Current Cohorts to Establish Signatures

Slide	Stage	e III	Stag	ge IV	IO I	ГМА	TIL Samples		nples
Antibody Conjugation	Fluorescent	Metal	Fluorescent	Metal	Fluorescent	Metal	Fluoreso	cent	Metal
# of Core (ROI)	384	301	704	640	77	77	130		45
# of Plex	7	36	7	37	7	36	7		36
Type of file	.qptiff	.mcd & .txt	.qptiff	.mcd & .txt	.qptiff	.mcd & .txt	.qptif	ff	.mcd & .txt
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 1011 12 1314 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	Stage III			Stage IV	ΙΟ	TMA 77	TIL Grow Treated 45	TIL G Un Treat 37	erow TIL No Grow Un Treate 48

iNOS; mPGES1

Low TIL

High TIL



Opal panel $\overline{\ }\overline{\ }\overline{\ }$: Melanoma

CD68; CD163; Arg1

Low TIL

High TIL



、 こ · Melanoma

IMC panel

Current Cohorts to Establish Signatures

Slide	Stage	e III	Stage IV		ΙΟ ΤΜΑ		TIL Samples	
Antibody Conjugation	Fluorescent	Metal	Fluorescent	Metal	Fluorescent	Metal	Fluorescen	nt Metal
# of Core (ROI)	384	301	704	640	77	77	130	45
# of Plex	7	36	7	37	7	36	7	36
Type of file	.qptiff	.mcd & .txt	.qptiff	.mcd & .txt	.qptiff	.mcd & .txt	.qptiff	.mcd & .txt
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 X Y <td>Stage III</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>Stage IV</td> <td></td> <td>D TMA 77</td> <td>TIL Grow Treated 45 Th 52</td> <td>IL Grow n reated 7</td>	Stage III			Stage IV		D TMA 77	TIL Grow Treated 45 Th 52	IL Grow n reated 7

Initial Findings w/Individual Markers in TIL Treated Patients

Gene Expression of CD74 Node Markers (CD44, MIF, NOS2, mPGESI) in CCLE and TIL Cohorts





The expression of CD74 related genes mRNA [in transcripts per million (TPM) in MDACC TIL patients' tumor lines dataset.

CD74 related genes mRNA expression (based on affymetrix mRNA arrays) in melanoma cell lines from the Cancer Cell Line Encyclopedia (CCLE). The y axis represents the log2 of the robust multi-array average.

Initial Findings w/Individual Markers in TIL Treated Patients

Tumor Cell NT Expression Correlates with Poor or No TIL Growth from Tumor Samples



NT expression in tumor cells associated with poor TIL growth. NT expression in tumor cells in successful TIL growth group, compared to TIL not grow and the significance of this association.



irRC of TIL Treated Patients and Progression of Disease Associate with NT Expression . NT expression in tumor cells in responders versus non-responders and their significance of this association. Mean staining intensity of NT expression in progressed patients is significantly high compared to non-progressed patients.

Initial Findings w/Individual Markers in TIL Treated Patients

Overall and Progression Free Survival by CD74 Number and Intensity

Progression Free Survival by MIF and iNOS Number and Intensity



Lunaphore Comet



Microscope

- Fluorescent microscope TRITC, Cy5, DAPI
- * 20X 0.75 NA 0.23 μm / pixel

Staining-Imaging Module

- 4 slides tray
- Works with standard histology slides
- Staining-imaging parallelization
- Temperature and pressure control

Reservoirs

- 20 for Abl; 4 for Ab2; 7 for buffers
- Designed to process 4 slides without refill

Slide Modified from Lunaphore

COMET – Core Chip Technology

Standard tissue incubation

Fast Fluidic Exchange (FFeX) Technology





- Microfluidic Imaging Chip enables staining & imaging
- Pressure-driven system allowing for fast and uniform delivery of reagents on a tissue section in a closed chamber
- Precisely controlled immuno-reaction within an extremely short incubation time enabled by the FFeX Technology



Slide Modified from Lunaphore

Protocol Times & Throughput

PREPARATION

AUTOMATED PROTOCOL

Staining (+ Elution) cycle <33 min

Slide Preparation 30 min – 2 hours

Imaging cycle ~ 20 min STAI Ν IMAG Ε REPE/ **ELUTE**

Automated Protocol Times

- 10-plex (Antibody Cocktail) on 4 slides: 10-15 hours
- 20-plex (Antibody Cocktail) on 4 slides: 24 hours

Throughput

- 30 slides / 5 days for 10-plex
- 20 slides / 5 days for 20-plex
 Slide Modified from Lunaphore

Stain & Elute

Q_<u>0.72x</u> & A



CD68 Stain in Green





Significant Findings

Our proposed markers of oxidative stress and immune-related enzymes and their mediators defines <u>TIME</u> architecture and predicts overall survival of advanced stage melanomas.

