Multimodality treatment of malignant pleural mesothelioma with or without immunotherapy: does it change anything?*,
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Abstract

The purpose of this study was to investigate immunological effector cells and angiogenesis in malignant pleural mesothelioma (MPM) patients, who underwent multimodality treatments. Clinical and pathological characteristics of 57 patients, with International Mesothelioma Interest Group (IMIG) stage II–III MPM, who underwent two different multimodality treatments (with and without immunotherapy) between 1999 and 2008 were analyzed. CD8+ , CD4+ and Foxp3+ tumor-infiltrating lymphocytes, tryptase and chymase mast cells (MCs), CD34, number of microvessels and vascular endothelial growth factor were determined by immunohistochemistry. The histology was 51 epitheliomorphpic and 6 biphasic. The stage was III in 41 cases and II in 16 cases. With an average follow-up of 69 months (range 9–115) 14 patients are still alive and the overall median actuarial survival is 21.4 months. Tryptase MCs, CD8+ and Foxp3+ lymphocytes had significantly increased in the interleukin 2 (IL-2) treated group. Moreover, the number of microvessels was significantly lower in IL-2 treated patients. This study indicates that immunotherapy leads to an increase in cytotoxic CD8+ lymphocytes and tryptase MCs and to a decrease of the tumoral neoangiogenesis. Changes in MPM microenvironment induced by immunotherapy may play a major role in the local control of this disease and need further investigations.
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1. Introduction

Unfortunately mesothelioma incidence is expected to continue in the near future and still there is neither any cure nor any evidence of the optimal treatment [1]. Multimodality treatments are currently adopted in most of the centers with different extent of surgical resections [pleurectomy/decortication (PD) or extended pleuro-pneumonectomy (EPP)] [2–4], different scheduling of chemotherapy administered in a pre- or postoperative setting [5] and radiotherapy at various dosages and with different intents.

Furthermore, malignant pleural mesothelioma (MPM) is an immunogenic tumor, which response and regression has been associated to the administration of immuno-modulators [6, 7]. Immunotherapy, especially interleukin 2 (IL-2) and interferon α (IFN-α) or β (IFN-β) can induce MPM regression in animal models and in human beings [6, 7]; it can be easily combined with other therapeutic modalities. We already reported in this journal our experience on a four-modality treatment of MPM including pre- and postoperative therapy with IL-2 [8].

The purpose of this research was to investigate changes in MPM microenvironment induced by immunotherapy by means of quantitative comparison of immunological effector cells and angiogenesis between MPM patients, who underwent multimodality treatments with and without preoperative IL-2.

2. Material and methods

2.1. Patients

Clinical and pathological characteristics of 57 patients, with International Mesothelioma Interest Group (IMIG) stage II–III MPM, who underwent two different multimodality treatments (with and without immunotherapy) between 1999 and 2008 were analyzed. The first group of patients (n=34) underwent, between 1999 and 2004, a multimodality treatment including preoperative intrapleural IL-2, as previously described in this journal [8]. The second group of patients (n=23) treated between 2005 and 2008 underwent primary PD, hyperthermic intrapleural chemotherapy with epidoxorubicin (25 mg/m²) and cisplatin (80 mg/m²), adjuvant radiotherapy, systemic chemothera-
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immunohistochemical criteria of the World Health Organization paraffin block of tumor was selected for immunohistochemical examination. The most representative of disease progression was rarely obtained. Survival was calculated from the date of the diagnosis until the date of death or of the last follow-up.

2.2. Tumor specimens

Tumor samples were formalin-fixed and paraffin-embedded for microscopic examination. The most representative paraffin block of tumor was selected for immunohistochemical analysis. A histological and pathological diagnosis was reviewed by two pathologists (G.A. and G.F.), according to the World Health Organization (WHO) 2004 histological and immunohistochemical criteria [9]. Disagreements concerning the histological diagnosis were discussed, and after a critical discussion, a mutual agreement was reached. The surgical-pathological staging was performed, according to the tumor, node, metastasis (TNM) classification by the IMIG [10].

2.3. Immunohistochemistry

Immunohistochemical analyses were performed on 3 μm tissue sections using specific antibodies. Immunoreaction was displayed using the avidin–biotin–peroxidase complex (ABC) method. Immunostaining was done using a Benchmark immunostainer (Ventana, Tucson, AZ). In all cases, the immunohistochemical evaluation was performed independently by two pathologists (G.A. and G.F.) who were blind to the clinico-pathological characteristics and treatment of the patients.

