T-Cell Infiltration and Adaptive Treg Resistance in Response to Androgen Deprivation With or Without Vaccination in Localized Prostate Cancer

Authors:
Aleksandar Obradovic[1*]; Matthew C. Dallos[2*]; Marianna L. Zahurak[5]; Alan W. Partin[6], Edward M. Schaeffer[7], Ashley E. Ross[8]; Mohamad E. Allaf[6]; Thomas R. Nirschl[4]; David Liu[9, 10], Carolyn Chapman[4]; Tanya O'Neal[4]; Haiyi Cao[4]; Jennifer N. Durham[4]; Gunes Guner[3]; Javier A. Baena-Del Valle[3]; Onur Ertunc[3]; Angelo M. De Marzo[3]; Emmanuel S. Antonarakis [4**]; Charles G. Drake[1,2,6**†]

Affiliations:
[1] Columbia Center for Translational Immunology, Columbia University Irving Medical Center, New York, NY, USA 10032.
[2] Division of Hematology and Oncology, Herbert Irving Comprehensive Cancer Center, Columbia University Medical Center, New York, NY, USA 10032.
[3] Department of Pathology, Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine, Baltimore, Maryland
[4] Department of Oncology, Sidney Kimmel Comprehensive Cancer Center at Johns Hopkins, Baltimore, MD, USA
[5] Department of Oncology and Biostatistics, Sidney Kimmel Comprehensive Cancer Center at Johns Hopkins, Baltimore, MD, USA
[6] Department of Urology, Brady Urological Institute, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, MD
[7] Department of Urology, Northwestern University Feinberg School of Medicine, Chicago, IL
[8] Texas Urology Specialists, Dallas, TX
[9] Dana-Farber Cancer Institute, Boston, MA
[10] The Broad Institute of Harvard and MIT, Cambridge, MA

* Aleksandar Obradovic and Matthew C. Dallos contributed equally
** Emmanuel S. Antonarakis and Charles G. Drake contributed equally

Keywords:
Immunotherapy, Cancer Vaccine, GVAX, Degarelix, Androgen deprivation therapy, Neoadjuvant therapy, prostate cancer, CD8 T cell, Treg, Cyclophosphamide

†**Corresponding Author:**

Charles G. Drake, MD, PhD
Columbia University Medical Center
Herbert Irving Comprehensive Cancer Center
Division of Hematology / Oncology
177 Fort Washington Avenue, Suite 6GN-435
New York, NY 10032
Phone: 646-317-5290
Fax: 212-305-3035
E-mail: cgd2139@columbia.edu

Statement of Translational Relevance:

In preclinical models of prostate cancer, androgen deprivation therapy (ADT) promotes immunogenic cell death, transiently mitigates T cell tolerance to tumors and augments vaccine-induced antigen-specific CD8+ T cell responses. However, there are limited data on the immunologic effects of ADT on the tumor microenvironment (TME) in patients. In a neoadjuvant trial, we treated men with high-risk localized prostate cancer with either ADT or ADT plus low-dose cyclophosphamide and a cell-based vaccine (Cy/GVAX), prior to radical prostatectomy. ADT induced a complex immune cell infiltrate and increased intratumoral cytolytic CD8+ T cells. However, this CD8+ T cell increase was accompanied by a proportional increase in FoxP3+ regulatory T cells (Tregs), proving strong evidence for adaptive Treg resistance. When given prior to surgery, Cy/GVAX modestly augmented the immunologic effects of ADT and decreased disease recurrence compared to ADT alone. These data support the observation that ADT has pro-inflammatory effects. However, these antitumor effects appear to be counterbalanced by a proportional increase in local immunosuppression.

Abstract:

Purpose: Previous studies suggest that androgen deprivation therapy (ADT) promotes antitumor immunity in prostate cancer. Whether a vaccine-based approach can augment this effect remains unknown.

Experimental Design: Therefore, we conducted a neoadjuvant, randomized study to quantify the immunologic effects of a granulocyte-macrophage colony-stimulating factor (GM-CSF)-secreting allogeneic cellular vaccine in combination with low-dose cyclophosphamide (Cy/GVAX) followed by degarelix versus degarelix alone in patients with high-risk localized prostate adenocarcinoma who were planned for radical prostatectomy.

Results: Both Cy/GVAX plus degarelix and degarelix alone led to significant increases in intratumoral CD8+ T cell infiltration and PD-L1 expression as compared to a cohort of untreated, matched controls. However, the CD8+ T cell infiltrate was accompanied by a

proportional increase in regulatory T cells (Treg), suggesting that adaptive Treg resistance may dampen the immunogenicity of ADT. Although Cy/GVAX followed by degarelix was associated with a modest improvement in time-to-PSA progression and time-to-next treatment as well as an increase in PD-L1, there was no difference in the CD8 T-cell infiltrate as compared to degarelix alone. Gene expression profiling demonstrated that CHIT1, a macrophage marker, was differentially upregulated with Cy/GVAX plus degarelix compared to degarelix alone.

Conclusions: Our results highlight that ADT with or without Cy/GVAX induces a complex immune response within the prostate tumor microenvironment. These data have important implications for combining ADT with immunotherapy. In particular, our finding that ADT increases both CD8+ T cells and Tregs, supports the development of regimens combining ADT with Treg-depleting agents in the treatment of prostate cancer.

Introduction:

Prostate cancer remains the second most common cause of cancer-related mortality in men and definitive local therapy represents the only treatment modality with the potential for cure.[1] Despite advances in surgical approaches, patients with high-risk localized prostate cancer continue to have a high likelihood of disease recurrence following definitive local therapy.[2,3] To date, no neoadjuvant therapy preceding prostatectomy has demonstrated sufficient efficacy to warrant FDA approval.

In contrast to traditional therapies which decrease tumor bulk prior to surgery, immunotherapy has the potential to re-engage systemic anti-tumor immune responses, thereby eradicating distant micro-metastases. Although the development of sipuleucel-T for castration-resistant prostate cancer (CRPC) demonstrated the potential for immunotherapy in prostate cancer, immune checkpoint inhibitors have not yielded significant responses, except perhaps when used in combination.[4-10] One significant challenge to inducing anti-tumor immunity in prostate cancer is the non-inflamed tumor microenvironment (TME).[11] Prostate tumors also generally have a low mutational burden and low PD-L1 expression; these factors predict response to immunotherapy in other

tumor types.[12,13] In addition, prostate tumors demonstrate multiple mechanisms of immune escape including defective antigen processing, decreased MHC class I expression, and infiltration with regulatory T cells (Tregs), myeloid-derived suppressor cells, and M2 macrophages.[14-17]

