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Summary

During the last two decades, two main schools of modern immunotherapy have come to the forefront. The chimeric anti-CD20 antibody rituximab that was introduced for the treatment of refractory follicular lymphoma in 1998 was one of the first examples of the school of passive immunotherapy. Subsequently major and ever more costly efforts were spent on the development of blockbuster monotherapies including other monoclonal but also bispecific antibodies of highly defined specificity and subclass, antibody–drug conjugates (ADCs), as well as ex vivo expanded tumor-infiltrating lymphocytes, chimeric antigen receptor (CAR)-transduced T cells, and TCR-transduced T cells. On the other hand, there is the school that works toward active induction of patient B- or T-cell immunity against antigens of choice, or active tolerance against pathogenic allergens, auto-antigens or allo-antigens. Straddled in between these two approaches is treatment with blockers of T cell checkpoint control, which releases the brakes of T cells that have already responded to antigen. Extensive and detailed insight into the cellular and molecular interactions that regulate specific immune responses is indispensable in order to be able to optimize efficacy and rule out treatment related toxicity. This applies to all types of immunotherapy. Our knowledge of the checks and balances in the immune system is still increasing at an unprecedented pace, fostering ever more effective and specific (combination) immunotherapies and offering a rich harvest of innovative immunotherapies in the years ahead.
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Introduction

Immunotherapy has now expanded into vast areas of medicine, including the treatment of infectious diseases, allergy, inflammatory disease, auto-immune conditions, and cancer. In auto-immune diseases, transplantation, and allergy, the holy grail of treatment is specific tolerance induction rather than immunosuppression or symptom suppression by monoclonal...
antibodies. Prevention of disease is increasingly based
on insight into the same immunological mechanisms
that have served us more recently regarding the de-
velopment of novel therapeutic strategies. Since times
immemorial, preventive vaccines have relied on the
induction of high levels of antibodies that neutralize,
neutralize, or lyse invading microorganisms (bac-
teria and viruses) or inactivate their major toxin(s).
However, textbooks of immunology teach us that for
established virus infections antibodies are no good,
and that infected cells are effectively dispensed with
by cell-mediated immune mechanisms only. Indeed,
T cells are not distracted by freely floating antigen in
body fluids. They kill virus-infected cells with micro-
surgical precision and effectiveness as these are rec-
ognized by viral peptide presentation in human leukocyte
antigen (HLA) molecules. In what follows I will argue
that preconceived ideas about the immune effector
mechanisms needed for prevention as well as disease-
modifying purposes are no longer valid, thanks to
novel biotechnology and new insights into prevention
and therapy. Nevertheless, we still need the basic prin-
ciples that dictate that antibodies have been designed
to primarily cleanse the body fluids from extracellular
organisms such as extracellular bacteria, whereas T
cells primarily clear the body cells of intracellular or-
ganisms such as viruses.

Innovative applications of monoclonal anti-
bodies and T cells

Infectious disease

Monoclonal antibodies

Human monoclonal antibodies (MoAbs) of choice can
now be produced very efficiently, thanks to the capacity
of hybridoma cells to produce MoAbs of pre-defined
specificity, avidity, and immunoglobulin subclass in un-
limited quantities, derived from B cells of infected or
immunized patients or from mice with a completely hu-
manized immunoglobulin gene and T cell receptor (TCR)
repertoire. This has even opened the doors for the treat-
ment of severe established virus disease with monoclonal
antibodies, such as established Ebola virus infection [1]
or (in mice) Middle East Respiratory Syndrome infection
[2]—with some degree of success. In the case of estab-
lished Ebola virus infections, the death rate after anti-
body treatment was reduced from over 50% to 33.5%
[1]. Therefore, this concept is currently being explored
(further) for the treatment of established infections with
the scourge of the current era: SARS-CoV-2. Still, these
treatments can only operate by neutralizing new extra-
cellular progeny virus released from dying cells, thereby
halting the spread of the virus to other cells. MoAb treat-
ment cannot be expected to replace the unsurpassed effi-
cacy of T cell-mediated killing of live virus-infected cells.
The reasons are simple: antibodies have insufficient ac-
cess to intracellular viral antigens, and T-cell-mediated
killing appears to be more effective at eradicating sur-
face antigen-positive cells than antibody-dependent cel-
ular cytotoxicity or complement-dependent lysis of
cells. Obviously, the lack of HLA restriction of anti-viral
MoAbs makes them attractive and broadly applicable
for the treatment of every infected patient. However,
treatments with the capacity to rapidly generate virus-
specific CD4+ and CD8+ T cells as well as activated NK
cells through rapid response initiation or transfusion of
TCR-transduced patient-derived T cells should be far
more effective than MoAbs when it comes to getting rid
of the infection. A parallel can be drawn here between the
much greater efficacy of chimeric antigen receptor (CAR)
T cells in eradicating B cell malignancies than that of
MoAbs against the same CD19 and CD20 B cell antigens
(see below).

