

Reprogramming Macrophages with HDAC6 Inhibitors for Anti-cancer Macrophage-based Cell Therapy

Satish Noonepalle¹, #, Maria Gracia-Hernandez², #, Christian Zevallos-Delgado², Nima Aghdam¹, Nithya Gajendran¹, Manasa Suresh¹, Xintang Li¹, Tessa Knox², Karen Tan², Eduardo Sotomayor³, Katherine B. Chiappinelli², Duncan Wardrop⁴, Anelia Horvath², Brett A. Shook², Norman Lee², Anatoly Dritschilo¹, Rohan Fernandes², Maho Shibata², Karthik Musunuri⁵, and Alejandro Villagra¹

ABSTRACT

I role in shaping the tumor microenvironment (TME). Responding to numerous cues from various cell types spectrum of phenotypes, often ranging between M1 (inflammatory) and M2 (tumor-supportive) macrophages. The pes due to their predisposition towards M2 function. Therefore, reprogramming TAMs to the M1 phenotype is a promising avenue to

bone marrow-derived macrophages (BMDMs) ex-vivo by treating them with HDAC6 inhibitor (HDAC6i) followed by polarization to tometry gene expression analysis by quantitative PCR and immunoblot analyses. We also acrophage-based cell therapy, we treated humanized NSG-SGM3 mice bearing melanoma PDX tumors with HDAC6i-treated numan M1 macrophages

Adoptive cell therapy (ACT) with HDAC6i-treated M1 macrophages resulted in significant tumor suppression and prolonged survival compared to other cohorts in he study. ACT macrophages were viable after two weeks of transplantation, and inhibition of HDAC6 rendered them resistant to M2 polarization. Inhibition of +DAC6 suppressed STAT3 activation and subsequent M2 marker Arg1 expression, further underscoring the role of HDAC6 in macrophage plasticity. M2 corroborated that HDAC6i-treated M1 macrophages were resistant to change into M2 phenotype. Single-cell secretome analysis by yfunctionality of HDAC6- treated M1 macrophages capable of secreting inflammatory cytokines such as Tnfa and T-cell recruiting emokine Cxcl10. Histological examination of tumor sections for macrophage phenotypic markers and single-cell transcriptomic analysis of tumor-infiltrated mune cells further corroborated the M1/M2 ratio increase observed by flow cytometry. Proinflammatory gene expression signature from scRNA-seq analysis hanced anti-tumor immunity by increasing the M1/M2 ratio and infiltration of CD8 effector T-cells shifting the balance towards anti-tumor immunity.

⁻or the first time, we demonstrate that reprogramming macrophages with class-specific HDAC inhibitors is a viable cell therapy option to treat solid tumors

INTRODUCTION

hybrid characteristics. High infiltration of TAMs is usually associated with poor prognosis in several cancer types due to their predisposition towards M2 function. Therefore, the M1/M2 macrophage ratio has become an emerging determinant of antitumor immunity. Due to the astic nature of TAM phenotypes, strategies to alter TAMs into antitumor M1 phenotype or diminish pro-tumor M2 phenotype within the tumor microenvironmer (TME) have gained prominence. Therefore, the anticipated outcome of such strategies is to effectively increase the M1/M2 ratio, and a higher M1/M2 ratio has een associated with a favorable outcome in cancer patients

omprehensive analysis of cancers in The Cancer Genome Atlas (TCGA) revealed several immune cancer subtypes dominated by macrophages. These mmune subtypes vary from being immunologically dormant to immunologically active, suggesting that macrophages play an essential role in shaping the TM One strategy to boost proinflammatory M1 macrophages in the TME is by transplantation of M1-polarized macrophages into tumors. Autologous and adoptive ransplantation of macrophages differentiated from circulating monocytes has been tested in clinical trials to treat immune related conditions and cancers. lowever, this approach has yielded only modest therapeutic benefits in cancer patients due to the overwhelming immunosuppressive nature of the TME. Moreover, some of these clinical trials were initiated prior to understanding the complexity of macrophage phenotypes, plasticity in response to various cytoking and the cues from TME

Towards reprogramming the TME, several groups, including us, have shown that intervention of specific histone deacetylases (HDACs) using small molecule bitors, such as HDAC6 inhibitors (HDAC6is), has immunomodulatory effects, particularly on macrophages. The above resulted in a paradigm shift from storical usage of pan-HDAC inhibitors for their cytotoxicity towards highly specific and isoform-selective HDAC inhibitors capable of regulating precise adoptive cell therapy increased the M1/M2 ratio by polarizing the host macrophages towards the M1 phenotype rthermore, ex vivo inhibition of HDAC6 in M1 macrophages attenuated STAT3 mediated M2 polarization in the hostile TME, thereby sustaining the M1 notype of transplanted macrophages. Similar results were observed in the SM1 syngeneic murine melanoma models and humanized NSG-SGM3 mice with lanoma patient-derived xenograft (PDX) tumors resulting in diminished tumor growth. Our study further validates the immunomodulatory effects of HDAC6 nibitors and demonstrates the effectiveness of macrophage-based cell therapy to treat solid tumors.