Prostate GVAX is an allogeneic cell-based prostate cancer vaccine composed of two irradiated cell lines (PC3 and LNCaP) that have been genetically modified to secrete granulocyte-macrophage colony-stimulating factor (GM-CSF).[14] The release of GM-CSF by these modified tumor cells promotes the recruitment of dendritic cells and subsequent presentation of tumor antigens to T-cells with associated activation of anti-tumor immune responses. Prior randomized controlled trials of GVAX as monotherapy or in combination with docetaxel in mCRPC failed to show a survival benefit over chemotherapy, suggesting that allogeneic cell-based immunotherapy may be insufficient on its own to generate a robust T cell response against prostate cancer.[14] This may be particularly relevant in advanced metastatic CRPC, wherein a more immunosuppressive TME predominates.[15] However, preclinical studies demonstrate that administering low-dose cyclophosphamide prior to a cell-based GM-CSF-secreting vaccine can increase CD8+ T cell infiltration in the prostate, and transiently deplete regulatory T cells (Tregs).[16,17] These preclinical data are supported by clinical trials combining GVAX with low-dose cyclophosphamide in breast cancer, colorectal cancer and pancreatic cancer.[18,19]

In addition, prior studies in murine models show that castration results in *de novo* presentation of prostate-restricted antigens in tumor-draining lymph nodes, with transient mitigation of T cell tolerance.[18] ADT can also induce a pro-inflammatory immune cell infiltrate, supporting the hypothesis that androgen ablation may augment vaccine-induced effector T cell responses, particularly during the peri-castration period.[18] Whether similar immune modulation occurs in patients remains poorly understood.

To address these questions, we conducted a randomized neoadjuvant study to test the hypothesis that the combination of low-dose cyclophosphamide plus GVAX (Cy/GVAX)

could augment the ADT-induced immune response in men with localized high-risk prostate cancer. The LHRH antagonist degarelix acetate was selected as ADT for this study based on its rapid onset-of-action allowing shorter time-to-surgery, lack of transient increase in testosterone reducing risk of tumor flare, and the observation that degarelix leads to a robust immune cell infiltrate in pre-clinical models, peaking around 2 weeks after administration[18]. A secondary endpoint of the study was to test whether ADT plus Cy/GVAX prolongs time to PSA recurrence as compared to ADT alone. We also sought to more deeply profile the immunological changes in the prostate TME mediated by ADT with or without Cy/GVAX.

Patients and Methods:
Patients

Men with intermediate to high-risk localized prostate adenocarcinoma, defined as clinical stage T1c-T3b, N0, M0 and a Gleason sum $\geq$ 4+3 (grade group $\geq$3) in at least two cores were considered eligible if they were planning to undergo prostatectomy. All patients were required to have an Eastern Cooperative Oncology Group performance status of 0 or 1; and normal kidney, liver, and marrow function. Patients with nodal (N1) or distant (M1) metastases were excluded. Key additional exclusion criteria included prior immunotherapy or vaccine therapy for prostate cancer, prior radiation, hormonal, or chemotherapy, autoimmune disease requiring corticosteroids, or known allergy to cyclophosphamide or G-CSF/GM-CSF. Written informed consent was obtained from all patients, and studies were conducted in accordance with the U.S. Revised Common Rule and approved by Institutional Review Board.

Study Design and Treatment

Patients were randomized 1:1 to degarelix alone (240 mg subcutaneously) versus cyclophosphamide (200 mg/m2 intravenously) and GVAX (2.5×10^8 PC3 cells, 1.6×10^8 LNCaP cells) given 2 weeks before degarelix. Randomization was stratified by Gleason sum: $\leq$7 vs 8-10. All patients underwent radical prostatectomy 2 weeks after degarelix (Figure 1). Prostatectomy specimens were assessed for Gleason grade, nodal involvement, and pathological stage using standard methods. Following pathological

review of prostatectomy specimens, a tumor block was selected from the highest grade tumor located in the prostate and microtome sections were prepared for biological analysis of the TME, including immunohistochemical staining for CD8, FOXP3, and PD-L1, with additional sections for expression profiling (Nanostring). In addition, a contemporaneous cohort of matched-controls (Cohort C) who did not receive any neoadjuvant therapy provided untreated radical prostatectomy tumor samples, which were compared to post-treatment prostatectomy samples from study Cohort A (degarelix alone) and Cohort B (Cy/GVAX plus degarelix) in genetic and immunohistochemical analysis. Patients were subsequently followed for biochemical (PSA) and metastatic disease progression.

Outcomes:

The co-primary endpoints of the trial were safety and CD8+ T cell density (CD8+ cells/mm^2) in the prostate tumor tissue following neoadjuvant therapy. Safety was assessed using NCI Common Toxicity Criteria version 4.03. Secondary endpoints included feasibility, Treg density (FoxP3+ cells/mm^2) in the prostate gland, CD8 to Treg ratio, time-to-PSA recurrence, time-to-next anti-cancer therapy, and time-to-metastatic progression. Time-to-PSA recurrence was defined as the interval from time of prostatectomy to the time when the PSA was ≥0.2ng/mL for the first of at least two serial rises in PSA (≥2 weeks apart).

Immunohistochemistry

CD8 staining was performed by steaming slides for 45 minutes in Dako Target Retrieval Solution (Agilent Technologies, Inc, Wilmington, DE), followed by incubation with a mouse anti-human monoclonal anti-CD8 antibody for 45 minutes at room temperature (Agilent Technologies, Inc, Wilmington, DE). For FoxP3 staining, slides were steamed for 45 minutes in Dako Target Retrieval Solution (Agilent Technologies, Inc, Wilmington, DE) and then incubated with a mouse monoclonal anti-FoxP3 antibody overnight at 4C (eBioscience, San Diego, CA, 1:250 dilution). For CD8, the secondary antibody used was the UltraVision Quanto Detection System HRP DAB (ThermoFisher, Waltham, MA). For Foxp3, the secondary antibody was the PowerVision+ kit (Leica

Biosystems, Buffalo Grove, IL). Staining was visualized using 3,3'-Diaminobenzidine (DAB) (Sigma, Saint Louis, MO, FAST 3,3'-Diaminobenzidine Tablets) and slides were counterstained with hematoxylin. For CD8 and Foxp3, IHC stained slides were scanned using an Aperio ScanScope CS. Sections for tumor for image analysis were performed using ImageScope by selecting regions of invasive carcinoma and carefully excluding regions in which inflammatory infiltrates involved benign glands. CD8 and Foxp3 cell data were obtained using positive IHC cell counting algorithms implemented in Aperio Spectrum software by applying Hue, Saturation and Brightness (HSB) color space. Cell numbers were normalized to the overall areas/region of interest and annotated a trained pathologist to provide cell density, which was assessed for each patient and compared across study arms. PD-L1 IHC staining and scoring was performed as previously described.[13] Although some PD-L1 expression has previously been reported on immune cells in prostate cancer, such cells are morphologically identified as primarily macrophages; here we analyzed and report tumor-cell PD-L1 expression.

