WORLD JOURNAL OF PHARMACEUTICAL RESEARCH
SJIF Impact Factor 8.084
Volume 10, Issue 9, 210-223. Review Article ISSN 2277– 7105

ROLE OF SINGLE IMMUNO-ONCOLOGY AGENTS AND COMBINATIONS IN CANCER THERAPY

Mobin P. Chacko[1]*, Swathy N. S.[1], Prasobh G. R.[2] and Grace N. Raju[3]

[1]Pharm D Students, Sree Krishna College of Pharmacy and Research Centre Parassala, Trivandrum, Kerala, India.

[2]Principal and Head of Department of Pharmacy Practice, Sree Krishna College of Pharmacy and Research Centre, Parassala, Trivandrum, Kerala, India.

[3]Assistant Professor, Department of Pharmacy Practice, Sree Krishna College of Pharmacy and Research Centre Parassala, Trivandrum, Kerala, India.

Article Received on
25 May 2021,

Revised on 15 June 2021,
Accepted on 05 July 2021

DOI: 10.20959/wjpr20219-20997

***Corresponding Author**
Mobin P. Chacko
Pharm D Students, Sree Krishna College of Pharmacy and Research Centre Parassala, Trivandrum, Kerala, India.

ABSTRACT

Immuno-oncology is a developing and progressing treatment method that has immunotherapies designed to tackle the patient's own system. Combining or sequencing immunotherapies that focus on distinct immune pathways may be a logical approach, with the potential to further enhance the magnitude of the antitumor immune reaction over single agents. Cancer immunotherapy has reached a juncture now that immune checkpoint inhibitors and two CAR-T products have received market approval in treating 16 kinds of cancers and 1 tissue-agnostic cancer indication. This particular approach is being viewed and researched for its potential effectiveness to improve and enhance long-term life-span or survival across multiple tumor types. It is important to design layout and work on how immunotherapies could also be most effectively useful to achieve the simplest possible patient outcomes. In this article, we highlight the old and new waves of IO therapy development, and supply perspectives on the newest momentum shifts in cancer immunotherapy.

KEYWORDS: Immuno-oncology, Immune checkpoint inhibitor, Tumor microenvironment, PD-1, PD-L1, CTLA-4, CAR-T.

INTRODUCTION

Tumors avoid immune destruction by a range of complex and sometimes overlapping mechanisms that disrupt key components of the system involved in mounting an efficient antitumor response.[1,2,3,4] Tumors can avoid finding and discarding of the system by interrupting antigen presentation mechanisms, either through down regulation of MHC class I molecules or by inactivating antigen processing cascade. Alternatively, or additionally, tumours may suppress the system by disrupting pathways involved in controlling T-cell inhibition (checkpoint) and activation or by recruiting immunosuppressive cell types, like regulatory T cells and myeloid-derived suppressor cells (MDSC).[3][4][5] The discharge of things, including adenosine and prostaglandin E2, and thus the enzyme Indoleamine 2, 3-dioxygenase (IDO) is another mechanism that tumors may use to suppress immune activity. Cytokines [interleukin-2 (IL2) and interferon-a (IFNa)] are used for several years predominantly in patients with renal cell carcinoma (RCC) and melanoma. However, these cytokines aren't target specific, and are related to significant toxicity and limited efficacy; these factors restrict use to healthy patients and only a get group of these patients will derive benefit. Immuno-oncology is an evolving treatment modality that has immunotherapies designed to specialize in and harness the patient's system on to kill tumor cells. Samples of immunotherapeutic methods under clinical investigation include T-cell checkpoint inhibitors or promoters for T-cell–activating pathway process, novel cytokines like IL12 and IL15, therapeutic vaccines, elimination of immunosuppressive cells, and other agents and approaches designed to strengthen immune cell function. Since the permit of IL2, Sipuleucel-T (a therapeutic vaccine formulated of recombinant antigen protein which is made to to stimulate T-cell responses) and Ipilimumab [a cytotoxic T-lymphocyte antigen 4 (CTLA-4) immune checkpoint blocker] were the first among immunotherapies to be sanctioned for patients with cancer. Sipuleucel-T was approved in 2010 for asymptomatic or minimally symptomatic metastatic castrate–resistant adenocarcinoma (CRPC) and Ipilimumab in 2011 for unresectable or metastatic melanoma. Both agents were shown to significantly improve overall survival (OS) in test |phase III| clinical trial clinical test"> test|phase III|clinical trial|clinical test} run clinical trial clinical trials. Monoclonal antibodies targeting programmed death-1 (PD-1) ligand (PD-L1) interaction, another immune checkpoint pathway, are the foremost advanced in clinical development after Ipilimumab and sipuleucel-T, and various agents are being tested in clinical trials across a variety of tumor types. One among the more vibrent areas of immunotherapies is explained with data from clinical trials

