicable alternative to PDX
Cell line or organoid derived from genetically engineered mouse (GEM).	Cell lines or organoids are established from tumours isolated from genetically engineered mice.	Straightforward to set up. Tumours arise in defined conditions with known natural history. Tumours are genetically defined and may have conditional activation/inactivation of multiple target genes. Tumours have well-defined stroma and same-species molecular interactions Intact immune system.	Tumours do not have the high level of genetic heterogeneity present in human tumours. Tumours do not generally metastasise. Tumour responses may not be predictive of (more complex) human disease.	Most refined models for investigating tumour biology. Identifying and validating new tumour targets.

approaches (Haldorsen et al., 2015; Scheepbouwer, Meyer, Burggraaf, Jose, & Molthoff, 2016; Wu et al., 2016).

Positron-emission tomography (PET), most notably ^{18}F-fluorodeoxyglucose (FDG) PET is used clinically for the detection of tumours and metastases but is not used widely in preclinical studies of orthotopic tumour growth or response to therapy, primarily because of its lack of spatial resolution (2–3 mm), high cost, and technical complexity. Nonetheless, by combining with optical imaging studies, PET studies can provide important functional information (e.g. metabolism, hypoxia, proliferation) on the effects of treatment on orthotopic tumours which is directly relevant to clinical development (Fu et al., 2016; Fushiki et al., 2013; Haldorsen et al., 2015; Song et al., 2016). In addition, with recent developments of theranostic agents (which couple an ^{18}F-labelled diagnostic biomarker and a radiolabelled therapeutic agent) (Bodei, Herrmann, Schöder, Scott, & Lewis, 2022) there is increasing interest in studying ^{18}F-labelled ligands such as PSMA and FAPI as PET tracers to determine tumour growth in orthotopic tumour models, again with the potential for direct translation to the clinic (Holzgreve et al., 2021; Kirchner et al., 2021; Zhang et al., 2022).

Established tumour cell lines have been most widely used for orthotopic and metastatic tumour models because they are easy to culture, have been studied in multiple laboratories and importantly are readily available from international tumour cell line banks such as ATCC (www.atcc.org), ECACC (www.ukbrcn.org), and RIKEN (cell.brc.riken.jp). Biobanks of PDX tumours, usually focussing on a particular disease site are being developed (Abdirahman et al., 2020; Bürtin et al., 2021; Damhofer et al., 2015; Elst et al., 2022; Manzella et al., 2020; Matschos et al., 2021; Moy et al., 2022; Tanaka et al., 2022) but the complexities of their growth, maintenance and distribution will likely limit their more widespread use in preclinical studies. However,

the recent rapid growth of disease-specific organoid biobanks, including in the major cancer types (Beshiri et al., 2018; Ebisudani et al., 2023; Farin et al., 2023; Shi et al., 2020; Shu et al., 2022) suggests that organoid methodology will play an increasing role in orthotopic tumour models in the future, especially where matched PDX/organoid samples are available (Beshiri et al., 2018; Xu et al., 2023).

A large-scale investigation of established therapies of approximately 1000 subcutaneous PDX tumours representing the major tumour types demonstrated that these models had good predictive value for clinical efficacy (Gao et al., 2015b). Nonetheless, the study also revealed that only a proportion of PDXs for a specific tumour responded to disease-specific therapies, in line with observed interpatient heterogeneity in response observed in clinical studies (Gao et al., 2015b). Consequently, studies using a single or a small number of PDX models to study biology or drug responses may be insufficient to draw firm conclusions, and multiple PDXs of a particular disease type (representing individual patients) may be needed to better estimate clinical efficacy. Importantly, although orthotopic models are thought to be more clinically relevant and therefore potentially more predictive of drug efficacy in patients than subcutaneous tumours (Garber, 2006; Ireson et al., 2019; Killion, Radinsky, & Fidler, 1998b; Villarroel et al., 2009), a comprehensive study to confirm this using patient-derived tumours and up-to-date therapies has yet to be carried out.

Many of the research examples that have been highlighted are from the most common cancer types. However, a significant gap exists in using in vitro and in vivo models, including orthotopic and metastatic models, to study a broad range of rare cancer (defined as incidence of <6 cases per 100,000 people per year) (Gatta et al., 2011) which as a group are often overlooked in terms of research attention. Importantly, when taken together, rare cancers constitute approximately 24% of all prevalent cancers (Gatta et al., 2011) representing an important

underserved disease group. However, the ongoing development of disease-specific banks of PDXs and organoids present an important opportunity that should facilitate bringing a broader range of rare tumour types into orthotopic and other mouse models (Li et al., 2022).

Although more technically difficult, more expensive, and placing a greater burden on animal welfare than subcutaneous tumour models, the promise of greater clinical predictivity has driven a growing interest in the use of orthotopic tumour models earlier in the drug development process.

In addition to the insights provided into the biological processes of oncogenesis and metastasis, orthotopic and metastatic models can be utilised at multiple stages of the drug discovery process, each serving specific purposes. In early discovery, orthotopic models can provide stronger validation of potential targets, by implanting cancer cells in the organ of origin to assess the relevance of a specific molecular target in a physiologically relevant context. In later stages (hit-identification and lead optimisation), as drug candidates emerge, orthotopic and metastatic models help assess anti-tumour efficacy and specificity in a more realistic tumour microenvironment. At candidate selection, when comparing several molecules, orthotopic models provide the most relevant physiological setting for choosing potential clinical candidates. As novel agents progress into the clinic, orthotopic models can bridge the gap between preclinical and clinical studies where insights can identify biologically relevant biomarkers and inform the design of early-phase clinical trials (Abou-Elkacem et al., 2013; Higuchi et al., 2018; Kabraji et al., 2023; Patton et al., 2021).

Improved humanised mouse models and increased accessibility to patient-derived tumours and organoids through the establishment of biobanks seems likely to further accelerate this interest. In parallel, further advances in non-invasive imaging techniques that accurately monitor growth of orthoptic and metastatic disease in mice offer a more direct translation of preclinical findings into the clinic. In conclusion, orthoptic tumour models now appear poised to take their place alongside subcutaneous tumour models as an essential component of the preclinical evaluation of new anti-cancer therapies.

CRediT authorship contribution statement

Stephen M. Stribbling: Writing – review & editing, Writing – original draft, Conceptualization. **Callum Beach:** Writing – review & editing. **Anderson J. Ryan:** Writing – review & editing, Writing – original draft, Funding acquisition, Conceptualization.

Declaration of competing interest

The Authors report no conflicts of interest.

The Authors have no affiliations with or involvement with any organization or entity with any financial or commercial interest (such as honoraria; educational grants; participation in speakers' bureaus; membership, employment, consultancies, stock ownership, or other equity interest; and expert testimony or patent-licensing arrangements) in the subject matter or materials discussed in this manuscript.

Acknowledgments

References

Abdirahman, S. M., et al. (2020). A biobank of colorectal cancer patient-derived xenografts. *Cancers (Basel) 12*. https://doi.org/10.3390/cancers12092340.

Abdolahi, S., et al. (2022). Patient-derived xenograft (PDX) models, applications and challenges in cancer research. *Journal of Translational Medicine 20*, 206. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12967-022-03405-8.

Abou-Elkacem, L., et al. (2013). Regorafenib inhibits growth, angiogenesis, and metastasis in a highly aggressive, orthotopic colon cancer model. *Molecular Cancer Therapeutics 12*, 1322–1331. https://doi.org/10.1158/1535-7163.Mct-12-1162.

Abu Quora, H. A., et al. (2021). Microenvironment of mammary fat pads affected the characteristics of the tumors derived from the induced cancer stem cells. *American Journal of Cancer Research 11*, 3475–3495.

Adigbli, G., et al. (2020). Humanization of Immunodeficient animals for the modeling of transplantation, graft versus host disease, and regenerative medicine. *Transplantation 104*, 2290–2306. https://doi.org/10.1097/tp.0000000000003177.

Allen, T. M., et al. (2019). Humanized immune system mouse models: Progress, challenges and opportunities. *Nature Immunology 20*, 770–774. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41590-019-0416-z.

Alsawaftah, N., Farooq, A., Dhou, S., & Majdalawieh, A. F. (2021). Bioluminescence imaging applications in Cancer: A comprehensive review. *IEEE Reviews in Biomedical Engineering 14*, 307–326. https://doi.org/10.1109/RBME.2020.2995124.

Amini, M. A., et al. (2019). Combining tumor microenvironment modulating nanoparticles with doxorubicin to enhance chemotherapeutic efficacy and boost antitumor immunity. *Journal of the National Cancer Institute 111*, 399–408. https://doi.org/10.1093/jnci/djy131.

Andreatta, F., et al. (2020). The organoid era permits the development of new applications to study glioblastoma. *Cancers (Basel) 12*. https://doi.org/10.3390/cancers12113303.

Anker, J. F., Mok, H., Naseem, A. F., Thumbikat, P., & Abdulkadir, S. A. (2018). A bioluminescent and fluorescent orthotopic syngeneic murine model of androgen-dependent and castration-resistant prostate cancer. *Journal of Visualized Experiments*. https://doi.org/10.3791/57301.

Antonello, Z. A., & Nucera, C. (2014). Orthotopic mouse models for the preclinical and translational study of targeted therapies against metastatic human thyroid carcinoma with BRAF(V600E) or wild-type BRAF. *Oncogene 33*, 5397–5404. https://doi.org/10.1038/onc.2013.544.

Astoul, P., Wang, X., Colt, H., Boutin, C., & Hoffman, R. (1996). A patient-like human malignant pleural mesothelioma nude-mouse model. *Oncology Reports 3*, 483–487.

ATCC (2023). Oncology and immuno-oncology. https://www.atcc.org/applications/oncology-and-immuno-oncology>.

Baklaushev, V. P., et al. (2017). Luciferase expression allows bioluminescence imaging but imposes limitations on the Orthotopic mouse (4T1) model of breast cancer. *Scientific Reports 7*, 7715. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-017-07851-z.

Behbod, F., et al. (2009). An intraductal human-in-mouse transplantation model mimics the subtypes of ductal carcinoma in situ. *Breast Cancer Research 11*, R66. https://doi.org/10.1186/bcr2358.

Belluomini, L., et al. (2022). SCLC treatment in the Immuno-oncology era: Current evidence and unmet needs. *Frontiers in Oncology 12*, Article 840783. https://doi.org/10.3389/fonc.2022.840783.

