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The Vigorous Immune Microenvironment of Microsatellite Instable Colon Cancer Is Balanced by Multiple Counter-Inhibitory Checkpoints


ABSTRACT
We examined the immune microenvironment of primary colorectal cancer using immunohistochemistry, laser capture microdissection/qRT-PCR, flow cytometry, and functional analysis of tumor-infiltrating lymphocytes. A subset of colorectal cancer displayed high infiltration with activated CD8+ cytotoxic T lymphocyte (CTL) as well as activated Th1 cells characterized by IFNγ production and the Th1 transcription factor TBET. Parallel analysis of tumor genotypes revealed that virtually all of the tumors with this active Th1/CTL microenvironment had defects in mismatch repair, as evidenced by microsatellite instability (MSI). Counterbalancing this active Th1/CTL microenvironment, MSI tumors selectively demonstrated highly upregulated expression of multiple immune checkpoints, including five—PD-1, PD-L1, CTLA-4, LAG-3, and IDO—currently being targeted clinically with inhibitors. These findings link tumor genotype with the immune microenvironment, and explain why MSI tumors are not naturally eliminated despite a hostile Th1/CTL microenvironment. They further suggest that blockade of specific checkpoints may be selectively efficacious in the MSI subset of colorectal cancer.

SIGNIFICANCE: The findings reported in this article are the first to demonstrate a link between a genetically defined subtype of cancer and its corresponding expression of immune checkpoints in the tumor microenvironment. The mismatch repair-defective subset of colorectal cancer selectively upregulates at least five checkpoint molecules that are targets of inhibitors currently being clinically tested. Cancer Discov; 5(1); 43–51. ©2014 AACR.
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INTRODUCTION

An increasing body of research has revealed that the immune microenvironment of cancer is unique and complex; indeed, tumors can be viewed as distinct immunologic organs. Pathologists have long recognized the diversity of immune infiltration into tumors, invoking terms such as “lymphocyte poor” and “inflammatory.” For some cancer types, it is becoming clear that simple quantitation of lymphocyte infiltration has prognostic significance, suggesting that lymphocyte infiltration is not passive but may actively promote or inhibit tumor growth (1). In the case of colorectal cancer, Galon and colleagues (2) demonstrated that levels of lymphocyte infiltration into primary tumors represented a strong independent predictor of relapse and overall survival, with high lymphocyte infiltration being a positive prognostic factor. Using expression profiling of colorectal cancers, they further defined the relevance of specific immune signatures, demonstrating that T helper 1 cells (Th1)–type, IFNγ-dominant immune profiles signified an improved prognosis, whereas Th17–type, IL17-dominant immune profiles signified a poor prognosis (3). These findings are in concordance with multiple studies in murine models demonstrating that Th1/cytotoxic T lymphocyte (CTL)–dominant immune responses are antitumorigenic (4), whereas Th17-dominant responses are typically procarcinogenic (5).

The relevance of molecular regulation of lymphocyte function in the tumor microenvironment (TME) has been further highlighted by the emerging clinical experience in treatment of cancer with antibody blockade of the PD-1 pathway. Anti-PD-1 and anti–PD-L1 antibodies have been demonstrated to induce significant durable tumor regressions in patients with melanoma, renal cancer, and non–small cell lung cancer (6–9). The finding that expression of PD-L1 in tumor biopsies is a predictor of response to PD-1 pathway–blocking antibodies (6) supports conclusions from murine studies that this pathway plays a major role in blocking antitumor immune responses directly within the TME (10). With increasing efforts to develop antibody blockers of multiple additional immune-inhibitory ligands and receptors (termed checkpoints) for cancer immunotherapy, understanding the expression patterns and functions of these molecules in the context of the TME will be critical in selecting patient populations most likely to benefit from their application (11). In contrast to melanoma, renal cancer, and lung cancer, colorectal cancer cohorts demonstrated a very low response rate to PD-1 or PD-L1 blockade and have been considered a nonresponding histology to the PD-1 pathway blockade (6–8). However, there was an insufficient number of patients to potentially define subsets of colorectal cancer that might be more amenable to checkpoint blockade.