for Ipilimumab, Nivolumab, and Pembrolizumab that exhibit the potential aspects for long-term survival.

The PD-1 immune checkpoint inhibitors nivolumab and pembrolizumabhave also shown durable responses in run|phase I|clinical trial|clinical test} test studies. This review focuses on:

(i) Combining or sequencing immunotherapies that look upon distinct immune pathways, particularly T-cell checkpoints.

(ii) Immunotherapies are made together with existing therapeutic factors, especially BRAF-targeted therapy. Combining or sequencing immunotherapies that analyse distinct immune pathways could even be a rational strategy employ out whether the magnitude of the antitumor response could even be improved over that generated with one agent. Phase I studies are ongoing to guage Ipilimumab plus Nivolumab in patients with a diffusion of solid tumors [including RCC, non–small cell carcinoma (NSCLC), Carcinoma, triple-negative carcinoma, gastric cancer, carcinoma , and small-cell carcinoma (SCLC); Although the assorted mechanisms of action of therapeutic vaccines are beyond the scope of this review.

(iii)Most vaccines are designed to: (i) present tumor antigens to the system (ii) provide immune modulation.

Chemotherpy combinations

Ipilimumab has shown results when combined with chemotherapy in patients with melanoma and lung cancer; however, data indicate that careful consideration of the mix approach goes to be important in relevance tolerability and optimizing patient outcomes. Patients with previously untreated melanoma who received Ipilimumab (10 mg/kg) plus chemotherapy (Dacarbazine) had significantly improved OS compared with people who received chemotherapy alone (11.2 months vs. 9.1 months).[6] Grade 3 or 4 adverse effects took place in 56.3% of patients given with Ipilimumab/Dacarbazine in comparison to 27.5% treated with Dacarbazine/Placebo in Melanoma patients.[9] Combining Ipilimumab with paclitaxel and carboplatin significantly improved immune-related progression free survival (irPFS) compared with chemotherapy alone in a very phase II clinical trial study in patients with NSCLC and extensive disease SCLC. Sipuleucel- T comprises autologous dendritic cells primed with a recombinant protein to boost the patient's native immunologic response in prostate cancer3. Ipilimumab may be a fully human IgG1 mAb that blocks ligand engagement and enhances lymph cell activation by directly binding to the cytotoxic T

lymphocyte-associated antigen 4 (CTLA4) receptor protein, thus blocking a critical inhibitory signal for activated T cells.[4,5] Pembrolizumab and Nivolumab are humanized mAbs that block ligand engagement, thus interfering with T lymphocyte signalling and necrobiosis.[6,7] Current cancer immunotherapy strategies seek to reverse immune tolerance either by modulating T lymphocyte co- receptor signals or boosting the popularity of tumour-associated antigens by using native biomolecules or mAbs. Small-molecule drugs offer the subsequent distinct advantages over recombinant protein approaches to medicine design:

1) High feasibility because of a close understanding and historical precedent of their clinical application and development.
2) Oral bioavailability.
3) Greater exposure within the tumour microenvironment or across physiological barriers (for example, the blood–brain barrier).
4) Permit to intracellular disease points not findable by protein therapeutic agents.
5) Extremely varriant and well-understood formulation and dosing methods to boost up pharmacokinetic and/or pharmacodynamic challenges and enabling rational involvement of drug exposure.

