June 7th, 2017 Torino

Cancer vaccines in the renaissance era of immunotherapy



federica.cavallo@unito.it

Breakthrough of the Year 2013



http://news.sciencemag.org/breakthrough-of-the-year-2013

federica.cavallo@unito.it



2016: The Year of Cancer Immunotherapy

This has been another year of exciting progress in cancer immunotherapy, providing even more help and hope for patients, although it was not without its challenges.

After last year's breakthroughs, 2016 cemented immunotherapy's role in the future of cancer treatment, and it was recognized as the "Advance of the Year" by the American Society of Clinical Oncology.

http://www.cancerresearch.org/news-publications/our-blog/december-2016/2016-the-year-of-cancerimmunotherapy#sthash.2DaBandD.dpuf



In its annual report, the American Society of Clinical Oncology (ASCO)—the world's leading professional organization representing physicians who care for people with cancer—has named cancer immunotherapy the "Advance of the Year".

"Although all research achievements highlighted in this report are remarkable, one area clearly stands out from the rest: cancer immunotherapy" the editors at ASCO note.



http://www.cancerresearch.org/news-publications/our-blog/february-2016/asco-names-cancer-immunotherapy-advance-of-the-year#sthash.raRg866V.dpuf





Anticancer immunotherapy

passive/adoptive

active

- Passive administration of tumor-targeting monoclonal antibodies (mAB)
- Adoptive therapy: isolation of killer cells from patients, ex vivo expansion and reinfusion in patients
- Unspecific active immunotherapy (immunostimulatory drugs, cytokines, mAB; oncolytic viruses; PRR antagonists)
- Specific active immunotherapy: cancer vaccines



Cancer Vaccines

Cancer vaccine represent a non-toxic treatment modality potentially capable of inducing strong anti-tumor immune responses by esablishment of immune memory leading to tumor regression, or stabilisation of a tumor and also help in prevention of tumor recurrence and metastatization after a complete treatment.

The present knowledge and esperience of cancer vaccines are still in infancy, but cancer vaccines promise to be a good strategy for the future.



Lollini, Cavallo, et al, Nat Rev Cancer 2006 6:204-16

VACCINE-ACTIVATED IMMUNE REACTIONS



VACCINE-ACTIVATED IMMUNE REACTIONS



federica.cavallo@unito.it

Tumor cells display:

Tumor specific antigens

unique to tumor cells result of point mutations or gene rearrangements viral antigens

Tumor associated antigens

not unique to, but overexpressed in tumor cells developmental antigens, which become derepressed differentiation antigens; are tissue specific abnormal post-translational modifications

...

Is tumor recognition a function of the immune system?



The immune status of mice is critical for their susceptibility to chemical induced carcinogenesis



federica.cavallo@unito.it

Immunodeficiencies and tumors:

- ✓ A complete and long-lasting immune depression significantly enhances the incidence of spontaneous, virally-induced and carcinogen-induced tumors
- ✓ A partial or transient immune depression is associated with increased incidence of some tumor types, e.g. virally-induced tumors, leukemias and lymphomas, sarcomas

The concept of *immunosurveillance*:

 ✓ Immunity is a critical mechanism for inhibiting cancer development and progression

- ✓ Tumors are antigenic and are spontaneously recognized by the immune system
- ✓ What is the consequence of spontaneous immune reactions to tumors?



The immune system shapes tumor immunogenicity

The three Es of cancer immunoediting



Dunn et al., Nat Rev Immunol 2002 3:991-998

federica.cavallo@unito.it



С

The immune hallmarks of cancer

Ability to

- \checkmark thrive in a chronically inflamed microenvironment
- \checkmark evade immune recognition
- ✓ suppress immune reactivity

Lollini et al., Nat Rev Cancer 2006 6:204-16

Cavallo et al, Cancer Immunol Immunother 2011; 60:319-26

federica.cavallo@unito.it

- ✓ Tumors are antigenic and are spontaneously recognized by the immune system
- ✓ This spontaneous immune reaction to tumors shapes tumor antigenicity
- A clinically evident tumor has acquired the ability to escape tumor recognition and to suppress the immune response
- ✓ These considerations must be taken into account to develop effective immunotherapies

Immunoprevention vs Immunotherapy



Adapted from Lollini et al, Nat Rev Cancer 2006 6:204-16

federica.cavallo@unito.it

Primary immunoprevention: a futuristic option for non-infection associated tumors

Vaccines against carcinogenic viruses, such as those against HBV and HPV, are currently used for primary prevention.

