International Journal of Trend in Scientific Research and Development (IJTSRD)
Volume 6 Issue 7, November-December 2022 Available Online: www.ijtsrd.com e-ISSN: 2456 – 6470

Immuno-Oncology Agents- A New Era of Cancer Therapy

Manjusha Shivkumar Kareppa[1], Kamble V. B. [2], Ratnaparkhi S. V. [2], Shaikh Sohel S. [2], Jankar K. G.[2]

[1]Associate Professor,
[1,2]SBSPM's College of Pharmacy, Ambajogai, Maharashtra, India

ABSTRACT

In past decade cancer therapy was treated with four main types: surgery, radiotherapy, chemotherapy and targeted therapy. But as compared to earlier therapies immunotherapy has come to work as a significant role in the treatment of cancer which can improve patients living and its survival. Cancer immunotherapy was discovered in the year 1890s with a cancer surgeon named Dr. William Coley. He discovered that infecting cancer patients with certain bacteria sometimes resulted in tumor regression and even some complete disappearance. Now immune checkpoint inhibitors and two CAR-T (therapy to treat blood cancers) products have received market approval in treating 22 types of cancers and 1 tissue-agnostic cancer indication. Biomarker testing for the programmed death-ligand 1 (PD-L1) checkpoint target has been developed and is now obligatory before treatment with pembrolizumab when used for non-small-cell lung carcinoma, gastric cancer, head and neck squamous cell carcinoma and cervical cancer, as well as before treatment with atezolizumab when used for urothelial carcinoma. The IO pipeline also includes chimeric antigen receptor T-cell therapies and cancer vaccines, which can be promising for the future. New pickouts such as Siglec-15 and new supervision including neoantigens, cancer vaccines, oncolytic viruses, and cytokines were judged. Currently it has been reported on the co-delivery of glucose oxidase (GOx) and indoleamine-2, 3-dioxygenase(IDO) inhibitor 1-methyltryptophan using a metal organic framework(MOF) base nano reactor, appearing to an developed release for tumor oxidation. Opdualag combination of two immunotherapy drugs (relatlimab and nivolumab) becomes first FDA-approved immunotherapy to target LAG-3. In this article, we have highlight new waves of IO therapy development, and provide standpoint on the latest inducement shifts towards cancer immunotherapy. It has been seen that success rate of immunotherapy drugs is 20-50% which can increase further with later development.

How to cite this paper: Manjusha Shivkumar Kareppa | Kamble V. B. | Ratnaparkhi S. V. | Shaikh Sohel S. | Jankar K. G. "Immuno-Oncology Agents- A New Era of Cancer Therapy" Published in International Journal of Trend in Scientific Research and Development (ijtsrd), ISSN: 2456-6470, Volume-6 | Issue-7, December 2022, pp.949-961, URL: www.ijtsrd.com/papers/ijtsrd52371.pdf

IJTSRD52371

KEYWORDS: *immuno-oncology (IO), immunotherapy, T-cells, immune checkpoint inhibitor, cancer, tumor.*

HISTORY:

It has been known for a long time that tumors can be identified and eliminated by the immune system. Recently, this has become more admirable. Tumors appeared to be showing a decreased severity in their early stages, which suggests that the immune system is capable of recognizing and eliminating early-stage cancer cells.

The idea of using cancer treatments to attack the immune system was first proposed by American surgeon Dr. William B. Coley in the late 1800s. He is well known for his work in immunotherapy. It has been seen that cancer patients who contracted post-surgical infections are doing better than those who did not, and it has also been seen that using bacteria can stimulate and enhance the body's natural immune response to fight against cancer. Later it was thought that Coley's toxin was first known as an IO therapy made from allenuated bacteria. The toxin was made from the bacteria Serratia marcescens and Streptococcus pyogenes.

Coley reviewed that 38 cancer patients with accidental or iatrogenic feverish erysipelas[fever from cancer and skin infection caused by streptococci pyrogens] out of which 12 patients were recovered and the remaining

were subsequently improved Later Cole decided to try the therapeutic use of iatrogenic erysipelas.

This treatment was used for the treatment of sarcoma until 1963. Over 1000 cancer patients were injected with bacterial products, 51.9% of patients with inoperable soft tissue tumors showed complete tumor recurrence and were alive for more than 5 years, and 21.2% of patients had no tumor symptoms for 20 years later.

Later, in 1929, the Bacillus Calmette-Guérin (BCG) vaccine was seen to play an important role in the treatment of cancer by causing deep stimulation of the mononuclear phagocyte system (also known as the reticuloendothelial system).theme) that has been recognized as an important defense against cancer It was found that babies who were immunised with BCG (a vaccine) had a significantly lower incidence of leukemia later in their lives.

The background and knowledge of IO led to an interest in the use of BCG for other types of cancers, in particular bladder cancer. Early investigations have shown that patients with melanoma metastatic to the bladder respond favorably to treatment with intralesional BCG. After the success of this study, work in animal models helped to publish the results of the first successful clinical trial of intravesical BCG in patients with recurrent bladder cancer. It is now understood that intravesical BCG can attach to bladder tumors and urothelial cells, thanks to specific fibronectin and integrin receptors. Following uptake by micropinocytosis, the mononuclear phagocyte system is stimulated by the BCG, leading to a local inflammatoryresponse characterized by the infiltration of granulocytes, macrophages and lymphocytes. One important part of the humoral immune response to BCG is the interleukins[Leukocyte-secreting cytokines] (ILs) IL1, IL2, IL6, IL8, IL10, IL12, tumor necrosis factor alpha (TNFa) and interferon gamma (INFg). More recently, studies have shown that BCG contains high levels of CpG oligodeoxynucleotide motifs known to induce TNF-related apoptosis-inducing ligand (TRAIL) through IFN production. Visceral BCG is still indicated for the treatment and prevention of recurrence of certain types of non-invasive bladder cancer.

In 2018, American immunologist James P. Allison and Japanese immunologist TasukuHonjo were awarded the Nobel Prize in Physiology or Medicine for their discovery of cancer therapy that inhibits negative regulation immunity.

INTRODUCTION

Cancer immunotherapy (also called immunooncology) is a type of cancer treatment that uses body`s own immune system to prevent, control, and eliminate cancer. improving on the immune system`s natural ability to fight the disease. The growth rate of cancer is steadily increasing over the past years. The number of variation rate is now more than 200 which is growing further to more. Treatment has undergone a slow evolution from its start in the 1800s, with the sequential development of four main recognised modes of treatment. The first was surgery, which was performed after the discovery of general anesthesia in the late 1800s. This was a revolutionary development as it was the first time that disease could be completely eliminated. as long as the tumor is small and well-defined.

A second development is radiation therapy, established in the late 19th century, which uses X-rays and/or grayscale to damage the DNA of tumor cells, thereby blocking biochemical processes. weaken and lead to cell death.