Bertram, J. S., & Janik, P. (1980). Establishment of a cloned line of Lewis lung carcinoma cells adapted to cell culture. *Cancer Letters 11*, 63–73. https://doi.org/10.1016/0304-3835(80)90130-5.

Beshiri, M., Agarwal, S., Yin, J. J., & Kelly, K. (2023). Prostate organoids: Emerging experimental tools for translational research. *The Journal of Clinical Investigation 133*. https://doi.org/10.1172/jci169616.

Beshiri, M. L., et al. (2018). A PDX/organoid biobank of advanced prostate cancers captures genomic and phenotypic heterogeneity for disease modeling and therapeutic screening. *Clinical Cancer Research 24*, 4332–4345. https://doi.org/10.1158/1078-0432.Ccr-18-0409.

Betge, J., & Jackstadt, R. (2023). From organoids to bedside: Advances in modeling, decoding and targeting of colorectal cancer. *International Journal of Cancer 152*, 1304–1313. https://doi.org/10.1002/ijc.34297.

Bianco, J., et al. (2017). Novel model of orthotopic U-87 MG glioblastoma resection in athymic nude mice. *Journal of Neuroscience Methods 284*, 96–102. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jneumeth.2017.04.019.

Bibby, M. C. (2004). Orthotopic models of cancer for preclinical drug evaluation: Advantages and disadvantages. *European Journal of Cancer 40*, 852–857. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejca.2003.11.021.

Bleijs, M., van de Wetering, M., Clevers, H., & Drost, J. (2019). Xenograft and organoid model systems in cancer research. *The EMBO Journal 38*, Article e101654. https://doi.org/10.15252/embj.2019101654.

Bodei, L., Herrmann, K., Schöder, H., Scott, A. M., & Lewis, J. S. (2022). Radiotheranostics in oncology: Current challenges and emerging opportunities. *Nature Reviews Clinical Oncology 19*, 534–550. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41571-022-00652-y.

Boj, S. F., et al. (2015). Organoid models of human and mouse ductal pancreatic cancer. *Cell 160*, 324–338. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cell.2014.12.021.

Boj, S. F., et al. (2016). Model organoids provide new research opportunities for ductal pancreatic cancer. *Molecular & Cellular Oncology 3*, Article e1014757. https://doi.org/10.1080/23723556.2015.1014757.

Bresnahan, E., Lindblad, K. E., Ruiz de Galarreta, M., & Lujambio, A. (2020). Mouse models of oncoimmunology in hepatocellular carcinoma. *Clinical Cancer Research 26*, 5276–5286. https://doi.org/10.1158/1078-0432.CCR-19-2923.

Bupathi, M., Kaseb, A., Meric-Bernstam, F., & Naing, A. (2015). Hepatocellular carcinoma: Where there is unmet need. *Molecular Oncology 9*, 1501–1509. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.molonc.2015.06.005.

Bürtin, F., et al. (2021). Creation and maintenance of a living biobank - how we do it. *Journal of Visualized Experiments*. https://doi.org/10.3791/62065.

Busuttil, R. A., et al. (2018). An orthotopic mouse model of gastric cancer invasion and metastasis. *Scientific Reports 8*, 825. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-017-19025-y.

Cai, J., et al. (2022). Establishment of an optimized orthotopic bladder cancer model in mice. *BMC Urology 22*, 142. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12894-022-01093-6.

Calles, A., Rubio-Viqueira, B., & Hidalgo, M. (2013). Primary human non-small cell lung and pancreatic tumorgraft models–utility and applications in drug discovery and

tumor biology. *Current Protocols in Pharmacology Chapter 14.* https://doi.org/10.1002/0471141755.ph1426s61 Unit 14 26.

Carrillo, P., et al. (2023). The synthetic molecule staupride impairs cell growth and migration in triple-negative breast cancer. *Biomedicine & Pharmacotherapy 158*, Article 114070. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biopha.2022.114070.

Chan, E. S., et al. (2009). Optimizing orthotopic bladder tumor implantation in a syngeneic mouse model. *The Journal of Urology 182*, 2926–2931. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.juro.2009.08.020.

Chang, Y. H., Wu, K. C., Harnod, T., & Ding, D. C. (2022). The organoid: A research model for ovarian cancer. *Tzu Chi Medical Journal 34*, 255–260. https://doi.org/10.4103/tcmj.tcmj_63_21.

Chao, C., et al. (2017). Patient-derived xenografts from colorectal carcinoma: A temporal and hierarchical study of murine stromal cell replacement. *Anticancer Research 37*, 3405–3412. https://doi.org/10.21873/anticanres.11707.

Charles_River (2023). Research models and services. https://www.criver.com/products-services/research-models-services>.

Chen, B., Liu, H., Liu, Z., & Yang, F. (2023). Benefits and limitations of humanized mouse models for human red blood cell-related disease research. *Frontiers in Hematology 1*. https://doi.org/10.3389/frhem.2022.1062705.

Chen, J., et al. (2022b). The development and improvement of immunodeficient mice and humanized immune system mouse models. *Frontiers in Immunology 13*, Article 1007579. https://doi.org/10.3389/fimmu.2022.1007579.

Chen, Y. C., et al. (2022a). Human amniotic fluid mesenchymal stem cells attenuate pancreatic cancer cell proliferation and tumor growth in an orthotopic xenograft mouse model. *Stem Cell Research & Therapy 13*, 235. https://doi.org/10.1186/s13287-022-02910-3.

Cho, H., et al. (2016). On-target efficacy of a HIF-2alpha antagonist in preclinical kidney cancer models. *Nature 539*, 107–111. https://doi.org/10.1038/nature19795.

Choi, S., et al. (2008). Vandetanib inhibits growth of adenoid cystic carcinoma in an orthotopic nude mouse model. *Clinical Cancer Research 14*, 5081–5089. https://doi.org/10.1158/1078-0432.CCR-08-0245.

Chulpanova, D. S., Kitaeva, K. V., Rutland, C. S., Rizvanov, A. A., & Solovyeva, V. V. (2020). Mouse tumor models for advanced Cancer immunotherapy. *International Journal of Molecular Sciences 21*. https://doi.org/10.3390/ijms21114118.

Cifuentes, F. F., Valenzuela, R. H., Contreras, H. R., & Castellon, E. A. (2015). Development of an orthotopic model of human metastatic prostate cancer in the NOD-SCIDgamma mouse (Mus musculus) anterior prostate. *Oncology Letters 10*, 2142–2148. https://doi.org/10.3892/ol.2015.3522.

Clevers, H. (2016). Modeling development and disease with organoids. *Cell 165*, 1586–1597. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cell.2016.05.082.

Cogels, M. M., et al. (2021). Humanized mice as a valuable pre-clinical model for cancer immunotherapy research. *Frontiers in Oncology 11*, Article 784947. https://doi.org/10.3389/fonc.2021.784947.

Cook, N., Jodrell, D. I., & Tuveson, D. A. (2012). Predictive in vivo animal models and translation to clinical trials. *Drug Discovery Today 17*, 253–260. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.drudis.2012.02.003.

Cool, S. K., Breyne, K., Meyer, E., De Smedt, S. C., & Sanders, N. N. (2013). Comparison of in vivo optical systems for bioluminescence and fluorescence imaging. *Journal of Fluorescence 23*, 909–920. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10895-013-1215-9.

Cree, I. A., & Charlton, P. (2017). Molecular chess? Hallmarks of anti-cancer drug resistance. *BMC Cancer 17*, 10. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12885-016-2999-1.

Cui, W., et al. (2020). Discovering anti-Cancer drugs via computational methods. *Frontiers in Pharmacology 11*, 733. https://doi.org/10.3389/fphar.2020.00733.

Curiel-Garcia, A., Decker-Farrell, A. R., Sastra, S. A., & Olive, K. P. (2022). Generation of orthotopic patient-derived xenograft models for pancreatic cancer using tumor slices. *STAR Protocols 3*, Article 101899. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.xpro.2022.101899.

Damhofer, H., et al. (2015). Establishment of patient-derived xenograft models and cell lines for malignancies of the upper gastrointestinal tract. *Journal of Translational Medicine 13*, 115. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12967-015-0469-1.

Daniel, V. C., et al. (2009). A primary xenograft model of small-cell lung cancer reveals irreversible changes in gene expression imposed by culture in vitro. *Cancer Research 69*, 3364–3373. https://doi.org/10.1158/0008-5472.CAN-08-4210.

Davis, C., et al. (2017). Availability of evidence of benefits on overall survival and quality of life of cancer drugs approved by European medicines agency: Retrospective cohort study of drug approvals 2009-13. *BMJ 359*, Article j4530. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.j4530.

Day, C. P., Merlino, G., & Van Dyke, T. (2015). Preclinical mouse cancer models: A maze of opportunities and challenges. *Cell 163*, 39–53. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cell.2015.08.068.

De Angelis, M. L., et al. (2022). An Orthotopic patient-derived xenograft (PDX) model allows the analysis of metastasis-associated features in colorectal cancer. *Frontiers in Oncology 12*, Article 869485. https://doi.org/10.3389/fonc.2022.869485.

De Haven Brandon, A., et al. (2020). Identification of ovarian high-grade serous carcinoma cell lines that show estrogen-sensitive growth as xenografts in immunocompromised mice. *Scientific Reports 10*, 10799. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-020-67533-1.

Decio, A., & Giavazzi, R. (2016). Orthotopic model of ovarian Cancer. *Methods in Molecular Biology 1464*, 139–149. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4939-3999-2_13.

DeRose, Y. S., et al. (2011). Tumor grafts derived from women with breast cancer authentically reflect tumor pathology, growth, metastasis and disease outcomes. *Nature Medicine 17*, 1514–1520. https://doi.org/10.1038/nm.2454.

Dillekas, H., Rogers, M. S., & Straume, O. (2019). Are 90% of deaths from cancer caused by metastases? *Cancer Medicine 8*, 5574–5576. https://doi.org/10.1002/cam4.2474.

Ding, J., Wang, C., & Chang, X. (2018). Establishment of a bioluminescent Renca cell line for renal carcinoma research. *International Urology and Nephrology 50*, 55–61. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11255-017-1707-7.

Dos Santos, M. S. C., et al. (2018). Nanographene oxide-methylene blue as phototherapies platform for breast tumor ablation and metastasis prevention in a syngeneic orthotopic murine model. *Journal of Nanobiotechnology 16*, 9. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12951-018-0333-6.