With these considerations in mind, we have undertaken a comprehensive analysis of the immune microenvironment of colorectal cancer, using a combination of immunohistochemistry (IHC), laser capture microdissection combined with quantitative reverse transcription PCR (LCM/qRT-PCR), multiparameter flow cytometry (MFC), and functional analysis of purified tumor-infiltrating lymphocytes (TIL) from a large set of surgically resected primary colorectal cancer. These analyses revealed, in an unbiased fashion, that a subset of colorectal cancer possesses a highly activated Th1- and CTL-rich microenvironment. Through concomitant genetic analysis, we found that this subset of tumors harbored microsatellite instability (MSI), indicating that they were mismatch repair–deficient (12). This finding was in accordance with numerous prior studies indicating that MSI tumors are highly infiltrated with T cells including CTLs (13–16).

How could tumors persist in this hostile microenvironment? To find out, we carried out an extensive investigation of the regulatory factors operative in this microenvironment. We found that there was a dramatic overexpression of immune checkpoint–related proteins in the microenvironment of MSI tumors, thus explaining a long-standing enigma and suggesting that immunotherapeutic interventions involving checkpoint blockade might be selectively effective in this important subset of cancers. On the basis of these findings, clinical trials have been initiated to test PD-1 blockade in patients with colorectal cancer identified as MSI.

RESULTS

We began our analysis of primary sporadic colorectal cancer by performing quantitative IHC for standard T-cell subsets using antibodies to CD3, CD4, CD8, and Foxp3. We distinguished three compartments: true TIL representing lymphocytes intercalated within the glandular or medullary epithelial component of the tumor, T cells in the tumor stroma surrounding the epithelial component of the tumor, and the invasive front where the tumor invades into the lamina propria (Supplementary Fig. S1). Infiltration by these T-cell types in each of the compartments was quantitated numerically by blinded analysis of 5 high-power fields (hpf; 0.0028 mm²/hpf) and displayed as average number of stained cells per hpf. We found a subset of tumors (roughly 20%) that had large infiltrates of total (CD3⁺ T cells) as well as CD4⁺ and CD8⁺ T cells in all three compartments, with CD8⁺ T cells the most dramatically increased. We wondered whether this subset of tumors was MSI, given prior studies indicating lymphocyte infiltrations in such tumors (13–16). Indeed, analysis of microsatellites showed that nearly all of the tumors with the infiltrates were MSI. We therefore focused on differences between tumors harboring MSI versus microsatellite stability (MSS; Supplementary Table S1) for the in-depth analysis of the immune TME of colorectal cancer.

Figure 1A and B show typical examples of IHC staining, and Fig. 1C shows the quantitative analyses demonstrating statistical differences between MSI and MSS tumors for the total CD3⁺ T cells and CD4⁺ T cells among TIL and invasive front as well as CD8⁺ T cells among all three compartments. Although it did not reach statistical significance in tumor stroma and the invasive front, we observed higher Foxp3⁺ cell infiltrates, representative of regulatory T cells (Treg), in MSI compared with MSS tumors. Of note, a single outlier included in our MSS cohort displayed a high infiltration of each T-cell subset, similar in range to the one of MSI tumors (Fig. 1C and Supplementary Figs. S2 and S3A).

We further explored the nature of the T-cell infiltrates by performing LCM on MSI and MSS tumors, separately dissecting the TIL, stroma, and invasive front compartments (Supplementary Fig. S1) and then performed qRT-PCR (Fig. 2A–C)
for selected genes encoding signature T-cell cytokines as well as core transcription factors for each of the three major Th subsets, Th1/Th2 (type 1 CTL, TBX21 and IFNG are common to Th1 and Th2), Th2, and Th17. We additionally analyzed genes associated with CTL and Treg and also general inflammatory cytokines. Finally, we analyzed expression of genes encoding both coinhibitory membrane ligands and receptors (commonly termed checkpoints) and metabolic enzymes that have been shown to regulate lymphocyte activity; these serve feedback-inhibitory functions in normal physiology but can represent important mechanisms of adaptive immune resistance by tumors in the face of an endogenous antitumor T-cell repertoire (11).