Radiotherapy combinations

Ipilimumab has been evaluated together with radiotherapy in patients with metastatic CRPC and melanoma. Promising activity with manageable tolerability was observed during a phase I/II trial in patients with CRPC who had progressed after anti-androgen therapy.[22] However, results from a phase III clinical trial trial showed no significant improvement in OS with the addition of Ipilimumab to radiotherapy in post-docetaxel CRPC. A subgroup evaluation did put forward the benefit for patients with less progressing disease.[23] An evaluation of clinical data from 21 patients with advanced melanoma who had undergone radiotherapy after Ipilimumab progression on the Italian Expanded Access Program showed that radiotherapy after Ipilimumab treatment may further potentiate its effect.[24] A neighborhood response to radiotherapy was detected in 13 patients (62%), while 8 patients (38%) didn't show any local regression. The median OS for every 21 patients was a total of 13 months (range 6–26). Eleven (85%) of 13 patients with local response showed an abscopal effect, suggesting that local response to radiotherapy is also predictive for the abscopal response and outcome. The median OS for patients with and without abscopal feedback was respectively a total of 22.4 months (range 2.5–50.3) and 8.3 months (range 7.6–9.0). There are now over 15 clinical trials alone current to guage ipilimumab plus radiotherapy. Initial data from a clinical test trial of

MPDL3280A, an anti–PD-L1 antibody, together with local radiotherapy showed evidence of activity within the five patients treated.[28] Overall, case reports and data from variety of small clinical studies showing successful, dramatic results with radiotherapy/immunotherapy combinations in patients with melanoma gives further support for further evaluation; these are comprehensively discussed by Barker and Postow.[32]

Targeted therapy combinations

Clinical data are limited on the efficacy of mixing Ipilimumab with targeted agents, although numerous trials are ongoing, particularly in melanoma, where three targeted therapies are now approved within the range for patients with melanoma and mutated BRAF (Dabrafenib, Vemurafenib, and Trametinib). Immunotherapy and BRAF inhibitor combination therapies are in detail checked upon by Hu-Lieskovan and others.[36] Some data indicate that the sequencing of BRAF inhibitors and Ipilimumab contains a marked effect on the efficacy and tolerability of the mixture in patients with BRAF-mutant melanoma, and indicate that the drugs should be sequenced.[38,26,34,29] Data from a recent retrospective analysis of a cohort of patients treated with immunotherapy then a BRAF inhibitor (with or without a MEK inhibitor) showed prior immunotherapy didn't appear to possess an adverse effect on response to a BRAF inhibitor. However, results were not upto the mark when Ipilimumab was given after BRAF inhibitor discontinuation.[29] More data are needed, but there's some rationale to use either agent first in a very sequencing approach, betting on the disease kinetics. in additional rapid progressors, a BRAF inhibitor is also used first to cut back tumor load followed by Ipilimumab to take care of a response; in patients with more indolent disease, Ipilimumab is also given first followed by Vemurafenib to cut back tumor burden.[39]

In a clinical trial, concurrent administration of Vemurafenib and Ipilimumab at the approved monotherapy doses or with a lower dose of Vemurafenib resulted in hepatotoxicity that was greater than expected for either agent alone.[34] These safety analyses demonstrate the chance of using Vemurafenib and Ipilimumab concurrently, and these drugs shouldn't be employed in combination outside of a run. Ongoing studies are evaluating the optimal sequence of those agents in patients with BRAF-mutant metastatic melanoma. Extreme or severe cutaneous and neurologic toxicity has also been evidently shown in two patients with melanoma during management with Vemurafenib after getting treatment with a PD-1 immune checkpoint inhibitor (Nivolumab or Pembrolizumab).[31] It's also noteworthy that dose-limiting toxicities are observed in patients with RCC treated with the targeted agent Sunitinib and either rhIL21

(hematologic toxicity) or the anti–CTLA-4 agent Tremelimumab (renal failure), further emphasizing the necessity for caution when evaluating combinations.[25,37] RCC could be a tumor that combining immunotherapy and targeted therapy is of considerable interest.