Dunn, L. K., et al. (2009). Hypoxia and TGF-beta drive breast cancer bone metastases through parallel signaling pathways in tumor cells and the bone microenvironment. *PLoS One 4*, Article e6896. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0006896.

Ebisudani, T., et al. (2023). Genotype-phenotype mapping of a patient-derived lung cancer organoid biobank identifies NKX2-1-defined Wnt dependency in lung adenocarcinoma. *Cell Reports 42*, Article 112212. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.celrep.2023.112212.

ECACC (2023). The European collection of authenticated cell cultures. https://www.culturecollections.org.uk/>.

Edinger, M., et al. (2002). Advancing animal models of neoplasia through in vivo bioluminescence imaging. *European Journal of Cancer 38*, 2128–2136. https://doi.org/10.1016/s0959-8049(02)00410-0.

Ehx, G., et al. (2018). Xenogeneic graft-versus-host disease in humanized NSG and NSG-HLA-A2/HHD mice. *Frontiers in Immunology 9*, 1943. https://doi.org/10.3389/fimmu.2018.01943.

Elst, L., et al. (2022). Establishment and characterization of advanced penile cancer patient-derived tumor xenografts: Paving the way for personalized treatments. *European Urology Focus 8*, 1787–1794. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.euf.2022.04.012.

Elumalai, K., Srinivasan, S., & Shanmugam, A. (2024). Review of the efficacy of nanoparticle-based drug delivery systems for cancer treatment. *Biomedical Technology 5*, 109–122. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bmt.2023.09.001.

Erstad, D. J., et al. (2018). Orthotopic and heterotopic murine models of pancreatic cancer and their different responses to FOLFIRINOX chemotherapy. *Disease Models & Mechanisms 11*. https://doi.org/10.1242/dmm.034793.

Eswaraka, J., et al. (2014). Axitinib and crizotinib combination therapy inhibits bone loss in a mouse model of castration resistant prostate cancer. *BMC Cancer 14*, 742. https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2407-14-742.

Evans, J. P., et al. (2019). Development of an orthotopic syngeneic murine model of colorectal cancer for use in translational research. *Laboratory Animals 53*, 598–609. https://doi.org/10.1177/0023677219826165.

Fares, J., Fares, M. Y., Khachfe, H. H., Salhab, H. A., & Fares, Y. (2020). Molecular principles of metastasis: A hallmark of cancer revisited. *Signal Transduction and Targeted Therapy 5*, 28. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41392-020-0134-x.

Farin, H. F., et al. (2023). Colorectal cancer organoid-stroma biobank allows subtype-specific assessment of individualized therapy responses. *Cancer Discovery*. https://doi.org/10.1158/2159-8290.Cd-23-0050.

Fidler, I. J. (1973). Selection of successive tumour lines for metastasis. *Nature: New Biology 242*, 148–149. https://doi.org/10.1038/newbio242148a0.

Fidler, I. J. (2003). The pathogenesis of cancer metastasis: The "seed and soil" hypothesis revisited. *Nature Reviews. Cancer 3*, 453–458. https://doi.org/10.1038/nrc1098.

Fidler, I. J. (2006). Models for spontaneous metastasis. *Cancer Research 66*, 9787. https://doi.org/10.1158/0008-5472.CAN-06-2396.

Fiebig, H. H., Maier, A., & Burger, A. M. (2004). Clonogenic assay with established human tumour xenografts: Correlation of in vitro to in vivo activity as a basis for anticancer drug discovery. *European Journal of Cancer 40*, 802–820. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejca.2004.01.009.

Flatmark, K., Maelandsmo, G. M., Martinsen, M., Rasmussen, H., & Fodstad, O. (2004). Twelve colorectal cancer cell lines exhibit highly variable growth and metastatic capacities in an orthotopic model in nude mice. *European Journal of Cancer 40*, 1593–1598. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejca.2004.02.023.

Fowlkes, N., et al. (2019). Factors affecting growth kinetics and spontaneous metastasis in the B16F10 syngeneic murine melanoma model. *Comparative Medicine 69*, 48–54. https://doi.org/10.30802/AALAS-CM-18-000036.

Fu, X., Guadagni, F., & Hoffman, R. M. (1992). A metastatic nude-mouse model of human pancreatic cancer constructed orthotopically with histologically intact patient specimens. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America 89*, 5645–5649. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.89.12.5645.

Fu, X., & Hoffman, R. M. (1993). Human ovarian carcinoma metastatic models constructed in nude mice by orthotopic transplantation of histologically-intact patient specimens. *Anticancer Research 13*, 283–286.

Fu, X., Le, P., & Hoffman, R. M. (1993). A metastatic orthotopic-transplant nude-mouse model of human patient breast cancer. *Anticancer Research 13*, 901–904.

Fu, X. Y., Besterman, J. M., Monosov, A., & Hoffman, R. M. (1991). Models of human metastatic colon cancer in nude mice orthotopically constructed by using histologically intact patient specimens. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America 88*, 9345–9349. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.88.20.9345.

Fu, Y., et al. (2016). A dual tracer 18F-FCH/18F-FDG PET imaging of an Orthotopic brain tumor xenograft model. *PLoS One 11*, Article e0148123. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0148123.

Fumagalli, A., et al. (2017). Genetic dissection of colorectal cancer progression by orthotopic transplantation of engineered cancer organoids. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America 114*, E2357–E2364. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1701219114.

Furukawa, T., Kubota, T., Watanabe, M., Kitajima, M., & Hoffman, R. M. (1993). Orthotopic transplantation of histologically intact clinical specimens of stomach cancer to nude mice: Correlation of metastatic sites in mouse and individual patient donors. *International Journal of Cancer 53*, 608–612. https://doi.org/10.1002/ijc.2910530414.

Fushiki, H., et al. (2013). Pre-clinical validation of orthotopically-implanted pulmonary tumor by imaging with 18F-fluorothymidine-positron emission tomography/computed tomography. *Anticancer Research 33*, 4741–4749.

Ganesh, K., & Massague, J. (2021). Targeting metastatic cancer. *Nature Medicine 27*, 34–44. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41591-020-01195-4.

Ganesh, K., et al. (2019). A rectal cancer organoid platform to study individual responses to chemoradiation. *Nature Medicine 25*, 1607–1614. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41591-019-0584-2.

Gao, H., et al. (2015a). High-throughput screening using patient-derived tumor xenografts to predict clinical trial drug response. *Nature Medicine 21*, 1318–1325. https://doi.org/10.1038/nm.3954.

Gao, H., et al. (2015b). High-throughput screening using patient-derived tumor xenografts to predict clinical trial drug response. *Nature Medicine 21*, 1318–1325. https://doi.org/10.1038/nm.3954.

Garber, K. (2006). Realistic Rodents? Debate grows over new mouse models of Cancer. *JNCI Journal of the National Cancer Institute 98*, 1176–1178. https://doi.org/10.1093/jnci/djj381.

Garrido-Laguna, I., et al. (2011). Tumor engraftment in nude mice and enrichment in stroma- related gene pathways predict poor survival and resistance to gemcitabine in patients with pancreatic cancer. *Clinical Cancer Research 17*, 5793–5800. https://doi.org/10.1158/1078-0432.CCR-11-0341.

Gatta, G., et al. (2011). Rare cancers are not so rare: The rare cancer burden in Europe. *European Journal of Cancer 47*, 2493–2511. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejca.2011.08.008.

Gengenbacher, N., Singhal, M., & Augustin, H. G. (2017). Preclinical mouse solid tumour models: Status quo, challenges and perspectives. *Nature Reviews. Cancer 17*, 751–765. https://doi.org/10.1038/nrc2017.92.

Georges, L. M. C., et al. (2019). Cell line derived xenograft mouse models are a suitable in vivo model for studying tumor budding in colorectal cancer. *Frontiers in Medicine (Lausanne) 6*, 139. https://doi.org/10.3389/fmed.2019.00139.

Gillet, J. P., et al. (2011). Redefining the relevance of established cancer cell lines to the study of mechanisms of clinical anti-cancer drug resistance. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America 108*, 18708–18713. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1111840108.

Goddard, E. T., Fischer, J., & Schedin, P. (2016). A portal vein injection model to study liver metastasis of breast cancer. *Journal of Visualized Experiments.* https://doi.org/10.3791/54903.

Gomez-Cuadrado, L, Tracey, N., Ma, R., Qian, B., & Brunton, V. G. (2017). Mouse models of metastasis: Progress and prospects. *Disease Models & Mechanisms 10*, 1061–1074. https://doi.org/10.1242/dmm.030403.

Gonzalez-Pastor, R., et al. (2019). Defining a murine ovarian cancer model for the evaluation of conditionally-replicative adenovirus (CRAd) virotherapy agents. *Journal of Ovarian Research 12*, 18. https://doi.org/10.1186/s13048-019-0493-5.

Greenlee, J. D., & King, M. R. (2022). A syngeneic MC38 orthotopic mouse model of colorectal cancer metastasis. *Biology Methods & Protocols 7*, Article bpac024. https://doi.org/10.1093/biomethods/bpac024.

Griessinger, E., et al. (2018). Acute myeloid leukemia xenograft success prediction: Saving time. *Experimental Hematology 59*, 66–71.e64. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.exphem.2017.12.002.

Guo, J., et al. (2017). Establishment of two ovarian cancer orthotopic xenograft mouse models for in vivo imaging: A comparative study. *International Journal of Oncology 51*, 1199–1208. https://doi.org/10.3892/ijo.2017.4115.

Haldorsen, I. S., et al. (2015). Multimodal imaging of orthotopic mouse model of endometrial carcinoma. *PLoS One 10*, Article e0135220. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0135220.

Han, Y., et al. (2020). Establishment and characterization of highly osteolytic luminal breast cancer cell lines by intracaudal arterial injection. *Genes to Cells 25*, 111–123. https://doi.org/10.1111/gtc.12743.

Hanahan, D., & Weinberg, R. A. (2000). The hallmarks of cancer. *Cell 100*, 57–70. https://doi.org/10.1016/s0092-8674(00)81683-9.

Hanahan, D., & Weinberg, R. A. (2011). Hallmarks of cancer: The next generation. *Cell 144*, 646–674. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cell.2011.02.013.

Hausser, H. J., & Brenner, R. E. (2005). Phenotypic instability of Saos-2 cells in long-term culture. *Biochemical and Biophysical Research Communications 333*, 216–222. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bbrc.2005.05.097.

