Annals of R.S.C.B., Vol. 24, Issue 1, 2020, pp. 525- 542
Received 18April2020; accepted 23June2020

Immunotherapy Methods Towards Colitis Associated Cancer - A Systematic Review

Naziya sayee4[3] Mohamed Adil A.A[1,2] Ashok kumar Pandurangan[3], Revathi. K[1], Anil kumar B[3], Kurshid alam khan[3]

1. Meenakshi academy of higher education and research, Chennai , India
2. Saveetha school of engineering (SSE), Saveetha institute of medical and technical sciences, Chennai india
3. B.S.Abdur Rahman crescent institute of science and technology, Chennai, India
4. karunya institute of science and technology, coimbatore, India

Corresponding author
Mohamed Adil A.A
Associate professor
Meenakshi academy of higher education and research, MMCHRI Chennai, India
directoriif@maher.ac.in

Abstract

Colorectal Cancer (CRC) is the third most regular disease type. Beginning from intestinal epithelial cells in the colon and rectum that are affected by various elements including hereditary qualities, condition and interminable, waiting aggravation, CRC can be a hazardous danger to treat at the point when recognized at cutting edge stages. Chemotherapeutic specialists fill in as the chronicled first line of barrier in the treatment of metastatic CRC. As of late, in any case, combinational treatment with directed treatments, for example, vascular endothelial development factor, or epidermal development factor receptor inhibitors, has demonstrated to be very powerful in patients with explicit CRC subtypes. While logical what's more, clinical advances have revealed promising new treatment alternatives, the five-year endurance rate for metastatic CRC is still low at about 14%. Ebb and flow examination into the adequacy of immunotherapy, especially insusceptible checkpoint inhibitor treatment (ICI) in bungle fix inadequate and microsatellite unsteadiness high (dMMR–MSI-H) CRC tumors have demonstrated promising outcomes, however its use in other CRC subtypes has been either fruitless, or not widely investigated. This Review will concentrate on the present status of immunotherapies, including ICI, inoculation and receptive T cell treatment (ATC) in the treatment of CRC and its latent capacity use, in dMMR–MSI-H CRC, however likewise in crisscross fix capable and microsatellite flimsiness low (pMMR-MSI-L).

Introduction

Colorectal Cancer

Colorectal malignant growth starts when sound cells in the covering of the colon or rectum change and develop crazy, shaping a mass called a tumor. A tumor can be malignant or benevolent. A carcinogenic tumor is dangerous, which means it can develop and spread to different pieces of the body. A generous tumor implies the tumor can develop however won't spread. These progressions normally take a very long time to create. Both hereditary and ecological elements can cause the changes. Be that as it may, when an individual has a remarkable acquired disorder, changes can happen in months or years.

About colorectal polyps

Colorectal disease regularly starts as a polyp, a noncancerous development that may create on the internal mass of the colon or rectum as individuals get more established. If not treated or evacuated, a polyp can turn into a conceivably hazardous malignant growth. Finding and evacuating precancerous polyps can forestall colorectal malignant growth. There are a few types of polyps.

Annals of R.S.C.B., Vol. 24, Issue 1, 2020, pp. 525- 542
Received 18April2020; accepted 23June2020

Adenomatous polyps, or adenomas, are developments that may get carcinogenic. They can be found with a colonoscopy (see Risk Factors and Prevention). Polyps are most effortlessly found during a colonoscopy since they typically swell into the colon, framing a hill on the mass of the colon that can be found by the specialist.

About 10% of colon polyps are level and elusive with a colonoscopy except if a color is utilized to feature them. These level polyps have a high danger of getting malignant, paying little heed to their size. Hyperplastic polyps may likewise create in the colon and rectum. They are not viewed as precancerous.

Sorts of colorectal malignancy

Colorectal malignancy can start in either the colon or the rectum. Malignancy that starts in the colon is called colon disease. Malignant growth that starts in the rectum is called rectal disease. Most colon and rectal malignant growths are a kind of tumor called adenocarcinoma, which is disease of the phones that line within tissue of the colon and rectum. This area explicitly covers adenocarcinoma. Different sorts of disease that happen far less frequently yet can start in the colon or rectum incorporate neuroendocrine tumor of the gastrointestinal tract, gastrointestinal stromal tumor (GIST), little cell carcinoma, and lymphoma.

Immunotherapy

Immunotherapy called biologic treatment, is a kind of malignant growth treatment that supports the body's regular resistances to battle disease. It utilizes substances made by the body or in a research center to improve or reestablish invulnerable framework work. Immunotherapy may work by: Stopping or easing back the development of malignant growth cells. (1)

Immunoprofiling

Immunoprofiling is useful for predicting prognosis in various malignancies and provides targets for immunotherapy.

Quantitative multispectral imaging framework, which permits concurrent recognition of different resistant markers, is a novel strategy for looking at the tumor insusceptible condition. We looked at the articulation levels of different surface markers in safe cells between colitis-related malignant growth (CAC) and sporadic colorectal disease (CRC) and assessed the clinical handiness of immunoprofiling in CRC. Tumor examples from 24 CAC patients and 48 sporadic CRC patients, coordinated by age, sex, and tumor area to CAC, were remembered for the investigation. The articulation levels of CD3, CD8, Foxp3, and modified demise ligand 1 (PD-L1) in safe cells at the intrusive edges of tumor tissues were assessed by quantitative multispectral imaging. The CAC bunch had fundamentally less degrees of cells communicating CD3, CD8, Foxp3, or PD-L1 (all, $p < 0.01$). In the CAC gathering, patients whose invulnerable cells had high articulation of CD3+

Annals of R.S.C.B., Vol. 24, Issue 1, 2020, pp. 525- 542
Received 18April2020; accepted 23June2020

and CD8+ would do well to in general endurance. The resistant profiling examples of CAC patients were altogether unmistakable from those of sporadic CRC patients, recommending that CAC and sporadic CRC have particular infection phenotypes. Immunoprofiling can be useful for assessment of clinical guess in CAC.
(2)

Origins of CRC

CRC can start from a huge number of inborn and outward factors, including a collection of new changes, prior transformations, and helplessness alleles related with family ancestry, or incessant, waiting aggravation. The dominant part (75%) of CRCs are sporadic, which means family ancestry isn't associated with their pathogenesis [3]. Basic changes in tumor silencer qualities and oncogenes that offer ascent to CRC incorporate adenomatous polyposis coli (APC), tumor protein 53 (TP53), and Kirsten rodent sarcoma (KRAS), which are available in 81%, 60% and 43% of the instances of sporadic CRCs, separately [4]. The job of these hereditary adjustments in the pathogenesis of CRC has been widely surveyed [5-7]. Most CRC-inciting changes act in a specific request, controlling the adenoma–carcinoma arrangement, which depicts the movement of an ordinary intestinal epithelia to an adenoma, obtrusive carcinoma, and possible metastatic tumor [8,9]. Family ancestry is embroiled in around 10–30% of CRCs [10,11]. For instance, familial adenomatous polyposis (FAP) and genetic nonpolyposis colorectal malignant growth (Lynch disorder) are the most normally acquired CRC disorders, and record for 2–4% and 1% of CRC cases, separately [11]. About 96% of all CRCs don't create with regards to prior irritation, the jobs of constant aggravation, tumor-evoked irritation, the tumor microenvironment (TME), and in part versatile resistant cells in CRC improvement, have been set up, especially in the setting of their association with gut dysbiosis [12-17]. Colitis-related malignant growth (CAC) is a particular subset of CRC described by its suggestion with irritation that represents 1%–2% of all CRCs [18]. CAC, starting from either the ceaseless irritation in both the colon and the little digestive system, or exclusively the colon, similar to the instance of Crohn's ailment (CD) or ulcerative colitis (UC), individually, is arranged by the over the top enactment and enlistment of invulnerable cells that produce provocative cytokines, for example, TNF, IL-17, IL-23 and IL-6, that lead to the spread of an provocative and conceivably premalignant condition [19]. Changes engaged with fiery entrail sickness (IBD) advancement incorporate qualities that manage insusceptible initiation and the resulting reaction, for example, IL12B, IL2, IFNG, IL10, TNFSF8, TNFSF15, IL7R, DENND1B, JAK2 and those that additionally manage ER stress, glucose, bile salt exchange and natural particle transporter, including XBP1, SLC9A4, SLC22A5 and SCL11A1 [20]. Both CRC and CAC display fiery microenvironments, however the request wherein irritation and tumorigenesis happen is by all accounts unique. In CRC, irritation follows tumorigenesis. Changes because of ecological elements start tumor advancement in CRCs, and the resulting actuation of provocative cells can incite further DNA harm through the creation of receptive oxygen species (ROS) and responsive nitrogen intermediates (RNIs) [19,21]. Then again, aggravation goes before tumorigenesis in CAC. Aggravation incited by the actuation of invulnerable cells and their arrival of proinflammatory cytokines can initiate DNA harm and changes in CAC [19]. Correspondingly, both CRC and CAC may involve comparable changes, yet the planning and request of these transformations are unique, as shown by early APC and late TP53 transformations in CRC, and early TP53 and late APC

