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Highlights

- DCVax-L is a second-generation autologous dendritic cell vaccine that targets potentially all of the neoantigens on a patient’s tumor, a key advantage over first-generation vaccine products that targeted only a single antigen with mixed success.
- DCVax-L newly diagnosed GBM phase III blinded interim results (published May 2018) for the entire cohort and also MGMT-M and MGMT-U subsets compare favorably with historic and contemporary trial results and may improve with additional follow-up.
- The mOS delta between patients with MGMT-M and MGMT-U tumors - an indicator that DCVax-L is working through neoantigens and the proposed vaccination mechanism - compares favorably with historic and contemporary trial results and may improve with additional follow-up.
- Results for patients with partial or complete resection offer the most accurate analysis and compare favorably with Stupp’s 2005 and 2017 SOC.
- Safety is impressive, commercial manufacturing is a surmountable challenge, and the regulatory environment for GBM, a deadly disease with severe unmet need, is favorable.
- With imminent phase III results and emerging mechanism evidence, Northwest Biotherapeutics ($NWBO) may be a severely discounted cancer immunotherapy company at a $100M market capitalization.
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Summary

Dendritic cell vaccines are beginning to bear fruit for cancer patients. As they are able to mount broad immune responses to neoantigens, they represent an important tool for cancer immunotherapy strategies. The DCVax-L phase III interim results in newly diagnosed glioblastoma (GBM) patients offer a first look at a second-generation product. Safety is impressive and commercial manufacturing is a surmountable challenge. While we await the formal analysis of efficacy, the interim publication offers fertile data for
debate and speculation. First-principles and Occam’s razor suggest there is unrealized value in Northwest Biotherapeutics.

**Cancer Immunotherapies and Tumor Mutational Burden**

Cancer immunotherapies are designed to evoke an immune response against neoantigens, which are the consequence of genetic alterations accumulated over the life of a tumor.\(^1\) Checkpoint inhibitors were initially tested in skin (melanoma) and lung (NSCLC and SCLC) cancers, which have an auspiciously high number of mutations. It has become clear that the tumor mutational burden (TMB) – often expressed as the number of non-synonymous mutations – is positively correlated with clinical outcomes for immunotherapies. In a landmark study by Le et al, the importance of TMB was demonstrated by the strikingly different clinical outcomes for colorectal cancer patients with mismatch-repair deficient (high mutations) vs proficient (low mutations) tumors using immune checkpoint blockade.\(^4\) The correlation between TMB and clinical outcomes for PD-1 blockade extends to a wide range of solid tumors and an equation was derived to predict clinical response rate using mutation number.\(^5,6\) Cancers employ immunoediting and modifications of the tumor microenvironment to avert the innate and adaptive components of the immune system, and while the immunoscore\(^7\) is emerging as a valuable composite prognostic factor because it surveys functional immune response, TMB remains an important biomarker in cancer immunotherapy and provides context for emerging clinical trial results.

**Quantitative Antigenicity**

The median TMB across various cancer types spans about three orders of magnitude - The number of mutations in MMR-deficient (~1,000s), mutagen-associated (~100s), adult solid (~10s), and liquid and pediatric (few) cancers largely reflects their etiology.\(^1\) However, relatively small differences in TMB have been shown to correlate with clinical outcomes. For the purposes of studying the relationship of immunotherapy response rates and TMB in lung cancer, some clinical trials have binned tumors into tertiles representing low (0 to <143 mutations), medium (143 to 247 mutations), and high (>247 mutations) burden and compared outcomes between these groups.\(^8,9\) For example, nivolumab monotherapy treatment of patients with small cell lung cancer (SCLC) containing low, medium, or high TMB resulted in 3.1, 3.9, and 5.4 months mOS, respectively. Likewise, treatment with nivolumab combined with ipilimumab resulted in 3.4, 3.6, and 22 months mOS, respectively, for SCLC patients with low, medium, and high TMB.\(^8\) Additionally, a substantial mPFS difference of 9.7 vs 4.1 months was shown, respectively, for patients with high vs low-to-medium TMB non-small cell lung cancer (NSCLC) treated with nivolipumab.\(^9\) These studies highlight the importance of TMB as a predictive biomarker for response to immunotherapies and suggest a two-fold difference in number of mutations can be clinically meaningful.