Preliminary data from a clinical trial trial of Nivolumab together with Pazopanib or Sunitinib in patients with metastatic RCC showed evidence of activity with ORRs of 45% and 52%, respectively, and a manageable safety profile.[33] This trial et al. evaluating various combinations in RCC continue. Clinical study of those agents with rituximab is predicated on preclinical data that have shown enhanced tumor regression when an anti-CD137 agent was used after a therapeutic antibody.[35,27] The anti-CD137 antibody is proposed to reinforce rituximab-dependent cytotoxicity through antigen-dependent cell-mediated cytotoxicity.[35] Recent preclinical data showing enhanced antilymphoma activity with rituximab combined with KIR blockade (Lirilumab) also support clinical investigation of this mixture.[30]

Incorporating immunotherapy with existing treatment plans

Existing treatment modalities, (e.g., chemotherapy, radiotherapy, and molecularly targeted therapies) cause tumor reduction, not only through cytotoxic/cytostatic effects, but also through mechanisms that will potentiate immune activity, including modification of the tumor microenvironment and release of tumor antigens. This activity could also be complementary, even synergistic, to the immunotherapies designed to support an antitumor immunologic response. The immune effects of chemotherapy and radiotherapy are widely known and reviewed elsewhere.[7-21] Immune activating mechanisms include release of tumor antigens for immune system, reduction of immunosuppressive cells (e.g., MDSCs, Tregs), activation and elevation of immune effectors (NK cells, DCs, B cells, conventional effector T cells), and immediate reactivity of tumor cells to lysis. Targeted therapies might also sensitize tumor cells to immune-mediated killing by a spread of mechanisms. These are reviewed by Vanneman and colleagues,[17] and include promoting effective DC maturation, T-cell priming, activation, and differentiation into long-lived memory T cells, increasing expression of death receptors or “distress” ligands, reducing expression of prosurvival signals, abrogating the assembly of tumorigenic inflammation, and inhibiting immunosuppressive cell types,[16] BRAF inhibitors can also increase TILs and enhance antigen presentation.[11,18] Interestingly, while the BRAF inhibitors have a potentiating effect on the system, MEK inhibitors have a possible reverse effect, reducing the secretion of cytokines [14] and reducing the activity of T lymphocytes[18] and DCs.[9]

Possible adverse effects of immunotherapy

Immunotherapy, in general, is a smaller amount toxic than chemotherapy for patients with cancer. However, the side effects [adverse events (AE)] linked to those new treatments [treatment-related adverse events (trAEs)] are often described and have variable severity.[42] Stimulation of an reaction by checkpoint inhibitors can lead, particularly, to side effects of immunological origin [immune-related adverse events (irAEs)], which are variable reckoning on the series, the therapeutic molecule, the pathology, the tumor and therefore the patient.[42] These irAEs cause the formation of lesions in one or different organs in keeping with the patient with very variable consequences.[39,41,42,44,48] When immunotherapy and many of the AEs are similarly well indulge the irAEs are sometimes very extreme or severely moving or running a risk of death of the patient, which eventually leads to rapid and adapted therapeutic care.[43,44,45,47]

Lisberg et al., showed that the emergence of trAEs in an exceedingly cohort of patients receiving first-line treatment with Pembrolizumab for advanced stage or metastatic non-small cell lung carcinoma (NSCLC) correlated with, a higher tumor response, a higher survival free progression and longer overall survival, compared to patients who didn't experience trAEs.[40] This mono centric (University of California) and retrospective study concerned analyses from 97 patients included within the KEYNOTE-001 (clinicaltrials. govNCT01295827), which contained a complete of 495 patients from several centers.[40,46] Within the study performed by Lisberg et al., the foremost frequent AEs were fatigue (50%), pain (36%) and dyspnea (29%).[40] This study have considered all the trAEs and not only those provided or defined as irAEs. Among 94/97 (97%) patients one or several AEs were reported for a complete of 826 AEs.[40] In fact, only 85/826 (10%) of those AEs occurring in 39/97 (40%) patients were considered by the investigators as being trAEs.[40] The results obtained with the cohort of patients hospitalized in a very single center were different from of the overall cohort of patients included within the KEYNOTE 001 since quite 71% of trAE were reported within the latter.[40,46] This difference will be explained by the increased experience of investigators of the University of California with the utilization of immunotherapy and therefore the better identification of side effects associated to treatment.[40] Other explanations were advocate to elucidate this difference, including the epidemiological factors of patients, the very fact that the cohort of the University of California contained, as an example, more non-smoking patients.[40]

