

**Immune Monitoring of Kidney Transplant
Recipients with Post-transplant Malignancy**

Christopher Martin Hope

University of Adelaide

School of Health Science

Discipline of Medicine

Submitted: February 2014

Declaration:

This work contains no material which has been accepted for the award of any other degree or diploma in any university or other tertiary institution to Christopher Martin Hope and, to the best of my knowledge and belief, contains no material previously published or written by another person, except where due reference has been made in the text.

I give consent to this copy of my thesis when deposited in the University Library, being made available for loan and photocopying, subject to the provisions of the Copyright Act 1968.

The author acknowledges that copyright of published works contained within this thesis entitled “The immune phenotype may relate to cancer development in kidney transplant recipients.” resides with the copyright holder(s) of those works. I also give permission for the digital version of my thesis to be made available on the web, via the University’s digital research repository, the Library catalogue, and also through web search engines.

Chris Hope

Acknowledgements:

First and foremost I wish to dedicate this thesis to, and acknowledge, those kidney transplant recipients who have donated blood, especially those who have subsequently died of their malignancies.

Secondly, I wish to acknowledge my supervisors, Dr Robert Carroll and Professor Toby Coates for enabling this research to occur and for their guidance and mentorship during the project.

I wish to thank all those who helped during my time at the Centre of Clinical and Experimental Transplantation (CCET), including; Katherine Pilkington for teaching me the intricacies of flow cytometry, Joy Mundy for access to the clinical flow laboratory's BD FACS Canto II at a time when access to our own machine was limited and impractical.

Professor Simon Barry and Mrs Susan Bresatz-Akins, for teaching me the CD154 suppression of expression assay.

Professor Peter Heeger and staff, for allowing me to visit and perform a variety of assays within the Mount Sinai Medical School Laboratory the most important being the B cell proliferation and subsequent Clinical Trials in Organ Transplantation, Enzyme Linked Immuno-SPOT (ELISPOT) assay.

I wish to thank all those who have helped me during my time researching from Honours through to the end of this PhD.

Abstract:

Half of all long-term (>10 years) Australian Kidney Transplant Recipients (KTR) will develop Squamous Cell Carcinoma (SCC) or Solid Organ Cancer (SOC), making cancer the leading cause of death with a functioning kidney graft. Immunosuppressive drugs increase the risk of cancer but prevent rejection. Finding a balance of immunosuppression may decrease cancer incidence without increasing rejection incidence. United Kingdom (UK) KTR with cancer have increased Regulatory T cells (Tregs) and decreased Natural Killer (NK) cells compared to UK KTR without cancer. However, it is not known if these immune cells and their function differ in Australian KTR with SCC or SOC. If so, then these tests will identify patients at risk of developing cancer and may benefit from reduction of immunosuppression. The presence of Donor Specific Antibodies (DSA) and a positive IFN- γ Enzyme Linked Immuno-SPOT (ELISPOT) assay associates with antibody mediated rejection and can predict cell mediated rejection episodes, respectively. It is not known if these differ in KTR with cancer vs KTR with no cancer. An immune phenotype was analysed in 116 KTR and prospectively followed for 3.5 years. The immune function of Tregs and NK cells as well as viral, mitogen and allo-responses were measured in 50/116 (43%) of these KTR.

Summary Table of Results	No Cancer	Cancer	P-value
Tregs cells/ μ l	8 (3, 19)	16 (6, 23)	0.016
NK cells/ μ l	107 (34, 195)	74 (43, 188)	0.980
CFSE 1:4 Treg:Eff. cell ratio, median (Range)	2 (1-7)	9 (3-15)	<0.001
CD154 1:4 Treg:Eff. cell ratio, median (Range)	13 (5-54)	36 (13-73)	0.015
PBMC (NK cell) Lysis, median (Range)	2 (0-11)	0 (0-5)	0.037
Donor Specific Antibodies (DSA)	3 (16%)	3 (10%)	0.661
Mitogen stimulation (PHA), median (Range)	1467(265-2000)	512 (51-1500)	0.002
Alloresponse (PRT), median (Range)	342 (11-1967)	151 (29-765)	0.008