To be clear, TMB is a proxy for the number of productive neoantigens or antigenic neoepitopes. It is estimated that only one tenth of non-synonymous mutations result in useful targets.\(^10\) First, the mutant protein must be expressed, a condition that may eliminate about half of the candidates. And expressed mutant proteins must be either recognized by the immune system on the cell surface in their intact form\(^11\) or become processed into peptides compatible with MHC-I or MHC-II in a patient that has the appropriate HLA-type to present the peptides.\(^2,12\) Finally, the tumor microenvironment - and perhaps the whole patient - must be permissive to mount an immune response.\(^13\)

Each neoantigen provides an opportunity to maximize the efficacy of immunotherapy strategies. Checkpoint inhibitors allow pre-existing or adoptively transferred T cells to perform better against their potentially numerous neoantigens. First-generation CAR-T strategies designed against only a single neoantigen were able to generate objective responses in various leukemias and lymphomas leading to drug approvals for Novartis, Kite, and Juno. More recently, complete regression of metastatic breast cancer was achieved in a single patient preconditioned with nonmyeloablative immunodepletion using cyclophosphamide and fludarabine and further treated with a combination of a checkpoint inhibitor and
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tumor-infiltrating lymphocytes (TILs) that recognized neoepitopes derived from only four neoantigens.\textsuperscript{14} Provenge is a clinically and commercially successful dendritic cell vaccine pulsed against a single antigen for prostate cancer.\textsuperscript{15,16} An advantage of second-generation dendritic cell vaccines pulsed against whole tumor lysate is their ability to stimulate an immune response to a variety of neoantigens.

DCVax-L has the opportunity, in theory, to present all the neoantigens that exist in a patient’s cancer and represents a second-generation approach. It is widely known that more mutations translate to a higher chance of having “winning” neoantigens and strategies that target more neoantigens are more likely to give better outcomes.\textsuperscript{17} Dendritic cells are professional antigen presenting cells well-suited to exploit all the neoantigens – Along with checkpoint inhibitors and adoptive T cell strategies, dendritic cell vaccine therapy development is on the rise and the value is becoming increasingly evident.\textsuperscript{18–21}

**Epitope Spreading**

Immunotherapies have been shown to induce immune responses against additional, non-target neoantigens, including intramolecular or intermolecular spread that may switch between MHC-I or MHC-II restricted responses.\textsuperscript{22,23} Epitope spreading can be documented in the blood by an increased diversity of TCRs and antibodies specific to tumor antigens. Cancer immunotherapies designed to target a single antigen (e.g. Provenge, Rindopepimut, and first-generation CAR-Ts) only have one shot at inducing antigen spread. On the other hand, dendritic cell vaccines primed against whole tumor lysate as well as checkpoint inhibitors have many chances of amplifying their assault on cancer cells. Epitope spread takes time and new immune-related response criteria may be required to track this important feature of immunotherapies.\textsuperscript{25} Initiating the immune response and epitope spread with more antigens should control tumors faster as the cascade will more rapidly target a sufficient number of good antigens. Provenge worked with a single antigen and epitope spread was documented, but prostate cancers are slow-moving offering patients time to mount an immune response. Since GBMs are notoriously immunosuppressive and progress rapidly,\textsuperscript{24} it’s possible that the single antigen (EGFRvIII) that failed in the Rindopepimut trial was simply not enough to drive a sufficient spread to other antigens and it’s likely that vaccine strategies will require many antigens for successful therapy. An increased abundance and heterogeneity of the anti-cancer adaptive immune response may awaken the force of the innate immune system. Epitope spread may also help to counteract genetic instability and heterogeneity, the hallmarks of cancer.