Therapeutic vaccines

Surprisingly, therapeutic vaccines for virus-induced diseases
have not yet been registered, with the exception of a ra-
bies vaccine, but their design and manufacture is straight-
forward, comparable to the production of therapeutic
cancer vaccines [3, 4], and directed at powerful effector and
memory T cell induction. Surprisingly, we know that virus
infections are most effectively cleared by NK cells and T
cells, but to date all preventive anti-viral vaccines rely on the
induction of neutralizing antibodies. A more effective way to
deal with both prevention and control of established virus
infections would be rapid mobilization of T cells alongside
neutralizing antibodies. Indeed, many of the persons who
spontaneously cleared SARS-CoV-2 infections showed no
evidence of serum antibodies against the virus, but merely
displayed memory T cell responses [5]. COVID-19 is a dis-
ease in which both rapid deployment of effective preventive
vaccines is needed as well as testing and tracing of recently
infected people. A therapeutic vaccine can help to prevent ex-
acerbation of disease in early infected persons at risk of full
blown disease by induction of a faster and more powerful
effector and memory T cell response than this person would
otherwise develop spontaneously. Therapeutic vaccines will
likely be developed against not only SARS-CoV-2, but also
other viruses that mediate subacute or chronic diseases. Such
therapeutic vaccines will typically be built on plasmid DNA,
RNA, or synthetic long peptide (SLP) vaccine platforms, ra-
ther than viral vectors. The biologic activity as monotherapy
of two of these modalities (SLP and plasmid DNA vaccines)
has already been proven in the case of pre-malignant lesions
caused by high-risk human papilloma virus (hrHPV) such as HPV16 [3, 4]. Similar therapies can be developed for other chronic persistent virus infections such as hepatitis B and associated conditions.

**Cancer**

**Bispecific antibodies, ADCs, and CARs**

Bispecific antibodies and ADCs have proven their value as effective anti-cancer therapies, and several of these agents have been approved since the early 2000s, especially in the context of therapy-resistant B cell leukemias, lymphomas, and acute myeloid leukemia [6–8]. The bispecific T cell engager (BiTE) antibody blinatumomab has dual CD3 and CD19 specificity. Its mode of action is to non-specifically engage (BiTE) antibody blinatumomab has dual CD3 and CD19 specificity. Its mode of action is to non-specifically engage CD3+ T cells to kill CD19+ malignant B cells, for example, B-ALL cells, by bringing them into close contact with each other [7]. In 2014, blinatumomab was approved to treat Philadelphia chromosome-negative relapsed or refractory B-cell precursor acute lymphoblastic leukemia (in first or second remission) in adults and children.

ADCs are complex molecules composed of an antibody linked to a biologically active cytotoxic (anti-cancer) payload or drug. ADCs combine the targeting capabilities of monoclonal antibodies with the cancer-killing ability of cytotoxic drugs; examples of registered agents are gemtuzumab ozogamicin (AML) [8] and trastuzumab emtansine (HER2-positive breast cancer) [9]. Gemtuzumab is a monoclonal antibody to CD33 linked to a cytotoxic agent from the class of calicheamicins; trastuzumab coupled with a linker to maytansine has been approved for the treatment of metastatic HER2-positive breast cancer since 2013.

