International Journal of Progressive Sciences and Technologies (IJPSAT)
ISSN: 2509-0119.

http://ijpsat.ijsht-journals.org
Vol. 26 No. 2 May 2021, pp.153-167

Updates of Cancer Immunotherapy Review

Maged Naser[1], Mohamed M. Nasr[2], and Lamia H. Shehata[3]

[1]Mazahmiya Hospital, Ministry of Health, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, Department of ob/gyn,

[2]King Fahd Hospital, Ministry of Health, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, Department of Surgery,

[3]Care National hospital. Department of Radiology

Abstract – In the approach of Immune Checkpoint inhibitors (ICI) and of Chimeric antigen receptor T cells (CAR-T) supportive T-cells, the new outskirts in Oncology are Cancer Immunotherapy as a result of its capacity to give long term clinical advantage in metastatic disease in a several solid and liquid tumor types. It is currently evident that ICI acts by exposing preexisting immune reactions just as by instigating once more reactions against tumor neoantigens. Because of the progress made in genomics innovations and the advancement of bioinformatics, neoantigens address ideal focuses, because of their particular expression in cancer tissue and the possible absence of results. In this review, we talk about the guarantee of preclinical and clinical outcomes with change inferred neoantigen cancer vaccines (NCVs) alongside the current constraints from bioinformatics forecast to assembling a compelling new restorative methodology.

Keywords

•personalized therapeutic cancer vaccines predicated on neoantigens have been demonstrated to be doable, protected and immunogenic in patients with melanoma and glioblastoma.

•Different antibody and conveyance systems are as of now being tried in clinical investigations including patients with different tumor types.

•Deeper assessment of the aggregates, usefulness and long-acting memory capability of antibody incited neoantigen-explicit CD4 + and CD8+T cells is warranted to improve comprehension of their therapeutic progress and streamline inoculation methodologies.

•Neoantigen target disclosure is consistently being progressed to improve the distinguishing proof of immunogenic neoepitopes that can be perceived by CD8+T cells; calculations for the really difficult assignment of anticipating CD4+T cell neoepitopes are likewise arising.

•Innovative antibody conveyance stages and the best planning of combinatorial treatments ought to be additionally investigated to lessen expenses and time deferrals and increment clinical efficiency.

I. BACKGROUND

Despite the fact that cancer treatment has made critical advances somewhat recently, in most of cases it actually neglects to accomplish enduring reactions in patients with metastatic diseases. To clarify the reasons why tumors relapse, the clonal advancement model has been proposed to uncover how intra-tumor heterogeneity (TH) is the reason for arising tumor variations under focused treatments and immunological pressing factors [1].

The utilization of next generation sequencing (NGS) for massive analysis of cancer genomes permits a quantitative estimation of mutational frequencies and genome duplicate varieties. The cancer atlas book is very different, going from a couple to a large number of changes for individual histological tumors [2], hence raising worries on the most proficient method to manage this high intricacy. Mutations are arranged by their part in tumor development. The vast majority of them don't give natural development

Corresponding Author: Maged Naser

advantage and are characterized "traveler changes" while fewer of them, known as "driver transformations", give a development advantage and are accordingly chosen during tumor advancement. Druggable changes, a subset of driver transformations, are characterized by the accessibility of a medication or (the likelihood to create a medication**)** .

Fit for focusing on a particular genomic adjustment. An exceptional examination action has at present been dispatched towards expanding the utilization of such medications to most tumor types which convey a chose change. A large portion of these transformations encode amino acid replacements and subsequently are on the whole known as nonsynonymous changes, bringing about new, cancer explicit protein succession not communicated in typical tissues.

The examination of various districts of a similar tumor uncovered that a few transformations are regularly present (clonal) while others are novel just in certain pieces of it (sub-clonal) adding to tumor heterogeneity (TH). High TH may clarify why starting clinical reactions characterized by the decrease of tumor mass can fall flat at later occasions because of the outgrowth by treatment-resistant cancer subpopulations. It is essential to stretch that under specific pressing factors, tumor advancement can be diverted by the circumstance and kind of malignant growth treatment [3]. In a perfect world, we need to consolidate treatments against as numerous conceivable tumor-explicit focuses to diminish the probability of arising get away from variations. Small molecules inhibitors just as biologics raised against driver/significant transformations are planned against one objective at that point, requiring a long improvement measure, which brings about a restricted accessible armamentarium with a progression of related results. In this situation, the achievability of a multivalent objective treatment made of small molecules or biologics is restricted by practical reasons and total results related with therapeutic medications.

The guarantee of a customized cancer vaccine is in this way to focus on different tumor explicit changes diminishing results by saving typical tissue and holding tumors under immunological memory control for as far as might be feasible. In this review, we portray the mechanisms underlying the basis of immune recognition of tumor cells and the proof of preclinical and clinical examinations in the arising field of mutation derived neoantigen cancer vaccines.

II. T-Cell Immune Reaction Against Self-And Non-Self-Antigens

T-cells are fit to recognize and kill cells introducing on their surface non-self or altered self-antigens, for example peptides derived from intracellular protein cleavage. Proteins are cleaved by the proteasome producing a peptide pool, which is loaded into the endoplasmic reticulum by the transporter associated with antigen processing 1 (TAP-1) system. To be introduced on the cell surface, peptides are additionally managed and complexed with major histocompatibility complex (MHC; otherwise called human leukocyte antigen - HLA - in humans) class I molecules for their presentation to CD8+ T cells. MHC-I is a heterodimer made out of a polymorphic heavy chain and β2-microglobulin. Peptides are likewise introduced by MHC-class II molecules when they are processed through autophagy. MHC-II complexes are exposed to the immune system by antigen presenting cells (APC), like dendritic cells (DC), and upon Interferon-γ (IFN-γ) stimulation additionally by other cell types including epithelial cells [4]. MHC-II presented peptides got from proteins processed in the endocytic pathway are perceived by CD4+ T-cells. The subset of peptides capable for stimulating T-cells are defined antigens.

Many years of research have prompted the recognizable proof of an enormous number of self-tumor antigens got from the processing of normal proteins that have been gathered into three classes: tumor associated antigens (TAAs), tumor specific antigens (TSAs) and cancer testis antigens (CTAs). TAAs are characterized as those antigens overexpressed by cancer cells than normal tissues. TSAs are those explicitly communicated uniquely in cancer cells and not in normal tissues. CTAs are expressed, other than tumor cells, just in germline tissues and trophoblastic cells [5]. These antigens have been the focal point of extreme preclinical and clinical exploration in the attempt to create therapeutic cancer vaccines focusing on these antigens. Tragically, disregarding promising pre-clinical information, a lifetime worth of clinical cancer research with these antigens has prompted the conclusion that breaking immunological tolerance against self-antigens is in reality more difficult than initially expected. Meanwhile, the enormous utilization of heterogeneity at the whole-genome (or omics) in cancer research has uncovered that non-self-antigens got from non-equivalent changes in the coding area of proteins are rather productively perceived by the T-cell specific immune reaction [5,6]. In this review, we won't talk about antigens got from post translational alterations as it has as of late been distributed in a paper [7], however just transformation determined ones that we will refer to as neoantigens.