**Unstable Genomes**

Cancer genomes are unstable and there is a considerable genetic heterogeneity among cells within and between tumors.\textsuperscript{25,1} Intratumoral heterogeneity is associated with reduced overall survival in colorectal cancers.\textsuperscript{26} Glioblastoma multiforme are notably heterogeneous and they were historically classified into four distinct tumor types, which were more recently refined to three types.\textsuperscript{27,28}

Cancers can escape therapeutic pressure through mutations that have accrued over the life of the tumor,\textsuperscript{26,29–31} including those that existed before therapy and those that have been induced by chemotherapies (e.g. alkylating or other DNA damaging agents). For example, treatment with temozolomide (TMZ) damages DNA and increases the genetic heterogeneity in a patient’s cancer. In fact, approximately one third of all MGMT-M cancers become MMR-deficient and hypermutable after TMZ treatment.\textsuperscript{32} The mutations that allow cancers to escape confer advantages and the tumor mutational landscape is able to evolve under the selective pressure of therapy. Much like the triple-drug cocktails that were able to tame the unstable HIV genome, it appears that therapies targeting at least four good neoantigens may be required for durable cancer outcomes - Four good neoantigens or about 40 non-synonymous mutations.\textsuperscript{14}

Adult GBMs overall have a median of 35 non-synonymous mutations,\textsuperscript{1} but it was shown more recently that there are 400% more mutations in MGMT-Methylated (MGMT-M) than MGMT-Unmethylated (MGMT-U) GBM tumors prior to chemotherapy and radiotherapy.\textsuperscript{33} MGMT converts O\textsuperscript{6}-methyl-guanine
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errors back to guanine, which is an important DNA repair function that helps cells maintain genomic integrity - This function is inactivated in MGMT-M GBM tumors, which results in the accumulation of more mutations (both normally and under DNA-damaging therapy), confers a better prognosis, and improves the response to therapies when compared to patients with MGMT-U tumors.

**DCVax-L Phase III Interim and Other Results in GBM**
The phase III interim results for DCVax-L in newly diagnosed GBM patients (when adjusted for time-to-randomization) compare favorably with historic and contemporary results for standard-of-care and portend similar or superior results to Optune, which was recently FDA approved (Table 1). Importantly, censored patients can artificially suppress mOS results, so there is a possibility that the data will improve as follow-up time (mFU) is increased in the DCVax-L trial to achieve parity with historic and contemporary trials (Table 1). Since the DCVax-L study is still blinded, the results report the combined cohort, which includes the placebo (n=45), cross-over (n=54), and DCVax-L-treated (n=232) patients. Based on the vintage (2008), duration (10 years), number of patients (n=331), patient characteristics, and number of international centers (>80) in the DCVax-L trial, it can be reasonably expected that patients treated with SOC (i.e. placebo in this trial) will fall within the tight range found in all of the large (n>150), relevant Phase III trials that also reported intent-to-treat (ITT) data – However, it’s difficult to estimate the mOS of the DCVax-L naïve/placebo patients (n=45) when many of the SOC that progressed were cross-over to vaccine treatment, leaving a potentially healthier population where, in contrast, some may have also died before the tumor detectably grew, leaving a less healthy population (Tables 1 and 2). Better estimates of the mOS for the n=45 SOC subset will be informative. Furthermore, but less well-appreciated, is the fact that the crossed-over patients progressed before they started receiving DCVax-L treatment and, in the Phase II trial, 0% of patients (n= 5) that progressed before vaccination were able to mount a vaccine-induced immune response, nor did they have a pre-existing native immune signature; whereas 100% of patients (n=6) with stable disease at the time of vaccination had measureable CTL responses after vaccination. Furthermore, 20 patients that progressed before randomization (an exclusion criteria for the phase III trial) and entered the informational arm to receive DCVax-L treatment were reported to have a mOS of 15.3 months. Patients that made it through the 3.1 month period from surgery to randomization before progressing should fare better than the information arm. This key insight suggests that the crossed-over patients will likely also have a mOS similar to the placebo group. Since patients that progress have a less favorable prognosis, even an intermediate vaccine benefit would be helpful. Because the vaccine may have a much lower immune response rate in patients that progress, comparisons between DCVax-L-treated (n=232) and the combined placebo and crossed-over groups (n=99) may be biologically relevant and offer more statistical power.

