

Integrative genomics highlights opportunities for innovative therapies targeting the tumor microenvironment in gallbladder cancer

Stephanie Roessler, Julien Edeline, Peter Schirmacher, Cédric Coulouarn

▶ To cite this version:

Stephanie Roessler, Julien Edeline, Peter Schirmacher, Cédric Coulouarn. Integrative genomics highlights opportunities for innovative therapies targeting the tumor microenvironment in gallbladder cancer. Journal of Hepatology, 2021, 74 (5), pp.1018-1020. 10.1016/j.jhep.2020.12.024 . hal-03156698

HAL Id: hal-03156698 https://hal.science/hal-03156698

Submitted on 11 May 2021 $\,$

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers. L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

Integrative genomics highlights opportunities for innovative therapies targeting the tumor microenvironment in gallbladder cancer

Stephanie Roessler¹, Julien Edeline², Peter Schirmacher^{1*}, Cédric Coulouarn^{2*}

¹ Institute of Pathology and Liver Cancer Center Heidelberg (LCCH), Heidelberg University Hospital, Heidelberg, Germany.

² Inserm, Univ Rennes 1, UMR_S 1242, COSS (Chemistry, Oncogenesis Stress Signaling), Centre de Lutte contre le Cancer Eugène Marquis, Rennes, France.

Correspondence: Cédric Coulouarn and Peter Schirmacher, corresponding authors *

Cédric Coulouarn: Inserm UMR_S 1242, "Chemistry, Oncogenesis, stress, Signaling" (COSS), Centre de Lutte contre le Cancer Eugène Marquis, Rue de la Bataille Flandres Dunkerque, Bat D, F-35042 Rennes, France. Tel: +33-2-2323-3881; E-mail: <u>cedric.coulouarn@inserm.fr</u>

Peter Schirmacher: Institute of Pathology, Heidelberg University Hospital, Im Neuenheimer Feld 224, 69120 Heidelberg, Germany. Tel: +49-6221-56-4161; E-mail: peter.schirmacher@med.uni-heidelberg.de Running title: Integrative genomics in GBC

Keywords: Gallbladder cancer; Genomics; Immunotherapy; Microenvironment; Therapies

Electronic word count: 1,422 words (excluding references)

Number of figures and tables: 1 figure and no table

Disclosures (for all authors): CC and SR declare no conflict of interest related to this work. JE provides expertise for MSD, Roche, AstraZeneca and BMS. PS received honoraries from BMS, Roche, MSD, AstraZeneca, Novartis, Ipsen, Incyte and Janssen.

Grant support: CC's team is supported by Inserm, Université de Rennes 1, Ligue Contre le Cancer (CD22, CD35, CD85), INCa, and ITMO Cancer AVIESAN (Alliance Nationale pour les Sciences de la Vie et de la Santé) dans le cadre du Plan cancer (Non-coding RNA in cancerology: fundamental to translational). SR and PS are supported by Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG, German Research Foundation) – Project-ID 314905040 – SFB/TRR 209 Liver Cancer and SR is supported by German Cancer Aid (Deutsche Krebshilfe, project no. 70113922).

Authors' contributions: All authors contributed equally to the intellectual content of the manuscript. All authors wrote the initial draft and contributed significantly to the final version.

Writing Assistance: none

Abbreviations: BTC, biliary tract cancer; CAFs, cancer-associated fibroblasts; CCA, cholangiocarcinoma; GBC, gallbladder cancer; ICIs, immune checkpoint inhibitors; MDSCs, myeloid-derived suppressor cells; OS, overall survival; TGFβ, transforming growth factor beta; TIDE, tumor immune dysfunction and exclusion; TIME, tumor immune microenvironment.

Gallbladder cancers (GBC) together with intrahepatic and extrahepatic cholangiocarcinoma (CCA) constitute rare malignancies of the biliary tract [1]. Although all biliary tract cancers (BTC) are associated with dismal outcome, GBC is the most common and aggressive one, with an estimated incidence of 2.5 per 100,000 individuals worldwide and a 5-year overall survival (OS) rate of less than 5% [2, 3]. According to the GLOBOCAN 2018 data, GBC accounts for 1.2% of all diagnosed cancers, but 1.7% of all cancer-related deaths [2, 3]. GBC exhibits a dismal outcome due to a high frequency of late diagnosis and a lack of long term curative therapeutic options. Striking geographical and ethnicity-related variations in the incidence rate of GBC are observed, suggesting that genetic variations contribute to GBC [1]. GBC is also one of the few cancers more common in women than in men. Besides geographical and gender bias, chronic inflammation is the most important risk factor for GBC [1].