Herter-Sprie, G. S., Kung, A. L., & Wong, K. K. (2013). New cast for a new era: Preclinical cancer drug development revisited. *The Journal of Clinical Investigation 123*, 3639–3645. https://doi.org/10.1172/JCI68340.

Hidalgo, M., et al. (2014). Patient-derived xenograft models: An emerging platform for translational cancer research. *Cancer Discovery 4*, 998–1013. https://doi.org/10.1158/2159-8290.CD-14-0001.

Higuchi, T., et al. (2018). Investigation into metastatic processes and the therapeutic effects of gemcitabine on human pancreatic cancer using an orthotopic SUIT-2 pancreatic cancer mouse model. *Oncology Letters 15*, 3091–3099. https://doi.org/10.3892/ol.2017.7722.

Higuchi, T., et al. (2023). High clinical concordance of drug resistance in patient-derived Orthotopic xenograft (PDOX) mouse models: First step to validated precise individualized cancer chemotherapy. *Anticancer Research 43*, 4277–4284. https://doi.org/10.21873/anticanres.16622.

Hiroshima, Y., et al. (2016). Patient-derived mouse models of cancer need to be orthotopic in order to evaluate targeted anti-metastatic therapy. *Oncotarget 7*, 71696–71702. https://doi.org/10.18632/oncotarget.12322.

Hoffman, R. M. (1999). Orthotopic metastatic mouse models for anticancer drug discovery and evaluation: A bridge to the clinic. *Investigational New Drugs 17*, 343–359. https://doi.org/10.1023/a:1006326203858.

Hoffman, R. M. (2015). Patient-derived orthotopic xenografts: Better mimic of metastasis than subcutaneous xenografts. *Nature Reviews Cancer 15*, 451–452. https://doi.org/10.1038/nrc3972.

Hollins, A. J., & Parry, L. (2016). Long-term culture of intestinal cell progenitors: An overview of their development, application, and associated technologies. *Current Pathobiology Reports 4*, 209–219. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40139-016-0119-1.

Holzgreve, A., et al. (2021). PSMA expression in glioblastoma as a basis for theranostic approaches: A retrospective, correlational panel study including immunohistochemistry, clinical parameters and PET imaging. *Frontiers in Oncology 11*, Article 646387. https://doi.org/10.3389/fonc.2021.646387.

van der Horst, G., Buijs, J. T., & van der Pluijm, G. (2015). *Bone cancer (Second Edition) (ed Dominique Heymann) 557-570.* Academic Press.

Howlader, N., et al. (2021). SEER Cancer Statistics Review, 1975–2018 (Based on November 2020 SEER data submission). https://seer.cancer.gov/csr/1975_2018/>.

Hubert, C. G., et al. (2016). A three-dimensional organoid culture system derived from human glioblastomas recapitulates the hypoxic gradients and cancer stem cell heterogeneity of tumors found in vivo. *Cancer Research 76*, 2465–2477. https://doi.org/10.1158/0008-5472.CAN-15-2402.

Hughes, R. M., Simons, B. W., & Hurley, P. J. (2017). A murine Orthotopic allograft to model prostate Cancer growth and metastasis. *Bio-Protocol 7*. https://doi.org/10.21769/BioProtoc.2137.

Hung, C. C., et al. (2020). Lung cancer cell-derived secretome mediates paraneoplastic inflammation and fibrosis in kidney in mice. *Cancers (Basel) 12*. https://doi.org/10.3390/cancers12123561.

Huynh, A. S., et al. (2011). Development of an orthotopic human pancreatic cancer xenograft model using ultrasound guided injection of cells. *PLoS One 6*, Article e20330. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0020330.

INOTIV (2023). Research models and services. https://www.inotivco.com/research-models-and-services>.

Invrea, F., et al. (2020). Patient-derived xenografts (PDXs) as model systems for human cancer. *Current Opinion in Biotechnology 63*, 151–156. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.copbio.2020.01.003.

Ireson, C. R., Alavijeh, M. S., Palmer, A. M., Fowler, E. R., & Jones, H. J. (2019). The role of mouse tumour models in the discovery and development of anticancer drugs. *British Journal of Cancer 121*, 101–108. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41416-019-0495-5.

Ito, M., et al. (2002). NOD/SCID/gamma(c)(null) mouse: An excellent recipient mouse model for engraftment of human cells. *Blood 100*, 3175–3182. https://doi.org/10.1182/blood-2001-12-0207.

Jackstadt, R., et al. (2019). Epithelial NOTCH signaling rewires the tumor microenvironment of colorectal cancer to drive poor-prognosis subtypes and metastasis. *Cancer Cell 36*. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ccell.2019.08.003 319-336 e317.

Jacob, F., et al. (2020). A patient-derived glioblastoma organoid model and biobank recapitulates inter- and intra-tumoral heterogeneity. *Cell 180*. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cell.2019.11.036 188–204 e122.

Jenkins, D. E., et al. (2003). Bioluminescent imaging (BLI) to improve and refine traditional murine models of tumor growth and metastasis. *Clinical & Experimental Metastasis 20*, 733–744. https://doi.org/10.1023/b:clin.0000006815.49932.98.

Jin, M. Z., et al. (2018). Organoids: An intermediate modeling platform in precision oncology. *Cancer Letters 414*, 174–180. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.canlet.2017.11.021.

Jing, R., et al. (2022). Functional imaging and targeted drug delivery in mice and patient tumors with a cell nucleolus-localizing and tumor-targeting peptide. *Biomaterials 289*, Article 121758. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biomaterials.2022.121758.

Johnson, J. I., et al. (2001). Relationships between drug activity in NCI preclinical in vitro and in vivo models and early clinical trials. *British Journal of Cancer 84*, 1424–1431. https://doi.org/10.1054/bjoc.2001.1796.

de Jong, M., Essers, J., & van Weerden, W. M. (2014). Imaging preclinical tumour models: Improving translational power. *Nature Reviews. Cancer 14*, 481–493. https://doi.org/10.1038/nrc3751.

Joo, K. M., et al. (2013). Patient-specific orthotopic glioblastoma xenograft models recapitulate the histopathology and biology of human glioblastomas in situ. *Cell Reports 3*, 260–273. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.celrep.2012.12.013.

Jung, Y., et al. (2013). Recruitment of mesenchymal stem cells into prostate tumours promotes metastasis. *Nature Communications 4*, 1795. https://doi.org/10.1038/ncomms2766.

Justilien, V., & Fields, A. P. (2013). Utility and applications of orthotopic models of human non-small cell lung cancer (NSCLC) for the evaluation of novel and emerging cancer therapeutics. *Current Protocols in Pharmacology 62*. https://doi.org/10.1002/0471141755.ph1427s62 14.27.11-14.27.17.

Kabraji, S., et al. (2023). Preclinical and clinical efficacy of Trastuzumab Deruxtecan in breast Cancer brain metastases. *Clinical Cancer Research 29*, 174–182. https://doi.org/10.1158/1078-0432.Ccr-22-1138.

Kaijzel, E. L., van der Pluijm, G., & Lowik, C. W. (2007). Whole-body optical imaging in animal models to assess cancer development and progression. *Clinical Cancer Research 13*, 3490–3497. https://doi.org/10.1158/1078-0432.CCR-07-0402.

Kalber, T. L., Waterton, J. C., Griffiths, J. R., Ryan, A. J., & Robinson, S. P. (2008). Longitudinal in vivo susceptibility contrast MRI measurements of LS174T colorectal liver metastasis in nude mice. *Journal of Magnetic Resonance Imaging 28*, 1451–1458. https://doi.org/10.1002/jmri.21600.

Khalsa, J. K., et al. (2020). Immune phenotyping of diverse syngeneic murine brain tumors identifies immunologically distinct types. *Nature Communications 11*, 3912. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-020-17704-5.

Killion, J. J., Radinsky, R., & Fidler, I. J. (1998a). Orthotopic models are necessary to predict therapy of transplantable tumors in mice. *Cancer and Metastasis Reviews 17*, 279–284. https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1006140513233.

Killion, J. J., Radinsky, R., & Fidler, I. J. (1998b). Orthotopic models are necessary to predict therapy of transplantable tumors in mice. *Cancer Metastasis Reviews 17*, 279–284. https://doi.org/10.1023/a:1006140513233.

Kim, M. P., et al. (2009). Generation of orthotopic and heterotopic human pancreatic cancer xenografts in immunodeficient mice. *Nature Protocols 4*, 1670–1680. https://doi.org/10.1038/nprot.2009.171.

Kim, T. W., et al. (2020). MicroRNA-17-5p regulates EMT by targeting vimentin in colorectal cancer. *British Journal of Cancer 123*, 1123–1130. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41416-020-0940-5.

Kirchner, M. A., et al. (2021). PSMA PET imaging in glioblastoma: A preclinical evaluation and theranostic outlook. *Frontiers in Oncology 11*, Article 774017. https://doi.org/10.3389/fonc.2021.774017.

Kleespies, A., et al. (2005). Vascular targeting in pancreatic cancer: The novel tubulin-binding agent ZD6126 reveals antitumor activity in primary and metastatic tumor models. *Neoplasia 7*, 957–966. https://doi.org/10.1593/neo.05304.

Kodani, T., et al. (2013). Flexible colonoscopy in mice to evaluate the severity of colitis and colorectal tumors using a validated endoscopic scoring system. *Journal of Visualized Experiments*, Article e50843. https://doi.org/10.3791/50843.

Kohnken, R., Porcu, P., & Mishra, A. (2017). Overview of the use of murine models in Leukemia and Lymphoma Research. *Frontiers in Oncology 7*, 22. https://doi.org/10.3389/fonc.2017.00022.

Kopper, O., et al. (2019). An organoid platform for ovarian cancer captures intra- and interpatient heterogeneity. *Nature Medicine 25*, 838–849. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41591-019-0422-6.

Kretzschmar, K. (2021). Cancer research using organoid technology. *Journal of Molecular Medicine (Berlin, Germany) 99*, 501–515. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00109-020-01990-z.

Krishnan, M. (2023). The evolving landscape of pancreatic. *Cancer 19*, 35–36. https://doi.org/10.1200/op.22.00636.

Kruse, J., et al. (2013). Macrophages promote tumour growth and liver metastasis in an orthotopic syngeneic mouse model of colon cancer. *International Journal of Colorectal Disease 28*, 1337–1349. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00384-013-1703-z.