A several lines of evidence support neoantigens as being significant focuses for immune responses. A higher neoantigen load was surely connected with improved patient survival in a study that evaluated many tumors with 6 distinctive histological types from the Cancer Genome Atlas (*TCGA*) [8]. A relationship between neoantigen load, expanded number of tumors invading

lymphocytes (TILs) and improved survival was seen in colorectal [9] and endometrial cancer [10]. Neoantigen-specific T-cell immunity corresponds with clinical reaction to immunity checkpoint inhibitors (ICI) [11].

Monoclonal antibodies interfering with the programmed cell death protein 1 (PD1) and cytotoxic T lymphocyte antigen 4 (CTLA-4) signaling pathway are viable in numerous solid and hematological malignancies leading the FDA to approve their utilization in a growing list of tumors with various types of histology [12]. The clinical reaction to ICI therapy for sure relates with neoantigen load in patients with melanoma [13], non-small cell cellular cancer in the lungs (NSCLC) [14], and colorectal cancer [15]. In addition, neoantigen-specific T-cell reactions become clear in patients treated with ipilimumab (anti CTLA-4) and with pembrolizumab: anti-Programmed cell death protein 1 (anti PD1). Albeit high neoantigen load is related with good prognosis, the idea of tumor changes is likewise applicable for the treatment dependent on ICI. Significant degrees of TH are related with resistance and tumor escape [16]. A potential clarification of this might be the set number of reactions against neoantigens saw in patients treated with ICI when contrasted with the neoantigen collection introduced by tumor cells [17]. At long last, in a different arrangement of perceptions with supportive T-cell move, patients with solid tumors showed quantifiable T-cell specific resistant reactions against neoantigens [18,19]. On this premise, neoantigen cancer vaccines (NCVs) may address an arising new clinical way to treat cancer.

NCVs in preclinical tumor models NCVs have demonstrated to be viable in various preclinical animal models. The current strategy used to distinguish neoantigens and create NCVs [20] depends on the accompanying three stages: 1) Collection of tumor and normal samples; 2) identification of neoantigens; 3) plan of the immunization. In the mouse framework, nonsynonymous tumor-specific point changes are recognized by examination of exome sequencing information of the tumor cell line of interest concerning the mouse genome. To be immunogenic, a neoantigen has to be expressed. In this way transformations are additionally chosen by the degree of gene expression estimated by RNA-seq. At long last, the expressed neoantigens are positioned by various bioinformatic pipelines as portrayed underneath. The most mainstream techniques to predict binding to MHC are NetMHC-4 and NetMHCpan [21].

The last step is the conveyance of neoantigens in an immunogenic plan that incorporates peptides complexed with adjuvants [20] or with liposome particles [22] or delivered as an RNA vaccine [22]. This work process brings about cancer specific immune reactions that are officious against several tumor types including melanoma, colon malignant growth and sarcoma.

The pipeline for NCV creation in preclinical mouse models can be additionally refined by the introduction of immunoproteomic techniques planned with find neoantigens related with MHC-I as it was appeared in a colon cancer model [23]. The validity of the neoantigens distinguished by this methodology was additionally upheld by the affirmation of the immune reactions in a resulting work where the neoantigens were effectively used with an alternate vaccination stage [24].

NCVs-induced immune reactions are as a rule specific for the neoantigens. The underlying study furnished proof of reactions with some cross-reactivity to wild kind related epitopes measured by *the* enzyme-linked immune absorbent *spot* (*ELISpot)* measure [20]. Despite what is generally expected, resulting papers showed a more stringent particularity for neoantigens likely because of the utilization of more limited peptides for flow cytometry analysis and the work of dextramer staining for the recognition of neoantigen specific T-cells [23–27]. The most surprising proof rising up out of mouse considers is the perception that NCV induces a CD8+ as well as a CD4 + T-cell reaction, and that the CD4+ T-cell reaction is fundamentally responsible for the therapeutic impacts [22]. This perception has at first been depicted utilizing an innovative RNA vaccination stage [28] and was subsequently affirmed by an independent gathering, which used vaccine dependent on peptides [29]. Just one study combined NCV with anti-PD1 treatment [29]. This study proposes an additive substance impact of NCVs and immunotherapy on tumor growth inhibition. Eminently, one report didn't show antitumor action in an ovarian cancer model in spite of the acceptance of a significant T-cell specific reaction against neoantigens [30]. The authors featured the limited number of changes in this tumor type and the absence of high-affinity neoantigens, which might be detrimental for effective NCV approach. A new paper investigated a head and neck cancer model giving additional proof that NCV can prevent tumor development [31].

While these underlying studies portraying distinctive immunization stages and detection frameworks reliably support NCVs as a promising methodology, a few inquiries actually stay unanswered. The first is that it isn't certain whether the equivalent neoantigen arrangements are similarly successful utilizing distinctive immunization strategies. It merits referencing that expectation of immunogenicity is generally founded on peptide immunizations that might be not instructive for other inoculation stages. Immunodominant epitopes may rank distinctively or even may not be affirmed in a setting subordinate way. Our experience and

perceptions from different gatherings in the field recommends that further exploration is expected to decide what vaccination technologies mean for the nature of the immune reaction. It is valuable to produce an exhaustive neoantigen information base that makes into account every one of the strides for the NCVs cycle including the conveyance technique and the subsequent resistant reactions to improve expectation models. A subsequent inquiry concerns the likely cross-reactivity of neoantigens with wild-type arrangements. For this situation immunological intensity might be restricted by central and peripheral tolerance prompting an incapable T-cell reaction against the tumor. This class of neoantigens may, along these lines, be more like the old style TAAs and may bring about lower immunogenicity. Moreover, vaccination with this gathering of neoantigens may cause side effects against normal tissues, especially when a vaccine could contain a few cross-reacting neoantigens, which can prompt cumulative side effects. To be in a safe side we propose to exclude them from the design of an NCV.

III. NCVs IN CLINICAL PRELIMINARIES

The efficacy of focusing on tumor-specific non-self-antigens has been exhibited on account of cervical cancer driven by human papilloma virus (HPV) [32,33]. The immunogenicity of HPV is all around recorded by prophylactic HPV vaccination, demonstrated to be successful in preventing cervical cancer in young adolescents. For the therapeutic methodology the vaccine needs to focus on an alternate gathering of viral proteins, specifically the oncogenic E6 and E7. A plasmid DNA encoding HPV oncogenic proteins was managed related to electroporation as the conveyance strategy to instigate CD8+ effector T-cells. Focusing on key viral proteins E6/E7 brought about decrease or adjustment of cervical intraepithelial neoplasia (CIN) 2/3 in half of patients [33] and in specific immune reactions against the HPV targets [34]. Interestingly, a comparable vaccine immunology delivering a combination protein made of a self-TAA melded to an immunogenic bacterial antigen resulted in immune reactions estimated uniquely against the non-self-part of the antigen, further supporting that non-self-antigens are immunogenic even in possibly immunocompromised patients with high tumor burden [35].