A third development, chemotherapy, was discovered in the 1940s, during World War II, when people exposed to mustard gas were observed to have bone marrow failure. Clinicians have speculated that patients with proliferative diseases (eg, leukemia) might benefit from treatment with such highly proliferative cell-killing agents. Essentially, the introduction of the first chemotherapeutic agents (analogues of nitrogen mustard gas) meant that cancers were more complex or had metastasized and could not be successfully treated with surgery. or radiation therapy, can now be treated.

In addition, chemotherapeutic agents have been developed to act at different stages of the cell cycle and can be used in combination to prevent the development of drug resistance. The fourth development concerns targeted cancer therapies (also known as precision therapies). This was established with the discovery of imatinib (Glivec; Novartis) in the late 1990s, a small molecule kinase inhibitor that targets the mutant BCRABL protein present in the tumor cells of patients with leukemia chronic myeloid (CML), but not in their healthy cells.

Concept of using modern methods of structural biology and drug discovery to generate small molecules, proteins, antibodies and even cell therapies designed to target biomarkers unique to tumor cells, but not healthy cells, is currently considered the "gold standard" approach to discovering new cancer treatments. Currently, the four main treatments, surgery, radiation,chemotherapy, and targeted agents are often used in combination to ensure that all cancer cells are eliminated from the body which works by harnessing the body's immune system to destroy

tumor cells. They are currently showing great clinical promise and are the focus of this review.

checkpoint proteins are found on the surface of T cells and act as regulators of the immune system. They are important for self-tolerance and prevent the immune system from indiscriminately attacking the body's cells, thus helping to distinguish between 'self' and 'not- self'.

Immune checkpoints also play an important role in suppressing runaway immune responsesby modulating the timing and amplitude of physiological immune responses, thereby preventing collateral damage, that's why the term "offwitch" is sometimes used to describe their role.

Tumors are known to adopt certain immune regulatory pathways as a mechanism to avoid an immune response against them. For example, certain types of tumor cells express these proteins on their surfaces to disguise themselves as "self," allowing them to go unnoticed by the immune system and promote tumor progression. PD1 (programmed death 1) is an example of aninhibitory checkpoint receptor protein found on the surface of T cells that normally acts as a "diversion" after interacting with the PD1 ligand (PDL1), a protein expressed on the surface of normal cells. However, PDL1 is expressed by many tumor cell types and is up-regulated in some, thereby activating "peripheral" and protecting malignant cells from immune system attack. Immune checkpoint inhibitors, such as the antiPD1/PDL1 agent, block the interaction between PDL1 on tumor cells and PD1 on T cells, allowing the immune system to enhance the anti-tumor response u. Currently, it has been reported on the co-administration of glucose oxidase (GOx) and the indoleamine2,3dioxygenase (IDO) 1-methyvianptophan inhibitor using metal-organic structure (MOF)-based nanoreactors. , which appeared as a release developed for tumor oxidation. Opdualag combines two immunotherapy drugs (relatlimab and nivolumab) to become the first FDA-approved immunotherapy to target LAG3. In this article, we have highlighted new waves of IO therapy development and taken a stance on the latest incentive changes to cancer immunotherapy.

Immuno-oncology methods based on pharmacogenomics and precision medicine

In the IO field, drug research and development is fast evolving toward a pharmacogenomic strategy, in which biomarkers are identified in biopsy material from tumours to provide predictions about which therapies will be the most effective for a given patient. A new retrospective research of 1,856 pancreatic cancer patients revealed the enormous impact that precision medicine can have on survival, especially in cancer types with poor prognosis. Patients with actionable mutations (including some linked to checkpoint inhibitors) who got matching targeted therapy had overall survival durations of up to 1.07 years longer than those who received just unmatched medicines, according to this study.

The clinical data on target expression and response to therapy for the two main families of IO drugs, anti-PD-1/PD-L1 and anti-cytotoxic T-lymphocyte-associated protein-4 (anti-CTLA-4) therapies, is complicated. There have been cases of patients responding to treatment regardless of PD-L1 expression. The criteria used to identify 'positive' and 'negative' biomarker expression results are similarly ambiguous. For PD-L1, 'weak positive' is defined as 1–49% expression, and strong positive is defined as greater than 50% expression. These broad definitions show that PD- L1 is not a clear dichotomous biomarker, and that additional biomarkers with better specificity and reproducibility are needed for IO therapies. The available PD-1/PD-L1 biomarker assays, response rates in PD-L-positive and PD-L-negative patients, and emerging biomarkers are discussed briefly below.

PD-1/PD-L1 biomarker assays

Around half of all ICPs approved to date target the PD-L1 ligand, which is expressed on the surface of various tumour cell types. When this ligand binds to PD-1 receptors on T-cell surfaces, it inhibits their inhibitory effect against tumour cells. PD-L1 is expressed by a variety of normal cells, but it is up-regulated in tumour cells and tumor-infiltrating immune cells, shielding them from immune attack. As a result, screening patients for PD-L1 expression on tumour cells may lead to better clinical outcomes if they are treated with anti-PD-L1 medicines. Early clinical studies investigating PD-L1 expression and patient response to the anti-PD-L1 agent nivolumab (Opdivo, Bristol-Myers Squibb) demonstrated the potential benefit of pharmacogenomic testing; the objective response rate in PD-L1-positive patients was 36%, whilethere were no responses in PD-L1-negative patients. Later results from other clinical trials (e.g., NCT01642004, NCT01668784, and NCT02008227) demonstrated that favourable responses with prolonged overall survival can occur in PD-L1-negative patients33–36 (when compared to current standards of care). As a result, it is clear from meta-analyses of clinical trial data that PD-L1 expression status alone is insufficient to indicate whether patients should be treated with PD- 1 or PD-L1 therapy.

Pembrolizumab (anti-PD-L1) was approved for first-line treatment of non-small-cell lung cancer (NSCLC) only after testing patients for PD-L1 expression. Nivolumab (anti-PD-1) and atezolizumab (anti-PD-L1) were both approved without PD-L1 testing. Biomarker expression is determined via an immunohistochemistry (IHC) test, with a threshold defined for first-lineclinical usage of the medication. PD-L1 expression must be greater than 50% using the Dako 22C3 IHC test, but only greater than 1% expression is necessary for second-line treatment. However, another study found that patients with a positive rate of 5% or above do not benefit from regular treatment. The US Food and Drug Administration (FDA) has approved complementary PD-L1 testing, although they are not required for pembrolizumab. There are currently four other companion PD-L1 assays in development for PD-1/PD-L1 inhibitors.