Annals of R.S.C.B., Vol. 24, Issue 1, 2020, pp. 525- 542
Received 18April2020; accepted 23June2020

changes in CAC [22-24]. Another significant supporter of CRC rise is supposed tumor-inspired irritation driven by the loss of typical obstruction work because of APC inactivation [12].

Colorectal Cancer: Molecular and Immunologic Landscape

To some degree because of the nearness of clear antecedent sores, the progression savvy pathogenesis of colorectal malignant growth was all around portrayed more than two decades back [25]. The endeavors of the Cancer Genome Atlas (TCGA) and worldwide agreement bunches have on the whole found a way to shape accord definitions of the colorectal malignant growth subtypes, with the point of helping future research endeavors [26]. Most of colorectal malignant growths show actuation of the wnt/B-catenin pathway, to a limited extent because of inactivation of the tumor silencer quality, APC. Pertinent to helpful focusing, in metastatic illness RAS (KRAS or NRAS), transformations are seen in over half of patients, with BRAF changes found in 5–10% [27,28]. Extra developing targets incorporate HER-2 amplifications, found in 2–5% of every single colorectal malignant growth [29]. While considering genomic precariousness across different malignant growth types, colorectal diseases fall in the pack as far as the normal tumoral transformation load, however there is checked heterogeneity [30].

A subset of colorectal cancers possesses markedly elevated mutational rates. Predominantly, these tumors are characterized by dysfunction of the mismatch repair genes (microsatellite high or MSI-H).MSI-H tumors make up a minority of colorectal cancers, with decreasing frequency in more advanced stage disease. The prevalence of MSI-H in stage II, III and IV colorectal cancers stands at 22%, 12%, and 3%, respectively [31,32]. A small fraction of hyper-mutated tumors possesses polymerase mutations, specifically within the catalytic domain. These hyper mutated tumors are of great relevance in our current understanding of colorectal cancer subtyping and the role of immunotherapy.

Colorectal Cancer Subtypes

Four consensus molecular subtypes (CMS) of colorectal cancer have recently been agreed upon in a unification of prior classification criteria [33]. This classification system is based upon gene expression assays, similar to the determination of consensus breast cancer subtypes. At present, this is predominantly a classification with application to research rather than routine patient care. Interestingly, recent data has suggested that these subtypes may be accurately assigned through straightforward IHC based assays, though this remains to be validated in additional data sets [34]. CMS 1 tumors (MSI Immune, 14%) are characterized by hyper mutation, MSI, and strong immune activation. CMS2 (Canonical, 37%) are epithelial, with chromosomal instability (CIN) and prominent WNT and MYC signaling activation. CMS3 (Metabolic, 13%) are epithelial, characterized by metabolic dysregulation. Finally, CMS4 (Mesenchymal, 23%) possesses prominent transforming growth factor β (TGF-β) activation, stromal invasion and angiogenesis. A remaining 13% possess mixed features. A recent analysis examined several independent cohorts of colorectal cancers, with the goal of better describing the tumor microenvironment as it pertains to the CMS subtypes [35]. While CMS1 tumors are characterized by overexpression of genes specific to cytotoxic lymphocytes, CMS2 and CMS3 tumors demonstrate low inflammatory and immune signatures. On the other hand, the CMS4 subtypeexpressesmarkersoflymphocyticandmonocyticoriginandischaracterizedbyanangiogenic,

Annals of R.S.C.B., Vol. 24, Issue 1, 2020, pp. 525- 542
Received 18April2020; accepted 23June2020

inflammatory and immunosuppressive signature, with a high density of fibroblasts seen on histologic examination. Thus, different strategies may be required for the success of immunotherapy in the various tumor subtypes. Immunecheckpointinhibitionandtherapieswhichmightreactivateastunted immune response may have greatest success in CMS1 tumors. On the other hand, CMS4 tumors will more likely require an approach which targets the suppressive monocytoid cells and related cytokines, alone or in combination with immune checkpoint inhibition. CMS2 and CMS3 tumors represent the classic 'cold' tumors, which might benefit from an immunogenic stimulus, such as radiation, a vaccine, or a co-stimulatory compound as a major part of the strategy. These are all strategies in development at present.

Key Immunotherapeutic Trials in Colorectal Cancer

An early investigation using a CTLA-4 adversary mAb, Tremelimumab, exhibited the chance of action of invulnerable checkpoint inhibitors in colorectal malignant growth, creating one reaction solid to a half year [36]. Notwithstanding, there was just one case among the 47 patients treated which didn't incite eagerness to help further examination. At the point when PD-1 inhibitors first made a sprinkle in the facility, there were indications of sturdy reaction and action in numerous diverse tumor types, including the MSI-H case recently depicted [37].

Immune suppressive cells

CD4+ Th cells are basic for actuating and managing resistant reactions. Invulnerable homeostasis is principally constrained by two unmistakable partner T cell subsets, Th1 and Th2 cells. Th1 cells discharge IFN-γ, which can additionally sharpen tumor cells to CTLs by actuating the up-guideline of MHC class I molecule articulation on tumor cells and antigen-handling apparatus in DCs. Th2 cells emit type II cytokines, for example, IL-4 and IL-10 that improve humoral invulnerability (the immunizer based antitumor response). Critically, tumor cell-inferred solvent factors, for example, changing development factor-β (TGF-β) and IL-10 prompt resilience by advancing the extension of the CD4+α-2R (CD25)+ forkhead box P3 (Foxp3)+ common Treg subset. Initiated Tregs (CD4+CD25+Foxp3-) discharge TGF-β and IL-10 and smother Th1 and Th2 phenotypes. In this manner, Tregs assume a vital job in tumor movement and the concealment of antitumor invulnerability. [38]

The disease microenvironment comprises of malignant growth cells as well as stromal cells, for example, malignant growth related fibroblasts, tolerogenic DCs, myeloid-determined silencer cells, immunosuppressive tumor-related macrophages (TAMs), and Tregs. These safe suppressive cells emit vascular endothelial development factor (VEGF), IL-6, IL-10, TGF-β, solvent FasL, and indolamine-2,3-dioxygenase (IDO), which restrain antitumor insusceptibility by different components, including consumption of arginine and elaboration of responsive oxygen species (ROS) and NO. In addition, the tumor microenvironment advances the gathering of Tregs that smother CD8+ CTL work because of the discharge of IL-10 or TGF-β from Tregs and tumor cells. [39]

Colitis Cancer vaccines

Annals of R.S.C.B., Vol. 24, Issue 1, 2020, pp. 525- 542
Received 18April2020; accepted 23June2020