While there are serious caveats when using the blinded data to estimate efficacy, the MGMT status can be used as a measure of how well therapies perform in relation to tumor mutational burden. Dendritic cell vaccines primed against a whole tumor lysate and other broad-spectrum immunotherapies (i.e. checkpoint inhibitors) are expected to selectively target tumors with more mutations and, therefore, should be more efficacious in MGMT-M tumors. Radiotherapy is known to induce an immune response against cancers, and temozolomide is known to selectively kill MGMT-M tumors due to their reduced ability to correct DNA damage caused by alkylating agents. Radiotherapy and temozolomide are used in the SOC of newly diagnosed GBM and provide an advantage to patients with MGMT-M compared to MGMT-U tumors – The mOS differences (i.e. M vs U deltas of 10.8, 6.9, 8.9, 6.5 months) published from 2009-2017 for the SOC arms in four clinical trials show how well radiotherapy and temozolomide exploit methylation of MGMT. If an immunotherapy works well, a significant broadening of the mOS delta between MGMT-M and MTMT-U would be expected.

Optune was recently FDA approved for recurrent and newly diagnosed glioblastoma and has achieved impressive results in non-small cell lung cancer, where there is high tumor mutational burden. Optune was originally reported to work by disrupting mitotic processes in cancer cells using radio frequencies.
However, emerging evidence suggests Optune stimulates the immune system by modifying the tumor microenvironment and it may be this property that selectively targets MGMT-M tumors, resulting in an improved mOS delta of 14.7 months. The only other published ITT phase III study with such impressive gains for MGMT-M tumors is DCVax-L, which resulted in a mOS delta of 14.9 months; again, this number includes untreated and crossed-over patients, so the delta for the treated patients is expected to improve when the trial is unblinded, as these 99 patients are expected to give a smaller mOS delta of approximately 6-10 months. Furthermore, since there is a two-fold enrichment of censored patients in the MGMT-M group compared to MGMT-U, it’s possible that the delta provided by DCVax-L will expand with additional follow-up as it did for Stupp’s SOC-defining 2005 trial when it was refreshed in 2009. It will be useful to carefully consider the delta after refresh of the phase III DCVax-L results.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Descr</th>
<th>Trial ID</th>
<th>Journal</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>d Patients</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Arm</th>
<th>mFU (months)</th>
<th>All</th>
<th>MGMT-M</th>
<th>MGMT-U</th>
<th>M-U</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stupp</td>
<td>Defining SOC</td>
<td>NCT00060353</td>
<td>NEJM</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>RT</td>
<td>concurrent and adjuvant TMZ (SOC)</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>21.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hara</td>
<td>Defining SOC</td>
<td>NCT00060353</td>
<td>NEJM</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>469/460</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>RT</td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hara</td>
<td>Defining SOC</td>
<td>NCT00060353</td>
<td>NEJM</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>469/460</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>RT</td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stupp</td>
<td>Defining SOC</td>
<td>NCT00060353</td>
<td>Lancet</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>469/460</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>RT</td>
<td></td>
<td>61</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stupp</td>
<td>Defining SOC</td>
<td>NCT00060353</td>
<td>Lancet</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>469/460</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>SOC</td>
<td></td>
<td>61</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilbert</td>
<td>Dose-dense TMZ</td>
<td>NCT00060353</td>
<td>Lancet</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>411(123M / 288U)</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>SOC</td>
<td></td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>16.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chiot</td>
<td>Bevacizumab A</td>
<td>NCT00060353</td>
<td>Lancet</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>SOC</td>
<td></td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chiot</td>
<td>Bevacizumab B</td>
<td>NCT00060353</td>
<td>Lancet</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>SOC</td>
<td></td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilbert</td>
<td>Bevacizumab</td>
<td>NCT00060353</td>
<td>Lancet</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>SOC</td>
<td></td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilbert</td>
<td>Bevacizumab B</td>
<td>NCT00060353</td>
<td>Lancet</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>SOC</td>
<td></td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilbert</td>
<td>Bevacizumab B</td>
<td>NCT00060353</td>
<td>Lancet</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>175M</td>
<td>428</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>combined SOC and SOC + Bev</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>Gilbert</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stupp</td>
<td>Gliadel in MGMT-M</td>
<td>NCT00695211</td>
<td>Lancet</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>279M</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>SOC</td>
<td></td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weber</td>
<td>In EGFRVIII</td>
<td>NCT00480749</td>
<td>Lancet</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>SOC (ITT)</td>
<td></td>
<td>na</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weber</td>
<td>In EGFRVIII</td>
<td>NCT00480749</td>
<td>Lancet</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>SOC (ITT)</td>
<td></td>
<td>na</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stupp</td>
<td>Optune Maintenance 1x</td>
<td>NCT00060353</td>
<td>JAMA</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>SOC</td>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stupp</td>
<td>Optune Maintenance 1x</td>
<td>NCT00060353</td>
<td>JAMA</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>SOC</td>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stupp</td>
<td>Optune refresh</td>
<td>NCT00060353</td>
<td>JAMA</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>229 (17M / 210U)</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>SOC</td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>14.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stupp</td>
<td>Optune refresh</td>
<td>NCT00060353</td>
<td>JAMA</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>496 (13M / 209U)</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>SOC</td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>16.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lau</td>
<td>DCVax Interim Analysis</td>
<td>NCT00060353</td>
<td>JCTM</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>331 (136M / 194U)</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>combined SOC and SOC + DCVax</td>
<td>-34</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>34.7</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>14.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All the trials in Table I measure mOS from randomization with the exception of the DCVax-L interim analysis which measures from surgery. This difference in methodology adds an absolute, systematic increase to the results for DCVax-L, which can be easily corrected. The median time from surgery to randomization in the DCVax-L trial was reported as 3.1 months and, therefore, the reported mOS numbers for DCVax-L can be reduced by 3.1 months to achieve parity with the trials that started the survival clock later, at randomization. However, this arbitrary clock-start difference does not result in differences in the critical time period from diagnosis to randomization, where different trial strategies may introduce immortal time bias.