T cells transduced with chimeric antigen receptors (CARs) have proven to be a powerful cellular anti-tumor approach, utilizing the exquisite specificity of antibodies coupled to the powerful effector function of T cells against (cancer) cells. The other successful approach to cause T cells to kill CD19+ leukemia or lymphoma cells is transduction of the T cells with a chimeric antigen receptor (CAR) [10], consisting of the antigen binding domains of a monoclonal anti-CD19 antibody coupled to the constant domain of the αβ TCR. A special required feature for efficacy is the incorporation into the CAR of the signaling domain of either CD28 or 4-1BB (CD137). Such a signaling domain makes the transduced T cells independent of the usual checks and balances regulating T cell responses, allowing their virtually unbridled antigen-driven expansion and persistence. Because of their powerful T cell activating properties, BiTEs, ADCs, and CAR-transduced T cells can cause a severe cytokine release syndrome in hematological malignancies [11]. This can either be prevented by cancer cell reducing measures in the case of BiTEs or by treatment with anti-IL-6 in the case of CAR-transduced T cell transfusion [11]. Another undesirable long-term side effect of anti-CD19 CAR T cell therapy is permanent depletion of normal B cells, necessitating supplementation therapy with immunoglobulins from pooled healthy donor plasma. It is likely that in the near future, it will become possible to have the CAR T cells destroy themselves through a built-in suicide gene that can be activated by a simple non-toxic drug. Obviously, this can only happen if very sensitive techniques have ascertained the complete absence of malignant B cells. Only in these circumstances, it is safe to eliminate the therapeutic CAR-transduced T cells from the body. So far, CAR T cells have shown excellent biological activity against hematological malignancies such as B cell leukemias and lymphomas. It has proven much harder to find good targets for CAR T cells on the surface of solid malignancies, but solid cancer-specific CAR T therapy has already been developed for prostate-specific membrane antigen and mesothelin [12, 13]. Therapy escape by loss of antigen expression can be avoided by the use of bispecific CARs, in the case of B cell malignancies directed against at least two B cell-specific antigens, for example, CD19 and CD20 [14].

**Adoptive T cell therapy**

Taking tumor-infiltrating T lymphocytes (TILs) or T cells from blood and expanding them for therapy of cancer has taken a big flight and has shown remarkable proof of concept, in particular in metastatic melanoma [15] and virus-induced malignancies [16]. In addition, αβ TCRs from T cell lines or clones, usually CD8+ T cells directed against epitopes presented by frequent HLA class I molecules, can be transduced into random T cell populations of cancer patients, again often melanoma [17, 18]. Like CAR T cell therapy, TCR transduction therapy is a form of somatic gene therapy. It is therefore personalized, and currently laborious and expensive, but efforts to use allogeneic T cells for off-the-shelf therapy are ongoing. An optimal antigen-driven effector CD8+ T cell response in addition to an optimal memory CD8+ T cell response requires simultaneous antigen recognition of HLA class II-presented epitopes on dendritic cells (DC) by CD4+ T cells. Usually, the intricate cognate cell interactions between CD4+ T cells, CD8+ T cells, and DC are not mimicked in TCR transduction therapies because this would require simultaneous transduction of CD4+ T cells with an HLA class II epitope-recognizing TCR. This would make this type of therapy even more complex and hard to implement. Progress in this area is likely to come from similar improvements as have made the difference in CAR T cell
Therapeutic vaccines, checkpoint blocking, and combination immunotherapy