Malignant growth immunizations are dynamic remedial methodologies intended to trigger the insusceptible framework to react to at least one tumor-explicit antigens and assault disease cells through the acknowledgment of these antigens. The difficulties in building up a malignancy antibody incorporate:1) recognizing a reasonable antigen target and 2) structuring a fitting immunization system to inspire insusceptible reactions against disease cells communicating that

antigen. Disease antibody approaches incorporate tumor cell immunizations, peptide immunizations, dendritic cell immunizations, DNA antibodies, and viral vector-based antibodies. [40]

Peptide vaccines

A peptide antibody depends on the distinguishing proof and combination of epitopes, which can incite TAA-explicit antitumor safe reactions. CRC cells express TAAs, for example, carcinoembryonic antigen (CEA)[41,42], mucin 1[41-43], epidermal development factor receptor (EGFR)[44], squamous cell carcinoma antigen perceived by T cells 3 (SART3)[45], β-human chorionic gonadotropin (β-hCG)[46], Wilms' Tumor antigen 1 (WT1)[47], Survivin-2B[48], MAGE3[49], p53[50], or changed KRAS[51], which are potential focuses for immunotherapy. Peptide immunizations focusing on these TAAs might be a valuable methodology for immunotherapy in CRC patients.

Peptide immunizations are straightforward, sheltered, stable, and efficient. Numerous MHC class I-restricting peptides have been distinguished and tried for immunogenicity. A few peptide antibodies for CRC have been tried in phase I clinical preliminaries. Fifteen patients with cutting edge or intermittent CRC communicating survivin were immunized with a peptide got from HLA-A*2402-limited epitopes [48]. In 6 patients, tumor marker levels (CEA and CA19-9) diminished temporarily during the survivin-2B peptide immunization. Besides, in stage I preliminary of peptide-mixed drink immunizations got from ring finger protein 43 (RNF43) and translocase of the external mitochondrial layer 34 (TOMM34), 8 of 21 patients displayed antigen-explicit CTL reactions to both RNF43 and TOMM34, and 12 patients showed CTL reactions to one of the peptides only [52]. The patients who didn't show any CTL reactions had the least endurance rates. By inoculation with a 13-mer freak ras peptide, 2 of 7 CRC patients indicated antitumor insusceptible reactions that were essentially connected with drawn out by and large survival [53]. In addition, in a stage II preliminary, inoculation with the β-hCG peptide prompted hostile to β-hCG counter acting agent creation in 56 of 77 CRC patients [46]. Strikingly, hostile to β-hCG counter acting agent acceptance was related with longer generally speaking survival [46]. In any case, some clinical preliminaries report an error among clinical and immunological reactions. In SART3 peptide immunization treatment, IgE-type against peptide antibodies were distinguished after inoculation; be that as it may, immunological reactions were not recognized in the patients [45]. Peptide immunizations for CRC patients are commonly all around endured, without any patients requiring discontinuance because of poisonous quality; notwithstanding, a high recurrence of responses were seen at the infusion site because of the utilization of adjuvants, for example, inadequate Freund's adjuvant, IL-

Annals of R.S.C.B., Vol. 24, Issue 1, 2020, pp. 525- 542
Received 18April2020; accepted 23June2020

2, granulocyte-macrophage settlement invigorating variable (GM-CSF), and bacillus Calmette-Guerin (BCG). Critically, peptide antibodies have demonstrated just constrained accomplishment in clinical preliminaries. There are a few downsides to the peptide immunization system, including: (1) impediments because of the patient's HLA type [54]; (2) ineffectualness of CD8+ CTLs because of the down-guideline of specific antigens and MHC class I molecules; (3) disabled DC work in patients with cutting edge cancer[55]; and (4) tumor microenvironments, where resistant suppressive cells, for example, Tregs exist[13]. Engineered long peptides might be increasingly appealing possibility for peptide-based antibodies. In a stage I/II preliminary, 10 CRC patients were inoculated twice with a lot of 10 covering p53 engineered long peptides [50]. P53-explicit CD4+ and CD8+ T-cell reactions were seen in 9 of 10 CRC patients, and 6 of 9 tried patients kept up p53-explicit T-cell reactivity for in any event 6 mo. New preliminaries may concentrate on improving the long peptide immunization instigated antitumor invulnerable reactions.

DC vaccines

Three signals were required for induction of efficient CTL responses: (1) simultaneous presentation of multiple TAAs by both MHC class I and class II molecules; (2) costimulation by membrane-bound receptor-ligand pairs; and (3) cytokines to direct polarization of the resultant antitumor immune responses. DCs can provide all three of these signals that are essential for the induction of antitumor immunity. Therefore, many clinical trials of antigen-pulsed DCs have been conducted in patients with various types of tumors, including CRC.

To date, various strategies for delivering TAAs to DCs have been developed to generate potent CTL responses against tumor cells. DCs have been pulsed with synthetic peptides derived from the known TAAs [56], tumor cell lysates [57], apoptotic tumor cells, and tumor RNA[58], or physically fused with whole tumor cells[59] to induce efficient antitumor immune responses. Because CEA is a tumor-associated antigen expressed by most CRCs, DCs have been pulsed with CEA peptides [60-64] or CEA mRNA [63,65]. In these phase I clinical trials, the majority of vaccinated CRC patients demonstrated the induction of CEA-specific T cell responses. Moreover, disease progression stabilized in several patients, and the vaccine was safe and well-tolerated. As CEA is a self-antigen and poorly immunogenic, Fong et al [64] generated altered peptide ligands that were derived from native T cell epitopes and contained amino acid substitutions that either increased the peptide affinity for the MHC peptide-binding groove or modified interactions with the T cell receptor. In this trial, 12 patients were immunized with DCs loaded with altered peptides derived from CEA and the Flt3 adjuvant ligand. Two of 12 patients showed disease stabilization for 3 months and 6 months, 2 patients showed complete responses for more than 10 months, and one patient had a mixed response with some regression of liver metastases. To improve the clinical efficacy of DC-based cancer vaccines, it is crucial to design novel strategies that boost adaptive antitumor immunity to overcome tolerance.

Whole tumor cell vaccines

Because autologous tumor cells express a whole TAAs including those known and unidentified, using whole tumor cells could greatly diminish the chance of tumor escape compared to using a single epitope peptide [41,42]. A significant disadvantage to this approach is the difficulty in

generating a “universal” vaccine that could be applicable to all patients with a given cancer. Autologous whole tumor cells have been used as cancer vaccines to induce polyclonal CTL induction in several cancer types [66,67], including CRC [68]. A randomized phase III clinical trial of a combined autologous whole tumor cell plus BCG vaccine was conducted to determine whether surgical resection plus vaccination was more beneficial than resection alone in 412 stage II and III CRC patients. This study showed no significant clinical benefit from whole tumor cell vaccination in surgically resected patients with stage II or III CRC. However, effective immune responses were associated with the improved disease-free and overall survival. Only a small proportion of the proteins in an autologous whole tumor cell vaccine are specific to tumor cells, while a vast majority of antigens in the vaccine are shared with normal cells. Moreover, whole tumor cell vaccines are likely to be poorly immunogenic. Therefore, the immune response generated by whole tumor cell vaccines is generally insufficient to provide benefit to patients. To improve the immunogenicity of whole tumor cell vaccines, autologous tumor cells have been genetically modified to secrete GM-CSF and then re-administered to the patient [69]. The trials have shown promising results in patients with prostate carcinoma [70], renal cell carcinoma [71], metastatic non-small-cell lung carcinoma [72], and melanoma [73]. This approach is based on the fact that GM-CSF is required at the site of the tumor to effectively prime TAA-specific immunity [69]. Another tumor cell vaccine approach utilizes Newcastle disease virus (NDV)-infected irradiated tumor cells as autologous CRC vaccines [74]. This approach resulted in a 97.9% two-year survival rate in patients with resected CRC, compared to 66.7% when treated with autologous tumor cells combined with BCG. However, a randomized phase III study of 50 patients with resectable CRC liver metastases demonstrated that vaccination with NDV-infected whole tumor cells did not significantly improve overall survival, disease-free survival or metastases-free survival, although subgroup analyses suggested that the vaccines were somewhat beneficial [75]. The immunogenicity of whole tumor cells needs to be improved for this vaccination strategy to be effective. However, it is unclear which specific agents (such as cytotoxic chemotherapeutics, ionizing irradiation, and chemical agents) are best suited for killing tumor cells to generate highly immunogenic whole tumor cell vaccines.

