TCR-peptide contact profile determines immunogenicity in

pathogen/tumor-derived MHC-I epitopes.

Authors: Masato Ogishi[1, 2*] and Hiroshi Yotsuyanagi[2]

Affiliations:

[1] National Center for Global Health and Medicine Hospital, Tokyo, 162-8655, Japan

[2] Department of Infectious Diseases and Applied Immunology, Research Hospital, The

Institute of Medical Science, The University of Tokyo, Tokyo, 108-0071, Japan

* To whom correspondence should be addressed: Masato Ogishi

(oogishi-tky@umin.ac.jp)

One Sentence Summary: Accurate epitope prediction was achieved via machine

learning by incorporating TCR-peptide contact profiles.

Keywords: Epitope prediction, T cell receptor repertoire, amino acid contact potential,

machine learning

Conflict of Interest (COI): The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

Abstract

Computational methodologies to predict epitopes for cytotoxic T lymphocytes (CTLs) will galvanize vaccine research and pave the way toward targeted immunotherapy of infections and cancer. However, the classification of immunogenic epitopes and non-immunogenic major histocompatibility complex (MHC) class I ligands *in silico* has yet to attain sufficient accuracy. Here, we demonstrated highly accurate epitope prediction by a machine learning-based classifier incorporating T cell receptor (TCR)-peptide contact profiles, with an accuracy of 0.77 and an area under the curve of 0.84 in hold-out validation. Predictive accuracy was retained for five major human leucocyte antigen supertypes. Successful prediction using independent datasets of viral epitopes and tumor neoepitopes was demonstrated. Collectively, this is the first study demonstrating accurate and generalizable CTL immunogenicity prediction from the TCR-peptide axis. The R package *Repitope* was implemented to maximize code reusability. Prospective validation in vaccination and/or cancer immunotherapy cohorts is warranted.

Introduction

The adaptive immune system is driven by antigen recognition. The capability of

triggering immune responses is termed 'immunogenicity'. Antigens are processed into

fragments of peptides by proteasomes, and coupled to major histocompatibility complex

[MHC; also called the human leucocyte antigen (HLA) in humans] molecules on the

surface of antigen-presenting cells (APCs). Antigenic peptides presented by

MHC-bearing cells are called MHC ligands. Naïve T cells interact with the MHC ligands

(MHCLs) via their receptor (T cell receptor, TCR), and successful recognition activates

them to initiate subsequent immunological orchestration(1). Immunogenic MHCLs are

termed 'epitopes'. Conversely, being MHCLs does not ensure immunogenicity(2).

Acquired immunity plays an indispensable role in rejecting both pathogens and

tumors. Accumulating evidence is shedding light on mutation-derived epitopes, or

neoepitopes, as the targets of anticancer T cell immunity. First, the efficacy of immune

checkpoint inhibitors correlates with tumor mutational burden(3–6). Second,

mismatch-repair deficiency, which increases the overall genomic instability and tumor

mutational burden, has been shown to predict a better outcome in patients receiving

checkpoint blockade therapy(7), which eventually led to the FDA approval of the first

pan-cancer efficacy biomarker(8). Third, the presence of neoepitope-specific T cells in

patients has been established(*9–11*). Finally, even outside the context of immunotherapy,

a heavier mutational burden has been shown to predict a longer overall survival through

the meta-analysis of genomic sequencing datasets from studies of six tumor types(*12*).

Collectively, these observations led to the unprecedented progress of precision

immunotherapy initiatives in oncoimmunology. However, personalized anticancer

immunotherapy is still at a nascent stage, in important part owing to the lack of a fast and

scalable methodology to screen potent neoepitopes. The test-one-by-one strategy is not

feasible given the heavy mutational burden observed in most types of cancer, and, albeit

extensively studied, immunoinformatics has achieved only minimal success to date in

predicting potent neoepitopes from their genomic profiles(*13*).

Two types of computational tools have been explored for applications in epitope

prediction. The first type predicts properties in the processes involved in antigen

presentation, including antigen processing, peptide transport, and the affinity and stability

of the MHC-peptide complex (*14–17*). A limitation of this approach is the high false

discovery rate in terms of immunogenicity (i.e., only a small fraction of the peptides

predicted and subsequently shown to bind to MHC are actually recognized by T cells and

elicit effective responses). The second category of tool used for epitope discovery is

aimed at the direct prediction of immunogenicity. Several immunoinformatic tools have

been proposed for the prediction of MHC class I (MHC-I) epitopes, which activate

cytotoxic T lymphocytes (CTLs) (*18–23*). However, none of them has demonstrated

adequate predictive performance in validation datasets, or has been successfully applied

to real-world datasets such as tumor neoepitope sequences obtained from immune

checkpoint inhibitor clinical trials.