The plan of mutation tumor-specific NCVs in human clinical preliminaries reiterates the mouse protocol for certain extra steps. Tumor biopsy analysis are indeed considerably more complex than cancer cell lines (as announced in mouse examines). For certain tumors, the low measure of tumor material requires an expanded sequencing profundity to uncover the presence of uncommon malignancy changes. Reference normal tissue, generally accessible as blood tests, serves not exclusively to contrast tumor genome with the point with recognize somatic mutations but in addition to set up the individual HLA. The profoundly polymorphic nature of the HLA locus represents an issue for the forecast of neoantigens, since restricted data is accessible for uncommon HLA. Albeit the forecast pipeline requires extra bioinformatic work, numerous apparatuses are as of now accessible on the web and also clinical preliminaries with cancer specific neoantigens have been accounted for in melanoma patients utilizing different vaccination methodologies [36–38]. Three HLA-A2.1 positive melanoma patients, who had been pretreated with ipilimumab, were immunized with Dendritic cells (DC) stacked with peptides enveloping the neoantigen changes [36]. Anticipated neoantigens were additionally chosen by a limiting test utilizing HLA-A2.1 expressing T2 cells and seven approved peptides were utilized for every persistent. Immune reactions were recognized in all patients albeit the examine required an in vitro growth of T cells with interleukin-2 (IL-2). The vaccine extended T-cells against previous predominant epitopes and induced new reactions, which were absent before treatment [37].

Six native melanoma patients were immunized with a pool of engineered long peptides + adjuvant. Up to 20 neoantigens were infused in 4 distinct locales upon detailing with poly-dIdC. Generally speaking, the authors affirmed specific T-cell reactions for 24 out of 28 neoantigens. The greater part of the reactions was intervened by CD4+ T-cells, anyway none of the neoantigen-specific T-cells recognized culture tumor cells in four out of six patients. The two patients with stage IV M1b relapsed after the last vaccination and were treated with against PD1. Both showed a clinical reaction, albeit the reaction rate in this subgroup of patients treated with ICI is expected to be just 61%. Upon ICI treatment, new CD4 and CD8 reactions against neoantigens were noticed. In a third report [38], the vaccination with RNA was effective in initiating strong neoantigen-specific CD4 and CD8 reactions in 13 melanoma patients in accordance with past mouse evidence from a similar research group [22]. Eight patients remained tumor free for the subsequent period (12/24 months) while five patients relapsed during immune treatment. One patient was treated with a blend of NCV and ICI, with a good reaction. A second patient didn't react to NCVs/ICI and died. In this persistent, the examination of recurring metastasis showed the biallelic deficiency of β2 microglobulin as the clarification for the absence of tumor reaction. The dominating CD4 reaction was additionally apparent for the RNA based vaccination notwithstanding a pertinent level of twofold sure CD4 and CD8 neoantigens.

These outcomes taken together recommend that NCVs may end up being a reasonable clinical methodology for exceptionally heterogeneous tumors giving the best equilibrium/proportion between focusing on tumors (specificity) while saving normal tissue (toxicity). Notwithstanding, corroborative information in bigger examinations are expected to affirm. Surely, a few dynamic clinical preliminaries with NCVs are continuous with various vaccination advancements and focusing on various cancers Bioinformatic strategies for neoantigen prediction One of the main issues for NCVs improvement is the correct prediction of neoantigens. A several bioinformatic tools have been planned to call putative neoantigens from genomic information. The expanding interest in this matter is demonstrated by the way that 5 out of 7 freely accessible pipelines were introduced last year.

Neoantigen prediction includes a progression of computational advances that can be induced with specific test methods. It is thus, that bioinformaticians in previous years have focused on making particular programming for specific sub-undertakings (for example HLA composing from groupings just as allele specific expression tools, [39–42], or fit-for all conditions with complex pipelines that address a several, or even all.

The commonplace strides of a neoantigen extraction technique begins with the calculation of allele-specific coverage. The algorithms regularly utilize adjusted succession information from all out RNA-seq and a list of variations from exome/genome sequencing to construe the overall wild type/mutant expression levels at base/change level of goal. With this yield it is feasible to compute the transformed protein arrangement through committed programming for the task of the change to the right protein. The anticipated epitopes are then prepared with forecast strategies that rank the epitopes for binding affinity. This straightforward three stage measure (allele coverage/sequence translation in/binding prediction contains a several caveats admonitions that can impede the entire interaction by calling false positives (nonexistent epitopes) or false negatives (missed epitopes).

In the translation process, it is clearly of absolute significance to pick the correct record isoform to translate. This progression isn't so clear when the mutant allele coverage is computed at the base level, for example it is needed to comprehend which of the covering communicated isoforms harbor that change. In the event that the calculation of the specific record results to be a cycle too cumbersome, a descent tradeoff is to pick the predominant record for the putative neoantigen identification since it has been shown that most profoundly expressed genes have one prevailing isoform [43].

Another issue identified with record identification is the overall plenitude of expression, inferable from the standardized coverage, since a sensible decision would be not to incorporate epitopes that are ineffectively expressed. The threshold for "low abundance expression" involves discussion in the bioinformatic community engaged with RNA-seq data analysis. Since an expression level of FPKM (Fragments Per Kilobase of record per Million mapped reads) somewhere in the range of 1 and 5 addresses around 1 record copy for every cell, the most sensible method of continuing is dispensing with all epitopes producing from isoforms of FPKM < 5. At the base level, since there is no acknowledged edge for the Reads Per Million (RPM) expression level of the actual change. Consequently, one chance might be to stick to the record FPKM channel and to a high relative, mutant/wild (MUT/WT) proportion.

The authors have executed a basic strategy called NaRciSo, to separate a list of expressed epitopes from paired Exome and RNA-seq data or independent RNA-seq. One of its modules is intended to predict neoantigens without exome sequencing data, processing an RNA-Variant calling format (RNA VCF) from RNA-seq sequence data and bringing it to the allele counter package.

The prediction tools that process from sequence reads to neoantigen calls don't attempt to compute the likelihood of trimming from the endoplasmic reticulum (ER) aminopeptidases ERAP1 (proteasomal cleavage) and peptide handling from (Transporter associated with antigen processing, TAP): TAP1/TAP2, regardless of whether some demonstrating work has been done in the past [44–47]. A few of remarkable special cases do exist yet they start the analysis from preprocessed FASTA records, including likewise an expectation strategy for T cell reactivity. It is sensible to imagine that the joining of these extra modules would expand the additional modules regarding specificity.