Viral vector vaccines

Recombinant viral vectors are possibly helpful antibody vehicles for malignant growth treatment. Numerous kinds of recombinant infections are normally immunogenic, taint APCs (explicitly DCs), and express TAAs [76]. The normal immunogenicity of viral vectors goes about as an adjuvant to help support TAA-explicit invulnerable reactions. In one examination, CRC patients were inoculated with vaccinia infection or a replication-flawed avian poxvirus encoding CEA. Right now study, viral-based inoculation with replication-damaged recombinant fowlpox and vaccinia infections encoding the CEA antigen and TRICOM (B7.1, ICAM-1, and LFA-3) instigated CEA-explicit T cell responses [77] and malady adjustment in 40% of patients with metastatic disease (counting CRC) for in any event 4 months [78]. A stage II clinical preliminary in patients with metastatic CRC inspected the viability of chemotherapy joined with immunization with a non replicating canary pox infection (ALVAC) communicating the CEA and T-cell costimulatory particle, B7.1 (ALVAC-CEA/B7.1). Hostile to CEA-explicit T cell reactions were effectively produced in half of patients experiencing chemotherapy and sponsor immunization. Objective clinical reactions were seen in 40% of the patients [79,80]. Strikingly, chemotherapy doesn't seem to restrain antibody interceded resistance.

Annals of R.S.C.B., Vol. 24, Issue 1, 2020, pp. 525- 542
Received 18April2020; accepted 23June2020

Clinical trials of immunotherapy

Up to this point, immunotherapy against colorectal malignant growth has met with constrained achievement. Old style draws near produced for the treatment of melanoma, for example, supportive immunotherapy with LAK or TIL and foundational organization of cytokines like IL-2 and INF-a,have demonstrated inadequate in colorectal carcinoma. Nonetheless, ceaseless logical and mechanical improvements both in monoclonal immunizer (mAb) and in antibody configuration have today incited another flood of clinical preliminaries, at times with empowering primer outcomes.

Adoptive immunotherapy:

Receptive immunotherapy is characterized as the helpful organization to the patient of live cell resistant effectors, for the most part after in vitro development, enactment or potentially quality control to build their enemy of tumor action. In colorectal carcinoma, receptive immunotherapy has been endeavored with INFg-initiated macrophages [81-83], and with IL2-actuated lymphocyte effectors, for example, LAK or TIL, without appearing significant clinical viability [84,85]. Low recurrence of against tumor T cells in lymphocyte arrangements [86] what's more, getaway of the T cell reaction by tumor cells due to HLA-misfortune variations are two potential clarifications of the low pace of achievement saw in T cell supportive immunotherapy. A system to conquer both low yields in collecting TAA-explicit T cells and loss of class I HLA by tumor cells could be to gather huge quantities of unselected T cells and to furnish them with fake receptors permitting acknowledgment of tumor cells in a non-HLA also, non-TCR confined way . Among the best portrayed instances of such counterfeit receptors are the supposed T-bodies, fanciful receptors made of counter acting agent determined variable locales (Fv or scFv) as extracellular acknowledgment spaces, joined to the intracellular areas of the flagging subunits of various lymphocyte antigen receptors (for example the z chain of TCRs, or on the other hand the g chain of Fc receptors) [87]. The plan of straightforward and practical T-bodies, that could be without any problem communicated in T cells and could successfully intervene T cell initiation after authoritative with target TAA, has required a extensive stretch of in vitro investigations and the systematical.

Adoptive cell therapy

Latent immunotherapy is a procedure where invulnerable effectors (cells or particles) are moved to the host, as opposed to enact the host's endogenous insusceptible framework (dynamic immunotherapy). One type of this treatment is supportive cell treatment (ACT). Most receptive cell treatments center fundamentally around T cell treatment, because of the profoundly explicit nature and powerful murdering capacity of T cells. In supportive T cell treatment, autologous T cells are expelled from patients, enacted and extended to huge numbers ex vivo and moved go into patients for a remedial impact. One bit of leeway of ACT is that ex vivo reinventing and initiation of T cells may conquer a few systems of self-resistance, which hinder T cell enactment in vivo [88]. To be sure, the organization of huge quantities of T cells with high explicitness to tumor antigens may prompt tumor relapse. In any case, a few inconveniences for receptive cell treatment additionally should be viewed as, for example, a potential absence of invulnerable memory, poor determination

Annals of R.S.C.B., Vol. 24, Issue 1, 2020, pp. 525- 542
Received 18April2020; accepted 23June2020

of supportive T cells in vivo, restrictive cost and time to deliver T cells (4 four months), just as hazard for cut off unfriendly impacts.

The essential procedures for assenting T cell move have used tumor invading lymphocytes (TILs) or hereditarily built T cells. It is realized that a few tumors have tumor-antigen-explicit T cells inside the tumor microenvironment [89]. Sadly, these cells are smothered or useless with the end goal that disease cells overpower the reaction [90] .In any case, T cells gathered from the TIL can be re-invigorated ex vivo in a procedure that inverts their lethargic state. Extended TIL re-controlled to patients with metastatic melanoma advance extraordinary decreases in tumor trouble in early stage clinical preliminaries [91]. In any case, the utilization of TILs is presently constrained to patients with melanoma, possibly because of a higher immunogenicity of melanoma in contrast with different malignant growths. On the other hand, hereditarily designed T cells communicating antigen receptors with foreordained liking encourage the focusing of for all intents and purposes any tumor type. In fact, T cells designed to communicate high devotion T cell receptors (TCRs) target tumors of different histological starting points. In any case, these TCRs would be constrained to patients with the relating MHC haplotype. On the other hand, the utilization of counter acting agent based fanciful antigen receptors (CARs), which express a solitary chain variable part got from a tumor antigen-perceiving monoclonal immunizer, combined to intracellular T cell flagging spaces, can be utilized all around over all patients since CARs target local antigens on the outside of tumors without MHC limitation.

In that unique situation, a stage I preliminary in colon malignancy analyzed human T cells built to communicate a high ardentness CEA-explicit murine TCR [92].Three patients with metastatic colon disease were treated with these designed T cells, all of which experienced diminished serum CEA levels and one of which encountered a goal clinical reaction. In any case, all patients built up a serious transient provocative colitis. Serious reactions likewise were found in one patient treated with Her2-explicit CAR T cells for metastatic colon malignant growth [93]. Therefore ACT has neglected to show wellbeing and viability in colorectal disease patients and future examinations should recognize components that permit CAR-communicating T cells to specifically wipe out malignancy cells, however leave ordinary tissues unaffected.