We found that the expression of the gene encoding IFNγ (IFNG), the canonical Th1/Th2 cytokine, is higher in all three compartments of MSI compared with MSS tumors (Fig. 2A–C; the differences reach statistical significance in the TIL and invasive front areas with Wilcoxon test \( P = 0.041 \) for both). The expression of TBX21 encoding TBET, the Th1/Th2 canonical transcription factor, is similarly increased in MSI tumors, though differences did not reach statistical significance among the cohort analyzed. The CD8A gene, mainly expressed by CTLs, is highly differentially expressed in the TIL regions of MSI relative to MSS tumors (Fig. 2A; \( P = 0.004 \)), in concordance with significantly higher CD8 infiltration observed by IHC (Fig. 1C). In marked contrast to Th1 and CTL genes, expression of Th17 genes is virtually identical between MSI and MSS tumors for all compartments. IL13 and IL4 (the canonical Th2-type cytokines) were undetectable in most of the MSI and MSS samples for each of the TME regions analyzed, and GATA3 (Th2 transcription factor) expression was not different between MSS and MSI (data not shown). Treg-associated genes, including FOXP3, were similar between MSI and MSS tumors. Gene group comparison analysis using the Wilcoxon–Mann–Whitney permutation test confirms that Th1/Th1 (TBX21 and IFNG) and CTL (CD8A, GZMB, PRFI, and IL21) groups but not the Th17 (IRF4, IL17A, and IL23) group show statistical differences in their representation between TIL compartments of MSI and MSS colorectal cancer (Fig. 2D). In summary, MSI tumors have a selective Th1 and CTL infiltration and activation relative to MSS tumors. The highest value for IFNG and TBX21 expression in TIL from a single MSS sample (detailed in Supplementary Fig. S3B) represents the same outlier observed in the quantitative analysis of CD4 and CD8 TIL infiltration from Fig. 1C. Among genes encoding inflammatory cytokines, IL18, which is generally associated with Th1 responses and selectively promotes IFNγ production by T cells, is more highly expressed in MSI tumors in all three compartments \( (P < 0.05) \), whereas genes encoding IL1 and IL6, which selectively promote Th17 responses, are not (Fig. 2A–C). The expression of PTGS2 (encoding COX2), IL12A (encoding IL12p35), and TNF (encoding TNFα) did not differ between MSS and MSI specimens.

Figure 1. Geographic distribution in situ of MSI and MSS colorectal cancer–infiltrating lymphocytes. Formalin-fixed, paraffin-embedded tissue sections were characterized by IHC for CD4, CD8, and FOXP3 cell infiltration. Three distinct histologic areas designated as TIL, tumor stroma, and invasive front (where tumor invaded normal lamina propria) were histologically identified and separately analyzed. Invasive front (A) and TIL/stroma (B) areas of representative MSS (bottom) and MSI (top) specimens are shown (×20 magnification). Dashed lines in A delineate the invasive front with the tumor tissue on the top side and the normal tissue on the bottom side. Red stars and blue arrows in B indicate the tumor stroma and tumor epithelium-infiltrating immune cells, respectively. Scale bars, 100 μm. C, cell density was scored in 14 MSS (blue) and 9 MSI (red) specimens by determining the average number of stained cells in 5 distinct hpf (0.0028 mm²/hpf). The graphs display the mean for each group; *, statistically significant differences between MSS and MSI \( (P < 0.05) \), using Mann–Whitney U test.
We next analyzed the expression of genes encoding checkpoint receptors. We found that all three of the clinically targeted checkpoint receptors—CTLA-4 (CTLA4), PD-1 (PDCD1), and LAG-3 (LAG3)—were expressed at considerably higher levels in MSI compared with MSS tumors (P < 0.05 in all compartments for CTLA4, in TILs and the invasive front for LAG3; P > 0.05 in all compartments for PDCD1). The gene encoding PD-L1 (CD274), a major IFNγ-inducible PD-1 ligand expressed in the epithelial cells of many solid tumors (17), was unexpectedly expressed in TILs and stroma of MSI tumors (Wilcoxon test P values are 0.009 and 0.015, respectively; Fig. 2A and B). Among inhibitory metabolic enzymes, the IFNγ-induced gene encoding indolamine 2′3′-dioxygenase (IDO), which metabolizes tryptophan to kynurenine, demonstrates significantly higher expression in TILs of MSI tumors (P = 0.041; Fig. 2A). In contrast, arginase-1 (ARG1), a myeloid enzyme induced by γ-inducible PD-1 ligand expressed (17), was unexpectedly expressed in TILs and stroma of MSI tumors (Wilcoxon test P values are 0.009 and 0.015, respectively; Fig. 2A and B).
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a combination of higher immune infiltration and cellular upregulation in MSI compared with MSS tumors.