Immunity in the tumour microenvironment

Tumour-associated antigens may also be differentiation antigens (for example, melanoma antigen recognized by T cells 1 (MART1; also called Melan-A), gp100 and tyrosinase in melanoma) or viral antigens (for example, hepatitis B virus in liver cancer). The cycle of generating an antitumour response is complex and is exquisitely interdependent on several close-knit factors. Indeed, there's a definite interplay between the tumour, antigen-presenting cells and T lymphocytes within the appropriate cytokine milieu. Professional antigen-presenting cells, like immature dendritic cells, engulf antigens from dying tumour cells. As these dendritic cells migrate to the draining lymphoid tissue, they process the antigen and mature into dendritic cells which will present the antigen via their MHC class I and sophistication II molecules on their cell surface.

At the draining node, the dendritic cells encounter CD4+ T helper (TH) and CD8+ effector T cells via engagement through MHC- TCR interactions, resulting in lymph cell priming and activation. As activated T cells emigrate from the node and are engaged in T cell surveillance, they encounter tumour cells that bear the cognate peptide via MHC class I molecules on the cell surface and initiate a programme of events resulting in tumour necrobiosis.

Natural killer cells, which represent one a part of the innate system. The tumour microenvironment contains a posh mixture of cells, including tumour cells, infiltrating immune cells and stromal cells with vasculature. These diverse immune cell types operate mutually with each other to either eradicate tumours using activated immune effectors or to push immune evasion that ultimately ends up in tumour growth and eventually metastasis. M2 macrophages are tumour-associated macrophages (TAMs) that contribute in neovasculature formation and conventional invasion and metastasis. M1 macrophages typically produce a TH1- type response in contrast to M2 macrophages, which initiate a TH2-type response. These two cell types inhibit T lymphocyte antigen-specific and nonspecific immune responses at the tumour site. Cancer-associated fibroblasts are maintained and activated by growth factors, like transforming protein- β (TGFβ) and fibroblast growth factor, and that they promote tumourigenesis. These cells contribute in tumour multiplication, vascularization processing, survival and metastasis.

Target for small molecule intervention

The tumour necrobiosis promoted by some antitumour agents (for example, doxorubicin and cyclophosphamide) leads to effective antigen presentation and priming of the immunologic response by a process mentioned as immunogenic necrobiosis. Other cytotoxic agents (for example, taxanes) block both tumour proliferation and affect innate immune cell function within the tumour microenvironment (for example, suppression of TReg cells and MDSCs). Similarly, targeted kinase inhibitors that inhibit both the target within the tumour cell (for example, BRAFV600E) and cells of the system have a primary effect of blocking tumour proliferation and an off-target effect of immune stimulation. In many cases, the intracellular mechanisms targeted by these small-molecule drugs cannot be targeted by mAbs and regulate immunosuppressive cell types (for example, MDSCs, dendritic cells and TAMs) that aren't directly regulated by checkpoint blockers. There are two definitely well-developed aspects of investigation: the progression of MDSC, dendritic cell and TAM effecting function by indoleamine 2,3- dioxygenase 1 (IDO1), arginase 1 (ARG1), inducible gas synthase (iNOS) or phosphodiesterase type 5 (PDE5), and therefore the regulation of purinergic signalling in lymphocytes by ATP, CD39 and CD73, adenosine and elevated cyclic AMP. Also discussed are samples of signal transduction inhibitors developed to specifically target dysregulated oncogenic signalling, but which are now known to own additional desirable immune regulatory effects in lymphocytes.

CONCLUSION

Immuno-oncology is a developing and progressing treatment method, with agents being researched for his or her effectiveness to provide long-term survival across a different range of tumor forms, and for his or her synergistic activity when combined with other treatment options. This ranges from an outlined immunotherapy development paradigm, improved clinical endpoints, harmonization concepts for immune monitoring to support immunological biomarker development, and minimal information for publication to reinforce interpretability and reproducibility, further as regulatory guidance. It's important to see optimal dose, schedule, and sequence when combining an immunotherapy with radiotherapy, chemotherapy, or targeted agents, as these therapies all have different mechanisms of action. A final consideration for combining immunotherapies are going to be to spot the regimens with the most effective risk–benefit profile. We are able to expect improvements in overall clinical efficacy as new agents targeting alternative or overlapping tumor-associated immunosuppressive mechanisms are developed and employed in combination or sequentially.