Surgery is currently the only curative option but few patients are eligible for surgery being usually diagnosed at an advanced stage. GBC onset and progression are usually asymptomatic at early stages. Cytotoxic chemotherapy remains the mainstay of treatment in first-line metastatic BTC, including GBC, but with modest efficacy regarding to long-term survival [4]. Combined chemotherapy did not improve OS compared with single-agent chemotherapy as second-line treatment in patients with advanced GBC [4]. A better morpho-molecular characterization of GBC is urgently needed to better stratify GBC patients into clinically relevant subgroups and to identify new actionable alterations. A deep and comprehensive characterization of GBC gene expression profiles constitutes also an important prerequisite to identify potential companion biomarkers to stratify patients, especially for first-line therapies [4].

In this issue of *Journal of Hepatology*, Nepal and colleagues address this issue by establishing a comprehensive landscape of genetic, epigenetic and transcriptomic alterations in a large cohort of patients with GBC [5]. Importantly, by integrating various data from DNA methylation changes, copy number analysis, RNA sequencing and whole exome sequencing,

they highlight clinically-relevant tumor subgroups associated with prognosis (Figure 1). The study further suggests that targeting the tumor immune microenvironment (TIME), alone or in combination with cytotoxic drugs, may provide effective therapeutic opportunities in GBC.

To date, only few large-scale studies focusing on GBC have been performed. In some studies GBC were included together with CCA revealing that GBC and CCA exhibit some distinct and common molecular alterations [6, 7]. Common mutations included *TP53*, *ARID1A* and *PI3KCA*. In contrast, mutation frequencies of *IDH1*, *BAP1* and *FGFR* fusions were very low or absent, while mutations of the ERBB family of proteins were higher in GBC compared to CCA [8, 9]. Thus, morphologically and molecularly GBC and CCA are clearly separate entities, suggesting also significant differences in molecular pathogenesis. A large integrative study of GBC patients from Korea, India and Chile analyzing exomes and transcriptomes found that mutated genes not previously linked to GBC include the ETS domain containing genes, *ELF3* and *EHF* [10]. Interestingly, *ELF3* mutations were predominantly frame-shift alterations resulting in several neoantigens which may activate CD8+ T cells, indicating that they may serve as potential cancer vaccine candidates [10].

Alterations in the Wnt pathway have been observed at the genomic or transcriptomic level in both GBC and CCA [10-12]. Mutations in the central Wnt pathway genes, *CTNNB1* and *APC*, have been detected in GBC and may lead to constitutively increased Wnt signaling [10]. Moreover, a study focusing on DNA methylation profiling revealed gradual hypermethylation and repressed gene expression of *APC* from non-neoplastic epithelia via dysplasia to invasive GBC [13]. Highlighting the importance of Wnt signaling, the integrative analysis by Nepal and colleagues on a large cohort of GBC patients demonstrated that Wnt signaling is among the most significantly affected pathways in GBC. Furthermore, this study identified three GBC subtypes based on the transcriptional profiles of which subtype 2 had relatively long survival, whereas and subtypes 1 and 3 had poor survival **(Figure 1)**.

Besides patient survival and gene expression, multiple differences in histomorphology and the tumor microenvironment were observed between the three subtypes. However, no significant differences in mutation profiles were observed in the three subtypes possibly due to low mutation frequencies. Histomorphological analysis by Nepal and colleagues showed an enrichment of biliary, gastric foveolar or intestinal growth patterns of subtype 1, subtype 2 and subtype 3, respectively [5]. Interestingly, this morpho-molecular subtyping resembles the pattern of intracholecystic papillary neoplasm, the known premalignant lesion of the gallbladder. This may open further interesting questions regarding tumor differentiation and malignant transformation processes. However, independent validation of this finding and identification of tissue biomarkers associated with the histological subtypes would provide additional support for association of gastric foveolar GBC with good prognosis. Furthermore, subtype 2, which is associated with good outcome, exhibited high levels of T cell infiltration, high tumor cell content and increased metabolism, whereas subtypes 1 and 3 (poor outcome group) showed a hypoxia signature, high levels of cancer-associated fibroblasts (CAFs), high levels of MDSCs (myeloidderived suppressor cells), and high Tumor Immune Dysfunction and Exclusion (TIDE) scores indicating T cell exclusion and dysfunction (Figure 1) [5]. MDSCs have been shown to exhibit strong immunosuppressive effects by upregulation of regulatory T cells and immune suppressive cytokines and to support the conversion of fibroblasts to CAFs [14]. Therefore, the study by Nepal and colleagues sheds new light on the tumor microenvironment of GBC in poor and good outcome subgroups supporting the hypothesis that immunosuppression and microenvironment remodeling may account for poor patient survival and possibly poor response to immune checkpoint inhibitors (ICIs) (Figure 1).