Epitopes, by definition, are recognized by T cells via TCRs. However, in contrast to

the MHC-peptide axis, the TCR-peptide axis has yet to be thoroughly examined in the

context of immunogenicity. Exceptional research led by Chowell et al. demonstrated that

immunogenicity prediction was improved by incorporating hydrophobicity at TCR

contact residues(*23*). However, their model focuses on the biochemical properties of

MHC-I-loaded peptides but does not specifically address TCR-peptide interactions

themselves. On the other hand, a groundbreaking study conducted by Strønen et al. shed

light on the TCR-dependent nature of peptide immunogenicity in the context of

oncoimmunology(*24*). They showed that naïve T cell repertoires of healthy blood donors

were able to trigger effective immune responses against a variety of neoepitopes isolated

from cancer patients treated with immune checkpoint inhibitors. Many of the targeted

neoepitopes were overlooked by autologous tumor-infiltrating lymphocytes *in vivo*.

Furthermore, patient-derived T cells transformed with the appropriate donor TCR

successfully invigorated anti-neoepitope immunity. Their results suggest that even

MHCLs non-immunogenic to autologous TCRs can serve as epitopes if recognized by

appropriate TCRs.

We started the whole project aiming at unveiling the enigma of the

immunogenicity on MHC-I-loaded peptides on the basis of the following hypothesis:

are peptides stably interacting with the host TCR repertoire more likely to be

immunogenic? If this is the case, prediction of peptide immunogenicity may be

significantly improved by incorporating the TCR-peptide axis. Given that human TCR

repertoires are evolutionarily optimized so as to effectively combat pathogens and

cancers, we utilized a pooled human TCR repertoire sequenced from the commercial

RNA of peripheral blood CD8$^+$ T cells for reference. We defined repertoire-wide

TCR-peptide contact profiles (rTPCP) using amino acid pairwise contact potential

(AACP) scales to quantitatively parametrize TCR-peptide interactions to classify

epitopes and MHCLs through a machine learning (ML) approach. Our initial model

achieved unprecedented accuracy in hold-out validation. When the rTPCP definition

was modified to incorporate position-specific effects (mrTPCP), comparable accuracy

was achieved with just one AACP scale. Prediction was not biased for at least five HLA

supertypes. Permutation of peptide sequences, but not TCR sequences, undermined

predictive accuracy. Successful prediction was demonstrated using independent

epitope/MHCL datasets of viral and tumor origin. Moreover, using a mutational

landscape dataset obtained from checkpoint inhibitor trials, a correlation between

predicted neoepitope burden and clinical outcome was shown. Overall, this is the first

study demonstrating a highly accurate and generalizable epitope prediction by

integrating the TCR-peptide axis. The codes for rTPCP and mrTPCP analysis were

compiled into the R package *Repitope* (https://github.com/masato-ogishi/Repitope/).

Prospective validation of this tool in independent cohorts of vaccination and cancer

immunotherapy is necessary to evaluate its possible clinical applicability.

Results

Preparation of pooled human TCR repertoire dataset

First, we screened public databases such as Sequence Read Archive, but failed to

find a suitable human TCR sequence dataset. Therefore, we generated an in-house TCR

repertoire data by sequencing the variable regions of TCR β chains (TCR-Vβ) from

commercially available pooled human peripheral $CD8^+$ T cells. Among the three

complementarity-determining regions (CDRs), we focused on CDR3, because it has the

largest diversity among CDR regions, and CDR1 and CDR2 are primarily involved in the

recognition of MHC, not the ligand presented(*1*). Rarefaction analysis estimated the total

CDR3 clonotype diversity be approximately 1500, out of which 872 unique clonotypes

were identified (fig. S1). No apparent bias in CDR3 length or Variable (V) and Junction

(J) segment usage was observed (fig. S2).