- Most of the melanoma cells reside in iNOS/mPGES1 NBH in both LTS and STS in Stage III and IV melanomas
- iNOS/mPGESI and iNOS/NT expressing cells reside significantly closer to each other than additional inflammatory profiles.

Inflammatory signatures (defined by iNOS/NT/mPGESI, and CD74/CD44/MIF expression characteristics) regulates immune profiles;

- There is a significantly higher average proportion of CTLs in LTS than in STS
- Anti-tumor immune cells (NK and CTLs) are more clustered together in LTS than STS.
- The average distance from a tumor community to the nearest CTL community is shorter in LTS than STS.
- The average distance from an average M2 TAM to the nearest B cells is longer in LTS than STS in Stage IV melanomas

• The proportion of M2 TAM cells that are also in the MIF CD44 NBH, out of all M2 TAM cells is higher in STS than in LTS

Future

More to Do – As always...



Correlate TIME signatures with multiscale radiomic properties that can be derived from routine CT scans to inform a mathematical model for the early prediction of the response to IO agents.

Extend and validate the mathematical model to predict melanoma response to immunooncology (IO) agents using the following data types;

• Imaging data: standard of care imaging, including pre-immunotherapy (TO) and postimmunotherapy (T1, T2, etc.) CT scans to quantify lesion volume and volume change over time. Our typical approach in the clinic is to obtain CT scans once every 3 months.

• Multiplex IHC data: We will correlate the refined set of markers in the mIF and CyTOF immune signatures, including iNOS, CXCR4, and CXCR7 for tumor cell proliferation rates (model parameter α ;, IFNgR1, CD3+, CD4+, CD8+ and macrophage markers CD11b+F4/80+CD11c-Ly6G- as quantitative measures of tumor immune infiltration (model parameter A); and CD44 and dendritic cell CD11c+Ly6G-F4/80-, and MDSC markers CD11b+Gr-1Ly6G+ as quantitative indicators of immune cell kill efficacy (model parameter μ).

Validate each marker individually, and then in sets signatures, for prognostic and then by <u>testing of predicting response to immunotherapy using (ongoing as well as</u> <u>retrospectively collected) human melanoma (and others) biopsy samples from</u> <u>patients with known immunotherapy outcomes</u>.





Summary

Our platform serves as comprehensive "molecular diagnosis" tool to support precision medicine approach by providing access to highdensity proteomics and radiomics information.



Team

Sungnam Cho, MS Yasunari Fukuda, MD, PhD Dai Ogata, MD, PhD Sun-Hee Kim, PhD Joel Eliason, GradStudent

MDACC Flow Cytometry and Cellular Imaging Core Facility **Jared K. Burks, PhD**

MDACC MelCore **Lauren Haydu, PhD** Jared Malke Sheila Duncan

MDACC Pathology Team Carlos Torres Cabala, MD Victor G. Prieto, MD, PhD

Melanoma Medical Oncology Elizabeth A. Grimm, PhD

Saint John's Cancer Institute Matias A. Bustos, PhD Dave S.B. Hoon, PhD BETHYL

Mike Spencer, Ph.D. *Director of IHC & Digital Path* T. Regan Baird, PhD Dan Winkowski, PhD

Computational Medicine and Bioinformatics Team University of Michigan **Arvind Rao, PhD**

Radiomics Project Team

Eugene J Koay, MD., PhD – MDACC, Radiation Oncology Vittorio Cristini, PhD - Methodist Research Institute, Mathematical Medicine Adi Diab, MD – MDACC, Melanoma Medical Oncology

MDACC Investigational Cancer Therapeutics **Aung Naing, MD, FACP** Funda Meric-Bernstam, MD

Thank You

Suhendan Ekmekcioglu, PhD

sekmekcioglu@mdanderson.org