PD-L1 inhibition has been proposed as a way to reactivate rare tumor-reactive T-cells. This can cause cytokine production, which can lead to the formation of several positive feedback loops and improved antigen presentation, making tumour cells more visible to T-cells. Furthermore,the PD-L1 pathway can protect tumours against cytotoxic T-cells, breaking the cancer immunity cycle by inhibiting cytotoxic T-cell priming and activation, as well as up-regulating PD-L1 on dendritic cells, resulting in cytotoxic T-cell deactivation. As a result, rather than focusing just on PD-L1 ligand expression, it may be more necessary to determine whether the PD-1/PD-L1 pathway is activated in the tumour.

Despite the ambiguity surrounding PD-L1 as a biomarker, there are currently both companion (i.e. required prior to starting treatment; currently only approved for pembrolizumab) and complementary (i.e. intended to aid clinical decision making but not a requirement for prescribing) tests approved for use before anti-PD-1/PD-L1 therapy.

A pilot project called ‘Blueprint’ has been launched through a collaboration between pharmaceutical companies, the FDA and several oncology organisations in an attempt to clarify some of the concerns relating to PD-L1 IHC assays (e.g. the cut-off values for PD-L1 positivity, the interchangeability of different assays and data reproducibility). Initial results suggest that assays may vary in performance, and that there is potential for false-positive or negative results with assays of this type. In particular, the Blueprint project compared the analytical performance of the four validated assays and found that three (i.e. the 22C3, 28-8 and SP263 assays) produced similar outcomes based on a tumour proportion score, although immune cell staining was poor. A pilot initiative dubbed 'Blueprint' was developed by a collaboration between pharmaceutical companies, the FDA, and numerous oncology organisations to address some of the concerns about PD-L1 IHC tests (e.g. the cut-off values for PD-L1 positivity, the interchangeability of different assays and data reproducibility). Initial findings reveal that assay performance mayvary, and that assays of this sort may produce false-positive or negative results. The Blueprint project, in particular, examined the analytical performance of the four validated assays and discovered that three of them (the 22C3, 28-8, and SP263) achieved identical results based on a tumour proportion score, despite weak immune cell labelling. The scoring of tumour cells was shown to be repeatable in one harmonisation investigation, although staining patterns were not consistent in all scenarios, and the scoring of immune cells had low concordance. Multiple investigations have revealed that the 22C3 and 28-8 tests can be interchanged, however the SP142 and SP263 tests cannot.

Response rates in PD-L1-positive and PD-L1-negative patients

Anti-PD-L1 IO drugs have been reported to work in PD-L1-negative patients, and immunostaining of tumour tissues has suggested a probable rationale. There can be a lot of variation in PD-L1 expression across a biopsy, with some places having no or very low PD-L1 expression and others having a lot of it. As a result, a patient may be classified as PD-L1-negative if a biopsy area shows no staining, despite the fact that other areas of the tumour overlooked during the biopsy may contain dense PD-L1 expression. As a result, determining whether a patient is unequivocally PD-L1-negative or PD-L1-positive from a single biopsy may be difficult. While higher levels of PD-L1 expression have been linked to better response rates to anti-PD-1/PD-L1 drugs in some studies, some PD-L1-negative individuals have also shown favourable results. As a result, PD-L1 does not appear to provide binary responsiveness differentiation. Another likely contributing aspect is that PD-L1 is a dynamic biomarker, with thedegree of expression being influenced by a variety of biological events. There are genetic processes that lead to constitutive PD-L1 expression, but T-cells can also stimulate expression. As a result, a tumour may be PD-L1-negative at one point in time due to a lack of T-cellinfiltrate, but this state may be reversed due to an immune response that may be triggered by IO drugs. Finally, biomarker heterogeneity of expression can be caused by a variety of other factors, such as disease stage, prior treatments (e.g., type of chemoradiotherapy), tumour mutation status (e.g.,

PD-L1 expression in NSCLC is regulated by several oncogenic drivers, such as estimated glomerular filtration rate and anaplastic lymphoma kinase, that can alter expression levels), and concurrent medication use (e.g. corticosteroids).

Emergent biomarkers

In the IO field, there are far too many emerging biomarkers to cover in detail in this review; nonetheless, some examples are included below.

Tumour mutational burden (TMB) is a metric for the amount of mutations found in a tumor's genome, and a high TMB has been linked to a better prognosis for ICPs. Many tumours that respond to anti-PD-1 drugs, for example, have a high mutational burden (e.g., melanoma, NSCLC, and bladder cancer). Some research have attempted to link mutational load with ICPis response in NSCLC and melanoma, but the results have not been able to indicate that a high mutational load alone improves therapy response, therefore its clinical relevance is currently unknown.

Although PD-L1 expression (in specific tumour types) and high microsatellite instability (MSIH;regardless of tumour type) are clinically validated biomarkers for predicting response to pembrolizumab, several emerging IO-related biomarkers associated with improved overall response rate (ORR) and progression-free survival (PFS) for ICPis are being investigated. T-cell-inflamed gene expression profile (GEP), TMB, and mutant mismatch repair (MMR) genes are examples of these. MSI-H and TMB are indirect indices of tumour antigenicity derived from somatic tumour mutations, whereas PD-L1 and GEP are both inflammatory biomarkers associated with a T-cell-inflamed tumour microenvironment. Cristescu et al. analysed more than 300 advanced solid tumour and melanoma samples from four KEYNOTE clinical trials from 22 cancer types in a 2018 study. Patients were divided into four biomarker-defined clinical groups: GEP low/TMB low, GEP low/TMB high, GEP high/TMB low, and GEP high/TMB high, to see if TMB and T-cell-inflamed GEP could predict clinical response to pembrolizumab. TMB and inflammatory biomarkers (i.e. T-cell-inflamed GEP and PD-L1 expression) can jointly stratify human cancers into groups with different clinical responses to pembrolizumab monotherapy, and TMB and inflammatory biomarkers can predict response independently and may be linked to neoantigenicity (the formation of new antigens not previously seen by the immune system) and T-cell activation, respectively.

Overall, patients with high TMB and GEP values had a longer PFS, with a small association between the two, while TMB and GEP could predict response independently in these studies.

TMB determination in tissue samples, on the other hand, has various drawbacks, including heterogeneous sample properties and a reliance on assay timing. Furthermore, the assays used to assess TMB are not uniform, and the concept of "high" TMB differs greatly between research. The majority of clinical trials conducted to date have used a variety of approaches, making it difficult to compare existing data and gather enough evidence to warrant its clinical use.

Finally, loss of function mutations in the MMR pathway have long been linked to favourable responses to PD-1 blockade therapy, which has sparked interest in using MMR as a biomarker to predict responses. All patients had previously been treated with pembrolizumab for up to 2 years in an expansion of a proof-of-concept study published in 2017 that looked at disease progression in patients with MMR deficiency across 12 different tumour types. Positive outcomes were observed across all tumour types, with 77 percent of patients achieving disease control for at least 12 weeks, with 18 patients achieving full responses. As a result, MMR deficiency is now regarded a potential biomarker for selecting patients for pembrolizumab treatment.