Immunogenicity prediction from repertoire-wide TCR-peptide contact profiles

parametrized using amino acid contact potentials

Immunogenicity prediction model necessitates quantitative parametrization of the

likelihood that a given peptide stably interacts with a given set of TCRs. Although

molecular dynamics simulation would be the most accurate method, it is not appropriate

because of its high demand for computational power; our goal is to construct a "portable"

prediction framework that can be run on ordinary desktop computers. To simplify the

framework, we adopted a sequence-based prediction strategy using AACPs listed in the

AAIndex database(*25*) (http://www.genome.jp/aaindex/AAindex/list_of_potentials) as

the measurement of energetic stability, or the decrease in free energy, of TCR-peptide

interaction. We hereby propose the concept of rTPCP, where a given peptide contacts

with all TCRs in a given repertoire with varying contact potentials (Fig. 1; see

Supplementary Materials and Methods for details). Using the rTPCP variables, we

attempted ML-based classification of MHCL peptides into immunogenic (functional

epitope) and non-immunogenic subsets. We utilized the peptide dataset compiled by

Chowell et al., which contains 7582 distinct human peptides (*23*). Preliminary analyses

suggested support vector machine (SVM) as the most accurate and balanced algorithm.

As an initial attempt, we focused on 450 epitopes and 450 ligands restricted on human

leucocyte antigen A2 (HLA-A2). We retrieved 35 AAIndex AACP scales (table S1) to

calculate rTPCP variables. To our surprise, the resultant SVM-based immunogenicity

prediction model achieved an unprecedentedly high predictive performance in the

hold-out validation dataset [accuracy, 0.81; 95% confidence interval (CI), 0.76 to 0.86;

receiver operating characteristic (ROC) area under the curve (AUC), 0.87; 95% CI, 0.83

to 0.91] (Fig. 2A). Four additional iterations using different random seeds yielded

comparable results (table S2).

One caveat of ML-based prediction is over-parametrization, which may lead to

model instability and limited generalizability, as is the case for our model (2520 rTPCP

variables against 900 HLA-A2-restricted peptides). Variable importance analysis

revealed that the AAIndex AACP scale MIYS990106, which represents inter-residue

pairwise contact energies(*26*), yielded the most consistently important variables (fig.

S3). Therefore, we retrained the SVM-based classifier solely using the

MIYS990106-derived rTPCP variables. This time, we included a full set of

epitopes/MHCLs in the dataset to maximize overall data size, resulting in a matrix with

72 variables for 7575 distinct peptides. The model achieved considerably high

performance despite the relatively small number of variables (accuracy, 0.75; 95% CI,

0.73 to 0.76; AUC, 0.81; 95% CI, 0.80 to 0.83) (Fig. 2B). Four additional iterations with

different random seeds yielded comparable results (table S3).

Improved immunogenicity prediction by incorporating position-specific contact

profiles

MHC-loaded peptides interact with TCRs at specific positions(*1*). The effects of

position-specific interactions may counterbalance each other in TPCP. To test this

hypothesis, we modified the rTPCP definition to incorporate position-specific

interactions (mrTPCP; schematically depicted in Figure 3). In this iteration, every TCR

was fragmented and pooled to generate a TCR fragment repertoire, and representative

statistics were calculated on a set of AACPs (see Supplementary Materials and Methods

for details). Because of the position-specific nature of the analysis, we limited the

subsequent analysis to 4738 unique nonapeptides in the Chowell dataset. The

SVM-based classifier trained from 187 mrTPCP variables outperformed our previous

rTPCP-based classifier (accuracy, 0.77; 95% CI, 0.75 to 0.79; AUC, 0.84; 95% CI, 0.82

to 0.86), with statistical significance [$p = 0.048$, according to the *roc.test* function

implemented in the *pROC* package(*27*)] (Fig. 4A). For comparison, the same dataset

was used to test three previously published immunogenicity prediction tools with

publicly available source code or web implementation. However, none of the tested

tools achieved similarly meaningful prediction; the accuracies were 0.56, 0.59, and 0.57

for POPISK(*19*), PAAQD(*20*), and EpitopePrediction(*28*), respectively.

183   The amino acid compositions of MHCLs are restricted by the HLA to which they

are coupled. Since our mrTPCP framework is not dependent on HLA information, it

might be useful for pan-specific immunogenicity prediction. To test this hypothesis,

4738 unique nonapeptides in the Chowell dataset were stratified based on their

corresponding HLA supertypes, and ROC analysis was conducted (Fig. 4B). The trained

classifier worked with no significant decrease in accuracy for at least five major HLA

supertypes (HLA-A1, A2, B15, B44, and B57) for which a sufficient amount of peptide

data was available.

