Published in final edited form as:

N Engl J Med. 2008 June 19; 358(25): 2664–2665. doi:10.1056/NEJMp0803663.

Cancer Immunotherapy: The End Game Begins

Louis M. Weiner, MD

Lombardi Comprehensive Cancer Center, Georgetown University Medical Center

In 1987, an editorial in the *Journal* that accompanied a report of high-dose interleukin-2 (IL-2) therapy for cancer (1,2) asked whether the field of immunotherapy was at “the beginning of the end” or “at the end of the beginning”. In retrospect, it was at the “beginning of the beginning”. Have we made progress since then? Finn, in her review of tumor immunology in this issue, answers emphatically in the affirmative, and the report by Hunder et al, also in this issue, (xxx) underscores the remarkable potential of the immune system to eradicate cancer, even when the disease is widespread.

It has long been known that graft-versus-tumor effects underlie the success of allogeneic bone marrow transplantation for hematological neoplasms and the efficacy of donor lymphocyte infusions in chronic myelogenous leukemia (3). These results show that the immune system can eradicate a cancer, just as it can reject an allogeneic organ unless the recipient receives potent immunosuppressive agents. However, since the immune system perceives most cancers as “self”, the allograft rejection mechanism is not often operative in cancer patients .

Nevertheless, the immune system can respond to some types of tumors. Interactions of developing tumors with the immune system can eliminate cancer cells that display highly immunogenic tumor antigens, thereby shaping the tumor’s repertoire of cancer antigens and enhancing the ability of the surviving tumor cells to evade the immune system (4). It is also possible to activate the immune system into an anti-tumor state. About 15% of patients with metastatic melanoma or renal cell carcinoma have clinically significant responses to activation of T cells by high-dose IL-2 therapy. Some of these responses are complete, durable, and apparently curative (2). Recently, Rosenberg and colleagues have improved on these results by treating melanoma with lymphocytotoxic chemotherapy, followed by an infusion of autologous tumor-derived T cells in conjunction with IL-2 to sustain T cell survival and activation (5). Hence, there is a precedent for the remarkable results of the adoptive cellular therapy approach described by Hunder et al in this issue of the *Journal*. (XXX). These successes indicate the possibility of inducing a restricted kind of autoimmunity, targeted primarily against cancer-related antigens, with limited toxicity to the patient.

T-cell therapy is promising, but there are many other examples of effective cancer immunotherapy. For example, monoclonal antibodies with clinical activity in non-Hodgkin’s lymphoma and breast cancer interact with the immune system. Treatment of non-Hodgkin’s lymphoma with rituximab, an anti-CD20 (B cell) antibody, is more effective in patients possessing the amino acid 158 (V/V) polymorphism in CD16A, the low-affinity Fcγ receptor expressed by natural killer cells. This variant receptor promotes antibody-dependent cellular cytotoxicity, and contributes to efficient immune clearance of antibody-coated targets (6). Recently, the beneficial effect on breast cancer of trastuzumab, a monoclonal antibody against HER2/*neu*, was associated with the induction of T cell responses against HER2/*neu* (7). Vaccines that prevent primary hepatitis B virus (HBV) infection also prevent the development

of HBV-induced hepatocellular carcinoma, and similar benefits for cervical cancer prevention are anticipated from human papillomavirus vaccines.

In contrast to vaccines directed against infectious agents that can initiate neoplasia, cancer vaccines have focused on cancer cell-related antigens. Many such vaccines can elicit immune responses mediated by T-cells or antibodies against tumor antigens. While there have been occasional hints of clinical benefit, no cancer vaccine has exhibited sufficient clinical activity to warrant approval of their use for cancer therapy. Even highdose interleukin-2 therapy, which can be curative in advanced melanoma and renal cell carcinoma, is frequently ineffective and has proven to be a limited platform for effective derivative treatments. Despite these limitations, every clinical investigator who has witnessed remarkable tumor regressions in some patients treated with immunotherapy has been intrigued and tormented by the idea that immunotherapy can trigger powerful and durable cancer control, even as the definitive targets and mechanisms of action remain elusive, perched at the outer limits of our knowledge.