Comparisons between trials may be harder to perform if the trials have different degrees of immortal time bias. Immortal time is the period of cohort follow-up in which the outcome can not occur, by design. In practical terms, this means that the time period before randomization may select for healthier patients who die or progress are excluded, introducing a bias. All the trials in Table 1 have some length of immortal time and, therefore, an associated bias. DCVax-L interim results reported a median of 3.1 months from surgery to randomization. The Stupp et al. 2017 Optune publication notes a median of 3.8 months from diagnosis to randomization. Since GBM progresses quickly and is deadly, the time from diagnosis to surgery is relatively short. For example, Flanigan et. al. describe a median wait time from diagnosis to surgery of 21-26 days, which would put the critical time from diagnosis to randomization for DCVax-L around 3.8 to 4.0 months. Since the Optune and DCVax-L trials have the same time period between diagnosis and randomization and similar exclusion criteria, the immortal time bias should be similar and should not compromise the comparison of the results.

The extent of resection is an important prognostic factor that requires special consideration. In the SOC arm of the Stupp et al. 2017 Optune trial, biopsy patients had the worst outcomes followed by partial
resection then complete resection with 11.6, 15.1, and 18.5 mOS results, respectively. A similar trend was found when SOC was defined in Stupp et al 2009. The DCVax-L trial excluded biopsy patients presumably because there was not enough tumor material to reliably create the vaccine. Exclusion of biopsy patients will result in inflated mOS outcomes for the DCVax-L combined cohort, but fortunately Liau et al also published mOS results for patients with partial and complete resections, allowing a more direct comparison to Stupp et al that avoids bias due to biopsy patients. Stupp et al reported 15.1 and 18.5 for SOC in partial and complete resections, respectively, whereas Liau et al reported 21.1 and 25.4 for the DCVax-L combined cohort (Table 2). When adjusted for the clock-start methodology differences, the DCVax-L combined cohort results in 18 and 22.3 months mOS – These results give DCVax-L an estimated therapeutic benefit of 3.9 months for patients with partial resection and 5.1 months for patients with complete resection, which compare favorably with Optune’s mOS efficacy (Table 2).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2: Effect of Extent-of-Resection on mOS in Optune compared to DCVax-L</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>partial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gross</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clock corrected = DCVax-L Combined 2017 mOS - 3.1 months; to adjust for time-to-randomization vs time-to-surgery Estimated mOS = Clocked + ((Clock - SOC)/3); Estimated effect on median of DCVax-L treated (n=232) when DCVax-L naive (n=45) and late-treated (n=54) patients removed Benefit = mOS treatment - mOS SOC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Because only subsets of patients respond to even the most successful immunotherapies, the most relevant efficacy signal is often demonstrated in the “long tail,” which is the period of follow-up beyond the median. Medians can entirely mask the benefit to small but important subsets of patients. For example, if the GBM subset representing the most favorable prognosis under SOC were shifted to the right by many years, it would have no effect on the mOS of the entire treatment arm if they were already on the right of the median. If DCVax-L is targeting the 400% higher mutations found in MGMT-M tumors and substantially improving the mOS for this subset, it might not appreciably shift the mOS of the entire cohort since these patients largely reside on the right side of the median. The effect of immunotherapies can be unmasked and fully realized by comparison of survival rates for experimental and control arms at key time points beyond the control arm median. As the understanding of cancer immunotherapy matures, future trials may select subsets of patients that are more likely to respond and the median outcomes will become more sensitive signals for efficacy, but medians will always be confounded and may underestimate or entirely miss important gains for patients.