Immunotherapy phase 2 trials studying anti-PD-(L)1 as monotherapy or combined with anti-CTLA-4 previously demonstrated disappointing response rates (5 to 16%), suggesting that only a minority of patients could benefit from immunotherapy [15, 16]. PD-L1 expression was not

suggested as a strong predictive factor of efficacy. Despite these disappointing results, large phase 3 trials were launched, based on a combination of standard of care chemotherapy with ICIs. These trials, run in an unselected population, are unlikely to identify the subgroup of patients that might benefit. The work of Nepal and colleagues, aiming at deciphering the different TIME present in GBC, could thus represent a major step forward for future clinical trial development [5]. Similar analyses were previously done in CCA, highlighting clinically relevant subgroups of patients who may benefit from immunotherapies based on specific TIME [17]. The subgroup of GBC with a better prognosis identified by Nepal and colleagues would be at first glance a good target for evaluating ICIs. In contrast, poor prognosis GBC were associated with dysregulation of immune-related pathways, including dysfunctional T cells and T cell exclusion [5]. In agreement with the presence of an immunosuppressive microenvironment, poor prognosis GBC also exhibited expression of markers linked to the activation of transforming growth factor beta (TGF β), a potent immunosuppressive cytokine (Figure 1). This again could be of value in the current effort of bringing TGFB inhibitors to the clinics. Indeed, bifunctional antibodies targeting TGF^β with either CTLA-4 or PD-L1 were suggested to improve results of anti-CTLA-4 or anti-PD-L1 antibodies, due to adequate local sequestration of TGF^β within the TIME [18]. Interestingly, preliminary results of a clinical trial testing bispecific anti-PD-L1/anti-TGFB suggested activity with a 23% response rate [19]. Once again, selecting the appropriate population might greatly improve predictive testing and achieving positive results in clinical trials. Finally, the author studied the TIDE signature of potential response to immune checkpoint inhibitors [20]. This analysis suggested that subtype 2 GBC might be the focus of interest for the implementation of ICIs.

Taken collectively, the study by Nepal and colleagues suggests that different prognosis in GBC depends on the tumor cell properties and/or the TIME. The study further suggests that a comprehensive analysis of the TIME might represent the best approach to identify the population of interest for the development of immuno-oncology drugs in GBC (Figure 1). Combined therapies targeting actionable alterations in tumor cells as well as in the TIME are emerging as relevant strategies to treat GBC, and also liver cancer. We believe that testing combination therapies should be considered together with relevant biomarkers for specific GBC subtypes. Biomarker-driven clinical trials would further help in better disease management and appropriate therapy selection.

Figure 1. Molecular stratification of GBC: implication for therapy.

In this issue of *Journal of Hepatology*, Nepal and colleagues report an integrative molecular analysis of a large cohort of GBC. Genomic alterations in the WNT, MAPK and p53 pathways were observed. The study highlights three GBC subtypes with differential prognosis. GBC with a better prognosis exhibit increased metabolism and infiltration of functional T cells, suggesting that this subtype may benefit from ICIs. On the contrary, GBC with a worse prognosis exhibit an immunosuppressive stroma and activation of the TGF β pathway, suggesting that TGF β inhibitors may offer potential in this subtype. TILs, tumor infiltrating lymphocytes.

References

Author names in bold designate shared co-first authorship

[1] Wistuba, II, Gazdar AF. Gallbladder cancer: lessons from a rare tumour. Nat Rev Cancer 2004;4:695-706.

[2] Bray F, Ferlay J, Soerjomataram I, Siegel RL, Torre LA, Jemal A. Global cancer statistics
2018: GLOBOCAN estimates of incidence and mortality worldwide for 36 cancers in 185
countries. CA Cancer J Clin 2018;68:394-424.

[3] Rawla P, Sunkara T, Thandra KC, Barsouk A. Epidemiology of gallbladder cancer. Clin Exp Hepatol 2019;5:93-102.