CD45RA is one of the newer biomarkers for anti-CTLA-4 drugs. The amount of its baseline expression in T-cells has been linked to clinical response to anti-CTLA-4 drugs. In both the CD4 and CD8 T-cell compartments, patients with a higher frequency of CD45RA- cells relative to CD45RA+ cells responded better to anti-CTLA-4 treatment. Because the CD45RA biomarker is linked to the induction of central and effector memory T-cells, these findings imply that the CD45RA status of baseline memory CD4 and CD8 T-cells, as well as CD8 effector memory T- cells, could be utilised to predict anti-CTLA-4 therapy response Another research of melanoma patients treated with ipilimumab indicated that patients with normal baseline levels of CD45RO+ CD8 T-cells reacted to treatment more frequently, and that normal baseline CD45RO+ patients had a considerably longer overall survival (OS).

Given that IO drugs are linked to potentially fatal side effects, some experts believe that thefocus of biomarker research should move to predicting toxicity rather than therapeutic response, allowing doctors to select individuals who will tolerate therapy better and benefit more overall. This technique could be especially significant for combination medicines,

which are known to have a higher rate of high-grade side effects.

LISTS OF APPROVED DRUGS FOR IMMUNO-ONCOLOGY YEAR 2022

1. It approved bevacizumab-maly (Alymsys), the third biosimilar for the monoclonal antibody bevacizumab, for the treatment of subgroups of patients with colorectal cancer, non-small cell lung cancer, glioblastoma, renal cell carcinoma, cervical cancer, and ovarian cancer on April 18, 2022.
2. It authorised axicabtagene ciloleucel (Yescarta) on April 1, 2022, for the treatment of adult patients with large B-cell lymphoma who have relapsed after first-line chemoimmunotherapy or who have relapsed within 12 months of first-line chemo immunotherapy.
3. On March 21 2022, it approved the PD-1 checkpoint inhibitor pembrolizumab (Keytruda) for a subset of patients with endometrial carcinoma that is microsatellite instability highor mismatch repair deficient.
4. On March 18, it approved a new combination of nivolumab and the LAG-3 checkpoint inhibitor relatlimab (Opdualag) for a subset of patients with melanoma. This is the first approval of a LAG-3 checkpoint inhibitor and the first approval of a new checkpoint inhibitor since 2014.
5. On March 4, it approved the PD-1 checkpoint inhibitor nivolumab (Opdivo) plus chemotherapy pre-surgery for a subset of lung cancer patients.
6. On February 28, it approved the BCMA-targeted CAR T cell therapy ciltacabtagene autoleucel (Carvykti) for the treatment of a subset of patients with multiple myeloma.
7. On February 21, it approved the companion diagnostic test Foundation One CDx to identify patients with microsatellite instability high (MSI-H) solid tumors who may be candidates for immunotherapy.
8. On January 26, it approved the bispecific fusion protein tebentafusp-tebn (KIMMTRAK) for the treatment of HLA-A*02:01-positive adult patients with unresectable ormetastatic uveal melanoma.

YEAR 2021

1. June 25, 2021 The Cancer Research Institute (CRI) launched its first-ever Spanish- language information hub to connect Hispanic patients and caregivers with the latest cancer immunotherapy research and treatment options. Addressing a need for diversity and representation of racial and ethnic minority communities in cancer research and treatment, the CRI site also serves as a platform to connect patients with potentially lifesaving clinical trials to directly impact the health and success of this group.
2. May 20, 2021 The FDA approved amivantamab (Rybrevant™), a bispecific antibody thattargets EGFR and MET receptors on tumor cells, to treat patients with locally advanced or metastatic non–small cell lung cancer (NSCLC) with EGFR exon 20 insertion mutations. This is the first FDA-approved bispecific antibody for use in lung cancer.
3. March 27, 2021 The FDA approved idecabtagene vicleucel (Abecma), the first cell-based gene therapy, for adult multiple myeloma patients who have not responded to, or whose disease has returned after, at least four different types of therapy. Idecabtagene vicleucel is an anti-BCMA CAR T cell immunotherapy.
4. February 08, 2021 The FDA approved cemiplimab (Libtayo), a PD-1 checkpoint inhibitor, for the treatment of patients diagnosed with advanced basal cell carcinoma who have either received a hedgehog pathway inhibitor (HHI) or for whom a HHI is not appropriate. This is the first immune checkpoint inhibitor approved for the treatment of basal cell carcinoma, a common skin cancer.

TILL YEAR 2020

1. In march 2020, Isatuximab-irfc Chimeric (IgG1) targets CD38. Binds to CD38, inducing broad spectrum apoptosis by Fc-mediated cross-linking, CDC, ADCC and immune-mediated tumour cell lysis.
2. Alemtuzumab (Campath-1H) is an anti-CD52 humanized IgG1 monoclonal antibodyindicated for the treatment of fludarabine-refractory chronic lymphocytic leukemia (CLL), cutaneous T-cell lymphoma, peripheral T-cell lymphoma and T-cell prolymphocytic leukemia. CD52 is found on >95% of peripheral blood lymphocytes (both T-cells and B-cells) and monocytes, but its function in lymphocytes is unknown. It binds to CD52 and initiates its cytotoxic effect by complement fixation and ADCC mechanisms. Due to the antibody target (cells of the immune system) common complications of alemtuzumab therapy are infection, toxicity and myelosuppression.
3. Durvalumab (Imfinzi) is a human immunoglobulin G1 kappa (IgG1κ) monoclonal antibody that blocks the interaction of

programmed cell death ligand 1 (PD-L1) with the PD-1 and CD80 (B7.1) molecules. Durvalumab is approved for the treatment of patients with locally advanced or metastatic urothelial carcinoma who: have disease progression during or following platinum-containing chemotherapy. have disease progression within 12 months of neoadjuvant or adjuvant treatment with platinum-containing chemotherapy. On 16 February 2018, the Food and Drug Administration approved durvalumab for patients with unresectable stage III non-small cell lung cancer (NSCLC) whose disease has not progressed following concurrent platinum-based chemotherapy and radiation therapy.

4. Ipilimumab (Yervoy) is a human IgG1 antibody that binds the surface protein CTLA4. Innormal physiology T-cells are activated by two signals: the T-cell receptor binding to an antigen-MHC complex and T-cell surface receptor CD28 binding to CD80 or CD86 proteins. CTLA4 binds to CD80 or CD86, preventing the binding of CD28 to these surface proteins and therefore negatively regulates the activation of T-cells.

5. Active cytotoxic T-cells are required for the immune system to attack melanoma cells. Normally inhibited active melanoma-specific cytotoxic T-cells can produce an effective anti-tumor response. Ipilimumab can cause a shift in the ratio of regulatory T-cells to cytotoxic T-cells to increase the anti-tumor response. Regulatory T-cells inhibit other T- cells, which may benefit the tumor.