Kuchimaru, T., et al. (2018). A reliable murine model of bone metastasis by injecting cancer cells through caudal arteries. *Nature Communications 9*, 2981. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-018-05366-3.

Kung, A. L. (2007). Practices and pitfalls of mouse cancer models in drug discovery. *Advances in Cancer Research 96*, 191–212. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0065-230X(06)96007-2.

Kunnumakkara, A. B., et al. (2019). Cancer drug development: The missing links. *Experimental Biology and Medicine (Maywood, N.J.) 244*, 663–689. https://doi.org/10.1177/1535370219839163.

Kuroda, S., et al. (2014). Establishment of a non-invasive semi-quantitative bioluminescent imaging method for monitoring of an Orthotopic esophageal cancer mouse model. *PLoS One 9*, Article e114562. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0114562.

Langley, R. R., & Fidler, I. J. (2007). Tumor cell-organ microenvironment interactions in the pathogenesis of cancer metastasis. *Endocrine Reviews 28*, 297–321. https://doi.org/10.1210/er.2006-0027.

Lardizabal, J., Ding, J., Delwar, Z., Rennie, P. S., & Jia, W. (2018). A TRAMP-derived orthotopic prostate syngeneic (TOPS) cancer model for investigating anti-tumor treatments. *Prostate 78*, 457–468. https://doi.org/10.1002/pros.23490.

Lauber, D. T., et al. (2017). State of the art in vivo imaging techniques for laboratory animals. *Laboratory Animals 51*, 465–478. https://doi.org/10.1177/0023677217695852.

Lavilla-Alonso, S., et al. (2011). Optimized mouse model for the imaging of tumor metastasis upon experimental therapy. *PLoS One 6*, Article e26810. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0026810.

Lee, S. H., et al. (2018). Tumor evolution and drug response in patient-derived organoid models of bladder cancer. *Cell 173*. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cell.2018.03.017 515-528 e517.

Li, H., Liu, H., & Chen, K. (2022). Living biobank-based cancer organoids: Prospects and challenges in cancer research. *Cancer Biology & Medicine 19*, 965–982. https://doi.org/10.20892/j.issn.2095-3941.2021.0621.

Li, Q. X., Feuer, G., Ouyang, X., & An, X. (2017). Experimental animal modeling for immuno-oncology. *Pharmacology & Therapeutics 173*, 34–46. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pharmthera.2017.02.002.

Limani, P., et al. (2016). Selective portal vein injection for the design of syngeneic models of liver malignancy. *American Journal of Physiology. Gastrointestinal and Liver Physiology 310*, G682–G688. https://doi.org/10.1152/ajpgi.00209.2015.

Lin, K. T., Sun, S. P., Wu, J. I., & Wang, L. H. (2017). Low-dose glucocorticoids suppresses ovarian tumor growth and metastasis in an immunocompetent syngeneic mouse model. *PLoS One 12*, Article e0178937. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0178937.

Linxweiler, J., et al. (2017). Experimental imaging in orthotopic renal cell carcinoma xenograft models: Comparative evaluation of high-resolution 3D ultrasonography, in-vivo micro–CT and 9.4T MRI. *Scientific Reports 7*, Article 14249. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-017-14759-1.

Liu, B., et al. (2022). Biomimetic GBM-targeted drug delivery system boosting ferroptosis for immunotherapy of orthotopic drug-resistant GBM. *Journal of Nanobiotechnology 20*, 161. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12951-022-01360-6.

Liu, G., et al. (2021). A review on drug delivery system for tumor therapy. *Frontiers in Pharmacology 12*, Article 735446. https://doi.org/10.3389/fphar.2021.735446.

Liu, P., Zhao, L, Senovilla, L., Kepp, O., & Kroemer, G. (2021). In vivo imaging of orthotopic lung cancer models in mice. *Methods in Molecular Biology 2279*, 199–212. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-0716-1278-1_16.

Liu, S., Su, Y., Lin, M. Z., & Ronald, J. A. (2021). Brightening up biology: Advances in luciferase systems for in vivo imaging. *ACS Chemical Biology 16*, 2707–2718. https://doi.org/10.1021/acschembio.1c00549.

Liu, W., Zhu, Y., Ye, L., Zhu, Y., & Wang, Y. (2022). Establishment of an orthotopic prostate cancer xenograft mouse model using microscope-guided orthotopic injection of LNCaP cells into the dorsal lobe of the mouse prostate. *BMC Cancer 22*, 173. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12885-022-09266-0.

Loi, M., et al. (2011). The use of the orthotopic model to validate antivascular therapies for cancer. *The International Journal of Developmental Biology 55*, 547–555. https://doi.org/10.1387/ijdb.103230ml.

Long, Y., Xie, B., Shen, H. C., & Wen, D. (2022). Translation potential and challenges of in vitro and murine models in cancer clinic. *Cells 11*. https://doi.org/10.3390/cells11233868.

Low, R. R. J., et al. (2021). The diverse applications of pancreatic ductal adenocarcinoma organoids. *Cancers (Basel) 13*. https://doi.org/10.3390/cancers13194979.

Lu, R. M., et al. (2013). Targeted drug delivery systems mediated by a novel peptide in breast cancer therapy and imaging. *PLoS One 8*, Article e66128. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0066128.

Lu, Y. S., et al. (2007). Efficacy of a novel histone deacetylase inhibitor in murine models of hepatocellular carcinoma. *Hepatology 46*, 1119–1130. https://doi.org/10.1002/hep.21804.

Luheshi, N. M., et al. (2016). Transformation of the tumour microenvironment by a CD40 agonist antibody correlates with improved responses to PD-L1 blockade in a mouse orthotopic pancreatic tumour model. *Oncotarget 7*, 18508–18520. https://doi.org/10.18632/oncotarget.7610.

Lumniczky, K., et al. (2002). Local tumor irradiation augments the antitumor effect of cytokine-producing autologous cancer cell vaccines in a murine glioma model. *Cancer Gene Therapy 9*, 44–52. https://doi.org/10.1038/sj.cgt.7700398.

Lv, X., et al. (2020). Orthotopic transplantation of breast tumors as preclinical models for breast cancer. *Journal of Visualized Experiments*. https://doi.org/10.3791/61173.

Lwin, S. T., Edwards, C. M., & Silbermann, R. (2016). Preclinical animal models of multiple myeloma. *Bonekey Reports 5*, 772. https://doi.org/10.1038/bonekey.2015.142.

Lyons, S. K. (2005). Advances in imaging mouse tumour models in vivo. *The Journal of Pathology 205*, 194–205. https://doi.org/10.1002/path.1697.

Ma, H., Pilvankar, M., Wang, J., Giragossian, C., & Popel, A. S. (2021). Quantitative systems pharmacology modeling of PBMC-humanized mouse to facilitate preclinical Immuno-oncology drug development. *ACS Pharmacology & Translational Science 4*, 213–225. https://doi.org/10.1021/acsptsci.0c00178.

MacEwan, J. P., et al. (2020). Changes in mortality associated with cancer drug approvals in the United States from 2000 to 2016. *Journal of Medical Economics 23*, 1558–1569. https://doi.org/10.1080/13696998.2020.1834403.

Malin, D., Chen, F., Schiller, C., Koblinski, J., & Cryns, V. L. (2011). Enhanced metastasis suppression by targeting TRAIL receptor 2 in a murine model of triple-negative breast cancer. *Clinical Cancer Research 17*, 5005–5015. https://doi.org/10.1158/1078-0432.CCR-11-0099.

Manzella, G., et al. (2020). Phenotypic profiling with a living biobank of primary rhabdomyosarcoma unravels disease heterogeneity and AKT sensitivity. *Nature Communications 11*, 4629. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-020-18388-7.

Manzotti, C., Audisio, R. A., & Pratesi, G. (1993). Importance of orthotopic implantation for human tumors as model systems: Relevance to metastasis and invasion. *Clinical & Experimental Metastasis 11*, 5–14. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00880061.

Matin, S. F., et al. (2010). Immunological response to renal cryoablation in an in vivo orthotopic renal cell carcinoma murine model. *The Journal of Urology 183*, 333–338. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.juro.2009.08.110.

Matschos, S., et al. (2021). The HROC-Xenobank-A high quality assured PDX biobank of >100 individual colorectal Cancer models. *Cancers (Basel) 13*. https://doi.org/10.3390/cancers13235882.

Mattie, M., et al. (2013). Molecular characterization of patient-derived human pancreatic tumor xenograft models for preclinical and translational development of cancer therapeutics. *Neoplasia 15*, 1138–1150. https://doi.org/10.1593/neo.13922.

McCarty, M. F., et al. (2004). ZD6126 inhibits orthotopic growth and peritoneal carcinomatosis in a mouse model of human gastric cancer. *British Journal of Cancer 90*, 705–711. https://doi.org/10.1038/sj.bjc.6601490.

McGovern, J. A., et al. (2018). Humanization of the prostate microenvironment reduces homing of PC3 prostate cancer cells to human tissue-engineered bone. *Cancers (Basel) 10*. https://doi.org/10.3390/cancers10110438.

McGovern, J. A., et al. (2021). A humanized orthotopic tumor microenvironment alters the bone metastatic tropism of prostate cancer cells. *Communications Biology 4*, 1014. https://doi.org/10.1038/s42003-021-02527-x.

Mehlen, P., & Puisieux, A. (2006). Metastasis: A question of life or death. *Nature Reviews. Cancer 6*, 449–458. https://doi.org/10.1038/nrc1886.

Meijer, R. P. (2021). Urothelial cancer organoids: A tool for bladder cancer research. *Der Pathologe 42*, 165–169. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00292-021-00988-9.

Michel, R. B., Rosario, A. V., Andrews, P. M., Goldenberg, D. M., & Mattes, M. J. (2005). Therapy of small subcutaneous B-lymphoma xenografts with antibodies conjugated to radionuclides emitting low-energy electrons. *Clinical Cancer Research 11*, 777–786.

Minn, A. J., et al. (2005). Genes that mediate breast cancer metastasis to lung. *Nature 436*, 518–524. https://doi.org/10.1038/nature03799.

Mordant, P., et al. (2011). Bioluminescent orthotopic mouse models of human localized non-small cell lung cancer: Feasibility and identification of circulating tumour cells. *PLoS One 6*, Article e26073. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0026073.

Moreau Bachelard, C., Coquan, E., du Rusquec, P., Paoletti, X., & Le Tourneau, C. (2021). Risks and benefits of anticancer drugs in advanced cancer patients: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *EClinicalMedicine 40*, Article 101130. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eclinm.2021.101130.