Results from DCVax-L compassionate use, informational arm, phase I/II and comparator cohorts are instructive although interpretation is limited by significant caveats (Table 3). Newly diagnosed GBM (ndGBM) that progressed rapidly or recurrent GBM (rGBM) patients have poor prognoses which are reflected in the mOS results (Table 3). When treated with DCVax-L, rapid progressors or rGBM patients in various trials had mOS results of 15.1, 14.7, 11.7, and 15.3 months and these numbers were extended to 17.9 months in rGBM with the addition of toll-like receptor (TLR) agonist therapy (shown in red, Table 3). On the other hand, patients with stable disease in Liau et al 2005 had a mOS of 35.8 months (shown in blue, Table 3). Newly diagnosed GMB and the pronuclear and mesenchymal subsets also had favorable mOS results of 35.9, 35, and 37.6 months when treated with DCVax-L combined with a TLR agonist. Notably, the mesenchymal subset is known to have a less favorable outcome with standard therapy, but this subset is particularly well-rescued with the mOS shifting from 14.6 to 37.6 months on SOC vs DCVax-L/TLR agonist therapy, respectively. The striking rescue of the mesenchymal subset is thought to be driven by a more pronounced induction of CD3+ and CD8+ T cell response.
Other Factors

Prognostic factors for newly diagnosed GBM include age, tumor size, performance status, extent of surgery, radiation dose, and adjuvant chemotherapy use. GBM classification and molecular markers are also important. Mesenchymal have worse outcomes than proneural, for example. MGMT-M and mutIDH-1 are independently associated with better survival and patients with combined mutIDH-1 and MGMT-M seem to survive longer than patients with only one of these markers. IDH-1 mutations conferred a large survival advantage compared to patients with wild-type IDH-1 (mOS 3.8 years vs 1.1 years, respectively, and a hazard ratio for death of 3.6). However, IDH-1 status has opposing effects on survival and response to TMZ, which should be carefully considered in subset analyses.

Therapy-induced lymphopenia has also been associated with a reduced survival of up to six months and the statistical package for the DCVax-L trial was adjusted to reflect this variable that emerged contemporaneously.

The DCVax-L interim publication cited other unknown factors for a patient subset (n=100 or about 30% of the entire cohort) with an estimated Kaplan-Meier derived mOS of 40.5 months. There are many emerging prognostic and predictive factors associated with tumor response to immunotherapies that may be contributing to the improved overall survival in this DCVax-L subset population (Table 4). Correlating these immune-factors with mPFS, mOS, survival at various time points, or hazard ratios in various patient subsets may provide early evidence that DCVax-L is working through its presumed immune mechanism.

Race, gender, and age have been shown to effect responses to immunotherapies. African Americans respond significantly better than Whites to Provenge (mOS of 45.3 vs 24.7 months, respectively), presumably because they have more numerous T cells. Males respond better than females to checkpoint inhibitors. Older patients appear to respond relatively better than younger patients, at least partly due to lower regulatory T cells. While age is a negative prognostic indicator in GBM, the Optune trial showed hazard ratios of .51 and .69 for older and younger patients, respectively, suggesting that treated older patients may be more responsive compared to age-matched controls than are younger patients. These examples support the central role of T-cells in the immune response to cancer and suggest that the T-cells induced by dendritic cell vaccines may show similar differences in these populations.