6. Nivolumab is a human IgG4 antibody that prevents T-cell inactivation by blocking the binding of programmed cell death 1 ligand 1 or programmed cell death 1 ligand 2 (PD-L1or PD-L2), a protein expressed by cancer cells, with PD-1, a protein found on the surface of activated T-cells.[58][59] Nivolumab is used in advanced melanoma, metastatic renal cell carcinoma, advanced lung cancer, advanced head and neck cancer, and Hodgkin's lymphoma.

7. Ofatumumab is a second generation human IgG1 antibody that binds to CD20. It is used in the treatment of chronic lymphocytic leukemia (CLL) because the cancerous cells of CLL are usually CD20-expressing B-cells. Unlike rituximab, which binds to a large loop of the CD20 protein, ofatumumab binds to a separate, small loop. This may explain their different characteristics. Compared to rituximab, ofatumumab induces complement- dependent cytotoxicity at a lower dose with less immunogenicity. [61][62] As of 2019, pembrolizumab, which blocks PD-1, programmed cell death protein 1, has been used via intravenous infusion to treat inoperable or metastatic melanoma, metastatic non-smallcell lung cancer (NSCLC) in certain situations, as a second-line treatment for head and neck squamous cell carcinoma (HNSCC), after platinum-based chemotherapy, and for the treatment of adult and pediatric patients with refractory classic Hodgkin's lymphoma (cHL). It is also indicated for certain patients with urothelial carcinoma, stomach cancer and cervical cancer.

8. Rituximab is a chimeric monoclonal IgG1 antibody specific for CD20, developed fromits parent antibody Ibritumomab. As with ibritumomab, rituximab targets CD20, makingit effective in treating certain B-cell malignancies. These include aggressive and indolent lymphomas such as diffuse large B-cell lymphoma and follicular lymphoma and leukemias such as B-cell chronic lymphocytic leukemia. Although the function of CD20 is relatively unknown, CD20 may be a calcium channel involved in B-cell activation. The antibody's mode of action is primarily through the induction of ADCC and complement- mediated cytotoxicity. Other mechanisms include apoptosis and cellular growth arrest. Rituximab also increases the sensitivity of cancerous B-cells to chemotherapy.

There are two main types of Immuno-Therapy in oncology treatment –

CELLULAR IMMUNOTHERAPY

Dendritic cell treatment stimulates anti-tumor responses by forcing dendritic cells to offer tumour antigens to lymphocytes, activating them and priming them to destroy additional antigen-presenting cells. Antigen presentation cells (APCs) in the mammalian immune system are called dendritic cells. They help tumour antigen targeting in cancer treatment. Sipuleucel-T is the only licenced cellular cancer treatment based on dendritic cells.

Vaccination with autologous tumour lysates or short peptides is one way to get dendritic cells to present tumour antigens (small parts of protein that correspond to the protein antigens on cancer cells). To boost immunological and anti-tumor responses, these peptides are frequently given in combination with adjuvants (particularly immunogenic chemicals). Proteins or other substances that attract and/or activate dendritic cells, such as granulocyte macrophage colony stimulating factor, are examples of adjuvants (GM-CSF). Whole tumour lysate, CMV antigen RNA, and tumour related peptides like EGFRvIII were the

most prevalent sources of antigens employed for dendritic cell vaccination in Glioblastoma (GBM), an aggressive brain tumour. Dendritic cellscan also be activated in vivo by making tumor cells express GM-CSF. This can be achieved by either genetically engineering tumor cells to produce GM-CSF or by infecting tumor cells with an oncolytic virus that expresses GM-CSF.

Another approach is to take dendritic cells from a patient's blood and activate them outside of thebody. In the presence of tumour antigens, which can be a single tumor-specific peptide/protein ora tumour cell lysate, dendritic cells get activated (a solution of broken down tumour cells). These cells (optional) Antibodies that attach to receptors on the surface of dendritic cells are used in dendritic cell treatments. Antigens can be mixed into antibodies to cause dendritic cells to develop and offer tumour immunity. TLR3, TLR7, TLR8, and CD40 are dendritic cell receptors that have been utilised as antibody targets. NK cell-stimulating potency should be considered while developing new dendritic cell-based immunisation techniques. It is crucial to include NK cell monitoring as an endpoint in anticancer DC-based clinical trials on a regular basis. ional adjuvants) are injected into the body and cause an immunological response.

Drugs

In 2010, Sipuleucel-T (Provenge) received FDA approval for the treatment of asymptomatic or mildly symptomatic metastatic castration-resistant prostate cancer. Antigen-presenting cells are removed from the blood via leukapheresis and grown with the fusion protein PA2024, which is made up of GM-CSF and prostate-specific prostatic acid phosphatase (PAP), before beingreinfused. This procedure is carried out three times.

Cart –t cell therapy

The idea of CAR-T immunotherapy is to alter T cells so that they can recognise cancer cells andtarget and destroy them more efficiently. Scientists take T cells from humans, genetically modify

them to add a chimeric antigen receptor (CAR) that targets cancer cells precisely, and then inject the CAR-T cells into patients to attack their tumours.

Approved drugs

In 2017, the FDA authorised tisagenlecleucel (Kymriah), a chimeric antigen receptor (CAR-T) therapy for the treatment of acute lymphoblastic leukaemia (ALL). CD19 positive cells (B-cells) are removed from the body with this treatment (including the diseased cells, but also normal antibody producing cells).

Another CAR-T therapy, axicabtagene ciloleucel (Yescarta), was licenced in 2017 for the treatment of diffuse large B-cell lymphoma (DLBCL).

T cell receptor T cell therapy

To identify MHC-presented polypeptide fragments molecules, TCR-T treatments utilise heterodimers made up of alpha and beta peptide chains. TCR-T can recognise a greater set of intracellular antigen fragments than CAR-T can recognise cell surface antigens. TCR-T cell treatment, on the other hand, is dependent on MHC molecules, which limits its utility.

Multifunctional alginate scaffolds for T cell engineering and release

MASTER (Multifunctional alginate scaffolds for T cell engineering and release) is a technology for in situ genetically modified T cell engineering, replication, and release. CAR-T cell treatment has progressed in this way. T cells are taken from the patient and combined with a virus that has been genetically modified to contain a cancer-targeting gene (as with CAR T). After then, the mixture is poured into a MASTER (scaffold), which absorbs them. Antibodies that stimulate T cells and interleukins that cause cell proliferation are found in the MASTER. After that, the MASTER is implanted into the patient. To become CAR T cells, activated T cells interact with viruses. These CAR T cells grow as a result of the interleukins, and then depart the MASTER to attack the cancer. Instead of weeks, the procedure takes only a few hours. Because the cells are younger, they remain longer in the body, have greater cancer-fighting potential, and show fewer signs of tiredness. In mouse models, these characteristics were demonstrated. In the case of lymphoma, the treatment was more successful and lasted longer.