Future perspective

Improved treatment options that selectively target cancer-dependent pathways with little or no toxicity to normal tissues are urgently needed. Work in our laboratory focuses on these key aspects by combining the use of DCs pulsed with MHC class I and II peptides and conventional chemotherapy. Immunotherapy may be combined with conventional therapy to reduce Tregs and enhance CTL responses. Knockdown of PD-L1 and PD-L2 on monocyte-derived DCs and tumor cells may help decrease tolerance . DCs electroporated with PD-L small-interfering RNAs are highly effective in enhancing T cell proliferation and cytokine production and are therefore attractive candidates for improving the efficacy of DC vaccines in cancer patients. Moreover, combined blockade of PD1 and CTLA-4, which play key roles in inhibiting T-cell activation, enhances antitumor immune responses compared to either agent alone . Combining immunotherapies, particularly agents that target different immune checkpoints, may be a promising approach. Preliminary clinical findings indicate that combined targeted therapies and simultaneous

blockade of multiple immune checkpoints could promote therapeutic synergy and long-term antitumor immunity to improve clinical outcomes for melanoma patients . In the metastatic CT26 CRC mouse model, simultaneous blockade of CTLA-4 and PD-L1 enhanced antitumor activity in an interleukin-15-dependent manner.[94]

Conclusion

CRC is a profoundly multifaceted and complex illness with a broad mutational signature and a mind boggling TME. Similarly as intricate as the sickness itself, are the treatments used to battle it **.**The constraints of medical procedure and adjuvant chemo/radio/counter acting agent treatments to treat CRC patients require the improvement of novel methodologies, including immunotherapy. While some clinical preliminaries using malignancy antibodies have shown objective clinical reactions in vaccinated patients with metastatic CRC, more work is required. The endorsement of the principal disease antibody, sipuleucel-T, ought to set up another worldview for the turn of events, clinical testing and administrative endorsement of future malignancy immunizations for colorectal and different malignancies. ACT in clinical preliminaries for CRC has brought about extreme toxicities; be that as it may, victories focusing on melanoma and leukemia have exhibited the achievability of this methodology. Elective ways to deal with limit toxicities in CRC patients by recognizing suitable antigen targets or intercessions that decrease the seriousness of toxicities will be fundamental for this treatment to make progress. While it is far-fetched that a solitary treatment will be an all inclusive solution for CRC, a future combination of therapeutics including medical procedure, chemotherapy, immunotherapy, and conceivably others may at last change persistent results in CRC.

References

1. "Immunotherapy | Memorial Sloan Kettering Cancer Center". www.mskcc.org. Retrieved 2017-07-27.
2. .Edge, S. B. & Compton, C. C. The American Joint Committee on Cancer: the 7th edition of the AJCC cancer staging manual and the future of TNM. Ann Surg Oncol 17, 1471–1474, https://doi.org/10.1245/s10434-010-0985-4 (2010).
3. Yamagishi, H.; Kuroda, H.; Imai, Y.; Hiraishi, H. Molecular pathogenesis of sporadic colorectal cancers. Chin. J. Cancer 2016, 35, 4–4.
4. . Robles, A.I.; Traverso, G.; Zhang, M.; Roberts, N.J.; Khan, M.A.; Joseph, C.; Lauwers, G.Y.; Selaru, F.M.; Popoli, M.; Pittman, M.E.; et al. Whole-Exome Sequencing Analyses of Inflammatory Bowel DiseaseAssociated Colorectal Cancers. Gastroenterology 2016, 150, 931–943.
5. Schell, M.J.; Yang, M.; Teer, J.K.; Lo, F.Y.; Madan, A.; Coppola, D.; Monteiro, A.N.A.; Nebozhyn, M.V.; Yue, B.; Loboda, A.; et al. A multigene mutation classification of 468 colorectal cancers reveals a prognostic role for APC. Nat. Commun. 2016, 7, 1–12.
6. Pandurangan, A. kumar; Divya, T.; Kumar, K.; Dineshbabu, V.; Velavan, B.; Sudhandiran, G. Colorectal carcinogenesis: Insights into the cell death and signal transduction pathways: A review. World J. Gastrointest Oncol. 2018, 10, 244–259. Cells 2020, 9, 618 11 of 18
7. Fearon, E.R. Molecular Genetics of Colorectal Cancer. Annu. Rev. Pathol. Mech. Dis. 2011, 6, 479–507.
8. Leslie, A.; Carey, F.A.; Pratt, N.R.; Steele, R.J.C. The colorectal adenoma–carcinoma sequence. Br. J. Surg. 2002, 89, 845–860.

9. Taylor, D.P.; Burt, R.W.; Williams, M.S.; Haug, P.J.; Cannon-Albright, L.A. Population-based family history-specific risks for colorectal cancer: A constellation approach. Gastroenterology 2010, 138, 877–885.
10. Kerber, R.A.; Neklason, D.W.; Samowitz, W.S.; Burt, R.W. Frequency of Familial Colon Cancer and Hereditary Nonpolyposis Colorectal Cancer (Lynch Syndrome) in a Large Population Database. Familial. Cancer 2005, 4, 239–244.
11. Stoffel, E.M.; Kastrinos, F. Familial colorectal cancer, beyond Lynch syndrome. Clin. Gastroenterol. Hepatol. 2014, 12, 1059–1068.
12. Grivennikov, S.I.; Wang, K.; Mucida, D.; Stewart, C.A.; Schnabl, B.; Jauch, D.; Taniguchi, K.; Yu, G.-Y.; Österreicher, C.H.; Hung, K.E.; et al. Adenoma-linked barrier defects and microbial products drive IL23/IL-17-mediated tumour growth. Nature 2012, 491, 254–258.
13. Wang, K.; Kim, M.K.; Di Caro, G.; Wong, J.; Shalapour, S.; Wan, J.; Zhang, W.; Zhong, Z.; Sanchez-Lopez, E.; Wu, L.-W.; et al. Interleukin-17 Receptor A Signaling in Transformed Enterocytes Promotes Early Colorectal Tumorigenesis. Immunity 2014, 41, 1052–1063.
14. Dmitrieva-Posocco, O.; Dzutsev, A.; Posocco, D.F.; Hou, V.; Yuan, W.; Thovarai, V.; Mufazalov, I.A.; Gunzer, M.; Shilovskiy, I.P.; Khaitov, M.R.; et al. Cell-Type-Specific Responses to Interleukin-1 Control Microbial Invasion and Tumor-Elicited Inflammation in Colorectal Cancer. Immunity 2019, 50, 166–180.e7.
15. Greten, F.R.; Grivennikov, S.I. Inflammation and Cancer: Triggers, Mechanisms, and Consequences. Immunity 2019, 51, 27–41.
16. Ziegler, P.K.; Bollrath, J.; Pallangyo, C.K.; Matsutani, T.; Canli, Ö.; De Oliveira, T.; Diamanti, M.A.; Müller, N.; Gamrekelashvili, J.; Putoczki, T.; et al. Mitophagy in Intestinal Epithelial Cells Triggers Adaptive Immunity during Tumorigenesis. Cell 2018, 174, 88–101.e16.
17. Goldszmid, R.S.; Dzutsev, A.; Viaud, S.; Zitvogel, L.; Restifo, N.P.; Trinchieri, G. Microbiota modulation of myeloid cells in cancer therapy. Cancer Immunol. Res. 2015, 3, 103–109.
18. . Zhen, Y.; Luo, C.; Zhang, H. Early detection of ulcerative colitis-associated colorectal cancer. Gastroenterol. Rep. (Oxf) 2018, 6, 83–92.
19. Terzić, J.; Grivennikov, S.; Karin, E.; Karin, M. Inflammatio and Colon Cancer. Gastroenterology 2010, 138, 2101–2114.e5.
20. Khor, B.; Gardet, A.; Xavier, R.J. Genetics and pathogenesis of inflammatory bowel disease. Nature 2011, 474, 307–317.
21. Shaked, H.; Hofseth, L.J.; Chumanevich, A.; Chumanevich, A.A.; Wang, J.; Wang, Y.; Taniguchi, K.; Guma, M.; Shenouda, S.; Clevers, H.; et al. Chronic epithelial NF- B activation accelerates APC loss and intestinal tumor initiation through iNOS up-regulation. PNAS 2012, 109, 14007–14012.
22. Levin, B.; Lieberman, D.A.; McFarland, B.; Andrews, K.S.; Brooks, D.; Bond, J.; Dash, C.; Giardiello, F.M.; Glick, S.; Johnson, D.; et al. Screening and Surveillance for the Early Detection of Colorectal Cancer and Adenomatous Polyps, 2008: A Joint Guideline From the American Cancer Society, the US Multi-Society Task Force on Colorectal Cancer, and the American College of Radiology. Gastroenterology 2008, 134, 1570– 1595.
23. Carethers, J.M.; Jung, B.H. Genetics and Genetic Biomarkers in Sporadic Colorectal Cancer. Gastroenterology 2015, 149, 1177–1190.e3.