Morillon, Y. M., 2nd, Sabzevari, A., Schlom, J., & Greiner, J. W. (2020). The development of next-generation PBMC humanized mice for preclinical investigation of cancer immunotherapeutic agents. *Anticancer Research 40*, 5329–5341. https://doi.org/10.21873/anticanres.14540.

Morton, C. L., & Houghton, P. J. (2007). Establishment of human tumor xenografts in immunodeficient mice. *Nature Protocols 2*, 247–250. https://doi.org/10.1038/nprot.2007.25.

Moss, N. S., Beal, K., & Tabar, V. (2022). Brain metastasis—A distinct oncologic disease best served by an integrated multidisciplinary team approach. *JAMA Oncology 8*, 1252–1254. https://doi.org/10.1001/jamaoncol.2022.1928 %J JAMA Oncology.

Moy, R. H., et al. (2022). Defining and targeting Esophagogastric cancer genomic subsets with patient-derived xenografts. *JCO Precision Oncology 6*, Article e2100242. https://doi.org/10.1200/po.21.00242.

Munoz, R., et al. (2006). Highly efficacious nontoxic preclinical treatment for advanced metastatic breast cancer using combination oral UFT-cyclophosphamide metronomic chemotherapy. *Cancer Research 66*, 3386–3391. https://doi.org/10.1158/0008-5472.CAN-05-4411.

Myers, J. N., Holsinger, F. C., Jasser, S. A., Bekele, B. N., & Fidler, I. J. (2002). An orthotopic nude mouse model of oral tongue squamous cell carcinoma. *Clinical Cancer Research 8*, 293–298.

Myers, M. S., Kosmacek, E. A., Chatterjee, A., & R, E. O.-D (2022). CT vs. bioluminescence: A comparison of imaging techniques for orthotopic prostate tumors in mice. *PLoS One 17*, Article e0277239. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0277239.

Nagatani, M., et al. (2019). Comparison of biological features between severely immunodeficient NOD/Shi-scid Il2rg(null) and NOD/LtSz-scid Il2rg(null) mice. *Experimental Animals 68*, 471–482. https://doi.org/10.1538/expanim.19-0024.

Nagle, P. W., Plukker, J. T. M., Muijs, C. T., van Luijk, P., & Coppes, R. P. (2018). Patient-derived tumor organoids for prediction of cancer treatment response. *Seminars in Cancer Biology 53*, 258–264. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.semcancer.2018.06.005.

Naito, T., Higuchi, T., Shimada, Y., & Kakinuma, C. (2020). An improved mouse orthotopic bladder cancer model exhibiting progression and treatment response characteristics of human recurrent bladder cancer. *Oncology Letters 19*, 833–839. https://doi.org/10.3892/ol.2019.11172.

Nolan, K., et al. (2020). Development of syngeneic murine cell lines for use in immunocompetent orthotopic lung cancer models. *Cancer Cell International 20*, 417. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12935-020-01503-5.

Nunez-Olle, M., Guiu, M., & Gomis, R. R. (2021). In vivo assessment of metastatic cell potential in prostate cancer. *Methods in Molecular Biology 2294*, 253–267. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-0716-1350-4_18.

Nussinov, R., Tsai, C. J., & Jang, H. (2021). Anticancer drug resistance: An update and perspective. *Drug Resistance Updates 59*, Article 100796. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.drup.2021.100796.

Ogino, S. (2008). Novel dual targeting strategy with vandetanib induces tumor cell apoptosis and inhibits angiogenesis in malignant pleural mesothelioma cells expressing RET oncogenic rearrangement. *Cancer Letters 265*, 55–66. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.canlet.2008.02.018.

Ohara, T., et al. (2010). The establishment of a new mouse model with orthotopic esophageal cancer showing the esophageal stricture. *Cancer Letters 293*, 207–212. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.canlet.2010.01.017.

Okano, M., et al. (2020). Orthotopic implantation achieves better engraftment and faster growth than subcutaneous implantation in breast cancer patient-derived xenografts. *Journal of Mammary Gland Biology and Neoplasia 25*, 27–36. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10911-020-09442-7.

Okazawa, Y., et al. (2018). High-sensitivity detection of micrometastases generated by GFP lentivirus-transduced organoids cultured from a patient-derived colon tumor. *Journal of Visualized Experiments*. https://doi.org/10.3791/57374.

Oliveira, R. C., Abrantes, A. M., Tralhao, J. G., & Botelho, M. F. (2020). The role of mouse models in colorectal cancer research-the need and the importance of the orthotopic models. *Animal Models and Experimental Medicine 3*, 1–8. https://doi.org/10.1002/ame2.12102.

Olson, B., Li, Y., Lin, Y., Liu, E. T., & Patnaik, A. (2018). Mouse models for Cancer immunotherapy research. *Cancer Discovery 8*, 1358–1365. https://doi.org/10.1158/2159-8290.CD-18-0044.

Paget, S. (1989). The distribution of secondary growths in cancer of the breast. 1889. *Cancer Metastasis Reviews 8*, 98–101.

de Paiva, I. M., et al. (2022). Biodistribution and activity of EGFR targeted polymeric micelles delivering a new inhibitor of DNA repair to Orthotopic colorectal Cancer xenografts with metastasis. *Molecular Pharmaceutics 19*, 1825–1838. https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.molpharmaceut.1c00918.

Partecke, L. I., et al. (2011). A syngeneic orthotopic murine model of pancreatic adenocarcinoma in the C57/BL6 mouse using the Panc02 and 6606PDA cell lines. *European Surgical Research 47*, 98–107. https://doi.org/10.1159/000329413.

Patton, E. E., et al. (2021). Melanoma models for the next generation of therapies. *Cancer Cell 39*, 610–631. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ccell.2021.01.011.

Peramuhendige, P., et al. (2018). TRAF2 in osteotropic breast cancer cells enhances skeletal tumour growth and promotes osteolysis. *Scientific Reports 8*, 39. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-017-18327-5.

PerkinElmer (2023). IVISbrite bioluminescent tumor cell lines. https://www.perkinelmer.com/uk/category/bioluminescent-tumor-cell-lines>.

Pillar, N., Polsky, A. L., Weissglas-Volkov, D., & Shomron, N. (2018). Comparison of breast cancer metastasis models reveals a possible mechanism of tumor aggressiveness. *Cell Death & Disease 9*, 1040. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41419-018-1094-8.

Piranlioglu, R., et al. (2019). Primary tumor-induced immunity eradicates disseminated tumor cells in syngeneic mouse model. *Nature Communications 10*, 1430. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-019-09015-1.

Podetz-Pedersen, K. M., Vezys, V., Somia, N. V., Russell, S. J., & McIvor, R. S. (2014). Cellular immune response against firefly luciferase after sleeping beauty-mediated gene transfer in vivo. *Human Gene Therapy 25*, 955–965. https://doi.org/10.1089/hum.2014.048.

Poirier, N., Dilek, N., Mary, C., & Vanhove, B. (2012). Graft versus host disease in humanized mice is differentially controlled by CD28 and CD80/86 antagonists. *Journal of Translational Medicine 10*, O2. https://doi.org/10.1186/1479-5876-10-S3-O2.

Pompili, L., Porru, M., Caruso, C., Biroccio, A., & Leonetti, C. (2016). Patient-derived xenografts: A relevant preclinical model for drug development. *Journal of Experimental & Clinical Cancer Research 35*, 189. https://doi.org/10.1186/s13046-016-0462-4.

Porrello, A., et al. (2018). Factor XIIIA-expressing inflammatory monocytes promote lung squamous cancer through fibrin cross-linking. *Nature Communications 9*, 1988. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-018-04355-w.

Porter, R. J., Murray, G. I., & McLean, M. H. (2020). Current concepts in tumour-derived organoids. *British Journal of Cancer 123*, 1209–1218. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41416-020-0993-5.

Potter, M. (1985). History of the BALB/c family. *Current Topics in Microbiology and Immunology 122*, 1–5. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-70740-7_1.

Puchalapalli, M., et al. (2016). NSG mice provide a better spontaneous model of breast Cancer metastasis than Athymic (nude) mice. *PLoS One 11*, Article e0163521. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0163521.

Puig, I., et al. (2013). A personalized preclinical model to evaluate the metastatic potential of patient-derived colon cancer initiating cells. *Clinical Cancer Research 19*, 6787–6801. https://doi.org/10.1158/1078-0432.CCR-12-1740.

Qiu, R., et al. (2021). A novel Orthotopic liver Cancer model for creating a human-like tumor microenvironment. *Cancers (Basel) 13*. https://doi.org/10.3390/cancers13163997.

Ramani, V. C., et al. (2019). Investigating circulating tumor cells and distant metastases in patient-derived orthotopic xenograft models of triple-negative breast cancer. *Breast Cancer Research 21*, 98. https://doi.org/10.1186/s13058-019-1182-4.

Ravoori, M. K., et al. (2019). Magnetic resonance imaging and bioluminescence imaging for evaluating tumor burden in orthotopic colon cancer. *Scientific Reports 9*, 6100. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-019-42230-w.

Ren, X., Chen, W., Yang, Q., Li, X., & Xu, L. (2022). Patient-derived cancer organoids for drug screening: Basic technology and clinical application. *Journal of Gastroenterology and Hepatology 37*, 1446–1454. https://doi.org/10.1111/jgh.15930.

Richmond, A., & Su, Y. (2008). Mouse xenograft models vs GEM models for human cancer therapeutics. *Disease Models & Mechanisms 1*, 78–82. https://doi.org/10.1242/dmm.000976.

Richter, A., et al. (2022). The molecular subtype of adult acute lymphoblastic leukemia samples determines the engraftment site and proliferation kinetics in patient-derived xenograft modelsvol. 11. (pp. 150), 150.

Riihimaki, M., Thomsen, H., Sundquist, K., Sundquist, J., & Hemminki, K. (2018). Clinical landscape of cancer metastases. *Cancer Medicine 7*, 5534–5542. https://doi.org/10.1002/cam4.1697.

RIKEN (2023). RIKEN BRC cell bank. https://cell.brc.riken.jp/en/>.

Roper, J., et al. (2017). In vivo genome editing and organoid transplantation models of colorectal cancer and metastasis. *Nature Biotechnology 35*, 569–576. https://doi.org/10.1038/nbt.3836.