For the tryptase and chymase immunohistochemical stainings, sections were incubated with a mouse anti-human tryptase monoclonal antibody (Chemicon International, Temecula, CA, USA) and with a mouse anti-human chymase monoclonal antibody (Chemicon International, Temecula, CA, USA). Immunostaining for tryptase and chymase was clearly visible as brown deposits within intact mast cells (MCs) and as highly localized extracellular granular material. Each pathologist counted the chymase and tryptase positive MCs at ×400 microscopic fields. The average of their counts in three fields was calculated.

For tumor-infiltrating lymphocyte-immunohistochemical staining, sections were incubated with the following antibodies:

- mouse anti-human Foxp3 monoclonal antibody (clone 236A/E7 diluted 1:300; Abcam, Cambridge, UK),
- mouse anti-human CD8 monoclonal antibody (clone C8/144B, ready to use for the Ventana automated slide stainer; Ventana, Tucson, AZ, USA),
- mouse anti-human CD4 monoclonal antibody (clone 1F6 diluted 1:20; Diagnostic BioSystem, Pleasanton, CA, USA).

Each pathologist counted the cells at ×400 microscopic fields. The average of their counts in five fields was calculated.

The microvessel count (MVC) was determined using the anti-CD34 antibody (Ventana Medical System, ready to use for the Ventana automated slide stainer) to better visualize the endothelial cells and, consequently, the microvessels. Each pathologist examined the samples and identified the area with the most intense vascularization (hot spot) under low microscopic power (×10 objective lens and ×10 ocular lens). In this area, the number of microvessels was counted and recorded at ×400.

For the Vascular Endothelial Growth Factor (VEGF) expression, the sections were incubated with an anti-VEGF rabbit polyclonal antibody (Santa Cruz Biotechnology, Santa Cruz, CA, USA). The expression of VEGF was evaluated as a percentage of positive cells in a total of at least 1000 tumor cells.

2.4. Statistical analysis

All of the statistical analyses were carried out using the Statistica software (Stat-sof). The Student’s t-test was used to determine the differences between the two different populations: preoperative IL-2 treated patients vs. untreated patients. The ANOVA test was used to determine the association between histo-pathological and clinical characteristics. Survival curves were estimated by the Kaplan–Meier’s product-limit method and were compared by using the log-rank test. The a priori level of significance was set at a P<0.05.

3. Results

Fifty-seven patients (49 male – 8 female) treated for MPM were analyzed. We considered two groups of patients according to the multimodality treatment, and the main difference between the two groups for the pathological correlation is that the first group received preoperative immunotherapy with IL-2 and the second group did not. Histological features of the tumors as well as other clinico-pathological characteristics of the series of patients of both groups are summarized in Table 1.

The number of tumor-infiltrating MCs was evaluated in all of the tumor samples. Regarding the tryptase MCs, they were significantly higher in the IL-2 treated group (P=0.01). No differences between the two groups of patients were observed for the chymase MCs (Table 2).

No significant associations were found between the density of tryptase and chymase positive MCs and other clinico-pathological parameters, such as age, gender, histology, performance status, and stage in both of the patients’ groups.

The number of CD8 positive (CD8+) lymphocytes was significantly higher in the preoperative IL-2 group (P=0.001). Evaluation of the number of Foxp3 positive (Foxp3+) lymphocytes revealed a significant difference (P=0.006)
Table 1
Patient characteristics according to the treatment with or without IL-2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clinico-pathological characteristics</th>
<th>IL-2 Treated patients (n = 34)</th>
<th>No IL-2 patients (n = 23)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range (years)</td>
<td>41–77</td>
<td>54–73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>68.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Histologic subtypes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epithelioid</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biphasic</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMIG stage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECOG performance status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IMIG, International Mesothelioma Interest Group; ECOG, Eastern Cooperative Oncology Group.

between the two different groups of treatment with a major number in the patients, who received preoperative IL-2 treatment.

No correlations were observed between the tumor-infiltrating lymphocytes, CD8, CD4, Foxp3, and the clinico-pathological characteristics of both groups of patients.

The mean of number of microvessels was significantly lower in the IL-2 treated patients compared with untreated patients ($P<0.000000$).

Regarding VEGF expression, there was no statistically significant difference between the two groups. Moreover, no significant correlations were observed between the MVC and VEGF expression and the patients’ clinico-pathological characteristics.

With an average follow-up of 86.7 months (range 51–115) and 26 (range 9–46) for the first and second group of patients, 2 and 12 patients are still alive, respectively. The two-year actuarial survivals were 44.8% and 43.2% for the first and second group, respectively, and the difference was not statistically significant (Fig. 1). The performance status at the diagnosis significantly affected survival ($P=0.005$) (Fig. 2). There was a better survival rate in stage II MPM respect to stage III, but the difference was not statistically significant. Among the pathologic variables which were investigated, only the Foxp3+ expression (median value as cut-off) impacted favorably the outcome with better survival in patients with low Foxp3+ expression ($P=0.001$) (Fig. 3).