Application of primary immunoprevention for non-infectionassociated tumors is still confined to pre-clinical experiments and futuristic projects.

The Artemis Project, supported by the US National Breast Cancer Coalition, is based on the identification of breast cancer-specific neoantigens expressed in the early phases of carcinogenesis and aims to stop people dying of breast cancer by 2020 (http://www.breastcancerdeadline2020.org)



federica.cavallo@unito.it

Immunoprevention vs Immunotherapy



federica.cavallo@unito.it

Standard definitions of prevention

| Type of prevention | Institute of Medicine of the National Academies, USA [2] | IARC, World Health Organization [3] |
|-----------------------|--|--|
| Primary | Primary prevention refers to health promotion, which fosters wellness in general and thus reduces the likelihood of disease, disability, and premature death in a nonspecific manner, as well as specific protection against the inception of disease. | Primary prevention is prevention of disease by reducing exposure of individuals to risk factors or by increasing their resistance to them. |
| Secondary | Secondary prevention refers to the detection and management of presymptomatic disease, and the prevention of its progression to symptomatic disease. | Secondary prevention (applied during the preclinical phase) is the early detection and treatment of disease. Screening activities are an important component of secondary prevention. |
| Tertiary | Tertiary prevention refers to the treatment of symptomatic disease in an effort to prevent its progression to disability or premature death. The overlap with treatment is self-evident, and perhaps suggests that preventive medicine has grandiose territorial ambitions. Be that as it may, there is a legitimate focus on prevention even after disease develops, such as the prevention of early cancer from metastasizing [] | Tertiary prevention (appropriate in the clinical phase) is the use of treatment and rehabilitation programmes to improve the outcome of illness among affected individuals. |

9

Lollini PL et al., Vaccines 2015

Cancer immunoprevention

| Cancer prevention | Aim | Target | Non-immunological examples | Immunological examples |
|----------------------|--|--|---|--|
| Primary | Removal or avoidance of cancer risk factors | Healthy individuals | Healthy diet; Ban on carcinogens in the workplace; Quitting smoking; Tamoxifen in healthy women; Prophylactic mastectomy in hereditary breast cancer | Anti- HBV and HPV vaccines |
| Secondary | Early diagnosis and therapy | Pre-symptomatic cancer bearers | Pap test; Mammography; Colonoscopy | Anti- Her2 and MUC1 vaccines against preneoplastic or early neoplastic lesions |
| Tertiary | Prevention of relapse and metastasis | Survivors with occult neoplastic lesions | Prophylactic radiotherapy; Adjuvant chemotherapy | Adjuvant monoclonal antibodies; Adjuvant therapeutic vaccines; Intravesical instillations of Bacillus Calmette-Guerin |

0

Lollini PL et al., Vaccines 2015

federica.cavallo@unito.it

The rational repositioning of vaccines in the renaissance era of cancer immunotherapy

- Repositioning of cancer vaccines in the pre-malignant or in the adjuvant settings
- Combining cancer vaccines with blocking of endogenous immune-inhibiting mechanisms
- Utilization of enhanced vaccination platforms
- Testing cancer vaccines in reliable pre-clinical models

Lollini et al, Vaccines 2015 Bot et al., Expert Rev Vaccines. 2013;12:1219-34 Secondary immunoprevention: a future option whose efficacy is being tested now

Testing a cancer vaccine based on a self/tumor associated antigen is possible in the premalignant setting.

High level immune responses can be achieved and memory responses can be evaluated.

Toxicity can be properly evaluated without the confounding effects of other previous or current treatments.

Many premalignant settings allow testing of vaccine efficacy in a relatively short time and in relatively small randomized trials.

MUC1 expression during colon cancer development



federica.cavallo@unito.it

Randomized, placebo-controlled Phase II efficacy trial of the MUC1 prophylactic vaccine

- Patients: Diagnosis of advanced adenoma (removed)
- Vaccine: 100 mg MUC1 100mer peptide admixed with 500 mg of poly-ICLC (TLR3 agonist, Hiltonol®), 300 ml volume administered ID/SQ at W0, W2, W8, W52
- Primary endpoint: anti-MUC1 immune response
- Secondary endpoint: adenoma recurrence at Year 3
- Colon Cancer Prevention Network, NCI Division for Cancer Prevention
- Start date May 22, 2014, 13 medical centers involved
- 3-5 years follow-up
- Preliminary results suggest 52% of patients respond

Tertiary immunoprevention: the present option

The vast majority of cancer vaccines that have recently emerged from successful preclinical testing have been translated into clinical trials of tertiary cancer prevention (adjuvant therapy).