Combination immunotherapy

Patients who react to IO monotherapy exhibit dramatic and long-lasting clinical responses, with none of the adverse effects associated with standard cytotoxic medicines. However, only about 25–50% of patients treated with ICPis belong to this group of responders. Because of thelow ORR, there has been a lot of interest in combining ICPs with other therapy modalities,such as other IO agents, in order to improve response rates and durability. The current increase in combination clinical studies demonstrates this. For example, between 2014 and 2017, there was a 705 percent rise in the number of combination studies but a 42 percent decrease in individual trial enrollment levels, owing in part to more targeted clinical trials. Combination therapy is appealing because it allows researchers to target many pathways

of tumour cell killing at the same time, reducing tumour growth and resistance.

The only licenced checkpoint inhibitor combo is ipilimumab plus nivolumab, which targets CTLA-4 and PD-1 at the same time. It was authorised by the FDA in 2015 and the EMA in 2016 for treatment in individuals with advanced melanoma. The FDA additionally approved this combination in 2018 for individuals with intermediate- or poor-risk advanced RCC who had previously gone untreated. While combining two ICPis may increase the risk of toxicity, other clinical trials are nowlooking into whether this combination could be beneficial in different cancer types. Given the capacity of modified T-cells to establish an inflammatory tumour microenvironment, there is growing interest in using PD-1/PD-L1 inhibitors in combination with CAR-T cell treatment.

The reason for combining IO medicines and chemotherapy is that their efficacies may be additive, but their toxicity profiles should not overlap, potentially improving patient tolerability and safety. Multiple approvals of chemotherapy/IO combos, particularly for NSCLC, have resulted from the synergy between a long-established strategy to cancer treatment and a fast evolving innovative kind of treatment. For non-squamous NSCLC, for example, pembrolizumab in conjunction with pemetrexed and platinum chemotherapy is currently the first-line treatment, regardless of PD-L1 expression. A combination of atezolizumab, bevacizumab, carboplatin, and paclitaxel, for example, is currently indicated as a treatment option for metastatic non-squamous NSCLC. This technique is particularly intriguing since it combines classic chemotherapy with 'conventional' IO (i.e. targeting PD-L1) and intra-tumoural T-cell infiltration via VEGF inhibition. However, these narrowly focused techniques may result in more stringent conditions for their approval.

Some targeted medicines, such as BRAF inhibitors, have been linked to some degree of immunomodulation, and it has been suggested that combining these with IO drugs could have a synergistic impact. In support of this, a pre-clinical investigation in mice discovered that the kinase inhibitor dasatinib greatly improves the response to immunotherapies by inhibiting the actions of the DDR2 gene, which ordinarily aids tumour invasion of healthy tissue. Depletion of DDR2 has been demonstrated to boost the sensitivity of cancer cells to anti-PD-1 treatment. This could lead to a future trial combining dasatinib and anti-PD-1/anti-PD-L1 therapy in illnesses such bladder, breast, and colon cancer.

While radiation suppresses the immune system, it stimulates the release and expression of tumour neo-antigens (antigens encoded by tumor-specific mutant genes), which alters the tumour microenvironment and increases T-cell activity. Furthermore, radiation increases the expression of PD-1 and PD-L1. The argument for combining anti-PD-1/PD- L1 and radiation is supported by both of these outcomes. ICPs are expected to synergize with radiation-induced T-cell activation in particular, and studies of this method suggest that a clinically significant tumour response can be achieved without an increased risk of toxicity as compared to monotherapy.

Despite being a hot topic of research, clinical application of CAR-T treatments is still limited, and the number of clinical trials is small compared to other types of IO agents. In 2017, there were 291 CAR-T studies reported as progressing globally, including 162 in the clinical stage, compared to 1,502 studies studying PD-1/PD-L1 medicines in the clinical stage. As of mid-2018, 439 CAR-T combination clinical trials were underway around the world, with 422 of them focusing on various B-cell haematological malignancies.

Current challenges

The inability to reliably forecast patient response and managing toxicity are the two most significant hurdles for IO treatments. However, there is a dearth of knowledge on pertinent biomarkers, as well as the high expense of research, development, and treatment. Some expertsalso believe that future research should focus on lowering toxicity as a way to improve total clinical benefit.

Unpredictability of clinical efficacy

Newly developed drugs have an unpredictably high efficacy rate. The presence of distinct gene mutations and differing degrees of activation of certain signalling pathwaysin individual individuals are two probable causes for these variances in clinical outcomes. The main goal is to develop therapies that are consistently effective in the majority of patients with the majority of cancer types. With the current increase of indications, things look to be headed in this way. For example, in 2018, the European Medicines Agency (EMA) enhanced pembrolizumab's marketing authorization by adding a new indication for the adjuvant treatment of stage III melanoma.

It's been proposed that the widespread use of chemotherapy as a first-line treatment for the majority of cancer types is delaying the development and usage of IO agents that aren't currently extensively approved for first-line use.

They are now given to patients who are immunocompromised as a result of past chemotherapy, making the restoration of antitumour immune function difficult. As a result, it has been proposed that greater efficacies may be attained if IO drugs are used early in the treatment plan in order to fully use the immune system's capabilities.

Another issue is that, in order to minimise off-target effects, IO drugs should preferablybe aimed against tumor-specific antigens that are only expressed by tumour cells.

If precise predictive biomarkers could be identified and produced, there would be considerable therapeutic and economic benefits, as those patients who are most likely to respond would be treated. However, like with PD-L1 expression tests, there is currently a lack of confidence in the use of IO-related biomarkers to guide treatment.

The treatment and/or prediction of drug–drug interactions is another emerging concern. Patients who got proton pump inhibitors (PPIs) or antibiotics had a worse overall survival (OS) than those who did not114, according to a study published in 2020. Patients in the POPLAR and OAK trials who received either second-line atezolizumab therapy (n=757) or docetaxel therapy (n=755) were included in this analysis. Antibiotics were given to 22.3 percent (n=169) of atezolizumab patients and 26.8% (n=202) of docetaxel patients, respectively, while PPIs were given to 30.9 percent (n=234) and 34.4 percent (n=260) of atezolizumab and docetaxel patients, respectively, 30 days before or after starting atezolizumab or docetaxel. For docetaxel-treated patients, there was no significant link between OS and the usage of antibiotics/PPIs. Patients treated with atezolizumab who also received antibiotics had an OS of 8.5 months, compared to 14.1 months for those who did not, while patients treated with PPIs had an OS of 9.6 months, compared to 14.5 months for those who did not. Overall, our findings imply that some commonly given medicines can have a major impact on immunological checkpoint efficacy.