![Fig. 1. Overall survival of the two groups of MPM patients, who underwent multimodality treatments with and without IL-2. MPM, malignant pleural mesothelioma.](https://academic.oup.com/icvts/article-abstract/10/4/572/659094)

![Fig. 2. Survival according to the patients' performance status at the diagnosis.](https://academic.oup.com/icvts/article-abstract/10/4/572/659094)

### 4. Discussion

Different multimodality treatments have been proposed for the treatment of MPM with both palliation and care intent [2–5]. As a matter of fact, there is no scientific evidence about the best treatment to offer to MPM patients and, unfortunately, survival, as well as quality of life, is still poor.

Table 2
Correlation of pathological parameters between the 2 MPM patient groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pathological parameters (mean ± S.D.)</th>
<th>IL-2 Treatment</th>
<th>No IL-2 treatment</th>
<th>P-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tryptase</td>
<td>29.61 ± 46.03</td>
<td>4.26 ± 6.70</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chymase</td>
<td>25.95 ± 19.14</td>
<td>20.07 ± 8.55</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foxp3</td>
<td>10.43 ± 10.23</td>
<td>3.58 ± 5.87</td>
<td>0.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CD4</td>
<td>63.33 ± 44.38</td>
<td>48.62 ± 34.16</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CD8</td>
<td>88.04 ± 27.16</td>
<td>58.05 ± 38.07</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CD34 – Microvessel count</td>
<td>56.47 ± 23.26</td>
<td>130.43 ± 49.57</td>
<td>0.000000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VEGF</td>
<td>38.43 ± 31.17</td>
<td>44.34 ± 37.27</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MPM, malignant pleural mesothelioma; VEGF, vascular endothelial growth factor.
In this study, we had the possibility of investigating surgical specimens of two series of patients, who underwent different multimodality treatments in different periods. Considering the pathological characteristics the main difference between the two groups was that the first group underwent intrapleural preoperative IL-2, while the second did not.

We observed a statistically significant increase of trypatase positive MCs in the IL-2 treated group of patients.

We have previously demonstrated in a series of IL-2 treated patients with MPM that tumor-infiltrating tryptase MCs predict a better clinical outcome [11]. In the present study, we observed that all of the MPM patients showed infiltrating trypatase MCs in the tumor microenvironment, even at different levels, supporting the hypothesis for an important role of trypatase MCs, independent of the IL-2 preoperative treatment.

Regarding the tumor-infiltrating lymphocytes, we observed a statistically significant increase in both CD8 and Foxp3+ lymphocytes in the IL-2 treatment group. It has already been demonstrated that CD8+ T-cells play a pivotal role in mediating local tumor immunity throughout antigen-specific tumor cell killing [12] and that in human MPM high levels of CD8+ tumor-infiltrating lymphocytes are associated with a better prognosis, and with a lower incidence of mediastinal lymph node metastasis [13]. If IL-2 increases the number of CD8+ lymphocytes and enhances CD8+ cytotoxic lymphocyte activity this is a valid rationale for using IL-2 in order to improve the survival of MPM patients.

Regulatory T-cells, a subset of CD4+CD25+Foxp3+ T-lymphocytes (Treg lymphocytes), are mediators with the functional ability to regulate/suppress tumor immunity [12]. In our study, we observed a significantly higher number of positive Treg cells in the group of IL-2 treated patients compared with untreated patients and, observing a better survival in the case of lower number of Foxp3+ T-lymphocytes, we may deduce that depletion of the Treg subset lymphocytes may enhance the ability of IL-2 to boost host immunity against cancer.

In conclusion, by comparing the clinical-pathological characteristics of MPM patients, who underwent preoperative immunotherapy and patients who did not, we verified the changes in MPM microenvironment induced by immunotherapy and we demonstrated that treatment of MPM with intra-pleural IL-2 leads, on one hand to an increase in trypatase positive MCs, and in CD8+ and Foxp3+ lymphocytes, and on the other hand to an inhibition of the tumoral angiogenesis.

These findings give new insights into the complex anti-tumoral mechanisms mediated by IL-2 in malignant mesotheliomas, which are useful if IL-2 is to be successfully used in the multimodality treatment of MPM patients. Further studies are required to confirm the functional properties of the effector, or regulatory phenotypes, since the anti-cancer effect of IL-2 as well as other immunostimulators is much more complex than we actually know.
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