REFERENCES

1. Kerkar SP, Restifo NP. Cellular constituents of immune escape within the tumor microenvironment. Cancer Res, 2012; 72: 3125–30.
2. Vesely MD, Kershaw MH, Schreiber RD, Smyth MJ. Natural innate and adaptive immunity to cancer. Annu Rev Immunol, 2011; 29: 235–71.
3. Drake CG, Jaffee E, Pardoll DM. Mechanisms of immune evasion by tumors. Adv Immunol, 2006; 90: 51–81.
4. Mellman I, Coukos G, Dranoff G. Cancer Immunotherapy comes of age. Nature, 2011; 480: 21–9.
5. Pardoll DM. The blockade of immune checkpoints in cancer immunotherapy. Nat Rev Cancer, 2012; 2: 252–64.
6. Robert C, Thomas L, Bondarenko I, O'Day S, Weber JW, Garbe C, et al. Ipilimumab plus dacarbazine for previously untreated metastatic melanoma. N Engl J Med, 2011; 364: 2517-26.
7. Kershaw MH, Devaud C, John LB, Westwood JA, Darcy PK. Enhancing immunotherapy using chemotherapy and radiation to modify the tumor microenvironment. Oncoimmunology, 2013; 2: e25962.
8. Kroemer G, Galluzzi L, Kepp O, Zitvogel L. Immunogenic cell death in cancer therapy. Annu Rev Immunol, 2013; 31: 51–72.
9. Ott PA, Henry T, Baranda SJ, Frleta D, Manches O, Bogunovic D, et al. Inhibition of both BRAF and MEK in BRAF(V600E) mutant melanoma restores compromised dendritic cell (DC) function while having differential direct effects on DC properties. Cancer Immunol Immunother, 2013; 62: 811–22.
10. Hannani D, Sistigu A, Kepp O, et al.Prerequisites for the antitumor vaccine-like effect of chemotherapy and radiotherapy. Cancer J, 2011; 17: 351–8.
11. Frederick DT, Piris A, Cogdill AP, Cooper ZA, Lezcano C, Ferrone CR, et al. BRAF inhibition is associated with enhanced melanoma antigen expression and a more favorable tumor microenvironment in patients with metastatic melanoma. Clin Cancer Res, 2013; 19: 1225–31.
12. Formenti SC, Demaria S. Combining radiotherapy and cancer immunotherapy: a paradigm shift. J Natl Cancer Inst, 2013; 105: 256–65.
13. Hodge JW, Ardiani A, Farsaci B, Kwilas AR, Gameiro SR. The tipping point for combination therapy: cancer vaccines with radiation, chemotherapy, or targeted small molecule inhibitors. Semin Oncol, 2012; 39: 323–39.