Cost of immuno-oncology therapies

The use of IO-based medicines has substantial financial ramifications. The cost of treating NSCLC with certain ICP's, for example, has been anticipated to be over US$80 billion over a one-year period. A number of IO agents are anticipated to cost over £100,000 (i.e, 95,97,862 per patient per year, putting severe strain on healthcare systems. Because many cancer types are now being treated as chronic rather than acute diseases, the costs of implementing these newer targeted medicines have skyrocketed, as has the length of therapy. The National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE) is the body in charge of deciding whethernew treatments are cost-effective for the NHS in the United Kingdom. A defined assessment known as a quality-adjusted life year is used to assess the cost of a new medicine for its clinical effectiveness (QALY). A therapy should cost no more than £20,000–30,000 perQALY gained, or £50,000 for end-of-life therapies, to be considered cost-effective for the NHS. New IO agents are progressively breaching these limits, resulting in NICE rejection andpatient access restrictions.

The Institute for Clinical and Economic Review, a non-profit organisation based in the United States that conducts comprehensive clinical and cost-effectiveness analyses oftreatments, tests, and procedures, examined the cost-effectiveness of the three mostpopular immunotherapies (atezolizumab, nivolumab, and pembrolizumab) and found that each therapy would need to be discounted by 31%–68% to meet the QALY threshold. With estimated QALYs of £58,791 (i.e, 56,44,165INR) versus paclitaxel and docetaxel, respectively, for treatment of urothelial cancer after cisplatin chemotherapy, NICE has stated that nivolumab cannot be recommended for routine use in the NHS. The Cancer Drugs Fund (a 'back-up' government-sponsored fund that allows patients to acquire expensive cancer therapies through the NHS) should not support the use of these medicines, according to NICE, because they do not have the potential to be cost efficient. Although the cost of IO medicines tends to surpass QALY limits, cost-effectiveness is not theonly aspect to consider when making a decision; clinical effectiveness and various patientconsiderations are usually examined simultaneously. When a new treatment technique is assessed, it is frequently found to be more clinically effective than many existing treatments while also being much more expensive. In this instance, additional economic analysis is carried out, such as determining the magnitude of the incremental cost-effectiveness ratio, which must not exceed a NICE upper threshold. Then it may be determined whether the cost rise is related with an increase in clinical efficacy that represents good value for money. NICEcurrently recommends IO drugs for numerous indications based on cost and clinical effectiveness (e.g. melanoma, UC, RCC, NSCLC, lymphoma, and breast cancer).

Many pharmaceutical industry analysts believe that, in the future, a greater emphasis should be placed on the value and affordability of novel IO agents,

rather than on producing a bigger number of prospective candidates with similar therapeutic performance. There is no simple answer to this dilemma because it is difficult to curb the biotechnology sector's enthusiasm; yet, it is clear that a longer-term, more sustainable research and development approach for innovative IO therapies is needed.

Precision medicine techniques offer the potential to lower the costs and hazards involved with drug discovery and development, especially in clinical trials, which areoften the most costly step of the process. The cost savings come from segmenting patients into smaller groups and selecting those who are more likely to respond, resulting in fewer clinical trials and lower expenditures. Patients benefit more from identifying individuals who are more likely to respond. For example, a 14-year review of 676 phase IIIb–IV NSCLC clinical trials indicated that using a biomarker resulted in a 26 percent reduction in risk-adjusted drug development costs.

Another way to cut costs is to change treatment pathways so that IO agents are used earlier in a patient's cancer journey, potentially saving money on treating severe ADRs that are often associated with conventional chemotherapy and radiotherapy, as well as the hospitalisation that many patients require.

Future of immunotherapy

There have been two comprehensive assessments of the worldwide IO landscape to date. Theglobal IO pipeline increased by 67 percent between September 2017 and August 2018, with celltherapy showing the most significant increase of 113 percent in the number of active agents, followed by other immunomodulatory (e.g. aldesleukin and interferons; 79 percent) and T-cell-targeted immunomodulatory therapies (76 percent).

There have been two comprehensive assessments of the worldwide IO landscape to date.The global IO pipeline increased by 67 percent between September 2017 and August 2018,with cell therapy showing the most significant increase of 113 percent in the number of active agents, followed by other immunomodulatory (e.g. aldesleukin and interferons; 79 percent) and T-cell-targeted immunomodulatory therapies (76 percent). This shows that product development is duplicative, and it raises questions about whether the current strategy of focusing on a restricted number of biomarker targets is suffocating further innovation. It's worth noting that within the same time span, the number of agents being produced against non-tumour specific antigens actually declined, implying that IO is becoming excessively focused on a few select targets. In both the pharmaceutical sector and academia, however, there is growing interest and enthusiasm for the IO field. Furthermore, clinical evidence suggests that IO drugs have a bright future ahead of them, with the potential to lead to a number of breakthrough treatments that could improve the standard of care in a variety of cancer types.

Benefits of immunotherapy

Immunotherapies are still less commonly used to treat cancer than surgery or chemotherapy. However, for some cancers, these medicines are now a viable treatment choice. Many other immunotherapies are still in the early stages of development.

Because they employ the body's own strength to combat the tumour rather than injecting drugs into the body, immunotherapies have the potential to be more comprehensive and less damaging than other types of cancer treatments.

Immunotherapies are a hot topic in cancer research, with new treatments being authorised all the time.

Risks of immunotherapy

The type of immunotherapy, the type of cancer, the stage, the patient's overall condition, and the existing treatment regimen all influence the risks. Every medication has its own set of side effects, and patients may react to the same treatment in different ways.

When you raise the immune system's function to "high," there are usually adverse consequences. Because the immune system is doing its job, you may suffer flu-like symptoms such as fever, chills, weakness, dizziness, nausea, muscular pains, fatigue, or headache, just as when you get a vaccine.

These treatments may result in excessive amounts of inflammation in healthy cells and tissues, aswell as adverse effects including a skin rash. Steroids can help with the side effects of inflammation, but they also have their own set of negative effects.

Immunotherapy resistance can develop in some patients. Some types of immunotherapy have been linked to severe or even fatal allergic and inflammatory reactions.

Immunotherapy may or may not have an effect on your body. Only a small percentage of those who receive these treatments respond to them. Researchers are trying to figure out what the common thread is among those that do respond and why.

Inquire with your doctor about the risks and advantages of immunotherapy for your cancer kind and stage.

Conclusion

IO is a revolutionary technique to cancer treatment that is changing the way solid and haematological tumours are handled. This new therapy paradigm, however, is not without its drawbacks. It's still in its infancy, and there's a long way to go before it's fully optimised. The application of these innovative medicines while minimising their side effects and figuring out how to include them into today's standard of care. Furthermore, considering their high price, there will be issues in the future. integrating them into healthcare systems in a cost-effective manner, Patients' availability will be increased in a sustainable manner.