Expression Profiling

Immune gene expression in the prostate TME was profiled using the Nanostring IO360 Immune Panel.[19] Sufficient tissue for analysis was available from 13 patients from arm A (degarelix) and 12 patients from arm B (degarelix + Cy/GVAX) as well as 18 untreated matched-control patients. Nanostring count data were normalized by first thresholding to exceed mean + 1 standard deviation of negative controls, then scaling each sample by a positive control normalization factor to correct for total counts, and additionally, scaling with a set of pre-defined housekeeping genes, as described in the Nanostring documentation[20]. Three housekeeping genes (FCF1, POLR2A, and TUBB) were excluded from the normalization process due to high cross-sample variance, and two additional genes (CC2D1B and GUSB) were excluded due to poor correlation with other housekeeping genes. This scaling corrected for background noise and differences in total gene count across samples, allowing for differential gene expression between groups to be calculated by unpaired t-test. For each pairwise comparison, we performed Benjamini-Hochberg multiple-testing correction and reported the number of differentially up-regulated and down-regulated genes with a corrected p-value<0.05.

Nanostring data were used to computationally infer an absolute abundance of immune cell types in each sample in order to compare the two study arms with each other and with the untreated group. These analyses were performed using the CIBERSORT algorithm, which de-convolutes gene expression matrices to a mixture of known immune cell types by fitting to a validated reference matrix of 22 immune cell subtypes, where each cell subtype has a defined set of differentially expressed genes.[21] This approach was limited by the fact that Nanostring profiles a limited set of targeted genes rather than the whole-transcriptome, so not all differentially expressed genes in the CIBERSORT reference matrix were captured. However, Nanostring specifically targets immune-related genes, and there are a significant number of differentially expressed genes captured for each immune cell subtype by the Nanostring panel. These are reported in Supplemental Table S1. CIBERSORT was able to de-convolute immune cell composition from these genes with a p-value of <0.05 for 13 treatment arm A samples, 10 treatment arm B samples, and 12 untreated control samples.

Statistical Analysis

Our primary hypothesis was that men receiving Cy/GVAX followed by ADT would have a 2-fold (100%) increase in CD8+ T cell infiltration as compared to men receiving ADT alone. With 16 patients per arm, and assuming an 86% coefficient of variation for the average CD8+ T cell density, a one-sided 0.05 α-level t-test of the logarithms of these ratios would provide 82% power to detect a 2-fold (100%) increase in CD8+ T cell density between treatment groups. Thus, the trial was powered to recruit 32 patients, with a total of 29 patients ultimately recruited. The primary statistical endpoint of this study was CD8+ T cell density quantified by the number of nuclei of staining positive for CD8 per mm2. Following a log transformation, the mean CD8+ T cell densities were compared between treatment arms using a two-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) with the stratification variable, Gleason score, treated as a block factor. Event time distributions for PSA recurrence, time to metastasis, and time to next cancer treatment were estimated with the method of Kaplan and Meier and compared using a stratified Cox proportional hazards model. For all comparisons of differential gene expression, t-

tests were applied to the normalized Nanostring counts matrix, and p-values corrected for multiple testing by the Benjamini-Hochberg method. Similarly, t-tests with Benjamini-Hochberg correction were applied to the inferred CIBERSORT immune cell abundance matrices, and to the IHC density values for CD8 and FOXP3. In a secondary analysis, hypothesis testing for unbiased association of clinical variables with time-to-PSA recurrence and time-to-next treatment was performed using multiple Cox regression with backward feature selection using the Akaike Information Criterion[26-28], and visualized using hazard ratio forest plots and Kaplan-Meier survival curves. The same multiple Cox regression with backward feature selection was performed to test for association of clinical variables with metastasis and time to testosterone recovery (Figure S1). Pearson correlation was also calculated between all clinical, gene expression, and IHC variables as well as correlation of each variable with disease recurrence, visualized in Figure S2. Statistical analyses were performed using R version 3.5.3 and SAS version 9.2.

Results:

32 patients were recruited to the study with 16 randomized to each arm. 1 patient randomized to degarelix alone and 2 patients randomized to degarelix plus Cy/GVAX withdrew consent before study drug initiation. Therefore, 29 patients received study treatment. 15 patients received degarelix alone and 14 received degarelix plus Cy/GVAX (one patient in this group withdrew following cerebrovascular ischemia, and was subsequently lost to follow-up). Clinical characteristics of the two treatment groups were similar with respect to age, risk status, Gleason sum, tumor stage, regional nodal involvement, and surgical margins (Table 1). 64% of patients had Gleason ≥8 disease, 56% had pathological stage T3b, and 18% were found to have N1 disease at the time of surgery.

Safety

Both degarelix alone and degarelix plus Cy/GVAX were well-tolerated. A single grade 3 ALT elevation was reported in the degarelix plus Cy/GVAX group, with no other treatment-related grade 3 or 4 adverse events reported (Table 2). All enrolled patients successfully underwent radical prostatectomy, with no significant unexpected surgical

complications or toxicities reported. Significant surgical complications were defined as blood loss in excess of 2500mL, operative time in excess of 3.5 hours, hospital stay in excess of 4 days or systemic symptoms including fever, rash or myelosuppression.

Degarelix (ADT) Induces CD8 T Cell Infiltration with a Proportional Increase in Tregs
Prostatectomy samples from both treatment arms, degarelix and degarelix + Cy/GVAX, showed significantly increased intratumoral CD8+ T cell density by IHC as compared to untreated matched controls (Figure 2C). However, this CD8 infiltration was balanced by a proportionally increased infiltration with Tregs, such that the CD8/Treg ratio remained consistent across all treatment groups (Figure 2D, 2E). While there was a significant increase in both CD8+ T cell and Treg infiltrate with degarelix versus controls and degarelix + Cy/GVAX versus controls, there was no statistically significant difference between the degarelix and degarelix + Cy/GVAX treatment groups (Figure 2), suggesting that the GVAX vaccine did not induce additional CD8 infiltration in this setting as compared to degarelix alone. Since FOXP3 can potentially be expressed in other T-cell populations, we also analyzed our transcriptomic data to identify whether treatment led to increased expression of other Treg markers including GITR (TNFRSF18), CTLA-4 and CD25 (IL2RA). We observed increased expression of GITR, CTLA-4 and CD25 with both degarelix alone and degarelix plus Cy/GVAX compared to untreated controls (Supplemental Figure 3). However, there was no difference in expression of these markers between degarelix and degarelix plus Cy/GVAX.

Increased PD-L1 Expression after GVAX Vaccination
Consistent with prior reports, tumor cell PD-L1 expression was minimal in untreated patients (Figure 3). Degarelix alone appeared to modestly increase PD-L1 expression, consistent with the notion that cytokine secretion from infiltrating CD8+ T cells may drive up-regulation of immune checkpoints. Tumor samples from patients treated with degarelix + Cy/GVAX were found to have increased PD-L1 staining compared to patients treated with degarelix alone, with a higher proportion of samples exceeding 5% PD-L1 positivity (Figure 3); this trend was not statistically significant. Although there appeared to be some areas of PD-L1 staining in inflammatory cells in the stroma, the

majority of cells staining positive for PD-L1 were tumor cells. Taken together, these data suggest that while the GVAX vaccine does not significantly increase CD8+ T cell density, the infiltrating immune cells induced by GVAX may be capable of promoting PD-L1 up-regulation.