24. Kameyama, H.; Nagahashi, M.; Shimada, Y.; Tajima, Y.; Ichikawa, H.; Nakano, M.; Sakata, J.; Kobayashi, T.; Narayanan, S.; Takabe, K.; et al. Genomic characterization of colitis-associated colorectal cancer. World J. Surg. Oncol. 2018, 16.
25. Vogelstein,B.;Fearon,E.R.;Hamilton,S.R.;ern,S.E.;Preisinger,A.C.;Leppert,M.;Nakamura,Y.;White, R.; Smits, A.M.; Bos, J.L. Genetic alterations during colorectal-tumor development. N. Engl. J. Med. 1988, 319, 525–532.
26. CancerGenomeAtlasNetwork.Comprehensivemolecularcharacterizationofhumancolonandrectalcancer. Nature 2012, 487, 330–337.
27. Peeters,M.;Kafatos,G.;Taylor,A.;Gastanaga,V.M.;Oliner,K.S.;Hechmati,G.;Terwey,J.H.;vanKrieken,J.H. Prevalence of RAS mutations and individual variation patterns among patients with metastatic colorectal cancer: A pooled analysis of randomised controlled trials. Eur. J. Cancer 2015, 51, 1704–1713.
28. Cremolini,C.;Loupakis,F.;Antoniotti,C.;Lupi,C.;Sensi,E.;Lonardi,S.;Mezi,S.;Tomasello,G.;Ronzoni,M.; Zaniboni, A.; et al. FOLFOXIRI plus bevacizumab versus FOLFIRI plus bevacizumab as first-line treatment of patients with metastatic colorectal cancer: Updated overall survival and molecular subgroup analyses of the open-label, phase 3 TRIBE study. Lancet Oncol. 2015, 16, 1306–1315.
29. Richman, S.D.; Southward, K.; Chambers, P.; Cross, D.; Barrett, J.; Hemmings, G.; Taylor, M.; Wood, H.; Hutchins, G.; Foster, J.M.; et al. HER2 overexpression and amplification as a potential therapeutic target in colorectal cancer: Analysis of 3256 patients enrolled in the QUASAR, FOCUS and PICCOLO colorectal cancer trials. J. Pathol. 2016, 238, 562–570.
30. Alexandrov,L.B.;NikZainal,S.;Wedge,D.C.;Aparicio,S.A.;Behjati,S.;Biankin,A.V.;Bignell,G.R.;Bolli,N.; Borg, A.; Borresen-Dale, A.L.; et al. Signatures of mutational processes in human cancer. Nature 2013, 500, 415–421.
31. Klingbiel, D.; Saridaki, Z.; Roth, A.D.; Bosman, F.T.; Delorenzi, M.; Tejpar, S. Prognosis of stage II and III colon cancer treated with adjuvant 5-fluorouracil or FOLFIRI in relation to microsatellite status: Results of the PETACC-3 trial. Ann. Oncol. 2015, 26, 126–132.
32. Koopman,M.;Kortman,G.A.;Mekenkamp,L.;Ligtenberg,M.J.;Hoogerbrugge,N.;Antonini,N.F.;Punt, C.J.; van Krieken, J.H. Deficient mismatch repair system in patients with sporadic advanced colorectal cancer. Br. J. Cancer 2009, 100, 266–273.
33. Guinney, J.; Dienstmann, R.; Wang, X.; de Reynies, A.; Schlicker, A.; Soneson, C.; Marisa, L.; Roepman, P.; Nyamundanda, G.; Angelino, P.; et al. The consensus molecular subtypes of colorectal cancer. Nat. Med. 2015, 21, 1350–1356.
34. Trinh, A.; Trumpi, K.; De Sousa, E.M.F.; Wang, X.; de Jong, J.H.; Fessler, E.; Kuppen, P.J.; Reimers, M.S.; Swets, M.; Koopman, M.; et al. Practical and Robust Identification of Molecular Subtypes in Colorectal Cancer by Immunohistochemistry. Clin. Cancer Res. 2017, 23, 387–398.
35. Becht, E.; de Reynies, A.; Giraldo, N.A.; Pilati, C.; Buttard, B.; Lacroix, L.; Selves, J.; Sautes-Fridman, C.; Laurent-Puig, P.; Fridman, W.H. Immune and Stromal Classification of Colorectal Cancer Is Associated with Molecular Subtypes and Relevant for Precision Immunotherapy. Clin. Cancer Res. 2016, 22, 4057–4066.
36. Chung, K.Y.; Gore, I.; Fong, L.; Venook, A.; Beck, S.B.; Dorazio, P.; Criscitiello, P.J.; Healey, D.I.; Huang, B.; Gomez-Navarro, J.; et al. Phase II study of the anti-cytotoxic T-lymphocyte-associated antigen 4 monoclonal antibody, tremelimumab, in patients with refractory metastatic colorectal cancer. J. Clin. Oncol. 2010, 28, 3485–3490.

37. Brahmer, J.R.; Drake, C.G.; Wollner, I.; Powderly, J.D.; Picus, J.; Sharfman, W.H.; Stankevich, E.; Pons, A.; Salay, T.M.; McMiller, T.L.; et al. Phase I study of single-agent anti-programmed death-1 (MDX-1106) in refractory solid tumors: Safety, clinical activity, pharmacodynamics, and immunologic correlates. J. Clin. Oncol. 2010, 28, 3167–3175.
38. Mechanisms of foxp3+ T regulatory cell-mediated suppression. Shevach EM Immunity. 2009 May; 30(5):636-45.
39. Regulation of tumor immunity by tumor/dendritic cell fusions. Koido S, Homma S, Hara E, Namiki Y, Takahara A, Komita H, Nagasaki E, Ito M, Ohkusa T, Gong J, Tajiri H Clin Dev Immunol. 2010; 2010():516768.
40. Colorectal Cancer Immunotherapy :Bo Xiang, Adam E. Snook,* Michael S. Magee, and Scott A. Waldman.
41. Koido S, Hara E, Torii A, Homma S, Toyama Y, Kawahara H, Ogawa M, Watanabe M, Yanaga K, Fujise K, et al. Induction of antigen-specific CD4- and CD8-mediated T-cell responses by fusions of autologous dendritic cells and metastatic colorectal cancer cells. Int J Cancer. 2005;117:587–595.
42. Koido S, Hara E, Homma S, Torii A, Toyama Y, Kawahara H, Watanabe M, Yanaga K, Fujise K, Tajiri H, et al. Dendritic cells fused with allogeneic colorectal cancer cell line present multiple colorectal cancer-specific antigens and induce antitumor immunity against autologous tumor cells. Clin Cancer Res. 2005;11:7891–7900.
43. Goydos JS, Elder E, Whiteside TL, Finn OJ, Lotze MT. A phase I trial of a synthetic mucin peptide vaccine. Induction of specific immune reactivity in patients with adenocarcinoma. J Surg Res. 1996;63:298–304.
44. González G, Crombet T, Catalá M, Mirabal V, Hernández JC, González Y, Marinello P, Guillén G, Lage A. A novel cancer vaccine composed of human-recombinant epidermal growth factor linked to a carrier protein: report of a pilot clinical trial. Ann Oncol. 1998;9:431–435.
45. . Miyagi Y, Imai N, Sasatomi T, Yamada A, Mine T, Katagiri K, Nakagawa M, Muto A, Okouchi S, Isomoto H, et al. Induction of cellular immune responses to tumor cells and peptides in colorectal cancer patients by vaccination with SART3 peptides. Clin Cancer Res. 2001;7:3950–3962.
46. Moulton HM, Yoshihara PH, Mason DH, Iversen PL, Triozzi PL. Active specific immunotherapy with a beta-human chorionic gonadotropin peptide vaccine in patients with metastatic colorectal cancer: antibody response is associated with improved survival. Clin Cancer Res. 2002;8:2044–2051.
47. Sugiyama H. Cancer immunotherapy targeting Wilms' tumor gene WT1 product. Expert Rev Vaccines. 2005;4:503–512.
48. Tsuruma T, Hata F, Torigoe T, Furuhata T, Idenoue S, Kurotaki T, Yamamoto M, Yagihashi A, Ohmura T, Yamaguchi K, et al. Phase I clinical study of anti-apoptosis protein, survivin-derived peptide vaccine therapy for patients with advanced or recurrent colorectal cancer. J Transl Med. 2004;2:19.
49. Sadanaga N, Nagashima H, Mashino K, Tahara K, Yamaguchi H, Ohta M, Fujie T, Tanaka F, Inoue H, Takesako K, et al. Dendritic cell vaccination with MAGE peptide is a novel therapeutic approach for gastrointestinal carcinomas. Clin Cancer Res. 2001;7:2277–2284.
50. Speetjens FM, Kuppen PJ, Welters MJ, Essahsah F, Voet van den Brink AM, Lantrua MG, Valentijn AR, Oostendorp J, Fathers LM, Nijman HW, et al. Induction of p53-specific immunity by

