Correlative High-Dimensional Analyses in Cancer Immunotherapy: From Infrastructure to Assays to Useful Predictive Biomarkers

Sacha Gnjatic, PhD

Associate Professor, Department of Medicine Division of Hematology and Medical Oncology Tisch Cancer Institute and Precision Immunology Institute Icahn School of Medicine at Mount Sinai, New York NY Associate Director of the Human Immune Monitoring Center



Precision Immunolog y Institute

The Tisch Cancer Institute

Disclosure information: Sacha Gnjatic, PhD

The following relationships exist:

Immune Design: Research Support Janssen R&D: Research Support Agenus: Research Support Genentech: Research Support Pfizer: Research Support Regeneron: Research Support Takeda: Research Support

Co-inventor on an issued patent for multiplex immunohistochemistry to characterize tumors and treatment responses. The technology is filed through Icahn School of Medicine at Mount Sinai (ISMMS) and non-exclusively licensed to Caprion. Mount Sinai has received payments associated with licensing this technology and both Mount Sinai and Dr. Gnjatic are entitled to future payments.

Third Rock Ventures/Neon Therapeutics: Consulting Fees (e.g., advisory boards)
B4CC: Consulting Fees (e.g., advisory boards)
OncoMed: Consulting Fees (e.g., advisory boards)
Merck: Consulting Fees (e.g., advisory boards)

Immunotherapy's continued explosive growth



Objectives and scope

- Why do some patients respond and others don't? To identify biomarkers with translational potential to optimize immunotherapeutic strategies
- To develop molecular signatures that define immune response categories to correlate with the clinical outcomes
- To define immunophenotype characteristics of response that will be valid for diverse immuno-oncology classes with different mechanisms of action



Need for analytically validated assays and procedures, and harmonized interpretation of data

Identifying immunotherapy biomarkers

- Cutting-edge technology platforms
- Technical expertise in assay development and instrument platforms
- Scientific expertise in human immunology
- Computation expertise in data analysis and visualization



Develop innovation with high-dimensional assays to monitor disease-relevant immune signatures and discover new mechanisms, biomarkers and immune targets Improve assay standardization and minimize experimental variability to maximize data quality and reproducibility

Multiscale, dynamic atlas of immune changes



Challenges of immune monitoring

Except adoptive transfer, most immunotherapies directly target the immune system rather than the tumor itself: how to find a good biomarker when targeting a network?

Assembling a multidisciplinary team for molecular, genetic, microbial, and cellular signatures

Ensuring reproducibility and robustness while fostering innovation

Obtaining adequate biospecimens to explore markers at the tumor site and in the periphery

Interpreting the complex data generated using computational tools

Correlating disparate data sets with clinical outcome

Some lead biomarkers in immune checkpoint blockade

- Tumor immune infiltration
- Tumor mutation burden
- Stratifying biomarkers (inclusion/exclusion): driver alterations (EGFR/ALK in NSCLC)
- MSI-H/dMMR (FDA approved general indications)
- PD-L1 tissue expression (FDA companion/complementary test)

Promising other candidates

- Gut microbiota composition and metabolites
- Peripheral blood markers
 - Soluble: cytokine, protein analytes, antibody
 - Cellular: activation/suppression markers, cell populations (pre-exhausted T cells), tumor antigen specificity, T cell repertoire
- Stromal markers and tissue-resident immune cells
- ctDNA/cfDNA/CTC

PD-L1 expression matters...

Independent predictive value of PD-L1 on immune cells and tumor cells (n=4549 NSCLC treated with atezolizumab, using SP263 IHC assay)



PD-L1 expression subgroup	n	Responders, n	Objective response rate (95% CI), %
TC3 and IC0	20	8	40% (19-64)
IC3 and TC0	108	24	22% (15-31)
TC3 and IC3	47	20	43% (28-58)
TC0 and IC0	73	6	8% (3-17)



Kowanetz et al. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A. 2018;115:E10119-E10126.