Degarelix and Degarelix plus Cy/GVAX Induce Complex Changes in Immune Gene Expression

Pairwise differential gene expression was performed on normalized Nanostring data from prostatectomy samples, comparing untreated control patients, degarelix-treated patients, and degarelix + Cy/GVAX treated patients. This analysis identified 98 genes up-regulated in both degarelix and degarelix + Cy/GVAX vs control (Figure 4A). CHIT1, a macrophage activation marker, was the only gene significantly up-regulated in degarelix + Cy/GVAX vs degarelix (Figure 4B). [22] The CIBERSORT algorithm was used to de-convolute and infer the abundance of immune cell subtypes in each sample from Nanostring gene expression. Fractional contributions of immune cell populations were then compared between treatment groups (Figure 4C). These data show that a complex immune infiltrate was present in these prostatectomy samples at time of surgery, with significant populations of B cells, CD4 T cells, M1 macrophages, M2 macrophages, and mast cells. Summing the inferred abundance of each cell type yielded a total immune infiltrate estimate from gene expression data. Those data showed that that total immune infiltrate was significantly increased in both degarelix and degarelix + Cy/GVAX compared to control, but not in degarelix + Cy/GVAX as compared to degarelix alone (Figure 4D). CIBERSORT analysis also revealed an increased infiltrate of CD8+ T cells, M2 macrophages, and gamma-delta T-cells in both treatment groups as compared to untreated controls, with a raw p-value < 0.05. Although the CD8+ T cell increase is consistent with the IHC data (Figure 1), these differences based on gene-expression analysis were not statistically significant after adjustment for multiple testing (Figure 4E). To further assess whether treatment could increase T-cell activation, we evaluated interferon-γ and granzyme B expression levels and demonstrated no significant difference in expression levels between the treatment groups (Supplemental Figure 3).

Degarelix plus Cy/GVAX is Associated with Clinical Outcome

At 24 months post-prostatectomy, 69% of patients were free of PSA recurrence in the Cy/GVAX plus degarelix treatment group as compared to 40% in the degarelix-only group (Table 1). Initial univariate cox regression of treatment group against time-to-PSA recurrence stratified by Gleason sum 7 versus Gleason sum greater than 7 yielded a hazard ratio of 0.44 (95% Confidence Interval 0.13-1.43, p = 0.17), with time-to-next-treatment yielding a hazard ratio of 0.41 (95% Confidence Interval 0.13-1.36, p = 0.15). After determining informative clinical variables for prediction of time-to-PSA recurrence using backwards feature selection by the Akaike Information Criterion, multiple Cox regression was performed accounting for interactions between patient age, tumor stage, Gleason sum, and treatment group. Using this regression analysis, treatment with Cy/GVAX plus degarelix showed an increased time to PSA recurrence as compared to that observed in patients treated with degarelix alone, with a hazard ratio of 0.29 (95% Confidence Interval 0.08-1.00, p = 0.05) (Fig. 5A, 5B). Backward feature selection converged to the same set of clinical variables for prediction of time-to-next treatment, where there was a statistically significant treatment effect for degarelix plus Cy/GVAX compared to degarelix alone, with a hazard ratio of 0.26 (95% Confidence Interval 0.071-0.97, p = 0.046) (Fig. 5C, 5D). There was no significant difference observed between the two treatment groups in prediction of time-to-metastasis, where backward feature selection converged to a null model, and univariate cox regression with treatment group yielded a p-value of 0.46 (Figure S1). This may be due to the overall low rate of metastases in this patient population, with only 5 cases of metastasis observed across the two treatment groups (Table 1). There was also no significant difference in time-to-testosterone recovery between the two treatment groups (Figure S1), suggesting that the improved time to PSA recurrence cannot be accounted for by differences in the duration of a castrate level of testosterone. Correlation with recurrence is shown in Figure S2 for each variable considered in the first step of the backward feature selection model, such that CD8+ and FOXP3+ density as well as PD-L1 level were each negatively correlated with recurrence, but were not individually predictive of time-to-recurrence and were not additionally informative after accounting for treatment group, age, stage, and Gleason sum.

Discussion:

This study demonstrates that neoadjuvant ADT (degarelix acetate) with or without the addition of GVAX immunotherapy and low-dose cyclophosphamide promotes a complex immune response within the prostate TME. Treatment was well-tolerated and did not lead to unexpected surgical complications, providing proof-of-concept for an immunotherapy-based neoadjuvant approach to prostate cancer treatment. Importantly, we found that ADT significantly increases the intra-tumoral CD8+ T cell infiltrate in prostate cancer. However, our comprehensive analyses of the immune TME showed that ADT induces other important immunologic changes, with both pro-inflammatory and immunosuppressive effects. Perhaps most strikingly, we observed that the CD8+ T cell infiltrate was accompanied by a proportional increase in Tregs, a key immunosuppressive cell population that mediates immune resistance in multiple tumor types.[20] The addition of cyclophosphamide, which has previously been shown to transiently deplete Tregs, did not appear to significantly deplete Tregs in this setting. The addition of Cy/GVAX to ADT did lead to a modest increase in PD-L1 expression as well as a statistically significant increase in the macrophage marker CHIT1, perhaps suggesting increased immunologic activity for the combination therapy. When accounting for patient age, tumor stage and Gleason sum in a multiple regression model selected by unbiased AIC backward feature selection[26-28], there were significant improvements in time-to-PSA recurrence and time-to-next therapy in patients treated with Cy/GVAX plus degarelix compared to degarelix alone, suggesting the possibility that the combination regimen has some clinical activity.

Prior pre-clinical and clinical studies showed that androgen deprivation can re-model the immune TME in prostate tumors towards a pro-inflammatory state. Our group previously demonstrated in the MycCaP murine model that ADT initially leads to a pro-inflammatory immune cell infiltrate in prostate tumors with increases in CD8+ T cells, Tregs, macrophages and NK cells.[18] However, this infiltrate is transient and appears to dissipate with the emergence of castration-resistance. Other groups have also shown that androgen ablation can increase B-cell infiltration, which may promote progression to

castration-resistance through B-cell-derived lymphotoxin production.[21] In patients, the androgen-receptor blocker flutamide was shown to induce T cell infiltration and increase expression of pro-inflammatory immune-related genes (interferon-γ, TNF-α, Granzyme A) in prostate cancers when given prior to prostatectomy.[22,23] Several prior studies have also investigated the use of neo-adjuvant vaccine-based immunotherapy approaches to enhance anti-tumor immune responses. For example, the autologous cellular vaccine, sipuleucel-T, was shown to promote lymphocyte recruitment and enhance T_H1 responses when given in the neoadjuvant setting.[24,25]