The effective prediction of immunogenicity can profit by some additional modeling on the quality of the neoantigen. In this unique circumstance, an underlying theory was planned in mice where successful neoantigen antibodies depended on a neoantigen with binding affinity partiality than the relating WT epitope as a method for anticipating NetMHC [25]. This element may save neoantigens (somatic mutations) from immunological tolerance, which erases self-reactive T-cells centrally or in periphery. A several papers have investigated the immune responses against neoantigens in patients treated with ICI supplied with characterized highlights that better relate with clinical results. Common sequence themes comparative/homolog to viral epitopes were recognized in neoantigens associating with good prognosis [48]. As per this theory, two bioinformatic papers proposed a "neoantigen fitness

model" to rank and choose the predominant clone-specific neoantigen [49,50]. This fitness model is computed by considering two main factors: the likelihood of MHC presentation and T-cell recognition. The first factor is gotten from the neoantigen binding affinity, with a coordinated with wild kind smoothing factor, as there is in reality a negligible "distance" needed from the wild type counterpart. The second factor is processed from the neoantigen similarity with a data base of known epitopes. Striking test proof showed viable immunological reaction against the anticipated neoantigens and their viral homolog however not against the neoantigen comparing self-peptide [49]. These information unequivocally recommend that nature of neoantigens may have an effect likewise on the plan of a compelling NCV, despite the fact that it stays to be explored.

All in all, an effective neoantigen expectation pipeline ought to include: identification of mutations at DNA level, expression from RNA-seq and binding prediction to the MHC of the transporter's HLA and final modeling of neoantigen.

IV. Recent Developments in Cancer Vaccine Platforms

4.1 Nanoparticles as vaccine delivery systems

Nanoparticle-based malignancy vaccines and adjuvants have been utilized to target cancers through alteration of surface properties and additionally arrangement to drag out bioavailability, protect antigens from degradation, and control antigen release [50]. Nanoparticles tried incorporate polymeric nanoparticles, liposomes, micelles, carbon nanotubes, mesoporous silica nanoparticles, gold nanoparticles, and virus nanoparticles, which have been evaluated in cancer types like melanoma, NSCLC, breast, prostate, and cervical [50]. Be that as it may, further investigations are expected to address concerns of poor reproducibility with uniform size and shape, aggregation, instability, and quick clearance before widespread clinical use [50]. Until now, only one nanoparticle vaccine, tecemotide (L-BLP25), a MUC1 antigen-specific immunization, has arrived at clinical preliminary. In a stage III preliminary of tecemotide contrasted to placebo treatment for stage III NSCLC no distinction in, overall survival (OS) was discovered [51]. Also, a stage II preliminary in early breast cancer exhibited a good safety profile, however showed no significant difference in residual cancer burden or pathologic complete response with tecemotide contrasted with standard of care [52].

4.2 Peptide-based vaccines

Synthetic long peptide (SLP) immunotherapeutics have been created, comprising of profoundly immunogenic long peptides intended to stay away from central tolerance systems by proficiently delivering antigens to DCs, initiating CD4þ and CD8þ T-cell reactions [53]. In a stage II preliminary, a SLP immunization, ISA101, joined with the anti- PD-1 immune checkpoint antibody, nivolumab, was discovered to be all around tolerated in patients with HPV-16–positive cancer (n ¼ 24), with additive effects noticed comparative with nivolumab monotherapy [54]. Also, a stage I/II investigation of ISA101 in combination with standard-of-care chemotherapy in patients with HPV-16–positive cervical cancer (n ¼ 77) showed a longer OS in patients who expressed a more than median immunization incited HPV-16–specific T-cell reaction [55].

(SurVaxM) is a vaccine containing a SLP mimic intended to animate an immune reaction targeting on survivin, a TSA which is exceptionally expressed in glioblastomas, among different cancer types [56,57]. In a stage II, patients with recently diagnosed glioblastoma who got SurVaxM in the adjuvant setting exhibited an altogether longer 12 months OS of 93.4% from finding, contrasted and 65% tolerance from historic investigations [58,59]. interestingly, SurVaxM is currently being researched in a stage I investigation of patients with survivin-positive neuroendocrine tumors [60].

An innovation technology, T-win, was created to permit recognizable proof, plan, and approval of immune modulatory peptide-based vaccine candidate targeting on the TME [61]. T-win vaccines draw in and initiate a subset of naturally occurring proinflammatory T cells specific for immune inhibitory molecules, for instance, indoleamine 2,3 dehydrogenase (IDO), PD-ligand 1 (L1), PD-L2, arginase, or CCL22 [62,63]. These T cells were at first named "antiregulatory T cells" ("ant- Tregs") for their particularity against cells with immunoregulatory capacities. These autoreactive T cells, found in high frequencies in patients with cancer, recognize and kill both tumor cells and normal immune cells that express their related targets [64,65], just as aid extension of effector T cells against viral and tumor antigens in vitro [64,66]. Significantly, both CD4þ and CD8þ T cells likewise add to the immunoregulatory function of anti- Tregs through the emission of proinflammatory cytokines [67,68]. In this manner, these T cells help the adaptive immune reaction either through their contribution in the immediate end of the immunosuppressive cells or through the discharge of proinflammatory cytokines [69,70]. In preclinical models, T-win immunization has prompted an antitumor reaction and synergizes with against PD-1 antibody treatment [71]. In mice treated with a T-win antibody against IDO, a generous decrease of IDOþ immune suppressor cells in the TME was noticed, joined by an expanded development of invading tumor-specific T cells

[71]. Taken together, proof proposes that T-win immunization can prompt the development of T cells that neutralize and adjust the insusceptible suppressive environment inside TME, considering proficient antitumor reactions to occur. Since T-win antibodies expect to grow inborn/prior T cells in patients with cancer, T-win immunizations don't have to "break tolerance" similarly as cancer immunizations focusing on TAAs [61].

The significant test of the T-win innovation is to enact the most powerful anti- Treg immune reaction without prompting autoimmunity and toxicity. Be that as it may, course of a quantifiable number of such specific T cells in patients with cancer has been depicted without autoimmunity; subsequently, the danger of potential long-term toxicity on account of vaccine prompted immune system mechanisms seems, by all accounts, to be negligible, outlined in murine in vivo considers and clinical preliminaries to date [61].

4.3 Customized immunization methodologies

With the accessibility of the next generation sequencing, customized neoantigen-based immunotherapies are arising, emerging information from a patient's tumor biopsy are analyzed to predict which mutations will produce tumor-specific neoantigens liable to be introduced by MHC molecules on the tumor cell surface around there. Most efforts center around recognizing antigen arrangements that produce epitopes fitting the notch of a patient's MHC-I molecules. Albeit customized cancer vaccines have shown encouraging results [72,73], neoepitope prediction algorithms return large number of "candidates," of which not very many trigger genuine antitumor reactions [74]. To eliminate the tumor, it is probably going to be important to target clonal or truncal neoantigens present in each cancer cell. Focusing on just sub clonal or branch transformations, present in a subset of cells, won't dispose of the tumor and can make resistance to treatment [75]. interestingly, some have suggested that neoantigens may have inhibitory properties that empower tumors to evade immune recognition.