ICPs have been at the centre of the recent IO revolution, with two key antibodies (pembrolizumab and ipilimumab, respectively) getting multiple approvals for PD-1/PD-L1 and CTLA-4 inhibition. Because of their success, IO agents have sparked a lot of interest in combining them with traditional therapy. Despite their potential clinical usefulness, the ICPis cause substantial side effects in some patients. These side effects are common, although they differ from those encountered with traditional cancer treatments. As a result, clinical research is increasingly focusing on managing and anticipating these side effects, as well as tracking long- term outcomes. This should lead to guidelines on how to manage these novel medicines and encourage practitioners to include them into treatment plans as soon as possible.

While the pipeline of ICP continues to grow, cancer vaccines and CAR-T cell treatments are alsogaining popularity. There is a special focus on creating new IO drugs that can modify T-cell activity via signalling pathways (e.g., VEGF-A, LAG-3, and IDO-1), with the goal of better understanding how modulating these pathways can restore the body's natural ability to fight cancer.

New targets and pathways in the IO sector are crucial for developing new therapies; nevertheless, it's worth noting that combining currently approved IO drugs with established chemotherapeutic or biological agents is also generating a lot of attention. For example, promising outcomes were reported in a research combining an IO agent with an antibody-drug conjugate.

Reference:

[1] McCarthy EF. The toxins of William B. Coley and the treatment of bone and soft-tissue sarcomas. Iowa Orthop J. 2006; 26:154–8. [PMC free article] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]

[2] Decker WK, Safdar A. Bioimmunoadjuvants for the treatment of neoplastic andinfectious disease: Coley's legacy revisited. Cytokine Growth Factor Rev. 2009; 20:271–81. doi: 10.1016/j.cytogfr.2009.07.004. [PubMed] [CrossRef] [Google Scholar]

[3] Dinarello CA. Historical insights into cytokines. Eur J Immunol. 2007; 37(suppl 1): S34–45. doi: 10.1002/eji.200737772. [PMC free article] [PubMed] [CrossRef] [Google Scholar]

[4] Lee S, Margolin K. Cytokines in cancer immunotherapy. Cancers (Basel) 2011; 3:3856–93. doi: 10.3390/cancers3043856. [PMC free article] [PubMed] [CrossRef] [GoogleScholar]

[5] Rosenberg SA. Interleukin 2 for patients with renal cancer. Nat Clin Pract Oncol. 2007; 4:497. doi: 10.1038/ncponc0926. [Comment on: Twardowski P, Figlin RA. What are the indications for sorafenib treatment in patients with renal cell carcinoma? Nat Clin Pract Oncol 2007; 4:456–7; and Stadler WM, Szmulewitz RZ. Sunitinib—a new standard of care for metastatic renal cell carcinoma. Nat Clin Pract Oncol 2007;4:458–9] [PMC free article] [PubMed] [CrossRef] [Google Scholar]

[6] Kodach LL, Peppelenbosch MP (August 2021). "Targeting the Myeloid-Derived Suppressor Cell Compartment for Inducing Responsiveness to Immune Checkpoint Blockade Is Best Limited to Specific Subtypes of Gastric Cancers" (https://doi.org/10.1053%2Fj.gastro.2021.03.047). Gastroenterology. 161 (2): 727. doi:10.1053/j.gastro.2021.03.047 (https://doi.org/10.1053%2Fj.gastro.2021.03.047). PMID 33798523 (https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/33798523).

[7] "The Nobel Prize in Physiology or Medicine 2018"(https://www.nobelprize.org/prizes/medicine/2018/summary/). NobelPrize.org.Retrieved 4 August 2019.

[8] Kucerova P, Cervinkova M (April 2016). "Spontaneous regression of tumour and the role of microbial infection—possibilities for cancer treatment" (https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC4777220). Anti-Cancer Drugs. 27 (4): 269–77. doi:10.1097/CAD.0000000000000033 https://doi.org/10.1097%2FCAD.0000000000000337). PMC 4777220 (https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC4777220).PMID26813865 (https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/26813865).

[9] Kienle GS (March 2012). "Fever in Cancer Treatment: Coley's Therapy andEpidemiologic Observations" (https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3833486). Global Advances in Healthand Medicine. 1 (1): 92–100. doi:10.7453/gahmj.2012.1.1.016 (https://doi.org/10.7453%2Fgahmj.2012.1.1.016). PMC 3833486 (https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC383 3486). PMID 24278806 (https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/24278806).

[10] McCarthy EF (2006). "The toxins of William B. Coley and the treatment of bone and soft-tissue sarcomas" (https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC1888599). The Iowa Orthopaedic Journal. 26: 154–8. PMC 1888599 (https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC1888599). PMID 16789469 (https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/16789469).

[11] King A & Broggio J. Cancer registration statistics, England: 2016. 2018. https://www.ons.gov.uk/releases/cancerregistrationstatisticsengland2016 (https://www.ons.gov.uk/releases/cancerregistrationstatisticsengland2016) (accessed May2020)

[12] King A. Index of cancer survival for clinical commissioning groups in England: adults diagnosed 2000 to 2015 and followed up to 2016. 2017. Available at: https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/healthandsocialcare/conditions and diseases/bulletins/indexofcancersurvivalforclinicalcommissioninggroupsinengland/adult sdiagnosed2000to2015andfollowedupto2016 (https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/healthandsocialcare/conditions and diseases/bulletins/indexofcancersurvivalforclinicalcommissioninggroupsinengland/adu lt sdiagnosed2000to2015andfollowedupto2016) (accessed May 2020)

[13] Cancer Research UK. Cancer survival for common cancers. 2014. Available at: https://www.cancerresearchuk.org/health-professional/cancerstatistics/survival/common-cancers-compared#heading-Three (#heading-Three) (accessed May 2020)

[14] American Cancer Society. The history of cancer. 2014. Available at: https://www.cancer.org/cancer/cancer-basics/history-of-cancer/cancer-treatmentsurgery.html (https://www.cancer.org/cancer/cancer-basics/history-of- cancer/cancertreatment-surgery.html) (accessed May 2020)

[15] King A & Broggio J. Cancer registration statistics, England: 2016. 2018. https://www.ons.gov.uk/releases/cancerregistrationstatisticsengland2016 (accessed May 2020)

[16] King A. Index of cancer survival for clinical commissioning groups in England: adults diagnosed 2000 to 2015 and followed upto 2016. 2017.Available at: https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/healthandsocialcare/conditionsanddiseases/bulletins/indexofcancersurvivalforclinicalcommissioninggroupsinengland/adultsdiagnosed2000to2015andfollowedupto2016 (accessed May 2020)

[17] Cancer Research UK. Cancer survival for common cancers. 2014. Available at: https://www.cancerresearchuk.org/health-professional/cancer-statistics/survival/common-cancers-compared#heading-Three (accessed May 2020)

[18] American Cancer Society. The history of cancer. 2014. Available at: https:// www.cancer.org/cancer/cancer-basics/history-of-cancer/cancer-treatmentsurgery.html (accessed May 2020)