The findings reported here are largely consistent with these prior observations and suggest that ADT may prime prostate-specific T cell responses. We observed that ADT led to a robust increase in CD8+ T cells, which was not further enhanced by Cy/GVAX. One possible reason for the lack of further CD8+ infiltration with Cy/GVAX could be the allogeneic nature of the GVAX vaccine relative to the patients' tumors. The vaccine cell line PC3 was originally derived from a skull metastasis, and LNCAP is originally derived from a lymph node metastasis, and it is possible that neither consistently shared tissue-specific antigens with the primary prostate tumors in the treated patients. It may also be the case that GM-CSF was insufficiently able to activate dendritic cells, as it has been found that modified versions of GVAX expressing dendritic cell activating molecules such as STING were far more effective in preclinical models[30]. It should also be noted that the prostate cancer microenvironment is particularly immunosuppressive, such that CD8 T-cells isolated from the prostate remain refractory to stimulation even in ex vivo experiments[31], indicating that improved depletion of Tregs may also improve response to GVAX. Of note, there was also increased PD-L1 expression with ADT, which did appear to be augmented by the addition of Cy/GVAX. The significance of this upregulation of PD-L1 is unclear but could reflect an adaptive response to interferon-γ produced by activated T-lymphocytes. Future mechanistic work is required to better understand this observation. Furthermore, and consistent with the hypothesis that counter-regulatory mechanisms can function to maintain immune evasion, we observed an increase in Treg infiltration with ADT. This process of adaptive Treg resistance has not previously been described in the setting of neo-adjuvant ADT, although increases in Treg density have

been observed in response to a range of therapies across a number of tumor types, highlighting the notion that adaptive Treg resistance may be a broad-based mechanism that can attenuate maximal responses to immunotherapy in patients with diverse malignancies.

Interestingly, in both treatment groups, differential gene expression analysis showed that degarelix treatment upregulated CHIT1, a marker of macrophage activation shown to regulate many inflammatory processes through stimulation of inflammatory mediators such as IL8, MMP9, CCL2, CCL5, and CCL11, and correlated with levels of IL-1β and TNFα[29].. Given that macrophages are key antigen-presenting cells, this finding corroborates the notion that ADT enhances prostate-antigen presentation and thereby promotes prostate-specific T-cell responses. CHIT1 expression appeared to be further upregulated by the addition of Cy/GVAX to ADT.

Limitations of this study include the relatively small number of patients in each treatment arm and our inability to capture serial immunologic changes within the prostate TME over time. We hypothesized that 2 weeks of ADT would be optimal to elicit robust immunologic responses, since pre-clinical data suggest that the immunologic effects of ADT are transient, with the initial immune infiltrate evolving over time into a more suppressive one, dominated by Tregs[18]. The optimal duration of ADT prior to radical prostatectomy remains unknown and it is possible that the single dose of degarelix acetate used in this study was insufficient to sustain a clinically significant immune response. Our study used cyclophosphamide in combination with GVAX based on the hypothesis that low-dose cyclophosphamide would be capable of depleting Tregs and therefore augmenting an anti-tumor immune response. This approach was supported by preclinical studies which showed significant augmentation of anti-tumor immunity upon administration of cyclophosphamide approximately 24 hours prior to vaccination with GVAX[32,33]. The dosage of cyclophosphamide used here reflects the dosage in a breast cancer study that also showed augmentation of anti-tumor immunity with administration of cyclophosphamide prior to a GM-CSF secreting vaccine[34]. However, we observed no difference in Treg density with the addition of Cy/GVAX to degarelix. One possibility is

that the dosing regimen of cyclophosphamide used in this study was not optimal for Treg depletion. Since the completion of our study, emerging data showed that oral cyclophosphamide may be more effective for Treg depletion[35,36]. Given these limitations, future studies may be required to fully characterize the evolution of the immune TME over time and to optimize neoadjuvant immunotherapy in patients with prostate cancer.

However, these results do provide important insights into the immunologic effects of ADT, either alone or in combination with an allogeneic cell-based vaccine. Importantly, the complexity of the immune response to ADT suggests that selectively targeting immunosuppressive cell populations may be essential for maximizing the immunogenicity of neoadjuvant ADT. The observation that ADT can induce adaptive Treg resistance provides a strong rationale for novel strategies aimed at depleting Tregs within the prostate TME. Finally, future mechanistic studies aimed at comprehensively understanding how androgen deprivation regulates anti-tumor immunity in prostate cancer are warranted.

Author Contributions:

A.O., M.D. and C.G.D. wrote and edited the manuscript. A.O. generated figures and performed bioinformatics and statistical analyses, including multiple cox regression with backward feature selection. M.Z. contributed to the statistical study design, performed initial analyses, gleason-stratified survival analyses, and edited the manuscript. C.G.D. and E. A. conceived of and designed the clinical study NCT01696877. C.G.D oversaw design of all laboratory studies, data analysis and interpretation, and edited the manuscript. G. G. carried out CD8 immunostaining of formalin-fixed paraffin-embedded prostatectomy samples, oversaw image acquisition/slide scanning, and helped gather image analysis data. O.E. performed image analysis for CD8, FOXP3, and PD-L1 quantification from IHC slides. A.D. oversaw all IHC analyses and data acquisition. T.N.

isolated RNA and generated the Nanostring data set from FFPE tissue samples. A.P., E.S., M.A., A.R., C.C., T.O., H.C., and J.D. recruited and treated patients on the trial, arranged clinical sample acquisition, and recorded adverse events and all clinical data.

Figure Legends:

Clinical Variable	Degarelix (N=15)	Degarelix + Cy/GVAX (N=13)
Median age (interquartile range), years	58 (55-64.5)	61 (54-63)
Very high risk (%)	6 (40%)	8 (61%)
Gleason sum, *n* (%)		
7	6 (40%)	4 (31%)
8	1 (7%)	2 (15%)
9	8 (53%)	6 (46%)
10	0 (0%)	1 (8%)
T Stage, *n* (%)		
pT2	4 (27%)	3 (23%)
pT3a	5 (33%)	6 (46%)
pT3b	6 (40%)	4 (31%)
ECOG Status, *n* (%)		
0	15 (100%)	13 (100%)
Regional Lymph Node Involvement, *n* (%)	2 (13%)	3 (23%)
Positive margin, *n* (%)	7 (47%)	5 (38%)
Recurred, *n* (%)	9 (60%)	4 (31%)
Developed Metastasis, *n* (%)	2 (13%)	3 (23%)

Table 1. Patient baseline demographics and disease characteristics. Clinical variables for patients treated with degarelix alone versus degarelix plus Cy/GVAX. [*]Gleason sums for the histologic pattern of carcinoma range from 7-10 with higher scores indicating a higher-grade tumor.