Rosfjord, E., Lucas, J., Li, G., & Gerber, H. P. (2014). Advances in patient-derived tumor xenografts: From target identification to predicting clinical response rates in oncology. *Biochemical Pharmacology 91*, 135–143. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bcp.2014.06.008.

Rossi, A., et al. (2019). Mechanisms and immunogenicity of nsPEF-induced cell death in B16F10 melanoma tumors. *Scientific Reports 9*, 431. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-018-36527-5.

Rozenberg, G. I., Monahan, K. B., Torrice, C., Bear, J. E., & Sharpless, N. E. (2010). Metastasis in an orthotopic murine model of melanoma is independent of RAS/RAF mutation. *Melanoma Research 20*, 361–371. https://doi.org/10.1097/CMR.0b013e328336ee17.

Rubio-Viqueira, B., et al. (2006). An in vivo platform for translational drug development in pancreatic cancer. *Clinical Cancer Research 12*, 4652–4661. https://doi.org/10.1158/1078-0432.CCR-06-0113.

Ruggeri, B. A., Camp, F., & Miknyoczki, S. (2014). Animal models of disease: Pre-clinical animal models of cancer and their applications and utility in drug discovery. *Biochemical Pharmacology 87*, 150–161. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bcp.2013.06.020.

Saar, M., et al. (2015). Orthotopic tumorgrafts in nude mice: A new method to study human prostate cancer. *Prostate 75*, 1526–1537. https://doi.org/10.1002/pros.23027.

Sachs, N., et al. (2018). A living biobank of breast cancer organoids captures disease heterogeneity. *Cell 172*. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cell.2017.11.010 373-386 e310.

Sahai, E. (2007). Illuminating the metastatic process. *Nature Reviews. Cancer 7*, 737–749. https://doi.org/10.1038/nrc2229.

Salem, A. F., et al. (2020). Prostate Cancer metastases are strongly inhibited by agonistic Epha2 ligands in an orthotopic mouse model. *Cancers (Basel) 12*. https://doi.org/10.3390/cancers12102854.

Sausville, E. A., & Burger, A. M. (2006). Contributions of human tumor xenografts to anticancer drug development. *Cancer Research 66*, 3351–3354 discussion 3354https://doi.org/10.1158/0008-5472.CAN-05-3627.

Scheepbouwer, C., Meyer, S., Burggraaf, M. J., Jose, J., & Molthoff, C. F. (2016). A multimodal imaging approach for longitudinal evaluation of bladder tumor development in an Orthotopic murine model. *PLoS One 11*, Article e0161284. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0161284.

Schlander, M., Hernandez-Villafuerte, K., Cheng, C. Y., Mestre-Ferrandiz, J., & Baumann, M. (2021). How much does it cost to research and develop a new drug? A systematic review and assessment. *Pharmacoeconomics 39*, 1243–1269. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40273-021-01065-y.

Scott, E. C., et al. (2023). Trends in the approval of cancer therapies by the FDA in the twenty-first century. *Nature Reviews. Drug Discovery*. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41573-023-00723-4.

Seidlitz, T., & Stange, D. E. (2021). Gastrointestinal cancer organoids-applications in basic and translational cancer research. *Experimental & Molecular Medicine 53*, 1459–1470. https://doi.org/10.1038/s12276-021-00654-3.

Sekar, T. V., & Paulmurugan, R. (2014). In Cancer Theranostics (eds Xiaoyuan Chen & Stephen Wong) 69–93. Academic Press.

Serkova, N. J., et al. (2021). Preclinical applications of multi-platform imaging in animal models of Cancer. *Cancer Research 81*, 1189–1200. https://doi.org/10.1158/0008-5472.CAN-20-0373.

Shaw, T. J., Senterman, M. K., Dawson, K., Crane, C. A., & Vanderhyden, B. C. (2004). Characterization of intraperitoneal, orthotopic, and metastatic xenograft models of human ovarian cancer. *Molecular Therapy 10*, 1032–1042. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ymthe.2004.08.013.

Shen, Y. T., et al. (2020). Potential limitations of bioluminescent xenograft mouse models: A systematic review. *Journal of Pharmacy & Pharmaceutical Sciences 23*, 177–199. https://doi.org/10.18433/jpps30870.

Shi, J., Li, Y., Jia, R., & Fan, X. (2020). The fidelity of cancer cells in PDX models: Characteristics, mechanism and clinical significance. *International Journal of Cancer 146*, 2078–2088. https://doi.org/10.1002/ijc.32662.

Shi, R., et al. (2020). Organoid cultures as preclinical models of non-small cell lung cancer. *Clinical Cancer Research 26*, 1162–1174. https://doi.org/10.1158/1078-0432.CCR-19-1376.

Shibuya, K., et al. (2007). Targeted therapy against VEGFR and EGFR with ZD6474 enhances the therapeutic efficacy of irradiation in an orthotopic model of human non-small-cell lung cancer. *International Journal of Radiation Oncology, Biology, Physics 69*, 1534–1543. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijrobp.2007.07.2350.

Shu, D., et al. (2022). Organoids from patient biopsy samples can predict the response of BC patients to neoadjuvant chemotherapy. *Annals of Medicine 54*, 2581–2597. https://doi.org/10.1080/07853890.2022.2122550.

Shultz, L. D., Brehm, M. A., Garcia-Martinez, J. V., & Greiner, D. L. (2012). Humanized mice for immune system investigation: Progress, promise and challenges. *Nature Reviews. Immunology 12*, 786–798. https://doi.org/10.1038/nri3311.

Shultz, L. D., et al. (2014). Human cancer growth and therapy in immunodeficient mouse models. *Cold Spring Harbor Protocols 2014*, 694–708. https://doi.org/10.1101/pdb.top073585.

Siegel, R. L., Miller, K. D., Wagle, N. S., & Jemal, A. (2023). Cancer statistics, 2023. *CA: a Cancer Journal for Clinicians 73*, 17–48. https://doi.org/10.3322/caac.21763.

Simon, C., et al. (1998). An orthotopic floor-of-mouth cancer model allows quantification of tumor invasion. *Laryngoscope 108*, 1686–1691. https://doi.org/10.1097/00005537-199811000-00018.

Simons, B. W., Dalrymple, S., Rosen, M., Zheng, L., & Brennen, W. N. (2020). A hemi-spleen injection model of liver metastasis for prostate cancer. *Prostate 80*, 1263–1269. https://doi.org/10.1002/pros.24055.

Sleeman, J. P., Nazarenko, I., & Thiele, W. (2011). Do all roads lead to Rome? Routes to metastasis development. *International Journal of Cancer 128*, 2511–2526. https://doi.org/10.1002/ijc.26027.

Smith, P. A., Merritt, D., Barr, L., & Thorley-Lawson, D. A. (2011). An orthotopic model of metastatic nasopharyngeal carcinoma and its application in elucidating a therapeutic target that inhibits metastasis. *Genes & Cancer 2*, 1023–1033. https://doi.org/10.1177/1947601912440878.

Sommaggio, R., et al. (2020). Adoptive cell therapy of triple negative breast cancer with redirected cytokine-induced killer cells. *Oncoimmunology 9*, Article 1777046. https://doi.org/10.1080/2162402X.2020.1777046.

Sonawane, R., Wagh, R., Dhumane, J. R., & Deore, A. B. (2019). The stages of drug discovery and development process. *Asian Journal of Pharmaceutical Research and Development 7*, 62–67. https://doi.org/10.22270/ajprd.v7i6.616.

Song, C., et al. (2016). Real-time tumor oxygenation changes after single high-dose radiation therapy in Orthotopic and subcutaneous lung cancer in mice: Clinical implication for stereotactic ablative radiation therapy schedule optimization. *International Journal of Radiation Oncology, Biology, Physics 95*, 1022–1031. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijrobp.2016.01.064.

Sosa Iglesias, V., et al. (2019). An orthotopic non-small cell lung cancer model for image-guided small animal radiotherapy platforms. *The British Journal of Radiology 92*, Article 20180476. https://doi.org/10.1259/bjr.20180476.

Stephenson, R. A., et al. (1992). Metastatic model for human prostate cancer using orthotopic implantation in nude mice. *Journal of the National Cancer Institute 84*, 951–957. https://doi.org/10.1093/jnci/84.12.951.

Stribbling, S. M., & Ryan, A. J. (2022). The cell-line-derived subcutaneous tumor model in preclinical cancer research. *Nature Protocols 17*, 2108–2128.

Sun, P., et al. (2020). Transferrin receptor-targeted PEG-PLA polymeric micelles for chemotherapy against glioblastoma Multiforme. *International Journal of Nanomedicine 15*, 6673–6688. https://doi.org/10.2147/IJN.S257459.

Takahashi, O., et al. (2012a). Combined MEK and VEGFR inhibition in Orthotopic human lung cancer models results in enhanced inhibition of tumor angiogenesis, growth, and MetastasisMEK1/2 and VEGFR inhibition in a mouse model of lung cancer. *Clinical Cancer Research 18*, 1641–1654.

Takahashi, O., et al. (2012b). Combined MEK and VEGFR inhibition in orthotopic human lung cancer models results in enhanced inhibition of tumor angiogenesis, growth, and metastasis. *Clinical Cancer Research 18*, 1641–1654. https://doi.org/10.1158/1078-0432.Ccr-11-2324.

Talmadge, J. E., & Fidler, I. J. (2010). AACR centennial series: The biology of cancer metastasis: Historical perspective. *Cancer Research 70*, 5649–5669. https://doi.org/10.1158/0008-5472.CAN-10-1040.

Talmadge, J. E., Singh, R. K., Fidler, I. J., & Raz, A. (2007). Murine models to evaluate novel and conventional therapeutic strategies for cancer. *The American Journal of Pathology 170*, 793–804. https://doi.org/10.2353/ajpath.2007.060929.

Tanaka, K., et al. (2022). The first Japanese biobank of patient-derived pediatric acute lymphoblastic leukemia xenograft models. *Cancer Science 113*, 3814–3825. https://doi.org/10.1111/cas.15506.

Tayoun, T., et al. (2019). CTC-derived models: A window into the seeding capacity of circulating tumor cells (CTCs). *Cells 8*. https://doi.org/10.3390/cells8101145.

Teicher, B. A. (2005). Tumor models for preclinical development of targeted agents. *Progress in Drug Research 63*, 43–66. https://doi.org/10.1007/3-7643-7414-4_3.