Pembrolizumab's FDA companion test 22C3 IHC



- PD-L1 staining as the only approved companion or complementary test for immunotherapy
- PD-L1^{hi} tumors respond better to PD-1/PD-L1 blockade But:
- Three tests are approved with only partial overlap in interpretation of their results
- Dynamic changes upon treatment and heterogeneity are difficult to capture
- Some patients experiencing benefit in PD-L1 low tumors, and many patients have no response despite PD-L1 high tumors.

Tumor mutation burden (TMB) as biomarker

TMB correlates with response to PD-1 blockade in NSCLC



- Multitude of studies indicating high TMB correlates with better response to immune checkpoint blockade (cutoff for high TMB typically at ≥ 10 mut/mb)
 - CheckMate-227 trial
 - CheckMate-568 trial independently of PD-L1 expression
- Meta-analysis in NSCLC treated with anti-PD-1/PD-L1 (n=1290) showed TMB ≥ 20 mut/mb associated with increased OS and clinical benefit (JAMA. 2019;321:1391-1399)
- Rationale based on higher likelihood of creating neoepitopes for T cell-mediated tumor rejection
- Trials have been proposed based on high TMB as a biomarker
- However, recent withdrawal of TMB ≥10 mut/mb as a supplemental biologics license FDA application for frontline combination ipilimumab/nivolumab in NSCLC

DCB = durable clinical benefit NDB = no durable clinical benefit

Rizvi et al. Science. 2015. 348-124

PD-L1 IHC and mutational load as independent biomarkers



Yarchoan, ..., Jaffee, JCI Insight, 2019

Hellman, ..., Wolchok. Cancer Cell. 2018;33:843-852

Density and localization of immune infiltrate matters...

CD8 T cell infiltration before and during pembrolizumab in advanced melanoma.



Metastatic urothelial carcinoma (n=214) treated with nivolumab



Wang, ..., Galsky. Nat Commun. 2018;9:3503.

Emerging biomarkers with novel methods may matter...

Cancer patients treated with PD-1 blockade, sequenced for gut bacteria by 16S or shotgun metagenomics



Signature of tumor macrophages by scRNAseq associated with poor outcome in early NSCLC



Matson, V. et al. Science 359, 104–108 (2018).

Gopalakrishnan, V. et al. Science 359, 97–103 (2018). Rout

Routy al. Science. 2018

0.6

Lavin, Rahman, Gnjatic, Merad, Cell 2017;169:750-765

T cell states, exhaustion, and metabolism



T cell exhaustion (but also TCF1, PTPN2, CD226...)

Khan...Wherry, Nature 2019; Seo...Rao, PNAS 2019; Alfei et al, Nature 2019; Scott et al, Nature 2019, Manguso et al, Nature 2017

https://www.cancerresearch.org/blog/september-2019/cicon19-day-2-t-cell-exhaustion-tumor-microenviron

(D) Chamoto, PNAS, 2019

Mitochondrial Fatty acid oxidation

OXPHOS

biogenesis

FOX01 omes

Metabolic change

Proliferation of T cells

(Glycolysis)

Expansion

Nucleus

Cytokines

Cancer Immune Monitoring and Analysis Centers and Cancer Immunologic Data Commons The CIMAC-CIDC Network: A Cancer Moonshot Initiative (U24)

The CIMAC-CIDC network will provide a standing infrastructure of bioassays and data commons for correlative studies in NCI-funded trials involving immunotherapy (\$50M+)

4 CIMACs for scientific expertise and a wide range of highly specialized services using state-of-the-art equipment

One CIDC for centralized bioinformatics resources for data collection and integration across trials and clinical databases Scope of work

Support correlative studies in early (phase 1 / 2) immunotherapy trials in the CTEP Trial Networks and Grant-supported trials 500 patients / multiple timepoints / year for comprehensive profiling

Many additional patients from industry and non-NCI trials through Partnership for Accelerating Clinical Trials (PACT, \$220M)







Immuno-Oncology Biomarkers Network



GlaxoSmithKline, Janssen, Novartis, Pfizer

Foundation for the National Institutes of Health AbbVie, Amgen, Boehringer Ingelheim, Bristol-Meyers Squibb, Celgene, Genentech, Gilead Sciences.