Immune Response to ADT and GVAX in Localized Prostate Cancer

Adverse Events	Degarelix (N=15)			Degarelix + Cy/GVAX (N=14)		
	Grade 1	Grade 2	Grade 3	Grade 1	Grade 2	Grade3
General Disorders						
Injection-site reaction	10 (66%)	0	0	11 (79%)	2 (14%)	0
Fatigue	4 (27%)	0	0	3 (21%)	0	0
Chills	2 (13%)			1 (7%)		
Fever	0	0	0	2 (14%)	0	0
Flu like symptoms	0	0	0	0	1 (7%)	0
Malaise	0	0	0	1 (7%)	0	0
Edema, limbs	1 (7%)	0	0	0	0	0
Localized Edema	0	0	0	1 (7%)	0	0
Gastrointestinal Disorders						
Abdominal Pain	2 (13%)	0	0	1 (7%)	0	0
Nausea	0	0	0	1 (7%)	0	0
Vascular Disorders						
Hot flashes	6 (40%)	0	0	8 (57%)	0	0
Reproductive System Disorders						
Erectile dysfunction	1 (7%)	0	0	2 (14%)	0	0
Testicular disorder	0	0	0	1 (7%)	0	0
Urinary disorders	0	0	0	0	0	0
Urinary incontinence	1 (7%)	0	0	1 (7%)	0	0
Laboratory Abnormalities						
Elevated ALT	1 (7%)	0	0	0	0	1 (7%)
Elevated AST	2 (13%)	0	0	0	1 (7%)	0
Skin Disorders						
Rash (systemic)	0	0	0	3 (21%)	2 (14%)	0
Dizziness	0	0	0	1 (7%)	0	0
Musculoskeletal Disorders						
Arthralgias	1 (7%)	0	0	2 (14%)	0	0
Myalgias	1 (7%)	0	0	1 (7%)	0	0
Nervous System Disorders						
Lethargy	0	0	0	1 (7%)	0	0
Dizziness	0	0	0	1 (7%)	0	0
Headache	0	0	0	2 (14%)	0	0
Ischemia, cerebrovascular	0	0	0	1 (7%)	0	0
Surgical Complications						
Post-op hematoma (pelvic)	0	0	0	0	1 (7%)	0

Table 2. Adverse events reported by treatment group. Adverse events for patients treated with degarelix alone versus degarelix plus Cy/GVAX were reported for all patients in the study, including one patient in the degarelix plus Cy/GVAX group that subsequently went off-study following cerebrovascular ischemia.

Figure 1. Clinical trial design and patient disposition diagram. Patients with high-risk localized prostate cancer (T1c–3b N0 M0, Gleason 7–10) were randomized 1:1 to degarelix (240 mg SQ) vs. Cyclophosphamide (200 mg/m2 IV) / GVAX (2.5×108 PC3 cells, 1.6×108 LNCaP cells) given 2 weeks before degarelix. All patients then underwent radical prostatectomy 2 weeks after degarelix. Abbreviations: Eastern Cooperative Oncology Group (ECOG); subcutaneously (SQ); intravenously (IV).

Figure 2. Degarelix and degarelix + GVAX increase CD8+ and FOXP3+ T cell infitration in prostate tumors. A) Representatitive H&E and immunohistochemistry (IHC) for CD8+ T cells, visualized at 4x and 20x magnification **B)** Representative H&E and IHC for FOXP3+ T cells, visualized at 4x and 20x magnification **C)** Boxplots of Log2(CD8+ T cell density), quantified from IHC as represented in Figure 2A. **D)** Boxplots of Log2(FOXP3+ T cell density), quantified from IHC as represented in Figure 2B. **E)** Boxplots of the CD8+/FOXP3+ T cell ratio, quantified from IHC as represented in Figures 2A and 2B. **F)** Table of mean CD8+ T cell density (cells/mm^2), mean Treg density (cells/mm^2), and CD8/Treg ratio for each treatment group and untreated controls, with 95% confidence intervals and p-values by Gleason-stratification-adjusted ANOVA reported for each comparison of groups; * = $p<0.05$, ** = $p<0.01$, and *** = $p<0.005$

Figure 3. Degarelix and degarelix + Cy/GVAX increase PD-L1 expression in prostate tumors. A) Representative IHC for PD-L1, visualized at 4x and 20x magnification **B)** Stacked barplot of %PD-L1 positive cells, showing relative proportion of samples with 0% PD-L1 staining, <1% PD-L1 staining, <5% PD-L1 staining, and >5% PD-L1 staining in tumor cells in each treatment group and a cohort of untreated matched controls. Distributions of %PD-L1 categories may be visually compared between groups,

such that the degarelix + Cy/GVAX group has the highest proportion of samples with PD-L1 > 5%. Proportions of samples with %PD-L1 > 0 were also compared between groups by Fisher's exact test, with p-values shown above the plot for each comparison, where * = p<0.05, ** = p<0.01, and *** = p<0.005.

Figure 4. Degarelix and degarelix + Cy/GVAX induce complex changes in immune gene signatures in primary prostate tumors. A) Differential expression of immune related genes by Nanostring Immune Profiling Panel in primary prostate tumors after degarelix, degarelix + Cy/GVAX, and untreated matched controls. Euler plots showing number of genes with Benjamini-Hochberg corrected t-test p-value < 0.01 for each pairwise comparison of groups, such that "up-regulated genes" refers to genes that have higher mean frequency in the degarelix + Cy/GVAX group than in the degarelix group (cyan), higher mean frequency in the degarelix group than the untreated control group (purple), and higher mean frequency in the degarelix + Cy/GVAX group than the untreated control group (orange), and "down-regulated genes" refers to genes that have lower mean frequency in degarelix + Cy/GVAX vs degarelix (cyan), degarelix vs controls (purple), and degarelix + Cy/GVAX vs controls (orange), respectively. **B)** Violin-plot of log-scaled post-normalization Nanostring gene counts for CHIT1 in each treatment group and untreated controls. In Figure 4A, CHIT1 is the sole gene significantly up-regulated in each comparison. **C)** Boxplot of immune cell type absolute abundances as inferred by CIBERSORT, colored by treatment group and reported for all samples with CIBERSORT p-value<0.05. **D)** Violin-plot of total immune cell infiltrate for each sample by treatment group, such that total immune cell infiltrate represents the sum of CIBERSORT immune cell abundances as shown in Figure 4C **E)** Boxplot of immune cell populations for which t-test comparing abundance between groups showed an uncorrected p-value<0.05. P-values were obtained by unpaired t-test with Benjamini-Hochberg multiple-testing correction, and shown on Figures 4B and 4D with * = p<0.05, ** = p<0.01, and *** = p<0.005.