Because differences in checkpoint expression could have significant implications in defining patient subgroups potentially responsive to checkpoint blockade, we sought to determine whether differences at the RNA level were mirrored at the protein level. Indeed, IHC for both PD-1 and LAG-3 demonstrated robust expression in lymphocytes of MSI tumors, whereas very little was observed in MSS tumors (Fig. 3A and B). The qRT-PCR/LCM analyses shown in Fig. 2 therefore underestimated the differences between MSI and MSS tumors with respect to PD-1 protein surface expression by TIL. Multiparameter flow cytometry of freshly isolated lymphocytes from tumors demonstrated that a large proportion of both CD4+ and CD8+ T cells infiltrating MSI tumors express high levels of PD-1 (Fig. 4A and B). This PD-1high population was largely absent in MSS tumors (except two MSS specimens, one of which was the highly infiltrated MSS outlier described above) and the normal mucosa adjacent to MSI tumors. The TBET downregulation and PD-1 upregulation by T cells is typically found in chronic viral infection and termed “exhaustion” (18). Because the presence of PD-1high T-cell infiltrate in MSI tumors is concomitant with the detection of high IFNγ (MFC in Fig. 4C and qRT-PCR in Fig. 2) and high TBET (qRT-PCR in Fig. 2), further investigation should be conducted to determine the coexpression of these molecules at the single cell level and formally rule out the classic “exhaustion” phenotype of these TILs. Of note, the two MSS tumors exhibiting an unusually strong proportion of PD1high CD8+ T cells (Fig. 4B) were also characterized by a high proportion of IFNγ-producing CD8+ T cells (Supplementary Fig. S3 and data not shown). Our findings suggest that a small proportion of MSS tumors are characterized by the concordant detection of Th1/CTL infiltration and immune checkpoint expression that is found in all MSI tumors.

Finally, we analyzed PD-L1 protein expression by IHC. MSI tumors demonstrated much higher PD-L1 expression than MSS tumors (Fig. 4D). Surprisingly, in contrast to other cancers, such as melanoma, renal cancer, and lung cancer (19), there was virtually no discernable PD-L1 expression on tumor cells of MSI tumors by IHC; rather, co-staining with CD163 demonstrated that the majority of PD-L1 expression was by myeloid cells. There were large numbers of PD-L1+ myeloid cells at the invasive front and in the stroma and some were intercalated between epithelial cells in the tumor nests of MSI specimens (Fig. 4D). Histologic scoring of PD-L1+ cells in TIL and the invasive front regions confirmed the high expression of PD-L1 in MSI tumors (Fig. 4E). Omitting the MSS outlier patient (high CD8+ T-cell infiltration and IFNγ production) that also demonstrated high PD-L1 expression, we found that the difference between MSS and MSI specimens reached statistical significance in the TIL area (P < 0.05, Mann–Whitney U test). MFC analysis performed on freshly dissociated MSI tumors confirmed high levels of PD-L1 expression on viable CD11b+CD33+HLA-DR+CD15−CD14+CD3+ myeloid cells (Fig. 4F). Because most human cancers appear to upregulate PD-L1 as an adaptive response to IFNγ (17), the lack of clear PD-L1 expression on tumor cells in the MSI specimens as assayed by IHC was unexpected, particularly given the high IFNγ level in these tumors. Of note, although PD-L1 was upregulated on a number of both MSI and MSS colon tumor cell lines after incubation with IFNγ, this upregulation was, in general, much less than the one observed in melanoma cell lines (Supplementary Fig. S4). Interestingly, cell lines with the weakest PD-L1 induction also showed weak MHC II induction after IFNγ treatment, suggesting that colon tumors may have relatively dampened STAT1 signaling.