CIMACs-CIDC Network Structure



16

CIMACs-CIDC Network Structure





Workflow with the clinical networks



Biomarker discovery strategy



B. Sanchez – Espiridion et al, MD Anderson Cancer Center CIMAC

Assays and platforms for CIMACs

Tier 1 assays

(recommended for most trials)

- Whole Exome Sequencing (WES)
- RNA-seq
- IHC singleplex
 - PD-L1 FDA approved assay
- IHC/IF multiplex
- CyTOF
- Olink
- Nanostring IO panel

Tier 2 assays (trial-dependent)

- Microbiome
- TCR repertoire
- Single-cell-seq
- ctDNA-seq
- MIBI
- ATAC-seq
- scRNA-TCR

Other Assays:

ELISA, B cell response, T cell functional assays (ELISPOT, multimers)

A prospective CIMAC Umbrella Protocol for collections and processing of specimens has been developed.



Slide Courtesy of Holden Maecker, PhD, Stanford University CIMAC



Analytical validation procedure and data

- accuracy
- precision
- analytical sensitivity



- analytical specificity including interfering substances
- reference intervals (normal values) with controls and calibrators
- standardization, harmonization, reproducibility and ruggedness
- establishment of appropriate quality control and improvement procedures
- any other performance characteristics required for assay performance

Sharing and comparing SOPs

Specimen collection umbrella protocols with QC parameters Harmonizing instrument, assay, and analytical procedures Proficiency panels – sending around samples for testing and analysis Agreeing on interpretation even when platforms differ (multiplex IHC...)

Harmonization and proficiency panels



Courtesy: DFCI Tissue Biomarker Laboratory

MDACC: Michael Tetzlaff, Edwin Parra, Jack Lee DFCI: Evisa Gjini, Ana Lako, Donna Neuberg, Scott Rodig Mt Sinai: Guray Akturk, Sacha Gnjatic Phase 0: Harmonization of algorithms and of scanning for singlet IHC

 DFCI shared pre-stained H&E slides from human tissues, scanned centrally and redistributed for local scanning: Normal tonsil (n=3), Melanoma (n=3), Colorectal adenocarcinoma (n=3), Head and Neck Squamous cell carcinoma (n=3), with KI67, CD68, CD3.

Phase I: Harmonization of algorithms for scoring mIF

 Two samples of head and neck SCC (HN-SCC) stained at one site (DFCI) and only ROI-Tiffs were scored in a multi-site manner using identically stained and scanned images, with CD3, CD8, PD-1, PD-L1, CytoK

Phase II: Harmonization of staining and algorithms for scoring mIF and mIHC

- Sequential unstained slides from the above 2 HN-SCCs were distributed to all sites
- Staining was performed for CD3, CD8, PD-1, PD-L1, CytoK at all sites, with site-specific protocols, site-specific platforms and site-specific antibody clones
- Image scoring was performed on ROI-Tiffs generated in each of the sites

Phase III: Expanded Harmonization of Staining and Algorithms for scoring mIF and mIHC

• Same as above with unstained serial slides from TMAs (n=27 tissues)

Challenge: harmonizing different methods of staining and quantification





PD-L1 CD8 CD3 PanCK Fibronectin CD68 FAP DC-LAMP CD11b





QuPath software

InForm software

KI67



Multispectral immunofluorescence (mIF) staining with TSA dyes

Multiplex immunohistochemistry (mIHC) chromogen staining on a single slide (MICSSS)

Challenges: Different antibody clones, platforms, and visualization

Ima

- Different antibody clones 1.
- 2. Different IHC/IF protocols
- Multiplex panels uniquely built at 3. each institution
- Different platforms for staining, 4. scanning and/or quantification
- Different geographic regions of the 5. tissue stained

Strategy:

Select same regions of interest (ROIs) from a tissue microarray (TMA) to harmonize