Figure 5. Combination of Cy/GVAX with degarelix improves time-to-PSA recurrence and increases time-to-next treatment. A) Kaplan-Meier curves comparing

time-to-PSA recurrence of patients treated with degarelix + Cy/GVAX vs degarelix alone. Informative clinical variables for multivariate analysis were selected by backward feature selection using the Akaike Information Criterion. **B)** Forest plot showing time-to-PSA recurrence hazard ratios with 95% confidence interval for multiple cox regression of progression-free-survival against Cy/GVAX status, patient age, tumor stage, and Gleason score. P-values for each variable are reported, as is the overall log-rank p-value, Akaike Information Criterion value, and concordance index for the regression **C)** Kaplan-Meier curves comparing time to next treatment for patients treated with degarelix + Cy/GVAX vs degarelix alone, with log-rank p-value reported from multiple cox regression of time-to-next-treatment against Cy/GVAX status, patient age, tumor stage, and Gleason score. Informative clinical variables were selected as in 5A **D)** Forest plot showing time-to-next-treatment hazard ratios with 95% confidence interval for multiple cox regression of time-to-next-treatment against Cy/GVAX status, patient age, tumor stage, and gleason score. P-values for each variable are reported, as is the overall log-rank p-value, Akaike Information Criterion value, and concordance index for the regression.

REFERENCES:
1.   Siegel RL, Miller KD, Jemal A. Cancer statistics, 2019. CA Cancer J Clin 2019;69:7-34.
2.   Pound CR, Partin AW, Eisenberger MA, Chan DW, Pearson JD, Walsh PC. Natural history of progression after PSA elevation following radical prostatectomy. JAMA 1999;281:1591-7.
3.   D'Amico AV, Whittington R, Malkowicz SB, et al. Combination of the preoperative PSA level, biopsy gleason score, percentage of positive biopsies, and MRI T-stage to predict early PSA failure in men with clinically localized prostate cancer. Urology 2000;55:572-7.
4.   Slovin SF, Higano CS, Hamid O, et al. Ipilimumab alone or in combination with radiotherapy in metastatic castration-resistant prostate cancer: results from an open-label, multicenter phase I/II study. Ann Oncol 2013;24:1813-21.
5.   Kwon ED, Drake CG, Scher HI, et al. Ipilimumab versus placebo after radiotherapy in patients with metastatic castration-resistant prostate cancer that had progressed after docetaxel chemotherapy (CA184-043): a multicentre, randomised, double-blind, phase 3 trial. Lancet Oncol 2014;15:700-12.
6.   De Bono J, Goh JC, Ojamaa K, Rodriguez JMP, Drake CG, Hoimes CJ, Wu H, Poehlein H, Antonarakis ES. KEYNOTE-199: Pembrolizumab (pembro) for docetaxel-refractory metastatic castration-resistant prostate cancer (mCRPC). J Clin Oncol 2018;36.
7.   Beer TM, Kwon ED, Drake CG, et al. Randomized, Double-Blind, Phase III Trial of Ipilimumab Versus Placebo in Asymptomatic or Minimally Symptomatic Patients With Metastatic Chemotherapy-Naive Castration-Resistant Prostate Cancer. J Clin Oncol 2017;35:40-7.
8.   Kantoff PW, Higano CS, Shore ND, et al. Sipuleucel-T immunotherapy for castration-resistant prostate cancer. N Engl J Med 2010;363:411-22.
9.   Boudadi K, Suzman DL, Anagnostou V, et al. Ipilimumab plus nivolumab and DNA-repair defects in AR-V7-expressing metastatic prostate cancer. Oncotarget 2018;9:28561-71.
10.   Sharma P, Pachynski RK, Narayan V, et al. Initial results from a phase II study of nivolumab (NIVO) plus ipilimumab (IPI) for the treatment of metastatic castration-resistant prostate cancer (mCRPC; CheckMate 650). Journal of Clinical Oncology 2019;37:142-.
11.   Drake CG. Prostate cancer as a model for tumour immunotherapy. Nat Rev Immunol 2010;10:580-93.
12.   Thorsson V, Gibbs DL, Brown SD, et al. The Immune Landscape of Cancer. Immunity 2018;48:812-30 e14.
13.   Haffner MC, Guner G, Taheri D, et al. Comprehensive Evaluation of Programmed Death-Ligand 1 Expression in Primary and Metastatic Prostate Cancer. Am J Pathol 2018;188:1478-85.
14.   Sanda MG, Restifo NP, Walsh JC, et al. Molecular characterization of defective antigen processing in human prostate cancer. J Natl Cancer Inst 1995;87:280-5.
15.   Su W, Han HH, Wang Y, et al. The Polycomb Repressor Complex 1 Drives Double-Negative Prostate Cancer Metastasis by Coordinating Stemness and Immune Suppression. Cancer Cell 2019;36:139-55 e10.

16.   Erlandsson A, Carlsson J, Lundholm M, et al. M2 macrophages and regulatory T cells in lethal prostate cancer. Prostate 2019;79:363-9.

17.   Calcinotto A, Spataro C, Zagato E, et al. IL-23 secreted by myeloid cells drives castration-resistant prostate cancer. Nature 2018;559:363-9.

18.   Shen YC, Ghasemzadeh A, Kochel CM, et al. Combining intratumoral Treg depletion with androgen deprivation therapy (ADT): preclinical activity in the Myc-CaP model. Prostate Cancer Prostatic Dis 2018;21:113-25.

19.   Benzon B, Zhao SG, Haffner MC, et al. Correlation of B7-H3 with androgen receptor, immune pathways and poor outcome in prostate cancer: an expression-based analysis. Prostate Cancer Prostatic Dis 2017;20:28-35.

20.   Yano H, Andrews LP, Workman CJ, Vignali DAA. Intratumoral regulatory T cells: markers, subsets and their impact on anti-tumor immunity. Immunology 2019;157:232-47.

21.   Ammirante M, Luo JL, Grivennikov S, Nedospasov S, Karin M. B-cell-derived lymphotoxin promotes castration-resistant prostate cancer. Nature 2010;464:302-5.

22.   Mercader M, Sengupta S, Bodner BK, et al. Early effects of pharmacological androgen deprivation in human prostate cancer. BJU International 2007;99:60-7.

23.   Mercader M, Bodner BK, Moser MT, et al. T cell infiltration of the prostate induced by androgen withdrawal in patients with prostate cancer. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences 2001;98:14565-70.

24.   Hagihara K, Chan S, Zhang L, et al. Neoadjuvant sipuleucel-T induces both Th1 activation and immune regulation in localized prostate cancer. Oncoimmunology 2019;8:e1486953.

25.   Fong L, Carroll P, Weinberg V, et al. Activated lymphocyte recruitment into the tumor microenvironment following preoperative sipuleucel-T for localized prostate cancer. J Natl Cancer Inst 2014;106.

26.   Akaike, Hirotogu. "Information Theory and an Extension of the Maximum Likelihood Principle." *Springer Series in Statistics Breakthroughs in Statistics*, 1992, pp. 610–624.

27.   Sanchez-Pinto, L. Nelson, et al. "Comparison of Variable Selection Methods for Clinical Predictive Modeling." *International Journal of Medical Informatics*, vol. 116, 2018, pp. 10–17.