14. Shindo T, Kim TK, Benjamin CL, Wieder ED, Levy RB, Komanduri KV. MEK inhibitors selectively suppress alloreactivity and graft-versus-host disease in a memory stage-dependent manner. Blood, 2013; 121: 4617–26.
15. Ménard C, Martin F, Apetoh L, Bouyer F, Ghiringhelli F. Cancer chemotherapy: not only a direct cytotoxic effect, but also an adjuvant for antitumor immunity. Cancer Immunol Immunother, 2008; 57: 1579–87.
16. Schilling B, Sucker A, Griewank K, Zhao F, Weide B, Görgens A, et al. Vemurafenib reverses immunosuppression by myeloid derived suppressor cells. Int J Cancer, 2013; 133: 1653–63.
17. Vanneman M, Dranoff G. Combining immunotherapy and targeted therapies in cancer treatment. Nat Rev Cancer, 2012; 12: 237–51.
18. Boni A, Cogdill AP, Dang P, Udayakumar D, Njauw CN, Sloss CM, et al. Selective BRAFV600E inhibition enhances T-cell recognition of melanoma without affecting lymphocyte function. Cancer Res, 2010; 70: 5213–9.
19. Ramakrishnan R, Assudani D, Nagaraj S, Hunter T, Cho HI, Antonia S, et al.Chemotherapy enhances tumor cell susceptibility to CTL-mediated killing during cancer immunotherapy in mice. J Clin Invest, 2010; 120: 1111–24.
20. Ferrara TA, Hodge JW, Gulley JL. Combining radiation and immunotherapy for synergistic antitumor therapy. Curr Opin Mol Ther 2009; 11: 37–42.
21. Hunter TB, Manimala NJ, Luddy KA, Catlin T, Antonia SJ. Paclitaxel and TRAIL synergize to kill paclitaxel-resistant small cell lung cancer cells through a caspase-independent mechanism mediated through AIF. Anticancer Res, 2011; 31: 3193–204.
22. Slovin SF, Higano CS, Hamid O, Tejwani S, Harzstark A, Alumkal JJ, et al. Ipilimumab alone or in combination with radiotherapy in metastatic castration-resistant prostate cancer: results from an open-label, multicenter phase I/II study. Ann Oncol, 2013; 24: 1813–21.
23. Kwon ED, Drake CG, Scher HI, Fizazi K, Bossi A, van den Eertwegh AJ, et al. Ipilimumab versus placebo after radiotherapy in patients with metastatic castration-resistant prostate cancer that had progressed after docetaxel chemotherapy (CA184-043): a multicentre, randomised, double-blind, phase 3 trial. Lancet Oncol, 2014; 15: 700–12.
24. Grimaldi AM, Simeone E, Giannarelli D, Muto P, Falivene S, Borzillo V, et al Abscopal effects of radiotherapy on advanced melanoma patients who progressed after ipilimumab immunotherapy. Oncoimmunology, 2014; 3: e28780.

25. Grünwald V, Desar IM, Haanen J, Fiedler W, Mouritzen U, Olsen MW, et al. A phase I study of recombinant human interleukin-21 (rIL-21) in combination with sunitinib in patients with metastatic renal cell carcinoma (RCC). Acta Oncol, 2011; 50: 121–6.
26. Ascierto PA, Simeone E, Sileni VC, Del Vecchio M, Marchetti P, Cappellini GC, et al. Sequential treatment with Ipilimumab and BRAF inhibitors in patients with metastatic melanoma: data from the Italian Cohort of the ipilimumab expanded access program. Cancer Invest, 2014; 32: 144–9.
27. Kohrt HE, Houot R, Goldstein MJ, Weiskopf K, Alizadeh AA, Brody J, et al. CD137 stimulation enhances the antilymphoma activity of anti-CD20 antibodies. Blood, 2011; 117: 2423–32.
28. Sagiv-Barfi I, Rajapaksa A, Czerwinski D, Chang S, Hebb J, Chester C, et al Local tumor irradiation combined with α-PDL-1 immune checkpoint inhibition results in local and systemic anti-tumor responses: successful translation of a mouse model to a human case series [abstract]. In: Proceedings of the 105th Annual Meeting of the American Association for Cancer Research; 2014 Apr San Diego, CA. Philadelphia (PA): AACR, 2014; 2941: 5–9.
29. Ackerman A, Klein O, McDermott DF, Wang W, Ibrahim N, Lawrence DP, et al Outcomes of patients with metastatic melanoma treated with immunotherapy prior to or after BRAF inhibitors. Cancer, 2014; 120: 1695–701.
30. Kohrt HE, Thielens A, Marabelle A, Sagiv-Barfi I, Sola C, Chanuc F, et al.Anti-KIR antibody enhancement of anti-lymphoma activity of natural killer cells as monotherapy and in combination with anti-CD20 antibodies. Blood, 2014; 123: 678–86.
31. Johnson DB, Wallender EK, Cohen DN, Likhari SS, Zwerner JP, Powers JG, et al. Severe cutaneous and neurologic toxicity in melanoma patients during vemurafenib administration following anti-PD-1 therapy. Cancer Immunol Res, 2013; 1: 373–7.
32. Barker CA, Postow M. Combinations of radiation therapy and immunotherapy for melanoma: a review of clinical outcomes. Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys, 2014; 88: 986–97.
33. Amin A, Plimack ER, Infante JR, Ernstoff MS, Rini BI, McDermot DF, et al.Nivolumab (anti-PD-1; BMS-936558, ONO-4538) in combination with sunitinib or pazopanib in patients (pts) with metastatic renal cell carcinoma (mRCC). J Clin Oncol, 2014; 32: 5s, 5010.
34. Ribas A, Hodi FS, Callahan M, Konto C, Wolchok. Hepatotoxicity with combination of vemurafenib and ipilimumab. N Engl J Med, 2013; 368: 1365–6.