M1/M2 macrophage ratio is an indicator of the immune status of the TME in melanoma



Fig. 1 | M1/M2 ratio reflects the immune status of the tumor microenvironment. A-F, Kaplan Meier survival analysis of key M1 macrophages genes is associated with better survival in melanoma patients (SKCM) (TCGA, n=470). G & H, Cibersortx analysis of scRNAseq data (GSE120575) from metastatic melanoma patients (n=48 tumor biopsies) treated with anti-PD1 and/or anti-CTLA4 immune checkpoint blockade therapy. I, Growth chart of immune-competent SM1 murine melanoma tumors in C57BL/6 mice. J, Negative correlation between SM1 murine melanoma tumor volume and tumor-associated M1 macrophages. K Positive correlation between the tumor volume and tumor-associated M2 macrophages. L Negative correlation between the tumor volume and M1/M2 macrophage ratio.









CD206 in HDAC6KD BMA3.1A7 murine M2 macrophages analyzed by flow cytometry. F, Immunoblot analysis of

BMDMs with or without NextA treatment. **H**, Immunoblot analysis of IL6 mediated STAT3 phosphorylation in RAW

BMDM macrophages for M1 (iNOS) and M2 (Arg1) markers. Tubulin is loading control and acetyl-tubulin as

markers for HDAC6 inhibition **G**. Immunofluorescence analysis M2 marker CD206 in naïve and M2 polarized



¹ Georgetown University, Washington, DC² The George Washington University, Washington, DC³ Tampa General Hospital, Tampa, FL ⁴ University of Illinois at Chicago, IL ⁵ Avstera Therapeutics, PA

Fig. 2 | HDAC6 inhibition modulates M2 macrophage phenotype. **A**, Tumor growth chart of syngeneic SM1 murine melanoma tumors in C57BL/6 mice treated with intraperitoneal (IP) injection of 25mg/kg HDAC6 inhibitor, NexturastatA (NextA) or vehicle. **B**, Tumor-associated M1, M2 macrophages and M1/M2 ratio in vehicle and NextA treated mice bearing SM1 murine melanoma tumors as a fraction of F4/80+ Cd80+ and F4/80+ Cd206+ macrophages, respectively. C, Polarization efficiency of murine bone marrow-derived macrophages (BMDMs) to M1 and M2 phenotypes after treatment with HDAC6i, NextA (5µM) determined by flow cytometry. Volcano plot showing fold-change and p-value for the comparisons of vehicle M1 versus M0 (D) and vehicle M2 versus M0 macrophages (E). The significance level was determined by log2 fold |changes ≥ 1.5 (upregulation/increased) or ≤-1.5 (downregulation/decreased) and p-value < 0.05. Differentially expressed genes are depicted in blue and red, where known M1 markers and M2 markers are labeled in figures D and E, respectively. F, Heatmap of known markers for classically activated M1 and M2-like macrophage markers Differential expression for HDAC6 inhibition versus vehicle was performed and M1 markers (in black) and M2 markers (in purple) were represented using the log 2 transformed fold changes relative to vehicle M0. **G**, UMAP analysis of BMDMs at a single cell resolution separated the cells into defined clusters based on their secretome profile. H, Polyfunctionality heatmap of M1 macrophages secreting more than one cytokine/chemokine compared to other phenotypes. I, Polyfunctionality strength index representing M1 and M1+NextA BMDMs secreting more than two proteins. J, 2-D tsne plots of each cell are represented as colored dots where blue indicates low expression and red indicates high expression. Proinflammatory cytokines Tnfa, Ifng, and T-cell recruiting chemokine Ip-10(Cxcl10) are elevated in M1+NextA, whereas growth factors Egf and Pdgf secreted by M2 phenotype are decreased with NextA treatment.