Biomarkers can provide early evidence that DCVax-L is working through the presumed immune mechanism. In ovarian cancer patients, a significant transient increase in serum IFN-gamma and
conversely, a significant transient decrease in TGF-beta was found after vaccination with an autologous dendritic cell strategy similar to DCVax-L.43 Response of various solid tumors to DCVax-D (a dendritic cell vaccine that is directly injected into tumors) is inversely correlated with TGF-beta levels in the tumor microenvironment where patients with low tumor-associated TGF-beta had a measurable systemic CTL response and higher overall survival.45 High TGF-beta in the tumor microenvironment is likely to be a negative predictive factor for response to many immunotherapy strategies. On the other hand, IL8, IL12p40, or TNF-alpha production and CD86 or MHC-II levels on dendritic cells positively correlated with DCVax-D outcomes.63 Also, activated dendritic, CD8+ T, CD4+ T, and natural killer cells were each associated with improved overall survival, whereas the number of regulatory T cells and MDSCs were associated with reduced overall survival in colorectal cancer.26 These biomarkers may be useful for interpretation of DCVax-L results.

Neoadjuvant immunotherapy is an emerging idea that aims to take advantage of the more numerous neoantigens that exist prior to surgery.64–66 Interestingly, in the Optune trial, there was an inverse relationship between extent of resection and improved hazard ratios, where biopsy, partial resection, and total resection gave .50, .56, .70 hazard ratios, respectively, suggesting that immune modulation by radio frequencies may have a relatively larger impact when there is more tumor present. It will be worth following neoadjuvant studies further to see if there is a correlation of tumor burden and response to immunotherapies. In any case, it will be useful to note the hazard ratios for extent-of-resection subsets in the DCVax-L trial. Notably, DCVax-L’s companion product, DCVax-D, is a neoadjuvant strategy.

DCVax-L might be expected to differently modify outcomes in the patients with factors that modulate the immune responses and these differences between patient subsets might be detectable in the interim or unblinded analyses. Correlation of immunoscore, TMB, and MGMT methylation status with DCVax-L efficacy will give insight into the dependence on functional immune responses and the instigating somatic mutations. Other subset analyses may also provide insight into the immune mechanism. For example, did the seven African Americans in the trial fare better than Whites? Does the older population witness a significant improvement to overall survival compared to age-matched historic and contemporary controls? Are males responding better than females? Are these effects visible by hazards ratios? While these are not requirements, they may contribute to the evidence that DCVax-L is a bona-fide immunotherapy.

Table 4: Selected factors that may predict or reflect response to immunotherapies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Expected Effect on Survival</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>tumor mutational burden</td>
<td>high tumor burden</td>
<td>higher risks for better survival</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSI status</td>
<td>high MSI</td>
<td>higher risks for better survival</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGMT status</td>
<td>MGMT-mutant</td>
<td>high survival rates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>serum IFN-gamma (24hrs after vaccination)</td>
<td>high IFN-gamma</td>
<td>higher survival</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>serum TGF-beta (4hrs after vaccination)</td>
<td>high TGF-beta</td>
<td>lower survival</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tumor specific native and vaccine-derived CD8+ clone level, heterogeneity, and activity</td>
<td>high CD8+ levels and activity</td>
<td>lower survival</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TMB</td>
<td>high TMB</td>
<td>higher survival</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>age</td>
<td>higher age</td>
<td>lower survival</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gender</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>race</td>
<td>African American</td>
<td>African American responds better than White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>extent of surgery</td>
<td>biopsy, partial, total</td>
<td>responses to checkpoint blockade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nRAS</td>
<td>wild type</td>
<td>responses to checkpoint blockade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PD-L1 expression</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>responses to checkpoint blockade</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion

Extensive preclinical and clinical data show exactly how DCVax-L operates as an immunotherapy. Along with favorable mOS data and survival rates at 3, 4, or 5 years, any evidence that DCVax-L is operating through the proposed immune mechanism in the ongoing phase III patients will be highly favorable for regulatory decisions. While the survival benefit is key, it will be useful to monitor the relationship between DCVax-L efficacy and other immune factors in the interim and final analyses for mechanism signals.
DCVax-L efficacy is improved with the addition of PD-1 blockade\textsuperscript{67} and further improved with combined PD-1 blockade and suppression of tumor infiltrating myeloid cell (TIM) function.\textsuperscript{68} These gains were demonstrated in models with high tumor burden, immunosuppressive tumor microenvironments, and poor prognosis, which – to some degree – emulates patients that have progressed. This triple-combination immunotherapy strategy effectively counters the tumor’s attempt to avert the independent effects of each component. These findings provide hope that it will translate to clinical gains for both stable and progressing GBM patients and highlight DCVax-L as an important platform that will allow clinicians to rapidly optimize combination chemo-immunotherapy strategies.\textsuperscript{69–71} It will be interesting to compare the relative efficacy of neoadjuvant DCVax-D and post-surgical DCVax-L dendritic cell vaccine strategies in future trials, although these distinct approaches may have different optimal combination strategies.

CancerCommons and the Musella Foundation for Brain Tumor Research are non-profit organizations aiming to more rapidly test therapeutic hypotheses by facilitating small, rigorous clinical trials that seek large efficacy signals. DCVax-L development would benefit from these strategies, perhaps in the right-to-try setting, and the best results could be used to inform larger phase III clinical trials.

By all measures, the safety profile of DCVax-L looks stellar. Importantly, GBM pseudoprogresion is correlated with improved survival\textsuperscript{72,73} and the DCVax-L results may give early insight into the considerations that may be relevant to developing modified response criteria and safety monitoring. Response criteria and safety monitoring flexibility may be desirable as the immunotherapy field moves into more complex double-, triple-, and chemo-immunotherapy combinations.\textsuperscript{69–71}

The FDA, by law, is afforded flexibility when considering potential treatments for diseases with severe unmet need.\textsuperscript{74} Likewise, the EMA gives special consideration to areas of unmet need. The DCVax-L trial was originally designed and powered for mPFS as primary and mOS as secondary outcomes. It’s not unreasonable to expect regulatory agencies to allow use of mOS in place of mPFS, as survival is the gold-standard and most important outcome. This is particularly likely considering that the FDA approved Bevacizumab for newly diagnosed GBM, which failed for both mOS (primary) and mPFS (secondary) in the Gilbert et al study and also failed for mOS (co-primary) in the Chinot et al study. While Chinot’s study suggests there is a mPFS (co-primary) benefit, the toxicity was also increased. While decision-making will rely on standards and the preponderance of evidence, regulatory leniency will not be surprising in the context of GBM, a deadly disease with severe unmet need.

**Conclusion**

Dendritic cell vaccines are designed to exploit antigens on cancer cells. The expansion of the mOS delta between newly diagnosed GBM patients with high (MGMT-M) and low (MGMT-U) tumor mutational burden suggests DCVax-L may be working through neoantigens and the proposed mechanism. Checkpoint inhibitor, MDSC suppression, Treg suppression, TGF-beta inhibitor, TLR agonist, cytokines and other strategies may further unleash DCVax-L efficacy. The regulatory environment for glioblastoma is highly favorable and the DCVax-L mechanism is tractable, which will allow rapid optimization in follow-on studies as well as an opportunity for agencies to routinely reassess the value for patients. The DCVax-L safety record is impressive and demand under the right-to-try legislation may challenge manufacturing capacity. DCVax-L is primed to be a landmark for dendritic cell vaccines and cancer immunotherapy and will, hopefully, provide a new treatment option for glioblastoma patients.

**Contemporaneous to Embargo**

Dr. Liau’s group recently published an abstract for the upcoming Society for NeuroOncology meeting that shows dendritic cell vaccination in combination with a TLR agonist for GBM patients (WHO Grade III and IV) results in a mOS of 54 months compared to 11 months for the placebo control.\textsuperscript{75} Furthermore, the mOS delta between MGMT-M and MGMT-U for the entire cohort was 38 months (57 vs 19 months,
respectively). Improved mOS and, particularly, expansion of the M vs U delta with addition of TLR agonists to dendritic cell vaccination provide further evidence that the mechanism is operable.
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