Teicher, B. A. (2006). Tumor models for efficacy determination. *Molecular Cancer Therapeutics 5*, 2435–2443. https://doi.org/10.1158/1535-7163.MCT-06-0391.

Teicher, B. A. (2009). Human tumor xenografts and mouse models of human tumors: Rediscovering the models. *Expert Opinion on Drug Discovery 4*, 1295–1305. https://doi.org/10.1517/17460440903380430.

Tentler, J. J., et al. (2012). Patient-derived tumour xenografts as models for oncology drug development. *Nature Reviews. Clinical Oncology 9*, 338–350. https://doi.org/10.1038/nrclinonc.2012.61.

Thalheimer, A., et al. (2009). The intraportal injection model: A practical animal model for hepatic metastases and tumor cell dissemination in human colon cancer. *BMC Cancer 9*, 29. https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2407-9-29.

The_Jackson_Laboratory (2023). JAX Mice & Services. https://www.jax.org/jax-mice-and-services>.

Theocharides, A. P., Rongvaux, A., Fritsch, K., Flavell, R. A., & Manz, M. G. (2016). Humanized hemato-lymphoid system mice. *Haematologica 101*, 5–19. https://doi.org/10.3324/haematol.2014.115212.

Tian, H., Lyu, Y., Yang, Y. G., & Hu, Z. (2020). Humanized rodent models for cancer research. *Frontiers in Oncology 10*, 1696. https://doi.org/10.3389/fonc.2020.01696.

Tomayko, M. M., & Reynolds, C. P. (1989). Determination of subcutaneous tumor size in athymic (nude) mice. *Cancer Chemotherapy and Pharmacology 24*, 148–154. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00300234.

Uccello, T. P., et al. (2022). Development of an orthotopic murine model of rectal cancer in conjunction with targeted short-course radiation therapy. *Advances in Radiation Oncology 7*, Article 100867. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.adro.2021.100867.

UK_Research_and_Innovation_(UKRI) (2023). Research and human tissue legislation in the UK. https://www.ukri.org/publications/research-and-the-human-tissue-act-2004/>.

Villarroel, M., et al. (2009). Abstract #2320: Orthotopic cancer models are better predictors of clinical response than s.c. models. *Cancer Research 69*, 2320.

Vlachogiannis, G., et al. (2018). Patient-derived organoids model treatment response of metastatic gastrointestinal cancers. *Science 359*, 920–926. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aao2774.

Walters, D. M., et al. (2013). Clinical, molecular and genetic validation of a murine orthotopic xenograft model of pancreatic adenocarcinoma using fresh human specimens. *PLoS One 8*, Article e77065. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0077065.

Wang, F., Xiang, K., Zhang, Y., & Wang, X. -F. (2022). Patient-derived organoids (PDOs) and PDO-derived xenografts (PDOXs): New opportunities in establishing faithful pre-clinical cancer models. *Journal of the National Cancer Center 2*, 263–276. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jncc.2022.10.001.

Wang, J., et al. (2022a). Patient-derived tumor organoids: New Progress and opportunities to facilitate precision cancer immunotherapy. *Frontiers in Oncology 12*, Article 872531. https://doi.org/10.3389/fonc.2022.872531.

Wang, Q., Luan, W., Goz, V., Burakoff, S. J., & Hiotis, S. P. (2011). Non-invasive in vivo imaging for liver tumour progression using an orthotopic hepatocellular carcinoma model in immunocompetent mice. *Liver International 31*, 1200–1208. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1478-3231.2011.02523.x.

Wang, S., et al. (2023). Targeting rare tumors: new focus for clinical research in China*15*, Article e16415. https://doi.org/10.15252/emmm.202216415.

Wang, X., Fu, X., & Hoffman, R. M. (1992). A new patient-like metastatic model of human lung cancer constructed orthotopically with intact tissue via thoracotomy in immunodeficient mice. *International Journal of Cancer 51*, 992–995. https://doi.org/10.1002/ijc.2910510626.

Wang, X., Fu, X., Kubota, T., & Hoffman, R. M. (1992). A new patient-like metastatic model of human small-cell lung cancer constructed orthotopically with intact tissue via thoracotomy in nude mice. *Anticancer Research 12*, 1403–1406.

Wang, Y., et al. (2005). An orthotopic metastatic prostate cancer model in SCID mice via grafting of a transplantable human prostate tumor line. *Laboratory Investigation 85*, 1392–1404. https://doi.org/10.1038/labinvest.3700335.

Wang, Z., et al. (2022b). HER-2-mediated nano-delivery of molecular targeted drug potently suppresses orthotopic epithelial ovarian cancer and metastasis. *International Journal of Pharmaceutics 625*, Article 122126. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijpharm.2022.122126.

Waters, D. J., Janovitz, E. B., & Chan, T. C. (1995). Spontaneous metastasis of PC-3 cells in athymic mice after implantation in orthotopic or ectopic microenvironments. *Prostate 26*, 227–234. https://doi.org/10.1002/pros.2990260503.

Weeber, F., Ooft, S. N., Dijkstra, K. K., & Voest, E. E. (2017). Tumor organoids as a preclinical cancer model for drug discovery. *Cell Chemical Biology 24*, 1092–1100. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chembiol.2017.06.012.

Weissleder, R. (2002). Scaling down imaging: Molecular mapping of cancer in mice. *Nature Reviews. Cancer 2*, 11–18. https://doi.org/10.1038/nrc701.

Welch, D. R., & Hurst, D. R. (2019). Defining the hallmarks of metastasis. *Cancer Research 79*, 3011–3027. https://doi.org/10.1158/0008-5472.CAN-19-0458.

Whiteford, C. C., et al. (2007). Credentialing preclinical pediatric xenograft models using gene expression and tissue microarray analysis. *Cancer Research 67*, 32–40. https://doi.org/10.1158/0008-5472.CAN-06-0610.

Whittle, J. R., Lewis, M. T., Lindeman, G. J., & Visvader, J. E. (2015). Patient-derived xenograft models of breast cancer and their predictive power. *Breast Cancer Research 17*, 17. https://doi.org/10.1186/s13058-015-0523-1.

Willoughby, C. E., et al. (2020). Selective DNA-PKcs inhibition extends the therapeutic index of localized radiotherapy and chemotherapy. *The Journal of Clinical Investigation 130*, 258–271. https://doi.org/10.1172/JCI127483.

Workman, P., et al. (2010). Guidelines for the welfare and use of animals in cancer research. *British Journal of Cancer 102*, 1555–1577. https://doi.org/10.1038/sj.bjc.6605642.

Wu, T., et al. (2016). Multimodal imaging of a humanized orthotopic model of hepatocellular carcinoma in immunodeficient mice. *Scientific Reports 6*, Article 35230. https://doi.org/10.1038/srep35230.

Wu, W., et al. (2007). Targeted therapy of orthotopic human lung cancer by combined vascular endothelial growth factor and epidermal growth factor receptor signaling blockade. *Molecular Cancer Therapeutics 6*, 471–483. https://doi.org/10.1158/1535-7163.Mct-06-0416.

Xu, X., et al. (2023). A living biobank of matched pairs of patient-derived xenografts and organoids for cancer pharmacology. *PLoS One 18*, Article e0279821. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0279821.

Yang, H., Wang, Y., Wang, P., Zhang, N., & Wang, P. (2021). Tumor organoids for cancer research and personalized medicine. *Cancer Biology & Medicine 19*, 319–332. https://doi.org/10.20892/j.issn.2095-3941.2021.0335.

Yoshida, G. J. (2020). Applications of patient-derived tumor xenograft models and tumor organoids. *Journal of Hematology & Oncology 13*, 4. https://doi.org/10.1186/s13045-019-0829-z.

Yu, C., et al. (2016). Intra-iliac artery injection for efficient and selective modeling of microscopic bone metastasis. *Journal of Visualized Experiments*. https://doi.org/10.3791/53982.

Yu, Y. Y., et al. (2022). The pivotal application of patient-derived organoid biobanks for personalized treatment of gastrointestinal cancers. *Biomarker Research 10*, 73. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40364-022-00421-0.

Zeng, Y., et al. (2017). Creation of an immunodeficient HLA-transgenic mouse (HUMAMICE) and functional validation of human immunity after transfer of HLA-matched human cells. *PLoS One 12*, Article e0173754. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0173754.

Zhang, C., Lowery, F. J., & Yu, D. (2017). Intracarotid cancer cell injection to produce mouse models of brain metastasis. *Journal of Visualized Experiments*. https://doi.org/10.3791/55085.

Zhang, H., et al. (2022). The application of [(68)Ga]-labeled FAPI-04 PET/CT for targeting and early detection of pancreatic carcinoma in patient-derived Orthotopic xenograft models. *Contrast Media & Molecular Imaging 2022*, Article 6596702. https://doi.org/10.1155/2022/6596702.

Zhao, X., et al. (2012). Global gene expression profiling confirms the molecular fidelity of primary tumor-based orthotopic xenograft mouse models of medulloblastoma. *Neuro-Oncology 14*, 574–583. https://doi.org/10.1093/neuonc/nos061.

Zhou, C., et al. (2023a). Standardization of organoid culture in cancer research. *Cancer Medicine 12*, 14375–14386. https://doi.org/10.1002/cam4.5943.

Zhou, Q., Facciponte, J., Jin, M., Shen, Q., & Lin, Q. (2014). Humanized NOD-SCID IL2rg−/− mice as a preclinical model for cancer research and its potential use for individualized cancer therapies. *Cancer Letters 344*, 13–19. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.canlet.2013.10.015.

Zhou, Y., et al. (2023b). Experimental mouse models for translational human cancer research. *Frontiers in Immunology 14*, Article 1095388. https://doi.org/10.3389/fimmu.2023.1095388.

Zhou, Z., Cong, L., & Cong, X. (2021). Patient-derived organoids in precision medicine: Drug screening, organoid-on-a-Chip and Living organoid biobank. *Frontiers in Oncology 11*, Article 762184. https://doi.org/10.3389/fonc.2021.762184.

Zhuo, J., et al. (2020). The ongoing trends of patient-derived xenograft models in oncology. *Cancer Communications (London, England) 40*, 559–563. https://doi.org/10.1002/cac2.12096.

Zitvogel, L., Pitt, J. M., Daillere, R., Smyth, M. J., & Kroemer, G. (2016). Mouse models in oncoimmunology. *Nature Reviews. Cancer 16*, 759–773. https://doi.org/10.1038/nrc.2016.91.