DFCI







	DFCI	MDACC	Mt Sinai	
Platform	Leica Bond	Leica Bond	Leica Bond	
Scanner	Vectra	Vectra	Hamamatsu	
age analysis	Inform 2.4.2 PE	Inform 2.4.2 PE	QuPath 0.1.3	
CD3	A0452 Dako	A0452 Dako	2GV6 Ventana	
CD8	C8/144b Dako	C8/144b Thermoscientific	C8/144b Dako	
PD-1	EH33 Cell Signaling	EPR48772 Abcam	NAT105 ABCAM	
PD-L1	405.9A11 Cell Signaling	E1L3N Cell Signaling	E1L3N Cell Signaling	
Keratin	AE1/AE3 Dako	AE1/AE3 Dako	AE1/AE3 Dako	

Multiplay IE and multiplay IUC

Different geographic regions of the same tumor change the values - even when carefully selecting the ROI.





Disease	Patients analyzed
Bladder	4
HNSCC	4
Lung	6
Melanoma	6
Renal	8
Total	28

Comparing CD3 in multiplex IHC/IF



Harmonization results from TMA multiplex IHC/IF





Coefficient of Variation (<0.1)



Challenges for combination biomarkers

- Infrastructure required to perform and implement various assays
- Harmonization of multiple assays more difficult to achieve
- Should each assay be considered independently or sequentially?
- Cost of complex assays
- Degree of required personalization cost/benefit analysis

Deliverables

- SOPs collected for all assays, to be posted on CIMAC website for larger scientific community
- Validation reports generated for most assays by each CIMAC
- Multiple rounds of harmonization and reports unprecedented concordance
- Umbrella guidelines for specimen collection, to be posted on CIMAC website

Next: Combing single cell protein and RNA detection

Cellular Indexing of Transcriptomes and Epitopes by Sequencing (CITE-Seq) Stoeckius et al. *Nature Methods* 14, 865–868 (2017) Multiplexed quantification of proteins and transcripts in single cells (REAP-Seq) Peterson et al., *Nat Biotechnol.* (2017)



Upcoming methods

Slide-seq: near-single cell transcriptomics directly on tissues at 10µm definition



Science 2019:363(6434);1463-1467

Importance of validation and harmonization to reliably define baseline characteristics and mechanisms of response or resistance to various immuno-oncology drugs

It is unlikely that a single predictive biomarker will be found for immuno-oncology

Validation and harmonization efforts should help push biomarker discovery forward

Single cell data analyses and data mining with deep learning are the next frontiers for discoveries in immunotherapy

Era of personalized combined biomarkers

Acknowledgments

Icahn School of Medicine at Mount Sinai, New York, NY

Seunghee Kim-S Adeeb Rahman Diane Del Valle Manuel Garcia-Q Shingo Eikawa Naoko Imai Patricia Kovatch Jose Clemente Jeremiah Faith Nina Bhardwaj

MD Anderson, Houston, TX

Ignacio Wistuba Beatriz Sanchez-E. Edwin Parra Jack Lee Chantale Bernatchez Guray Akturk Nicolas Fernandez Romain Remark Yonit Lavin Ilaria Laface El-Ad Amir Ben Greenbaum Gerold Bongers Tom Marron Miriam Merad

Michael Tetzlaff

Sarah Fayle

Gheath El-Atrash

Courtney Hudgens

Dana-Farber Cancer Institute, Boston, MA

Cathy Wu Steve Hodi Ana Lako Pei-Hsuan Chen Shirley Liu

Stanford University, Palo Alto, CA Holden Maecker Mike Angelo Evisa Gjini Scott Rodig Junko Tsuji Donna Neuberg Ethan Cerami

Sean Bendall

National Cancer Institute, Bethesda, MD

Magdalena Thurin Helen Chen Minkyung Song David Patton Melissa Bowman Rebecca Enos Radim Moravec Bill Merritt

Support from:

Cancer Research Institute Ludwig Institute for Cancer Research NCI P01 CA190174 NCI U24 CA224319 (CIMAC)

ARRA RC2 NCI