[4] Azizi AA, Lamarca A, Valle JW. Systemic therapy of gallbladder cancer: review of first
line, maintenance, neoadjuvant and second line therapy specific to gallbladder cancer. Chin Clin
Oncol 2019;8:43.

[5] **Nepal C, Zhu B, O'Rourke CJ,** Bhatt DK, Lee D, Song L, et al. Integrative molecular characterization of gallbladder cancer reveals microenvironment-associated subtypes. J Hepatol 2020.

[6] Valle JW, Lamarca A, Goyal L, Barriuso J, Zhu AX. New Horizons for Precision Medicine in Biliary Tract Cancers. Cancer Discov 2017;7:943-962.

[7] **Wardell CP, Fujita M,** Yamada T, Simbolo M, Fassan M, Karlic R, et al. Genomic characterization of biliary tract cancers identifies driver genes and predisposing mutations. J Hepatol 2018;68:959-969.

[8] Lamarca A, Barriuso J, McNamara MG, Valle JW. Molecular targeted therapies: Ready for "prime time" in biliary tract cancer. J Hepatol 2020;73:170-185.

[9] Li M, Zhang Z, Li X, Ye J, Wu X, Tan Z, et al. Whole-exome and targeted gene sequencing of gallbladder carcinoma identifies recurrent mutations in the ErbB pathway. Nat Genet 2014;46:872-876.

[10] **Pandey A, Stawiski EW, Durinck S, Gowda H,** Goldstein LD, Barbhuiya MA, et al. Integrated genomic analysis reveals mutated ELF3 as a potential gallbladder cancer vaccine candidate. Nat Commun 2020;11:4225.

[11] Boulter L, Guest RV, Kendall TJ, Wilson DH, Wojtacha D, Robson AJ, et al. WNT signaling drives cholangiocarcinoma growth and can be pharmacologically inhibited. J Clin Invest 2015;125:1269-1285.

[12] Perugorria MJ, Olaizola P, Labiano I, Esparza-Baquer A, Marzioni M, Marin JJG, et al.
Wnt-beta-catenin signalling in liver development, health and disease. Nat Rev Gastroenterol
Hepatol 2019;16:121-136.

[13] Bragelmann J, Barahona Ponce C, Marcelain K, Roessler S, Goeppert B, Gallegos I, et al. Epigenome-wide analysis of methylation changes in the sequence of gallstone disease, dysplasia, and gallbladder cancer. Hepatology 2020.

[14] **Veglia F, Perego M,** Gabrilovich D. Myeloid-derived suppressor cells coming of age. Nat Immunol 2018;19:108-119.

[15] Bang Y-J, Ueno M, Malka D, Chung HC, Nagrial A, Kelley RK, et al. Pembrolizumab (pembro) for advanced biliary adenocarcinoma: Results from the KEYNOTE-028 (KN028) and KEYNOTE-158 (KN158) basket studies. Journal of Clinical Oncology 2019;37:4079-4079.

[16] Ioka T, Ueno M, Oh D-Y, Fujiwara Y, Chen J-S, Doki Y, et al. Evaluation of safety and tolerability of durvalumab (D) with or without tremelimumab (T) in patients (pts) with biliary tract cancer (BTC). Journal of Clinical Oncology 2019;37:387-387.

[17] Job S, Rapoud D, Dos Santos A, Gonzalez P, Desterke C, Pascal G, et al. Identification of Four Immune Subtypes Characterized by Distinct Composition and Functions of Tumor Microenvironment in Intrahepatic Cholangiocarcinoma. Hepatology 2020;72:965-981.

[18] Ravi R, Noonan KA, Pham V, Bedi R, Zhavoronkov A, Ozerov IV, et al. Bifunctional immune checkpoint-targeted antibody-ligand traps that simultaneously disable TGFbeta enhance the efficacy of cancer immunotherapy. Nat Commun 2018;9:741.

[19] Kang Y-K, Doi T, Kondo S, Chung H-C, Muro K, Helwig C, et al. M7824 (MSB0011359C), a bifunctional fusion protein targeting PD-L1 and TGF-β, in Asian patients with pretreated recurrent or refractory gastric cancer: Preliminary results from a phase I trial. Journal of Clinical Oncology 2018;36:100-100.

[20] **Jiang P, Gu S, Pan D,** Fu J, Sahu A, Hu X, et al. Signatures of T cell dysfunction and exclusion predict cancer immunotherapy response. Nat Med 2018;24:1550-1558.