KTR with cancer have different immune phenotype and function compared to KTR with no cancer. Memory B cells and CD8 $\gamma\delta$ T cells associated with cancer development (Odds Ratio (95% C.I.); (1.03[1.00-1.06], $p=0.038$ and 1.01 [1.00-1.02], $p=0.080$, respectively). Treg numbers associate with SOC ($p=0.053$), predict SCC that develops (AUC=0.78), and can also predict aggressive lesions (AUC=0.86). Treg numbers are dynamic around cancer diagnosis ($p=0.022$) and resection ($p<0.001$). Australian KTR with cancer have increased non-specific Treg function ($p<0.05$) and decreased NK cell mediated cancer cytolysis ($p=0.037$), signs of a Treg induced/cancer-permissive immune system. Additionally, KTR have decreased IFN- γ release under allogeneic ($p=0.008$) and mitogenic stimulation ($p=0.002$) and similar levels of DSA ($p=0.661$) than KTR with no cancer.

These data indicate that KTR with cancer who have reduced allo-responses may have the potential to have alterations to their immunosuppressive drug levels. This reduction and its effects on the immune system can be monitored using the assays described in this thesis.

Table of Contents

Chapter 1: Introduction	10
1. Cancer complications post renal transplantation.....	10
1.1 Immunosuppression type	11
1.1.1 Azathioprine	12
1.1.2 Mycophenolate	12
1.1.3 Calcineurin Inhibitors	13
1.1.4 Corticosteroids.....	14
1.1.5 mammalian Target Of Rapamycin inhibitors	14
1.1.6 Anti-Thymocyte Globulin (ATG) induction therapy	15
1.2 Immunosuppression dose	15
1.3 Immunosuppression duration	15
1.4 Age and Gender.....	16
1.5 Ultra-violet radiation	16
1.6 Viral infection	17
1.7 Immune phenotyping	18
1.7.1 Regulatory T cells (Tregs).....	19
1.7.2 CD4 ⁺ Treg subsets	19
1.7.3 Tregs in viral infections.....	21
1.7.4 Tregs and Transplantation	21
1.7.5 Tregs in Cancer and Immune surveillance	22
1.7.6 NK cells in Cancer and Immune surveillance	23
1.7.7 CD8 Subsets in Cancer and Immune surveillance	24
1.8 Treatment options for KTR with cancer	25
1.8.1 Pre-treatment alloresponse measures	26
1.9 Summary, Aims and Hypotheses	26
1.9.1 Aims:	27
1.9.2 Hypotheses:	27
Chapter 2: Patients, Materials and Methods	28
2.1 Patient recruitment	28
2.2 Blood Collection and sample handling	28
2.2.1 Cryopreservation	29
2.2.2 Thawing.....	29
2.3 Immune Phenotyping	30
2.3.1 Immune Phenotyping: Surface and Intra-Cellular Staining	30