MSI tumors have a much higher mutational load (and thus potentially more neoantigens) than MSS tumors, and...
MSI colorectal cancers are characterized by IFNγ-producing PD1hi TIL and PDL-1+ tumor-infiltrating myeloid cells. A, freshly dissociated MSS and MSI colon tumors (T) as well as patient-matched normal tissue (N) were assessed by MFC for the expression of PD-1 on infiltrating CD4+ and CD8+ T cells. PD-1 expression in tumor was normalized to the normal tissue run simultaneously and both histograms were aligned to delineate in tumor samples the PD1hi cells when compared with normal tissue. B, proportion of PD-1hi CD4+ and CD8+ cells among CD3+ lymphocytes infiltrating MSS (blue squares) and MSI (red circles) specimens. In each group the mean is indicated; *, statistically significant differences between MSS and MSI (*, P < 0.05; ****, P < 0.0001; nonparametric Mann–Whitney U test). C, representative ICS for IFNγ production by in vitro phorbol-12-myristate-13-acetate/ionomycin–activated T cells (3 hours). The dot plots show the coexpression of PD-1 and IFNγ in CD4+ T cells and CD8+ T cells in a representative set of MSS (left) and MSI (right) colorectal cancer (top) and patient-matched normal (bottom) specimens. The gates delineate PD1hi and PD1lo cells. D, colocalization of CD163 and PD-L1 expression in invasive front (left) and TIL/stroma (right) areas of a representative set of MSS (left) and MSI (right) colorectal cancer specimens were assessed by IHC; ×20 magnification. Scale bars, 100 μm. Red stars indicate the tumor stroma. E, PD-L1 expression scores in 7 MSS (blue) and 7 MSI (red) colorectal cancer specimens (average of 5 hpf/sample). F, MFC analysis of PD-L1 expression on MSI colorectal cancer–infiltrating myeloid cells. Dot plots represent the expression of myeloid-associated markers on CD11b+HLA-DR+ cells. Infiltrating myeloid cells were characterized as CD15+CD14+CD33+CD11c+ cells. PD-L1 expression (dark gray) is overlaid with corresponding isotype control (light gray).
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this could be related to the presence of the vigorous immune microenvironment in this genotypic subset of colorectal cancer. We therefore wondered whether the highly infiltrated MSS tumor described above had more mutations than expected for an MSS tumor. To address this question, we performed exome sequencing on the microdissected tumor of this individual. We found only 49 nonsynonymous, somatic mutations in this tumor, a number well within the typical range for MSS colorectal cancer and much less than in MSI tumors (20). In addition, no mutations in POLE and POLD1 genes were identified; tumors with mutations in these genes also contain a high mutational load despite having stable microsatellites (21). Thus, in this individual tumor, the prominent T-cell infiltration was not due to an unusually high mutational load (Supplementary Table S2).

**DISCUSSION**

Direct analysis of the immune microenvironment of tumors is emerging as the most important means of understanding the relationship between patients’ immune systems and their cancer (1). These analyses are bearing fruit in informing prognosis and guiding immunotherapy, particularly using antibody blockade of immune checkpoints. We demonstrate here that the immune microenvironment of DNA repair–deficient MSI colorectal cancer contains a strong Th1 and CTL component not found in the vast majority of DNA repair–sufficient MSS tumors, in keeping with previous reports of high T-cell infiltration in MSI tumors (13–16). More importantly, we address a vexing question in the field: Why are human tumors, which are apparently strongly immunogenic, as judged by histopathologic criteria, not rejected by the host? The numbers of infiltrating activated lymphocytes and CTLs in some tumors are huge, in some cases larger than the number of neoplastic cells. The answer to this question was found through the analysis of immune checkpoints. Multiple key immune-inhibitory ligands, receptors, and metabolic enzymes, including those that are IFNγ inducible (PD-L1, IDO), were highly upregulated in MSI tumors relative to MSS (Fig. 2). We suggest that MSI represents a classic example of adaptive resistance in which an active immune Th1/CTL microenvironment results in compensatory induction of checkpoints that protect the tumor from killing (11).