a p53 synthetic long peptide vaccine in patients treated for metastatic colorectal cancer. Clin Cancer Res. 2009;15:1086–1095.

51. Paulsen JE, Bjørheim J, Røe J, Eide TJ, Alexander J, Gaudernack G. Effect of vaccination with mutant KRAS peptides on rat colon carcinogenesis induced by azoxymethane. Anticancer Res. 2002;22:171–175.
52. Okuno K, Sugiura F, Hida JI, Tokoro T, Ishimaru E, Sukegawa Y, Ueda K. Phase I clinical trial of a novel peptide vaccine in combination with UFT/LV for metastatic colorectal cancer. Exp Ther Med. 2011;2:73–79.
53. Toubaji A, Achtar M, Provenzano M, Herrin VE, Behrens R, Hamilton M, Bernstein S, Venzon D, Gause B, Marincola F, et al. Pilot study of mutant ras peptide-based vaccine as an adjuvant treatment in pancreatic and colorectal cancers. Cancer Immunol Immunother. 2008;57:1413–1420.
54. Mocellin S, Pilati P, Nitti D. Peptide-based anticancer vaccines: recent advances and future perspectives. Curr Med Chem. 2009;16:4779–4796.
55. Koido S, Hara E, Homma S, Namiki Y, Komita H, Takahara A, Nagasaki E, Ito M, Sagawa Y, Mitsunaga M, et al. Dendritic/pancreatic carcinoma fusions for clinical use: Comparative functional analysis of healthy- versus patient-derived fusions. Clin Immunol. 2010;135:384–400.
56. Celluzzi CM, Mayordomo JI, Storkus WJ, Lotze MT, Falo LD. Peptide-pulsed dendritic cells induce antigen-specific CTL-mediated protective tumor immunity. J Exp Med. 1996;183:283–287.
57. Nestle FO, Alijagic S, Gilliet M, Sun Y, Grabbe S, Dummer R, Burg G, Schadendorf D. Vaccination of melanoma patients with peptide- or tumor lysate-pulsed dendritic cells. Nat Med. 1998;4:328–332.
58. Koido S, Kashiwaba M, Chen D, Gendler S, Kufe D, Gong J. Induction of antitumor immunity by vaccination of dendritic cells transfected with MUC1 RNA. J Immunol. 2000;165:5713–5719.
59. Gong J, Chen D, Kashiwaba M, Kufe D. Induction of antitumor activity by immunization with fusions of dendritic and carcinoma cells. Nat Med. 1997;3:558–561.
60. Morse MA, Deng Y, Coleman D, Hull S, Kitrell-Fisher E, Nair S, Schlom J, Ryback ME, Lyerly HK. A Phase I study of active immunotherapy with carcinoembryonic antigen peptide (CAP-1)-pulsed, autologous human cultured dendritic cells in patients with metastatic malignancies expressing carcinoembryonic antigen. Clin Cancer Res. 1999;5:1331–1338.
61. Liu KJ, Wang CC, Chen LT, Cheng AL, Lin DT, Wu YC, Yu WL, Hung YM, Yang HY, Juang SH, et al. Generation of carcinoembryonic antigen (CEA)-specific T-cell responses in HLA-A*0201 and HLA-A*2402 late-stage colorectal cancer patients after vaccination with dendritic cells loaded with CEA peptides. Clin Cancer Res. 2004;10:2645–2651.
62. Lesterhuis WJ, de Vries IJ, Schuurhuis DH, Boullart AC, Jacobs JF, de Boer AJ, Scharenborg NM, Brouwer HM, van de Rakt MW, Figdor CG, et al. Vaccination of colorectal cancer patients with CEA-loaded dendritic cells: antigen-specific T cell responses in DTH skin tests. Ann Oncol. 2006;17:974–980.
63. Nair SK, Hull S, Coleman D, Gilboa E, Lyerly HK, Morse MA. Induction of carcinoembryonic antigen (CEA)-specific cytotoxic T-lymphocyte responses in vitro using autologous dendritic cells loaded with CEA peptide or CEA RNA in patients with metastatic malignancies expressing CEA. Int J Cancer. 1999;82:121–124.
64. Fong L, Hou Y, Rivas A, Benike C, Yuen A, Fisher GA, Davis MM, Engleman EG. Altered peptide ligand vaccination with Flt3 ligand expanded dendritic cells for tumor immunotherapy. Proc Natl Acad Sci USA. 2001;98:8809–8814.