2.3.2 Immune Phenotyping: Flow Cytometry	31
2.3.3 Immune Phenotyping: Statistical Analyses	34
2.4 Treg Function	35
2.4.1 Healthy CD4 ⁺ CD25 ⁻ effector T cell isolation.....	35
2.4.2 Healthy control and KTR CD4 ⁺ CD127 ^{lo} CD25 ⁺ Treg isolation	35
2.4.3 CFSE dilution assay	35
2.4.4 Suppression of CD154/CD40L expression assay.....	36
2.5 NK cell Function	37
2.5.1 Lactate dehydrogenase release	37
2.5.2 Target Induced NK cell Lysis (TINKL).....	38
2.6 Cellular immune responses in KTR	38
2.6.1 Anti-HLA and Anti-DSA antibody measurements (B cell responses).....	38
2.6.2 B-cell expansion	39
2.6.3 Panel of Reactive T (PRT) cell IFN-gamma ELISPOT	39
2.7 Prospective study of immunosuppression dose reductions in 12 KTR.....	40
Chapter 3: Patient demographics and clinical characteristics.....	42
3.1 Introduction	42
3.1.1 Chapter aims	42
3.1.2 Chapter hypotheses.....	42
3.2 Patient selection	43
3.3 Patient Demographics	45
3.4 Immunosuppression regimen dose and serum levels.....	49
3.5 Functional study sub-cohort.....	51
3.6 Discussion	53
Chapter 4: Immune Phenotyping	54
4.1 Introduction	54
4.1.2 Chapter Hypotheses.....	56
4.2 Chapter Methods	57
4.2.1 Antibody Panel	57
4.2.2 Antibody Titrations	59
4.2.3 Titration of whole blood.....	60
4.2.4 Regulatory T cell staining optimisation	61
4.2.5 FOXP3 antibody titration	61
4.2.6 FOXP3 Whole blood staining	62
4.2.7 FOXP3 clone validation	63

4.3 Results	64
4.3.1 Utilisation of HELIOS as natural Treg (nTreg) marker	64
4.3.2 Immune Phenotype and association to cancer in KTR.....	65
4.3.3 Viral and immunosuppression drug related associations to immune phenotype	70
4.3.4 Induction therapy and immune phenotype	74
4.3.5 Immunosuppression regimen and immune phenotype	75
4.3.6 Immune phenotype ability to predict cancer	84
4.3.7 Cancer presence and immune phenotype	91
4.4 Discussion	93
Chapter 5: Immune Cell Function	100
5.1 Introduction	100
5.1.1 Chapter Aims:.....	103
5.1.2 Chapter Hypotheses:.....	103
5.2 Chapter Methods:.....	103
5.2.1 Carboxyfluorescein diacetate succinimidyl ester (CFSE) dilution assay.....	103
5.2.2 CD154 suppression of expression assay.....	107
5.2.3 Lactate Dehydrogenase (LDH) release assay	109
5.2.4 Target Induce NK cell Loss (TINKL) Assay	115
5.3 Results	117
5.3.1 CFSE dilution assay of nTreg function in Kidney Transplant Recipients (KTR)..	117
5.3.2 CD154 suppression of expression of natural Treg (nTreg) function in Kidney Transplant Recipients (KTR)	120
5.3.3 Correlations of CD154 to CFSE suppression assays.....	122
5.3.4 Cancer and LDH release in KTR.....	122
5.4 Discussion	127
Chapter 6: Measurement of Alloresponses	130
6.1 Introduction	130
6.1.1 Chapter Aims.....	132
6.1.2 Chapter Hypotheses.....	132
6.2 Chapter Methods	132
6.2.1 Panel of Reactive Antibodies (PRA) solid phase assay	132
6.2.2 Panel of Reactive T cells (PRT) stimulated Interferon- γ Enzyme Linked Immuno- SPOT (ELISPOT) assay.	133
6.3 Results	139

6.3.1 Anti-Human Leukocyte Antigen (HLA) and Anti-Donor Specific Antibodies (DSA) in Kidney Transplant Recipients (KTR).....	140
6.3.2 Panel of Reactive T-cells (PRT) Interferon-gamma (IFN- γ) response in Kidney Transplant Recipients (KTR) as measured by Enzyme Linked ImmunoSPOT (ELISPOT).	141
6.3.3 Viral and mitogen stimulated Interferon- γ release	143
6.4 Discussion	144
Chapter 7: Concluding remarks and future directions	146
7.1 Key findings	146
7.1.1 Patient Cohort Characteristics	146
7.1.2 Immune Phenotype	146
7.1.3 Immune Cell function.....	146
7.1.4 Allo-responses	146
7.2 Future directions.....	147
7.3 Conclusions	149
References:.....	150
Appendix: Published Paper:	1508