EDGE is an artificial intelligence stage used to explore sequence information from tumor biopsies and distinguish tumor-specific neoantigens. Rock 001 is a customized cancer immunization dependent on individual patients' anticipated neoantigens, focusing on a tape of 20 patient-and tumor-specific neoantigens distinguished by EDGE. A continuous stage I/II clinical examination is assessing GRANITE-001 in mix with CPIs for solid tumor treatment. Additionally, SLATE is an immunotherapy aimed at the best 20 tumor-specific neoantigens shared by a subset of patients, recognized by EDGE. For these patients, an "off-the-shelf" treatment that works across numerous tumor types might be proper.

A progressing stage I study is assessing SLATE in combination with CPIs for solid tumor treatment. Both GRANITE-001 and SLATE utilize a preparing adenoviral vector and a self-enhancing RNA vector to convey the neoantigen tape in a repeated boost arrangement [76].

ATLAS book is another innovation stage that utilizes patient's T-cell immune reaction apparatus to distinguish ideal patient-and tumor specific neoantigens [76]. By including neoantigens to which patients have had preconformed reactions in vitro, customized disease antibodies are made that the patients' immune system are now prepared for. GEN-009 is being researched in a stage I/IIa preliminary for different tumor types (GEN-009-101), with positive starting outcomes, and GEN-011 is in preclinical turn of events [77,78].

A RECON Bioinformatics Engine for prediction and recognizable proof of theoretically relevant neoantigen targets was utilized to research cancer vaccine focusing on both patient-and tumor-specific and shared neoantigens (present on a similar tumor type in various patients). NEO-PV-01, a customized neoantigen immunization, specially crafted based on interesting mutational fingerprints of individual patients, is being scrutinized in various stage Ib clinical preliminaries. NEO-SV-01, an "off-the-shelf" multivalent neoantigen antibody for therapy of a genetically characterized subset of chemical receptor–positive breast cancer, is in preclinical turn of events [76].

Several candidate mRNA-based cancer vaccines are being assessed in stage I preliminaries, in light of a "FixVac" stage (fixed mix of shared cancer antigens) [79]. These remember BNT111 for metastatic melanoma [80], BNT113 in HPV-positive head and neck malignancies, and BNT114 in triple-negative breast cancer. Another mRNA-based cancer immunization competitor, RO7198457 (BNT122), in light of an individualized Neoantigen Specific Immunotherapy (iNeST) stage, is being explored in mix with pembrolizumab for melanoma (stage II), alone and with atezolizumab for solid tumors (stage I) [81, 82], and with atezolizumab for NSCLC (stage II).

Extra customized mRNA-based malignant growth antibodies in stage I testing incorporate [87]: mRNA-4157 alone or joined with pembrolizumab in solid tumors [50].

An immunization encoding the four most regular KRAS changes, mRNA-5671, is additionally in stage I testing for patients with KRAS-freak NSCLC, colorectal malignant growth, or pancreatic adenocarcinoma [83].

Reaction to immunotherapy regularly relates with high tumor transformation load [84] and ensuing higher quantities of anticipated neoantigens. Researches attempting to distinguish clinically important neoantigens in malignancies of moderate or low mutational weight, for instance, head and neck squamous cell carcinoma (HNSCC). Approved neoantigens will be additionally examined in HNSCC tumor models [85]. They additionally plan to investigate the part of T-cell weariness in mouse and human HNSCC, with the end goal of having the option to balance this and revive T cells.

Hilf and associates are exploring more viable immunotherapies for low mutational burden tumors, by incorporating exceptionally individualized inoculations with unmutated antigens and tumor neoepitopes. A stage I preliminary is researching novel patient-customized vaccines, APVAC1 ("off the shelf" glioblastoma-related peptides) and actively personalized vaccine2 (APVAC2) again incorporated patient-specific glioblastoma associated tumor-changed peptides), in glioblastoma [86].

V. Conclusion

Over the most current couple of years, NCVs have entered the discipline of Immune remedy as a consequence elevating tremendous assumptions due to the fact of the underlying results in preclinical reviews and all the extra currently in scientific investigations. All matters considered, progresses in recognizing neoantigens just as an extra interior and out comprehension of most cancers' resistance structures [87–93] will increase the scope of tumor kinds that are certified for NCVs treatment. In mild of the preclinical and medical information, the inquiry set ahead is: which is the most suitable population for NCVs in the contemporary putting off encouraged drugs? It is clear that low (TH-) then again preceding immunity, as verified with the aid of the presence of TILs (TILs+), simply as excessive mutational burden, characterizes the most responsive population to ICI. Conversely, the NCVs method may be extra possible in treating most cancers with variants addressed at a low allele recurrence that react much less to ICI, induction of a higher series of sickness particular T-cells through adopting the NCVs strategy can also immediate a foremost inclusion of TH.

In the medical world, for example, these highlights apprehend infinite cell breakdown in the lungs sufferers that do not react to pembrolizumab in first or 2nd line therapy [94]. Moreover, in the medical setting, it has been considered that ICI therapy rescues a predetermined range of neoantigens-specific T-cells that can be prolonged in aggregate with NCVs [37, 38]. Nonetheless, for each ICI and NCV approaches, a purposeful HLA presentation equipment is needed, as it is exact for nothing to deal with an affected person with ICI if the β2 microglobulin gene is converted [95]. Induction of a wonderful T-cell response may be insufficient due to the fact of tumor avoidance approaches different than PD1 or Cytotoxic T lymphocyte antigen 4(CTLA-4).

Finally, NCVs pose tremendous manufacturing, regulatory and advertising issues. The authorization manner for a new drug is generally based totally on luxurious giant scale randomized scientific trials. This is now not possible with individualized cures such as

NCVs. Pleasingly, this paradigm is altering additionally thanks to the success of CAR-T remedies where, for instance in the case of Tisagenlecelucel, FDA approval used to be received primarily based on the (striking) outcomes of a registration trial involving solely sixty-three patients. Individualized treatment plans such as CAR-T have additionally set the floor for very excessive costs. Are NCVs anticipated observe the equal paradigm? And if so, how sustainable are the growing charges of customized treatments in financially "stressed "health systems? These are all necessary questions that want to be addressed to permit our sufferers get right of entry to innovation.

Abbreviations

APC: Antigen presenting cells.