65. Nair SK, Boczkowski D, Morse M, Cumming RI, Lyerly HK, Gilboa E. Induction of primary carcinoembryonic antigen (CEA)-specific cytotoxic T lymphocytes in vitro using human dendritic cells transfected with RNA. Nat Biotechnol. 1998;16:364–369.
66. Jocham D, Richter A, Hoffmann L, Iwig K, Fahlenkamp D, Zakrzewski G, Schmitt E, Dannenberg T, Lehmacher W, von Wietersheim J, et al. Adjuvant autologous renal tumour cell vaccine and risk of tumour progression in patients with renal-cell carcinoma after radical nephrectomy: phase III, randomised controlled trial. Lancet. 2004;363:594–599.
67. Berd D, Sato T, Maguire HC, Kairys J, Mastrangelo MJ. Immunopharmacologic analysis of an autologous, hapten-modified human melanoma vaccine. J Clin Oncol. 2004;22:403–415.
68. Harris JE, Ryan L, Hoover HC, Stuart RK, Oken MM, Benson AB, Mansour E, Haller DG, Manola J, Hanna MG. Adjuvant active specific immunotherapy for stage II and III colon cancer with an autologous tumor cell vaccine: Eastern Cooperative Oncology Group Study E5283. J Clin Oncol. 2000;18:148–157.
69. Nemunaitis J. Vaccines in cancer: GVAX, a GM-CSF gene vaccine. Expert Rev Vaccines. 2005;4:259–274.
70. Simons JW, Jaffee EM, Weber CE, Levitsky HI, Nelson WG, Carducci MA, Lazenby AJ, Cohen LK, Finn CC, Clift SM, et al. Bioactivity of autologous irradiated renal cell carcinoma vaccines generated by ex vivo granulocyte-macrophage colony-stimulating factor gene transfer. Cancer Res. 1997;57:1537–1546.
71. Simons JW, Mikhak B, Chang JF, DeMarzo AM, Carducci MA, Lim M, Weber CE, Baccala AA, Goemann MA, Clift SM, et al. Induction of immunity to prostate cancer antigens: results of a clinical trial of vaccination with irradiated autologous prostate tumor cells engineered to secrete granulocyte-macrophage colony-stimulating factor using ex vivo gene transfer. Cancer Res. 1999;59:5160–5168.
72. Salgia R, Lynch T, Skarin A, Lucca J, Lynch C, Jung K, Hodi FS, Jaklitsch M, Mentzer S, Swanson S, et al. Vaccination with irradiated autologous tumor cells engineered to secrete granulocyte-macrophage colony-stimulating factor augments antitumor immunity in some patients with metastatic non-small-cell lung carcinoma. J Clin Oncol. 2003;21:624–630.
73. Soiffer R, Hodi FS, Haluska F, Jung K, Gillessen S, Singer S, Tanabe K, Duda R, Mentzer S, Jaklitsch M, et al. Vaccination with irradiated, autologous melanoma cells engineered to secrete granulocyte-macrophage colony-stimulating factor by adenoviral-mediated gene transfer augments antitumor immunity in patients with metastatic melanoma. J Clin Oncol. 2003;21:3343–3350.
74. Ockert D, Schirrmacher V, Beck N, Stoelben E, Ahlert T, Flechtenmacher J, Hagmüller E, Buchcik R, Nagel M, Saeger HD. Newcastle disease virus-infected intact autologous tumor cell vaccine for adjuvant active specific immunotherapy of resected colorectal carcinoma. Clin Cancer Res. 1996;2:21–28.
75. Schulze T, Kemmner W, Weitz J, Wernecke KD, Schirrmacher V, Schlag PM. Efficiency of adjuvant active specific immunization with Newcastle disease virus modified tumor cells in colorectal cancer patients following resection of liver metastases: results of a prospective randomized trial. Cancer Immunol Immunother. 2009;58:61–69.
76. Larocca C, Schlom J. Viral vector-based therapeutic cancer vaccines. Cancer J. 2011;17:359–371.
77. von Mehren M, Arlen P, Tsang KY, Rogatko A, Meropol N, Cooper HS, Davey M, McLaughlin S, Schlom J, Weiner LM. Pilot study of a dual gene recombinant avipox vaccine containing both

carcinoembryonic antigen (CEA) and B7.1 transgenes in patients with recurrent CEA-expressing adenocarcinomas. Clin Cancer Res. 2000;6:2219–2228.

78. Marshall JL, Gulley JL, Arlen PM, Beetham PK, Tsang KY, Slack R, Hodge JW, Doren S, Grosenbach DW, Hwang J, et al. Phase I study of sequential vaccinations with fowlpox-CEA(6D)-TRICOM alone and sequentially with vaccinia-CEA(6D)-TRICOM, with and without granulocyte-macrophage colony-stimulating factor, in patients with carcinoembryonic antigen-expressing carcinomas. J Clin Oncol. 2005;23:720–731.
79. Hörig H, Lee DS, Conkright W, Divito J, Hasson H, LaMare M, Rivera A, Park D, Tine J, Guito K, et al. Phase I clinical trial of a recombinant canarypoxvirus (ALVAC) vaccine expressing human carcinoembryonic antigen and the B7.1 co-stimulatory molecule. Cancer Immunol Immunother. 2000;49:504–514.
80. Kaufman HL, Lenz HJ, Marshall J, Singh D, Garett C, Cripps C, Moore M, von Mehren M, Dalfen R, Heim WJ, et al. Combination chemotherapy and ALVAC-CEA/B7.1 vaccine in patients with metastatic colorectal cancer. Clin Cancer Res. 2008;14:4843–4849.
81. Lopez M, Fechtenbaum J, David B, et al. Adoptive immunotherapy with activated macrophages grown in vitro from blood monocytes in cancer patients: a pilot study. J Immunother 1992;11:209/17.
82. Hennemann B, Scheibenbogen C, Andreesen R. Biological response to intrahepatic adoptive immunotherapy with autologous interferon activated macrophages. Eur J Cancer 1995;31A:852.
83. Eymard JC, Lopez M, Cattan A, Bouche O, Adjizian JC, Bernard J. Phase I/II trial of autologous activated macrophages in advanced colorectal cancer. Eur J Cancer 1996;32A:1905/11.
84. Dillman RO, Oldham RK, Tauer KW, et al. Continuous interleukin-2 and lymphokine-activated killer cells for advanced cancer: a National Biotherapy Study Group trial. J Clin Oncol 1991;9:1233/40.
85. Fabbri M, Ridolfi R, Maltoni R, et al. Tumor infiltrating lymphocytes and continuous infusion interleukin-2 after metastasectomy in 61 patients with melanoma, colorectal and renal carcinoma. Tumori 2000;86:46 /52.
86. Parmiani G. An explanation of the variable clinical response to interleukin 2 and LAK cells. Immunol Today 1990;11:113/5.
87. Eshhar Z. Tumor-specific T-bodies: towards clinical application. Cancer Immunol Immunother 1997;45:131/6.
88. Adoptive immunotherapy for cancer: harnessing the T cell response. Restifo NP, Dudley ME, Rosenberg SANat Rev Immunol. 2012 Mar 22; 12(4):269-81.
89. Cancer regression and autoimmunity in patients after clonal repopulation with antitumor lymphocytes. Dudley ME, Wunderlich JR, Robbins PF, Yang JC, Hwu P, Schwartzentruber DJ, Topalian SL, Sherry R, Restifo NP, Hubicki AM, Robinson MR, Raffeld M, Duray P, Seipp CA, Rogers-Freezer L, Morton KE, Mavroukakis SA, White DE, Rosenberg SA Science. 2002 Oct 25; 298(5594):850-4.
90. Immune suppression in cancer: effects on immune cells, mechanisms and future therapeutic intervention. Whiteside TL Semin Cancer Biol. 2006 Feb; 16(1):3-15.
91. Cancer regression and autoimmunity in patients after clonal repopulation with antitumor lymphocytes. Dudley ME, Wunderlich JR, Robbins PF, Yang JC, Hwu P, Schwartzentruber DJ, Topalian SL, Sherry R, Restifo NP, Hubicki AM, Robinson MR, Raffeld M, Duray P, Seipp CA,

Rogers-Freezer L, Morton KE, Mavroukakis SA, White DE, Rosenberg SA Science. 2002 Oct 25; 298(5594):850-4.

92. T cells targeting carcinoembryonic antigen can mediate regression of metastatic colorectal cancer but induce severe transient colitis. Parkhurst MR, Yang JC, Langan RC, Dudley ME, Nathan DA, Feldman SA, Davis JL, Morgan RA, Merino MJ, Sherry RM, Hughes MS, Kammula US, Phan GQ, Lim RM, Wank SA, Restifo NP, Robbins PF, Laurencot CM, Rosenberg SA Mol Ther. 2011 Mar; 19(3):620-6.
93. Case report of a serious adverse event following the administration of T cells transduced with a chimeric antigen receptor recognizing ERBB2. Morgan RA, Yang JC, Kitano M, Dudley ME, Laurencot CM, Rosenberg SA Mol Ther. 2010 Apr; 18(4):843-51.
94. Simultaneous blockade of multiple immune system inhibitory checkpoints enhances antitumor activity mediated by interleukin-15 in a murine metastatic colon carcinoma model. Yu P, Steel JC, Zhang M, Morris JC, Waldmann TA Clin Cancer Res. 2010 Dec 15; 16(24):6019-28.