More often than not immunosuppressive conditions prevail in cancer tissues and their stroma, as summarized under the term T cell-hostile tumor micro-environment (TME). This is exemplified by the fact that pre-malignant lesions caused by hrHPV16 can be effectively treated with therapeutic vaccines as monotherapy [19–22], whereas late-stage recurrent or metastatic cancers at the other end of the disease spectrum require combination therapies of vaccination in combination with anti-PD-1 checkpoint blocking [23] or chemotherapy [24]. Curiously, checkpoint blockers, such as anti-PD-1 or anti-CTLA-4, when injected intravenously at high dose cause substantial inflammatory or auto-immune side effects. However, local delivery of a CD40 agonist or CTLA-4 checkpoint blocker MoAb into the draining lymph node area of a tumor lesion at lower dose, and in a slow release, vehicle is just as effective in mouse models. Furthermore, this approach is not associated with the aforementioned side effects, although it generates a systemic T cell response of equal magnitude [25, 26]. Combination of monoclonal antibodies against the two T cell checkpoints CTLA-4 and PD-1 has successfully increased the clinical response rate in metastatic melanoma, but at a price of increased toxicity [27]. This combination may in particular benefit from slow release local delivery. Other therapeutics that can be combined with ACT or therapeutic vaccination are improved versions of γC cytokines, FLT3 Ligand, anti-TGFβ, and many other immunomodulators in the pipeline [28]. The challenge in late-stage disease is to define what the precise immunological TME deficiencies are in each individual patient, in order to be able to select the tailor made most effective combination therapy for that patient, requiring sophisticated precision biomarker analyses [28]. In addition, the selection of the best target(s) for therapeutic T cells in each patient with a non-viral mutation-based cancer must be individualized by defining the immunogenic mutation-based neo-epitopes in that patient [29, 30]. Ideally, the mutations are contained in mutant driver molecules of the malignancy, ensuring ubiquitous expression in all malignant (sub)clones and avoiding easy immune escape by antigen loss during clonal evolution of the malignant cells [28].

Specific immunological tolerance induction in allergy, auto-immune disease, and transplantation

Allergy

In allergic disease such as atopic eczema and bronchial asthma, monoclonal antibody therapy such as anti-IL-4 receptor MoAb can alleviate symptoms [31], but an even more specific and permanent solution is to channel the specific immune response away from pathogenic Th2/IgE responses. This can in theory be achieved whenever the target T and B cell epitopes of disease-causing immune responses are known. While current desensitization therapies are based on this principle [32], such immune deviation can most likely be achieved in a much more precise, predictable, and rapid fashion by peptide vaccines against these allergens with extreme Th1-polarizing platforms [33, 34].

Auto-immune disease

Both organ-specific and systemic auto-immune diseases are traditionally treated with either non-specific immunosuppressive drugs or antibodies depleting cytokines, B cells, or activated T cells, depending on whether the disease is thought to be primarily caused by antibodies or by T cells. Complete pathogenic B cell depletion may require CAR T cell therapy against CD19/20 as discussed above for B cell-derived lymphoma/leukemia, followed by auto-elimination of the CAR T cells, allowing regeneration of a normal B cell repertoire without pathogenic B cell clones. A more attractive option is specific tolerance induction against the pathogenic antigen(s) (reviewed in ref. [35]), including induction of antigen-specific FoxP3+ regulatory T cells. Unfortunately, the precise T- and/or B cell antigens causing auto-immune disease are often still unknown for many diseases. A complicating factor is that multiple target antigens may be presented by multiple HLA class I and II molecules to pathogenic CD4+ and CD8+ T cells.
Transplantation

Effective survival of allografts, like treatment of autoimmune diseases, still largely depends on non-specific immunosuppression—whether that be chemical or biological suppression—on top of tissue matching. However, although donor-specific tolerance induction is a theoretical possibility, it has not reliably succeeded with the possible exception of liver allografts, which benefit from the tolerogenic properties of the immune environment in the liver [36]. Much work thus remains to be done. It proved possible to successfully treat organ/tissue recipients with several types of tolerogenic DC of donor origin in mouse, rat or non-human primate allo-transplantation and clinical trials are ongoing [37].
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