APVAC: the actively personalized vaccination (APVAC)in newly diagnosed glioblastoma (GB) patients;

CAR-T: Chimeric antigen receptor T cells;

CPI: Checkpoint Inhibitors;

CTAG1A also known as NY-ESO-1: Cancer testis antigen;

CTAs: Cancer testis antigens;

CTLA-4: Cytotoxic T lymphocyte antigen 4;

DC: Dendritic cells;

ELISpot: *the* enzyme-linked immune absorbent *spot ELISpot;*

ERAP1: The endoplasmic reticulum (ER) aminopeptidases ERAP1;

FPKM: Fragments Per Kilobase of transcript per Million mapped reads; HBV: Hepatitis B virus; HER2: Epidermal growth factor receptor 2;

HLA: Human leukocyte antigen;

HPV: Human papillomavirus;

ICI: Immune check point inhibitors;

IDO: indoleamine 2,3 dehydrogenase;

IFN-γ: Interferon-γ;

KRAS: A gene that makes a protein that is involved in cell signaling pathways that control cell growth, cell maturation, and cell death;

MHC: Major histocompatibility complex

(MUT/WT): one of two alleles carry mutation; disease is not clinically expressed;

NCV: Neoantigen cancer vaccine;

NGS: Next generation sequencing;

NSCLC: Non-small-cell lung cancer;

omics: heterogeneity at the whole-genome;

OS: The length of time from either the date of diagnosis or the start of treatment for a disease,

(overall survival);

PAP-GMCSF: Granulocyte-macrophage colony-stimulating factor;

PD1: Programmed cell death protein 1;

RPM: Reads per Million mapped reads;

SLP: stomatin like protein;

TAAs: Tumor associated antigens;

TAP1: Transporter associated with antigen processing 1 (TAP1) gene codes for a transporter protein, which is responsible for tumor antigen presentation in the MHC I or HLA complex;

TCGA: The *Cancer* Genome Atlas (*TCGA*) is a landmark *cancer* genomics program;

TCR: T cell receptor;

TERT: Human telomerase reverse transcriptase;

TH: Tumor heterogeneity;

TILs: Tumor infiltrating lymphocytes;

TME: Tumor Microenvironment;

TSAs: Tumor specific antigens;

VCF: Variant calling format.

Conflict Of Interest

All authors declare no conflicts of interest.

Author's Contribution

Authors have equally participated and shared every item of the work.

References

[1] Anagnostou, Valsamo, et al. "Evolution of neoantigen landscape during immune checkpoint blockade in non–small cell lung cancer." *Cancer discovery* 7.3 (2017): 264-276.

[2] Alexandrov, Ludmil B., et al. "Signatures of mutational processes in human cancer." *Nature* 500.7463 (2013): 415-421.

[3] Zhao, Boyang, et al. "Exploiting temporal collateral sensitivity in tumor clonal evolution." *Cell* 165.1 (2016): 234-246.

[4] Seliger, Barbara, Matthias Kloor, and Soldano Ferrone. "HLA class II antigen-processing pathway in tumors: molecular defects and clinical relevance." *Oncoimmunology* 6.2 (2017): e1171447.

[5] Hu, Zhuting, Patrick A. Ott, and Catherine J. Wu. "Towards personalized, tumor-specific, therapeutic vaccines for cancer." *Nature Reviews Immunology* 18.3 (2018): 168.

[6] Yarchoan, Mark, et al. "Targeting neoantigens to augment antitumor immunity." *Nature Reviews Cancer* 17.4 (2017): 209.

[7] Aurisicchio, Luigi, et al. "The perfect personalized cancer therapy: cancer vaccines against neoantigens." *Journal of Experimental & Clinical Cancer Research* 37.1 (2018): 1-10.

[8] Brown, Scott D., et al. "Neo-antigens predicted by tumor genome meta-analysis correlate with increased patient survival." *Genome research* 24.5 (2014): 743-750.

[9] Vickers, Neil J. "Animal communication: when I'm calling you, will you answer too?" *Current biology* 27.14 (2017): R713-R715.

[10] Howitt, Brooke E., et al. "Association of polymerase e–mutated and microsatellite-instable endometrial cancers with neoantigen load, number of tumor-infiltrating lymphocytes, and expression of PD-1 and PD-L1." *JAMA oncology* 1.9 (2015): 1319-1323.

[11] Tran, Eric, Paul F. Robbins, and Steven A. Rosenberg. "'Final common pathway' of human cancer immunotherapy: targeting random somatic mutations." *Nature immunology* 18.3 (2017): 255-262.

[12] Li, Li, et al. "Autoimmune diabetes and thyroiditis complicating treatment with nivolumab." *Case Reports in Oncology* 10.1 (2017): 230-234.

[13] Liu, David, et al. "Integrative molecular and clinical modeling of clinical outcomes to PD1 blockade in patients with metastatic melanoma." *Nature medicine* 25.12 (2019): 1916-1927.

[14] Rizvi, Naiyer A., et al. "Mutational landscape determines sensitivity to PD-1 blockade in non–small cell lung cancer." *Science* 348.6230 (2015): 124-128.

[15] Le, Dung T., et al. "Mismatch repair deficiency predicts response of solid tumors to PD-1 blockade." *Science* 357.6349 (2017): 409-413.

[16] McGranahan, Nicholas, et al. "Clonal neoantigens elicit T cell immunoreactivity and sensitivity to immune checkpoint blockade." *Science* 351.6280 (2016): 1463-1469.

[17] Strønen, Erlend, et al. "Targeting of cancer neoantigens with donor-derived T cell receptor repertoires." *Science* 352.6291 (2016): 1337-1341.

[18] Tran, Eric, et al. "Cancer immunotherapy based on mutation-specific CD4+ T cells in a patient with epithelial cancer." *Science*344.6184 (2014): 641-645.

[19] Robbins, Paul F., et al. "Mining exomic sequencing data to identify mutated antigens recognized by adoptively transferred tumor-reactive T cells." *Nature medicine* 19.6 (2013): 747.

[20] Boegel, Sebastian, et al. "HLA typing from RNA-Seq sequence reads." *Genome medicine* 4.12 (2013): 1-12.

[21] Liu, X. Shirley, and Elaine R. Mardis. "Applications of immunogenomics to cancer." *Cell* 168.4 (2017): 600-612.

[22] Kreiter, Sebastian, et al. "Mutant MHC class II epitopes drive therapeutic immune responses to cancer." *Nature* 520.7549 (2015): 692-696.

[23] Yadav, Mahesh, et al. "Predicting immunogenic tumor mutations by combining mass spectrometry and exome sequencing." *Nature* 515.7528 (2014): 572-576.

[24] Kuai, Rui, et al. "Designer vaccine nano discs for personalized cancer immunotherapy." *Nature materials* 16.4 (2017): 489-496.

[25] Duan, Fei, et al. "Genomic and bioinformatic profiling of mutational neoepitopes reveals new rules to predict anticancer immunogenicity." *Journal of Experimental Medicine* 211.11 (2014): 2231-2248.

[26] Gubin, Matthew M., et al. "Checkpoint blockade cancer immunotherapy targets tumor-specific mutant antigens." *Nature*515.7528 (2014): 577-581.

[27] Schumacher, Theresa, et al. "A vaccine targeting mutant IDH1 induces antitumor immunity." *Nature* 512.7514 (2014): 324-327.