The mechanistic basis for the link between MSI genetic status and a high Th1/CTL microenvironment in colorectal cancer is not known. However, one important factor may be the increased number of tumor “neoantigens” in DNA repair–deficient tumors created by the high mutational load, typically between 10 and 50 times that of DNA repair–sufficient tumors (14, 16). The notion is that mutation-generated neoantigens are truly tumor specific and may not induce immune tolerance to the same extent as self-antigens, even those upregulated in tumors due to epigenetic dysregulation (22). Ultimately, an altered amino acid due to a coding mutation is only relevant to the same extent as self-antigens, even those upregulated in tumors due to epigenetic dysregulation (22). Ultimately, an altered amino acid due to a coding mutation is only relevant to the same extent as self-antigens, even those upregulated in tumors due to epigenetic dysregulation (22). Ultimately, an altered amino acid due to a coding mutation is only relevant to the same extent as self-antigens, even those upregulated in tumors due to epigenetic dysregulation (22).

**METHODS**

**Patient Selection, Tumor Samples, and Cell Lines**

Tumor tissues were collected at the Johns Hopkins Hospital (Baltimore, MD) from patients with primary sporadic colorectal cancer and free of prior chemotherapy. Demographic, pathologic [tumor location and tumor-node-metastasis (TNM) grade] and genetic status are detailed in Supplementary Table S1. This study was approved by the Johns Hopkins Institutional Review Board. All samples were obtained in accordance with the Health Insurance and Accountability Act.

Assessment of MSI was done using the length of a panel of microsatellite markers in the tumor and a normal reference (either normal mucosa or germline) by using fragment analysis of PCR products labeled with fluorescent dyes. Fragment analysis determined the expression level of the proteins in charge of maintaining the integrity of microsatellite tracts. Differences in the length of two or more markers (the standard Bethesda panel uses five markers) were...
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indicative of MSI status. Eleven patients tested as MSI positive and 14 patients as MSS (Supplementary Table S1).

Analysis of mutations on the MSS outlier sample was performed using DNA exomic sequencing from formalin-fixed, paraffin-embedded (FFPE) tissues. Identification of tumor-specific mutations involved comparison with normal matched cells derived from FFPE sections that contained no tumor. Genomic DNA libraries were prepared following Illumina’s suggested protocol with small modification. Briefly, the ends of sheared genomic DNA fragments are blunted and Illumina adaptors are ligated. The fragment library was amplified by 15 cycles of PCR. Human exome capture is performed following a modified protocol from Agilent’s SureSelect Paired-End Version 2.0 Human Exome Kit (Agilent). The genomic library is hybridized to the SureSelect probes. After washes, the genomic regions captured by the probes are eluted. The captured region covers 38 Mb of exomic sequences. Following PCR amplification of six cycles, the library is hybridized to an Illumina flow cell and eventually sequenced according to Illumina’s protocols. Mismatched bases were identified as a mutation based on an Illumina flow cell and eventually sequenced according to Illumina’s protocols. Mismatched bases were identified as a mutation based on an Illumina flow cell and eventually sequenced according to Illumina’s protocols.

Statistical Analysis

IHC scoring in each of the three histologic areas (i.e., TIL, stroma, and invasive front) and MFC data were summarized using scatter plots and compared between MSI and MSS patients using means and the nonparametric Mann-Whitney U test. For the gene expression analysis, scatter plots and geometric means were used to characterize MSI/MSS patient groups for each of the three locations. Genes were grouped by lineage and/or function (Th1/Th2, CTL, Th17, Treg, proinflammation, and metabolism), and to distinguish which groups of genes were differentially expressed on the basis of MSS/MSI status, a resampling-based permutation test was conducted on the basis of the maximum Wilcoxon–Mann–Whitney test statistic within the gene group. Individual gene expression was also compared across MSI/ MSS status using the Wilcoxon–Mann–Whitney test. All tests are descriptive and no multiplicity adjustment was considered. Statistical analysis was performed using the R statistical package (version 2.15.1).
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