The odyssey of the first FDA approved therapeutic cancer vaccine, sipuleucel-T (Provenge), is quite an interesting example.

Provenge®

FDA approved for the treatment of asymptomatic or minimally symptomatic metastatic castration-refractory prostate cancer patients.

Withdrawal of the marketing authorisation in the European Union.

What's in a name?

Sipuleucel-T (Provenge®) approved by US FDA in 2010 for the treatment of asymptomatic or minimally symptomatic metastatic castration-refractory prostate cancer patients

| Stem | What it means | |
|-------|------------------------------|--|
| si- | unique name | |
| -pu- | pulsed with a cancer protein | |
| -leu- | white blood cells | |
| -cel | cellular therapy | |
| -T | autologous | |

http://cancerresearch.org



Provenge®

Autologous peripheral blood mononuclear cells pulsed with a proprietary fusion protein (PA2024), which combines the antigen prostatic acid phosphatase (PAcP) with granulocyte macrophage colony stimulating factor (GM-CSF)



Adapted from Huber et al., J Natl Cancer Inst, 104: 273-279; 2012

federica.cavallo@unito.it



Modified from Huber et al., J Natl Cancer Inst, 104: 273-279; 2012

M B O '

federica.cavallo@unito.it

The first problem with Provenge® is the *cost* (>\$70,000), too expensive to justify its use by National Health Service.

Secondly, the *therapeutic benefit* in term of survival, about four months *versus* placebo, is modest.



Provenge®: modest therapeutic benefit A possible explanation in the target antigen?

PAcP is a prostate epithelium-specific *differentiation antigen*. In normal differentiated prostate epithelia, PAcP protein can be detected intracellularly and secreted in seminal fluid.

Serum PAcP level is low in healthy individuals, while it is elevated in individuals with metastatic prostate cancer and correlates with the stage of the disease.

Dual role in cancer: *oncosuppressor* (dephosphorylates p-Tyr of ErbB-2) and *marker* (overexpressed and released by prostate cancer cells). Its reduced intracellular amount correlates with increased tumor cell proliferation...
The rational repositioning of vaccines in the renaissance era of cancer immunotherapy

- Repositioning of cancer vaccines in the pre-malignant or in the adjuvant settings
- Combining cancer vaccines with blocking of endogenous immune-inhibiting mechanisms
- Utilization of enhanced vaccination platforms
- Testing cancer vaccines in reliable pre-clinical models
- Redirecting cancer vaccines to *more relevant targets*

Lollini et al, Vaccines 2015 Bot et al., Expert Rev Vaccines. 2013;12:1219-34



ONCOANTIGENS are tumour associated antigens (TAA) that

 have an essential role in tumor growth or progression and a restricted distribution in normal tissues

unique TAA (neoantigens)

derived from protein-altering "driver" mutations

conserved TAA

non-mutated proteins involved in the oncogenic process

- cannot be easily down-modulated or negatively immunoedited under the pressure of a specific immune attack
- when expressed on the cell membrane can be the target of both cell and antibody mediated immune responses
- if (over)expressed by cancer stem cells are ideal targets for anti-tumor vaccination
 Lollini et al, Nat Rev Cancer 2006

Cavallo et al, Nat Rev Cancer 2006 Cavallo et al, Nat Rev Cancer 2007 Cavallo et al, Cancer Immunol Immunother 2011



Why targeting cancer stem cells (CSC)



Adapted from Frank et al, J Clin Invest. 2010;120:41-50

federica.cavallo@unito.it

The cystine/glutamate antiporter system x_c⁻



xCT expression in normal and neoplastic human tissues



 \mathbf{C}

Lanzardo S et al. Cancer Res 2016; 76:62-72

federica.cavallo@unito.it

xCT is overexpressed in CSC



federica.cavallo@unito.it

Vaccination against xCT induces antibodies that target CSC and affect their self-renewal and ROS flux