35. Houot R, Kohrt H, Levy. Boosting antibody-dependent cellular cytotoxicity against tumor cells with a CD137 stimulatory antibody. Oncoimmunology, 2012; 1: 957–8.
36. Hu-Lieskovan S, Robert L, Homet Moreno B, Ribas. Combining targeted therapy with immunotherapy in BRAF-mutant melanoma: promise and challenges. J Clin Oncol, 2014; 32: 2248–54.
37. Rini BI, Stein M, Shannon P, Eddy S, Tyler A, Stephenson JJ Jr., et al. Phase 1 dose-escalation trial of tremelimumab plus sunitinib in patients with metastatic renal cell cancer. Cancer, 2011; 117: 758–67.
38. Ascierto PA, Simeone E, Giannarelli D, Grimaldi AM, Romano A, Mozzillo N, et al.Sequencing of BRAF inhibitors and ipilimumab in patients with metastatic melanoma: a possible algorithm for clinical use. J Trans Med, 2012; 10: 107.
39. Petrelli F, Ardito R, Borgonovo K, et al. Haematological toxicities with immunotherapy in patients with cancer: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Eur J Cancer, 2018; 103: 7-16. 10.1016/j.ejca.2018.07.129.
40. Lisberg A, Tucker DA, Goldman JW, et al. Treatment-Related Adverse Events Predict Improved Clinical Outcome in NSCLC Patients on KEYNOTE-001 at a Single Center. Cancer Immunol Res, 2018. [Epub ahead of print]. 10.1158/2326-6066.CIR-17-0063.
41. Yang S, Asnani A. Cardiotoxicities associated with immune checkpoint inhibitors. Curr Probl Cancer, 2018; 42: 422-32. 10.1016/j.currproblcancer.2018.07.002.
42. Sosa A, Lopez Cadena E, Simon Olive C, et al. Clinical assessment of immune-related adverse events. Ther Adv Med Oncol, 2018; 10: 1758835918764628. 10.1177/1758835918764628.
43. Thompson JA. New NCCN Guidelines: Recognition and Management of Immunotherapy-Related Toxicity. J Natl Compr Canc Netw, 2018; 16: 594-6. 10.6004/jnccn.2018.0047.
44. Winer A, Bodor JN, Borghaei H. Identifying and managing the adverse effects of immune checkpoint blockade. J Thorac Dis, 2018; 10: S480-9. 10.21037/jtd.2018.01.111.
45. Haanen JBAG, Carbonnel F, Robert C, et al. Management of toxicities from immunotherapy: ESMO Clinical Practice Guidelines for diagnosis, treatment and follow-up. Ann Oncol, 2018; 29: iv264-6. 10.1093/annonc/mdy162.
46. Garon EB, Rizvi NA, Hui R, Leighl N, et al. KEYNOTE-001 Investigators Pembrolizumab for the treatment of non-small-cell lung cancer. N Engl J Med, 2015; 372: 2018-28. 10.1056/NEJMoa1501824.

47. Bhandari S, Gill AS, Perez CA, et al. Management of immunotherapy toxicities in older adults. Semin Oncol, 2018; 45: 226-31. 10.1053/j.seminoncol.2018.09.001.
48. Chang LS, Barroso-Sousa R, Tolaney SM, et al. Endocrine toxicity of cancer immunotherapy targeting immune checkpoints. Endocr Rev, 2019; 40: 17-65.