28.   Vittinghoff, E., and C. E. Mcculloch. "Relaxing the Rule of Ten Events per Variable in Logistic and Cox Regression." *American Journal of Epidemiology*, vol. 165, no. 6, Dec. 2007, pp. 710–718.

29.   Elmonem, Mohamed A., et al. "Immunomodulatory Effects of Chitotriosidase Enzyme." *Enzyme Research*, vol. 2016, 2016, pp. 1–9.

30.   Fu, Juan, et al. "STING Agonist Formulated Cancer Vaccines Can Cure Established Tumors Resistant to PD-1 Blockade." *Science Translational Medicine*, vol. 7, no. 283, 2015.

31.   Bronte, Vincenzo, et al. "Boosting Antitumor Responses of T Lymphocytes Infiltrating Human Prostate Cancers." *The Journal of Experimental Medicine*, vol. 201, no. 8, Nov. 2005, pp. 1257–1268.

32.   Wada, S., et al. "Cyclophosphamide Augments Antitumor Immunity: Studies in an Autochthonous Prostate Cancer Model." *Cancer Research*, vol. 69, no. 10, Dec. 2009, pp. 4309–4318.

33.   Machiels, JP, et al. "Cyclophosphamide, Doxorubicin, and Paclitaxel Enhance the Antitumor Immune Response of Granulocyte/Macrophage-Colony Stimulating Factor-Secreting Whole-Cell Vaccines in HER-2/Neu Tolerized Mice." *Cancer Research*, vol. 61, no. 9, May 2001.

34.   Emens, Leisha A., et al. "Timed Sequential Treatment With Cyclophosphamide, Doxorubicin, and an Allogeneic Granulocyte-Macrophage Colony-Stimulating Factor–Secreting Breast Tumor Vaccine: A Chemotherapy Dose-Ranging Factorial Study of Safety and Immune Activation." *Journal of Clinical Oncology*, vol. 27, no. 35, Oct. 2009, pp. 5911–5918.

35.   Scurr, Martin., et al. "Low-Dose Cyclophosphamide Induces Antitumor T-Cell Responses, Which Associate with Survival in Metastatic Colorectal Cancer." *Clinical Cancer Research*, vol. 23, no. 22, Nov. 2017.

36.   Huijts, Charlotte M., et al. "Phase 1 Study of Everolimus and Low-Dose Oral Cyclophosphamide in Patients with Metastatic Renal Cell Carcinoma." *Cancer Immunology, Immunotherapy*, vol. 68, no. 2, Sept. 2018, pp. 319–329.

1)

High Risk Localized Prostate Cancer

- Clinical stage T1c-T3b, N0, M0
- Gleason sum $\geq$ 4+3 (in at least 2 cores)
- ECOG 0-1
- Normal kidney, liver and marrow function

Randomize

D1: Cyclophosphamide 200mg/m^2 I.V.

**D2: GVAX-prostate**

D14: Degarelix acetate 240mg SQ

n=14

**D14: Degarelix acetate 240mg SQ**

n=15

Radical prostatectomy on day 28 (+/-3)

2A) CD8

|	Untreated	Degarelix	Degarelix + Cy/GVAX	
				4x
				20x

2B) FOXP3

	Untreated	Degarelix	Degarelix + Cy/GVAX	
				4x
				20x

2C) CD8+ T-Cell Density

2D) FOXP3+ T-Cell Density

**2E) CD8+/FOXP3+ Ratio**

2F)

	Untreated (U) N = 20	Degarelix (D) N = 15	Degarelix + Cy/GVAX (G) N = 13	P-value
CD8+ T cell density (mean, 95%CI)	96 (72–120)	205 (121–289)	263 (129–397)	<0.01 (G vs U) 0.03 (D vs U) 0.35 (G vs D)
Treg cell density (mean, 95%CI)	29 (21–36)	59 (34–85)	78 (48–107)	<0.01 (G vs U) 0.02 (D vs U) 0.18 (G vs D)
CD8+ / Treg ratio (mean, 95%CI)	3.7 (2.9–4.6)	4.0 (2.7–5.3)	3.9 (2.2–5.7)	0.87 (G vs U) 0.68 (D vs U) 0.66 (G vs D)

3A)

Untreated Degarelix Degarelix + Cy/GVAX

PD-L1

4x

20x

3B)

PD-L1 Staining

PDL1 %

*

*

ns.

Untreated Degarelix Degarelix + Cy/GVAX

■ 0% positive
■ <1% positive
■ <5% positive
■ >5% positive

4A)

Significantly Up-regulated Genes

68 | 97 | 1 | 19

Significantly Down-regulated Genes

38 | 61 | 16 | 12 | 7

Degarelix+Cy/GVAX vs Degarelix
Degarelix+Cy/GVAX vs Control
Degarelix vs Control

4B)

Differential Expression (log-counts): CHIT1

***

**

**

cluster
Control
Degarelix
Degarelix+Cy/GVAX

Control   Degarelix   Degarelix+Cy/GVAX

4C)

CIBERSORT Immune Cell Type Abundances

abundance

B.cells.naive, B.cells.memory, Plasma.cells, T.cells.CD8, T.cells.CD4.naive, T.cells.CD4.memory.resting, T.cells.CD4.memory.activated, T.cells.follicular.helper, T.cells.regulatory..Tregs., T.cells.gamma.delta, NK.cells.resting, NK.cells.activated, Monocytes, Macrophages.M0, Macrophages.M1, Macrophages.M2, Dendritic.cells.resting, Dendritic.cells.activated, Mast.cells.resting, Mast.cells.activated, Eosinophils, Neutrophils

4D)

CIBERSORT: Total Immune Infiltrate

total immune infiltrate

*

*

NS.

Control   Degarelix   Degarelix+Cy/GVAX

4E)

CIBERSORT Abundance: Significant Populations

abundance

CD8 T-Cells   M2 Macs   gamma-delta T-Cells

5A)

Strata + Treatment=Degarelix + Treatment=Degarelix+Cy/GVAX

5C)

Strata + Treatment=Degarelix + Treatment=Degarelix+Cy/GVAX

5B)

PSA Recurrence Hazard Ratios

age	(N=28)	0.92 (0.843 - 1.0)		0.045 *
gleason	(N=28)	1.59 (0.821 - 3.1)		0.169
stage	(N=28)	2.91 (1.346 - 6.3)		0.007 **
cy/gvax	(N=28)	0.29 (0.083 - 1.0)		0.054

Events: 13; Global p-value (Log-Rank): 0.0031157
AIC: 70.54; Concordance Index: 0.8

5D)

Time to Next Treatment Hazard Ratios

age	(N=28)	0.94 (0.864 - 1.02)		0.116
gleason	(N=28)	1.62 (0.818 - 3.22)		0.166
stage	(N=28)	2.68 (1.251 - 5.74)		0.011 *
cy/gvax	(N=28)	0.26 (0.071 - 0.97)		0.046 *

Events: 13; Global p-value (Log-Rank): 0.0057493
AIC: 70.19; Concordance Index: 0.79