Lanzardo et al., Cancer Res 2016

Vaccination against xCT slows down tumor growth in vivo





federica.cavallo@unito.it

Vaccination against xCT reduces lung metastasis formation



Vaccination against xCT increases CSC chemo-sensitivity



Lanzardo et al., Cancer Res 2016

federica.cavallo@unito.it

Vaccination against xCT increases CSC chemo-sensitivity



В

Lanzardo et al., Cancer Res 2016

federica.cavallo@unito.it

Lanzardo S, Conti L, et al., Cancer Res 2016

Conclusions

- > xCT is expressed in tumors and over-expressed in CSC
- xCT is required for CSC function (oncoantigen)
- xCT therapies should not lead to cancer escape mutants via antigen loss mechanisms
- > xCT is an immunotherapeutic target for breast CSC
- Vaccination against xCT:
 - $\checkmark\,$ induces antibodies that impair CSC function
 - \checkmark has limited (if any) effects on normal tissues
 - ✓ slows down tumor growth and impairs lung metastases formation in both Her2⁺ and TNBC models
 - ✓ increases CSC chemosensitivity (combination therapies)
- xCT represents a novel target (aminoacid transporter) for a new class of anticancer vaccines directed against CSC functional molecules

University of Torino



Laboratory of Immunology Molecular Biotechnology Center



Stefania Lanzardo Laura Conti Roberto Ruiu Maddalena Arigoni Federica Riccardo Elisabetta Bolli Marco Macagno Giuseppina Barutello Raffaele Adolfo Calogero

Dept of Clinical and Biological Sciences

Giuseppina Barrera Stefania Pizzimenti *Takis Srl, Rome* Luigi Aurisicchio

Elsalys Biotech, Illkirch Graffenstaden Ronald Rooke

Novartis Institute for Medical Research, Basel Nathalie Accart



University of Southampton Christian Ottensmeier Natalia Savelyeva

University of Parma Gaetano Donofrio



MS2 and QB VLP

AgilVax Inc, Albuquerque Federica Pericle John O'Rourke Jayne Christen

Grants from Italian Association for Cancer Research



ASSOCIAZIONE ITALIANA PER LA RICERCA SUL CANCRO

federica.cavallo@unito.it

Did you know? 1 in 3 people 1 in 4 dogs 1 in 5 cats will develop cancer in their lifetimes



National Cancer Institute

Naturally occurring cancer in companion animals An undervalued resource at the center of growing attention because of the translational implications it may hold for human disease



Comparative Oncology Program

https://ccrod.cancer.gov/confluence/display/CCRCOPWeb/Home



http://www.eurolupa.eu

federica.cavallo@unito.it

Pets & People Shared cancers, shared hopes

Similar in

- risk to develop tumors (association with age and behaviour)
- tumor onset, progression, histotypes
- antigen expression patterns
- interaction with the immune system
- response to therapy

Both may benefit from the testing of new therapies

The treatment of canine/feline patients today could be of great help for their owners tomorrow



Mirroring the human reality: the importance of the canine avatar



federica.cavallo@unito.it

The rationale for evaluating (immuno)therapeutics in dogs before carrying out in-human studies

- high translational value
- complement other in vivo cancer models
- societal acceptance
- pet owners allow their dogs to participate in clinical trials
- reduced regulatory guidelines
- compressed life span allows rapid development and completion of clinical trials
- the treatment of canine patients today could be of great help for their owners tomorrow

Adjuvant immunotherapy of dog oral malignant melanoma with electroporated human chondroitin sulfate proteoglycan-4 (CSPG4) DNA



Molecular Biotechnology Center federica.cavallo@unito.it





Veterinary Teaching Hospital paolo.buracco@unito.it

University of Torino

Chondroitin Sulfate Proteoglycan 4 (CSPG4)

Key role in:

- proliferation and survival D1
- EMT
- cytoskeletal reorganization
- chemo resistance
- invasion and migration

High density expression on melanomas and various other tumor types

Overexpressed in cancer stem cells

Human vs canine aa sequence: 82% homology, 88% similarity



CSPG4 expression in canine MM

Tissue samples from 65 canine oral (55) and subungueal (10) MMs collected between 2000 and 2010 at the Diagnostic Laboratory of the Department of Animal Pathology of the University of Turin were examined