Macrophage ACT in NSG-SGM3 melanoma PDX model B 4000 → Control 3000 Chany ve to MC 4 -old elati Control ACT Fig. 6 | Macrophage ACT with NSG-SGM3 humanized mice harboring melanoma PDX tumor. A, Validation of M1 genes in human monocyte-derived macrophages. **B**, Tumor growth kinetics of melanoma PDX tumors in NSG-SGM3 mice in control and ACT treatment groups. C, Immunophenotyping of tumor infiltrated immune cells by flow cytometry. **D**, Immunohistochemistry analysis of PDX tumors post ACT therapy for M1 macrophages (CD38) and M2 macrophages (CD206). CONCLUSIONS melanoma tumors with vehicle (PBS) or bone marrow-derived M1 macrophages from HDAC6KO mouse. E, Flow cytometry based immunophenotyping of M1, M2 macrophages as a fraction of F4/80+ Cd80+ and F4/80+ Cd206+ Phenotype switch Single cell studies of tumor infiltrated immune cells. Adoptively transferred CD206+ M2 Mc CD38+ M1 Mφ M1 phenotype Tumor arowth CD38+ M1 Mo Fig. 7 | HDAC6 inhibitor treated M1 macrophages improve antitumor immunity with adoptive cell therapy. A, M1 macrophages upon intratumor transplantation are influenced by immunosuppressive and anti-inflammatory cytokines to change towards tumor promoting M2 phenotype. **B**, On the other hand, M1 macrophages treated with HDAC6 inhibitor, Nexturastat A (NextA) are resistant to changing towards M2 phenotype due to deactivation of STAT3 signaling. Therefore, M1+NextA retain M1 phenotype in the TME and improver antitumor immunity by increasing the M1/M2 ratio and infiltration of CD8 effector T-cells. АСТ • For the first time, we demonstrated that HDAC6i treated macrophage ACT is effective as antitumor therapy. . . . • HDAC6 inhibition in macrophages suppressed STAT3 mediated M2 polarization and sustained M1 Iphenotype Transplanted macrophages survived and retained M1 phenotype in the TME as evidenced by lincrease in the M1/M2 ratio in SM1 murine melanoma model Macrophage ACT increase infiltration of effector, effector memory and central memory CD8 T-cells. • Histology and scRNA-seq analyses validated the flow cytometry data of increased M1/M2 ratio. Fig. 5 | Single-cell analyses of CD45 (RNA-seq) and F4/80 (Isoplexis) sorted tumor infiltrated immune cells. Single cell secretome analysis further validated the anti-tumor activity of transplanted macrophages **A**, UMAP cluster analysis of aggregated immune cells by SingleR cell annotation revealing three major immune • Finally, observations in murine melanoma model with macrophage ACT were recapitulated in NSGcell populations. **B**, Percentage of M1 and M2 macrophages in control and M1+NextA treated tumors. **C**, a Heat SGM3 mice bearing human PDX tumors further underscoring the potential of macrophage based ACT as an anti-tumor therapy. by red, and low expression is indicated by white. Not significant expression in that cancer is indicated by black. **D**, FUNDING | single cell secretome. Increased expression of proinflammatory cytokines Tnfa, Ifng, Mif in macrophages isolated from tumors treated with macrophage adoptive cell therapy compared to control. Also, increased secretion of Ip-1 This work has been supported by: NIH R01 R01CA249248 Melanoma Research Foundation Team Award NSF1830941 treated with ACT compared to Control suggesting a lower propensity of tumor macrophages to polarize toward M2 Cancer Research Institute 228514 phneotype. E, Increased percentage of polyfunctional tumor macrophages in ACT group compared to the control McCormick Foundation NIH R41CA217294

• Avstera Therapeutics

growth inimmunocompetent mice. A, Schematic workflow of macrophage adoptive cell therapy (ACT) in SM1 murine melanoma model. **B**, Tumor growth chart of SM1 murine model treated with vehicle (PBS), intratumor implantation of M1 macrophages, NextA (100ug) and M1 macrophages pretreated with NextA (5µM) ex-vivo. C, Survival analysis of mice treated with macrophage adoptive cell therapy. **D**, Tumor growth chart of SM1 murine macrophages respectively and M1/M2 ratio in SM1 murine melanoma tumors treated with adoptive cell therapy. **F**, CD8 T-cells as a fraction of Cd3+ cells. **G**, CD4 T-cells and T-regs as a fraction of Cd3+ cells. **H**, Analysis of SM1 murine melanoma tumors treated with vehicle control, M1 macrophages or HDAC6 inhibitor treated M1 macrophages (M1+NextA) by H&E staining and I, immunohistochemistry staining to detect GFP expressing macrophages, GFP and CD38 expressing macrophages **J**, GFP and CD206 expressing M2 macrophages **K**.



map of M1 gene signature expression in different cancer types in TCGA database. High expression is indicated Tumor associated macrophages were sorted for F4/80 and analyzed on Isoplexis platform for innate immune /Cxcl10 which recruits CD8 T-cells along with immunostimulatory II-5 by tumor macrophages treated with ACT compared to Control (treated with PBS). Finally, immunoregulatory II-10 secretion is reduced by macrophages group suggesting a robust anti-tumor response with HDAC6 inhibitor treated macrophage ACT.

Georgetown | Lombardi

COMPREHENSIVE CANCER CENTER