[28] Kranz, Lena M., et al. "Systemic RNA delivery to dendritic cells exploits antiviral defense for cancer immunotherapy." *Nature*534.7607 (2016): 396-401.

[29] Kranz, Lena M., et al. "Systemic RNA delivery to dendritic cells exploits antiviral defense for cancer immunotherapy." *Nature*534.7607 (2016): 396-401.

[30] Martin, Spencer D., et al. "Low mutation burden in ovarian cancer may limit the utility of neoantigen-targeted vaccines." *PloS one* 11.5 (2016): e0155189.

[31] Zolkind, Paul, et al. "Cancer immunogenomic approach to neoantigen discovery in a checkpoint blockade responsive murine model of oral cavity squamous cell carcinoma." *Oncotarget* 9.3 (2018): 4109.

[32] Kim, Tae Jin, et al. "Clearance of persistent HPV infection and cervical lesion by therapeutic DNA vaccine in CIN3 patients." *Nature communications* 5.1 (2014): 1-14.

[33] Trimble, Cornelia L., et al. "Safety, efficacy, and immunogenicity of VGX-3100, a therapeutic synthetic DNA vaccine targeting human papillomavirus 16 and 18 E6 and E7 proteins for cervical intraepithelial neoplasia 2/3: a randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled phase 2b trial." *The Lancet* 386.10008 (2015): 2078-2088.

[34] Morrow, Matthew P., et al. "Clinical and immunologic biomarkers for histologic regression of high-grade cervical dysplasia and clearance of HPV16 and HPV18 after immunotherapy." *Clinical Cancer Research* 24.2 (2018): 276-294.

[35] Diaz, Claudia Marcela, et al. "Phase 1 studies of the safety and immunogenicity of electroporated HER2/CEA DNA vaccine followed by adenoviral boost immunization in patients with solid tumors." *Journal of translational medicine* 11.1 (2013): 1-13.

[36] Guo, Yugang, Kewen Lei, and Li Tang. "Neoantigen vaccine delivery for personalized anticancer immunotherapy." *Frontiers in immunology* 9 (2018): 1499.

[37] Ott, Patrick A., et al. "An immunogenic personal neoantigen vaccine for patients with melanoma." *Nature* 547.7662 (2017): 217-221.

[38] Sahin, Ugur, et al. "Personalized RNA mutanome vaccines mobilize poly-specific therapeutic immunity against cancer." *Nature* 547.7662 (2017): 222-226.

[39] Castel, Stephane E., et al. "Tools and best practices for data processing in allelic expression analysis." *Genome biology* 16.1 (2015): 1-12.

[40] Boegel, Sebastian, et al. "HLA typing from RNA-Seq sequence reads." *Genome medicine* 4.12 (2013): 1-12.

[41] Warren, René L., et al. "Derivation of HLA types from shotgun sequence datasets." *Genome medicine* 4.12 (2012): 1-8.

[42] Shukla, Sachet A., et al. "Comprehensive analysis of cancer-associated somatic mutations in class I HLA genes." *Nature biotechnology* 33.11 (2015): 1152-1158.

[43] Tang, Shaojun, and Subha Madhavan. "neoantigenR: An annotation-based pipeline for tumor neoantigen identification from sequencing data." *bioRxiv* (2017): 171843.

[44] Bhasin, Manoj, and G. P. S. Raghava. "Analysis and prediction of affinity of TAP binding peptides using cascade SVM." *Protein Science* 13.3 (2004): 596-607.

[45] Hearn, Arron, Ian A. York, and Kenneth L. Rock. "The specificity of trimming of MHC class I-presented peptides in the endoplasmic reticulum." *The Journal of Immunology* 183.9 (2009): 5526-5536.

[46] Zhang, Guang Lan, et al. "PRED TAP: a system for prediction of peptide binding to the human transporter associated with antigen processing." *Immunome research* 2.1 (2006): 1-12.

[47] Chen, Hanna, et al. "ERAP1-ERAP2 dimers trim MHC I-bound precursor peptides; implications for understanding peptide editing." *Scientific reports* 6.1 (2016): 1-13.

[48] Snyder, Alexandra, et al. "Genetic basis for clinical response to CTLA-4 blockade in melanoma." *New England Journal of Medicine* 371.23 (2014): 2189-2199.

[49] Balachandran, Vinod P., et al. "Identification of unique neoantigen qualities in long-term survivors of pancreatic cancer." *Nature* 551.7681 (2017): 512-516.

[50] Burris, Howard A., et al. "A phase I multicenter study to assess the safety, tolerability, and immunogenicity of mRNA-4157 alone in patients with resected solid tumors and in combination with pembrolizumab in patients with unresectable solid tumors." (2019): 2523-2523.

[51] Butts, Charles, et al. "Tecemotide (L-BLP25) versus placebo after chemoradiotherapy for stage III non-small-cell lung cancer (START): a randomized, double-blind, phase 3 trial." *The lancet oncology* 15.1 (2014): 59-68.

[52] Singer, Christian F., et al. "Efficacy and safety of the therapeutic cancer vaccine tecemotide (L-BLP25) in early breast cancer: Results from a prospective, randomized, neoadjuvant phase II study (ABCSG 34)." *European Journal of Cancer* 132 (2020): 43-52.

[53] Melief, Cornelis JM, et al. "Therapeutic cancer vaccines." *The Journal of clinical investigation* 125.9 (2015): 3401-3412.

[54] Massarelli, Erminia, et al. "Combining immune checkpoint blockade and tumor-specific vaccine for patients with incurable human papillomavirus 16–related cancer: a phase 2 clinical trial." *JAMA oncology* 5.1 (2019): 67-73.

[55] Melief, Cornelis JM, et al. "Strong vaccine responses during chemotherapy are associated with prolonged cancer survival." *Science translational medicine* 12.535 (2020).

[56] Fenstermaker, Robert A., et al. "Survivin monoclonal antibodies detect survivin cell surface expression and inhibit tumor growth in vivo." *Clinical Cancer Research* 24.11 (2018): 2642-2652. [57]- Fenstermaker, Robert A., et al. "Clinical study of a survivin long peptide vaccine (SurVaxM) in patients with recurrent malignant glioma." *Cancer Immunology, Immunotherapy* 65.11 (2016): 1339-1352.

[57] Ahluwalia, Manmeet Singh, et al. "SurVaxM with standard therapy in newly diagnosed glioblastoma: Phase II trial update." *J Clin Oncol* 37. suppl 15 (2019): 2016.

[58] Ostrom, Quinn T., et al. "Adult glioma incidence and survival by race or ethnicity in the United States from 2000 to 2014." *JAMA oncology* 4.9 (2018): 1254-1262.

[59] Hanif, Ahmad, et al. "Exploring the role of survivin in neuroendocrine neoplasms." *Oncotarget* 11.23 (2020): 2246.

[60] Andersen, Mads Hald. "The T-win® technology: immune-modulating vaccines." *Seminars in immunopathology*. Vol. 41. No. 1. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2019.