Immunohistochemical staining revealed 37 positive MMs

| Histotypes | Melanotic (positive/total) | | Amelanotic (positive/total) | | All tumours (positive/ | |
|---------------|-------------------------------|---------|--------------------------------|---------|---------------------------|--|
| | Oral | Digital | Oral | Digital | total) | |
| Epithelioid | 12/15 | 3/3 | 6/8 | 0/0 | 21/26 (80.8%) | |
| Fusiform | 2 / 6 | 1/2 | 3/6 | 0/1 | 6/15 (40.0%) | |
| Mixed | 5 /17 | 2/4 | 3/3 | 0/0 | 10/24 (41.7%) | |
| Proportion of | 19/38 | 6/9 | 12/17 | 0/1 | 37/65 | |
| CSPG4-stained | (50%) | (66.7%) | (70.5%) | (0) | (56.9%) | |
| tumours | | | | | | |

Prognosis of canine oral MM

- Surgery, radiotherapy and chemotherapy, alone or in combination, control the tumor locally in up to 75% of animals; however the 1-year survival rate does not exceed 30% because of metastasis
- The ONCEPT (Merial) vaccine is labelled to extend median survival times in dogs with stage II or III OMM that have achieved local disease control via surgery and/or radiation therapy (Grosenbaugh et al., 2011). Its efficacy has been recently questioned (Ottnod et al., 2013)
- Need to explore *new immunotherapeutic options* (new targets, different formulations, ...)



Pilot study of DNA vaccination against CSPG4 in dogs with CSPG4⁺ spontaneous oral malignant melanoma

- 1. Histological diagnosis of oral malignant melanoma
- 2. Biopsy-evaluation of CSPG4 expression by IHC
- 3. Complete work-up for clinical staging
- 4. Estimated life expectancy of more than 4 months (absence of serious concurrent diseases)
- 5. Possibility of *"en bloc"* tumor and regional LN(s) resection (evaluation of excision margins and LNs)
- 6. Absence of distant metastases beyond the first draining LN
- 7. Written consent from the dog owner

Riccardo et al, Clinical Cancer Res 2014 Piras et al, Vet Comp Oncol. 2016

Xenogeneic DNA electrovaccination against CSPG4 in dogs



500 μ g of a plasmid coding for *human CSPG4* injected i.m. into the semimembranosus semitendinosus muscle region of anesthetized dogs, followed by electroporation (CliniporatorTM IGEA, Carpi, Italy).

Vaccination started at the 3rd-4th post-operative week and was repeated after 2 weeks and then monthly; dogs surviving over 2 years were then vaccinated every 6 months.

federica.cavallo@unito.it

June 07, 2017

Piras et al, Vet Comp Oncol. 2016

DNA vaccination targeting CSPG4 is associated with increased disease free and overall survival

| Population | Stage II | Stage III | Local | Excision Margins | |
|----------------------------|--------------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|------------------------|
| | Stage II | Stage III | Invasion | Complete | Incomplete |
| Overall (n=42) | 15 (35.71) ^a | 27 (64.29) ^a | 16 (38.09) ^a | 34 (80.95) ^ª | 8 (19.05) ^ª |
| Vax (n=23) | 9 (39.13) | 14 (60.87) | 9 (39.13) | 19 (82.61) | 4 (17.39) |
| Ctrl (n=19) | 6 (31.58) | 13 (68.42) | 7 (36.84) | 15 (78.95) | 4 (21.05) |
| ^a % in brackate | | | | | |

*% in brackets



Piras et al, Vet Comp Oncol. 2016

federica.cavallo@unito.it

University of Torino

Molecular Biotechnology Center

Federica Riccardo



Veterinary Teaching Hospital

the state

Paolo Buracco Raffaella De Maria Selina Iussich Saray Lorda Mayayo Lorella Maniscalco Marina Martano Emanuela Morello Lisa Adele Piras Elena Lardone Francesca Gattino

Veterinary Clinic "Roma Sud" Francesco Collivignarelli Daniela Mignacca



Fondazione CRT

Grants:



federica.cavallo@unito.it

June 07, 2017

Valeria Rolih Elena Quaglino Maddalena Arigoni Stefania Lanzardo Alessandra Fiore Raffaele Adolfo Calogero Giuseppina Barutello Simone Prestigio Sergio Occhipinti

Massachusetts General Hospital Harvard Medical School, Boston Soldano Ferrone