In an era when huge randomized clinical trials are frequently required to demonstrate the efficacy of new treatments, there is still a role for an illuminating, carefully performed and thoughtfully analyzed pilot study or case report. Virtually everything that was important to learn about the future of monoclonal antibody therapy of lymphoma was described in a small trial reported by Miller and Levy in 1981 (9). Similarly, the case report by Hunder et al lays out important principles. The success of their novel strategy, and the clear immune mechanisms of action, point to a feasible new direction for adoptive cellular therapy of cancer. Hunder et al infused only 10^8 purified CD4+ T-cells, which were expanded by co-incubation with antigen-presenting cells that displayed melanoma-derived peptides bound to the patient's class II MHC antigens, thereby driving the proliferation of CD4+ T cells that recognize cancer-relevant targets. They showed that such CD4+ T-cells can coordinate an effective, prolonged anti-tumor immune response. Moreover, the infused CD4+ T-cells produced their own survival factors when they encountered their cognate targets, thereby eliminating the need for exogenous IL-2, and hence minimizing acute toxicity. In addition, Hunder et al found that the induction of an effective anti-tumor immune response against a cancer-rejection antigen elicited responses against other antigens of the patient's melanoma. This broader immune response likely blocks escape routes, such as loss of expression of the targeted antigen, that otherwise could allow a tumor to circumvent immune control.

This type of approach will not always work. Variability in the immune response and the biology of the tumor will require customized immunotherapy regimens that take these complexities into account. For example, cancers employ a variety of immunosuppressive mechanisms to defeat potentially effective immune responses (8) (Figure). While the CD4+ T-cells infused by Hunder were able to overcome tumor-derived immunosuppression, this will not always be the case, and it may prove necessary to therapeutically target immune suppression mechanisms on an individualized basis.

Does the report by Hunder et al represent a mirage, an oasis, or an early sighting of the destination? Time will tell, but if the destination is not yet at hand, it is in sight. The end game has begun.

References

1. Durant JR. Immunotherapy of cancer: the end of the beginning? *N Engl J Med* 1987 Apr 9;316(15): 939–941. [PubMed: 3493434] PMID: 3493434.
2. Rosenberg SA, Lotze MT, Muul LM, Chang AE, Avis FP, Leitman S, Linehan WM, Robertson CN, Lee RE, Rubin JT, et al. A progress report on the treatment of 157 patients with advanced cancer using lymphokine-activated killer cells and interleukin-2 or high-dose interleukin-2 alone. *N Engl J Med* 1987 Apr 9;316(15):889–897. [PubMed: 3493432] PMID: 3493432. *Blood*. 1993 Oct 15;82(8):2310-8

3. Drobyski WR, Keever CA, Roth MS, Koethe S, Hanson G, McFadden P, Gottschall JL, Ash RC, van Tuinen P, Horowitz MM, et al. Salvage immunotherapy using donor leukocyte infusions as treatment for relapsed chronic myelogenous leukemia after allogeneic bone marrow transplantation: efficacy and toxicity of a defined T-cell dose. *Blood* 1993 Oct 15;82(8):2310–2318. [PubMed: 8400284]
4. Shankaran V, Ikeda H, Bruce AT, White JM, Swanson PE, Old LJ, Schreiber RD. IFN γ and lymphocytes prevent primary tumour development and shape tumour immunogenicity. *Nature* 2001 Apr 26;410(6832):1107–1111. [PubMed: 11323675]PMID:11323675.
5. Morgan RA, Dudley ME, Wunderlich JR, Hughes MS, Yang JC, Sherry RM, Royal RE, Topalian SL, Kammula US, Restifo NP, Zheng Z, Nahvi A, de Vries CR, Rogers-Freezer LJ, Mavroukakis SA, Rosenberg SA. Cancer regression in patients after transfer of genetically engineered lymphocytes. *Science* 2006 Oct 6;314(5796):126–129. [PubMed: 16946036]Epub 2006 Aug 31. PMID: 16946036.
6. Weng WK, Levy R. Two immunoglobulin G fragment C receptor polymorphisms independently predict response to rituximab in patients with follicular lymphoma. *J Clin Oncol* 2003 Nov 1;21(21):3940–3947. [PubMed: 12975461]Epub 2003 Sep 15. PMID: 12975461.
7. Taylor C, Hershman D, Shah N, Suci-Foca N, Petrylak DP, Taub R, Vahdat L, Cheng B, Pegram M, Knutson KL, Clynes R. Augmented HER-2 specific immunity during treatment with trastuzumab and chemotherapy. *Clin Cancer Res* 2007 Sep 1;13(17):5133–5143. [PubMed: 17785568]PMID: 17785568.
8. Rabinovich GA, Gabrilovich D, Sotomayor EM. Immunosuppressive strategies that are mediated by tumor cells. *Annu Rev Immunol* 2007;25:267–296. [PubMed: 17134371]Review. PMID: 17134371.
9. Miller RA, Maloney DG, Warnke R, Levy R. Treatment of B-cell lymphoma with monoclonal anti-idiotypic antibody. *N Engl J Med* 1982 Mar 4;306(9):517–522. [PubMed: 6173751]No abstract available. PMID: 6173751.

Tumor Derived Immunosuppression

Figure 1.

Tumors evade or defeat the host tumor response to obtain a host-specific selective survival advantage.