[61] Andersen, Mads Hald. "Anti-regulatory T cells." *Seminars in immunopathology*. Vol. 39. No. 3. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2017.

[62] Pedersen, Ayako Wakatsuki, et al. "Immunoregulatory antigens-novel targets for cancer immunotherapy." *Chinese clinical oncology* 7.2 (2018): 19-19.

[63] Sørensen, Rikke Bæk, et al. "Indoleamine 2, 3-dioxygenase specific, cytotoxic T cells as immune regulators." *Blood, The Journal of the American Society of Hematology* 117.7 (2011): 2200-2210.

[64] Munir, Shamaila, et al. "HLA-restricted CTL that are specific for the immune checkpoint ligand PD-L1 occur with high frequency in cancer patients." *Cancer Research* 73.6 (2013): 1764-1776.

[65] Ahmad, S. M., I. M. Svane, and M. H. Andersen. "The stimulation of PD-L1-specific cytotoxic T lymphocytes can both directly and indirectly enhance antileukemic immunity." *Blood cancer journal* 4.7 (2014): e230-e230.

[66] Munir, Shamaila, et al. "Natural CD4+ T-cell responses against indoleamine 2, 3-dioxygenase." *PLoS One* 7.4 (2012): e34568.

[67] Munir, Shamaila, et al. "The immune checkpoint regulator PD-L1 is a specific target for naturally occurring CD4+ T cells." *Oncoimmunology* 2.4 (2013): e23991.

[68] Andersen, Mads Hald. "Immune regulation by self-recognition: novel possibilities for anticancer immunotherapy." *JNCI: Journal of the National Cancer Institute* 107.9 (2015).

[69] Kjeldsen, Julie Westerlin, et al. "Durable clinical responses and long-term follow-up of stage III–IV non-small-cell lung cancer (NSCLC) patients treated with IDO peptide vaccine in a Phase I study—a brief research report." *Frontiers in immunology* 9 (2018): 2145.

[70] Dey, Souvik, et al. "Peptide vaccination directed against IDO1-expressing immune cells elicits CD8+ and CD4+ T-cell-mediated antitumor immunity and enhanced anti-PD1 responses." *Journal for immunotherapy of cancer* 8.2 (2020).

[71] Sahin, Ugur, et al. "Personalized RNA mutanome vaccines mobilize poly-specific therapeutic immunity against cancer." *Nature* 547.7662 (2017): 222-226.

[72] Ott, Patrick A., et al. "An immunogenic personal neoantigen vaccine for patients with melanoma." *Nature* 547.7662 (2017): 217-221.

[73] Biotechnol, Nat. "The problem with neoantigen prediction." *Nat Biotechnol* 35 (2017): 97.

[74] Joshi, Kroopa, et al. "The “Achilles' Heel” of Cancer and its implications for the development of novel immunotherapeutic strategies." *Cold Spring Harbor perspectives in medicine* 8.1 (2018): a027086.

[75] Jou, Jessica, et al. "The Changing Landscape of Therapeutic Cancer Vaccines—Novel Platforms and Neoantigen Identification." *Clinical Cancer Research* 27.3 (2021): 689-703.

[76] Cohen, Roger B., et al. "A phase 1/2a study of GEN-009, a neoantigen vaccine based on autologous peptide immune responses." (2019): 2611-2611.

[77] Cohen, Roger B., et al. "GEN-009, a neoantigen vaccine containing ATLAS selected neoantigens, to generate broad sustained immunity against immunogenic tumor mutations and avoid inhibitory peptides." (2020): 3107-3107.

[78] BioNTech. Available from: https://biontech.de/science/individualized-cancermedicine.

[79] Loquai, Carmen, et al. "A shared tumor-antigen RNA-lipoplex vaccine with/without anti-PD1 in patients with checkpoint-inhibition experienced melanoma." (2020): 3136-3136.

[80] Braiteh, F., et al. "A phase Ia study to evaluate RO7198457, an individualized Neoantigen Specific immunotherapy (iNeST), in patients with locally advanced or metastatic solid tumors." *Proceedings of the Annual Meeting of the American Association for Cancer Research*. Vol. 2020. 2020.

[81] Braiteh, F., et al. "A phase Ia study to evaluate RO7198457, an individualized Neoantigen Specific immunotherapy (iNeST), in patients with locally advanced or metastatic solid tumors." *Proceedings of the Annual Meeting of the American Association for Cancer Research*. Vol. 2020. 2020.

[82] Moderna. Available from:https://www.modernatx.com/pipeline/therapeuticareas/immuno-oncology.

[83] Rizvi, Naiyer A., et al. "Mutational landscape determines sensitivity to PD-1 blockade in non–small cell lung cancer." *Science* 348.6230 (2015): 124-128.

[84] Jou, Jessica, et al. "The Changing Landscape of Therapeutic Cancer Vaccines—Novel Platforms and Neoantigen Identification." *Clinical Cancer Research* 27.3 (2021): 689-703.

[85] Hilf, Norbert, et al. "Actively personalized vaccination trial for newly diagnosed glioblastoma." *Nature* 565.7738 (2019): 240-245.

[86] Peng, Weiyi, et al. "Loss of PTEN promotes resistance to T cell–mediated immunotherapy." *Cancer discovery* 6.2 (2016): 202-216.

[87] [88] Rizvi, Naiyer A., and Timothy A. Chan. "Immunotherapy and oncogenic pathways: the PTEN connection." *Cancer discovery*6.2 (2016): 128-129.

[88] Milella, Michele, et al. "PTEN status is a crucial determinant of the functional outcome of combined MEK and mTOR inhibition in cancer." *Scientific reports* 7.1 (2017): 1-15.

[89] Hugo, Willy, et al. "Genomic and transcriptomic features of response to anti-PD-1 therapy in metastatic melanoma." *Cell*165.1 (2016): 35-44.

[90] George, Suzanne, et al. "Loss of PTEN is associated with resistance to anti-PD-1 checkpoint blockade therapy in metastatic uterine leiomyosarcoma." *Immunity* 46.2 (2017): 197-204.

[91] Gao, Jianjun, et al. "Loss of IFN-γ pathway genes in tumor cells as a mechanism of resistance to anti-CTLA-4 therapy." *Cell*167.2 (2016): 397-404.

[92] Charoentong, Pornpimol, et al. "Pan-cancer immunogenomic analyses reveal genotype-immunophenotype relationships and predictors of response to checkpoint blockade." *Cell reports* 18.1 (2017): 248-262.

[93] Peters, Solange, Keith M. Kerr, and Rolf Stahel. "PD-1 blockade in advanced NSCLC: A focus on pembrolizumab." *Cancer treatment reviews* 62 (2018): 39-49.

[94] Sade-Feldman, Moshe, et al. "Resistance to checkpoint blockade therapy through inactivation of antigen presentation." *Nature communications* 8.1 (2017): 1-11.