Previous studies suggest that position-specific amino acid usage biases in

MHC-coupled peptides affect their immunogenicity[21, 23]. In our model, windows 1

and 2 seemed to be of higher importance, but no exceptionally important window was

identified (fig. S4). To further evaluate these position-dependent characteristics, we next

conducted sequence manipulation analysis; mrTPCP variables were calculated for

manipulated peptide sequences or using manipulated reference TCR repertoire

sequences. The classifier trained from authentic TCRs and peptides was then applied to

perform ROC analysis. Manipulation of TCRs led to a minimal decrease in AUC,

whereas manipulation of peptides led to a significant decrease in AUC (Fig. 4C).

Difference in amino acid compositions between epitopes and MHCLs was only of

partial predictive significance, indicating that position-specific or sequence-specific

features are the major determinants of immunogenicity.

Collectively, these observations suggest that the mrTPCP framework effectively

mimics the biological mechanisms of CTL immunogenicity, thereby providing a

promising methodology for accurate epitope prediction.

Immunogenicity prediction using independent datasets

207   Any pattern learned from one dataset is not always extendable to other datasets

constructed in different contexts. Therefore, we tested the performance of our

immunogenicity prediction model by utilizing independent datasets adopted from

previous publications(*4*, *10*, *24*, *29–32*), after removing peptides overlapping with those

in the Chowell dataset. As expected, randomly selected 10,000 MHCLs retrieved from

the Immune Epitope Database (IEDB) were predicted as either immunogenic or

non-immunogenic in an approximately 1:1 ratio, with a uniform distribution of

predicted probabilities (Fig. 5A and Table 1). In contrast, epitope datasets of viral and

tumor origin were significantly enriched with peptides predicted as epitopes ($p < 0.01$ by

Wilcoxon's rank sum test in comparison with randomly selected MHCLs from IEDB). It

is notable that 16 out of 22 (73%) well-defined neoepitopes and 22 out of 35 (63%) best

neoepitopes reported by Stronen et al. had probabilities of > 0.80 (Fig. 5A). With the

probability threshold of 0.80, our model also effectively classified the epitope/MHCL

dataset from various pathogens originally reported by Calis et al.(*21*) (accuracy, 0.71;

95% CI, 0.67 to 0.75; AUC, 0.77; 95% CI, 0.71 to 0.82) (Fig. 5B).

222   Encouraged by these observations, we next explored the possibility that our

immunogenicity prediction model improves the correlation between neoepitope burden

and clinical outcomes in checkpoint inhibitor trials. First, we adopted clinical and

mutational data from non-small cell lung carcinoma (NSCLC) patients treated with

pembrolizumab (n = 23)(*3*). We observed a slightly improved correlation between

neoepitope burden and progression-free survival (PFS) ($R = 0.55$, $p = 0.007$), compared

with the correlation between originally reported mutated peptide burden and PFS ($R =$

0.61, $p = 0.002$), although the improvement is not statistically significant as determined

by the methods implemented in the *cocor* package(*33*) (Fig. 6A). The PFSs of three

patients, namely, CA9903, CU9061, and SA9755, were better predicted (Fig. 6A). Next,

we analyzed clinical and mutational data from melanoma patients treated with

ipilimumab (n = 110)(*5*). Clinical benefit (CB) was defined as originally reported(*5*).

There were significant differences in both mutational burden and predicted neoepitope

burden between patients with and without CB (Fig. 6B). Overall, our results showed

that neoepitope burden predicted through the mrTPCP framework retains at least

comparable usefulness as a biomarker as compared with conventional mutational

burden, with greatly reduced number of neoepitope candidates, enabling more focused

approach in view of precision immunotherapy.

Finally, we compared estimated neoepitope burden across 21 tumor types in The

Cancer Genome Atlas (TCGA)(*34*). HLA-A-02:01 was chosen for subsequent analysis

as an example. Using the *EpitopePrediction* package(*28*), a total of 108,730 9-mer

MHCLs, of which 105,959 were unique, were identified. Immunogenicity prediction

was performed as described, with the probability threshold of 0.80. A total of 69,587

(64%) mutated peptides were predicted as neoepitopes. Skin cutaneous melanoma

(SKCM), lung squamous cell carcinoma (LUSC), and lung adenocarcinoma (LUAD)

were the three most MHCL-enriched, and neoepitope-enriched types of cancer (Fig. 7A).

There was a significant gene-by-gene variation of the ratio of neoepitope burden to the

MHCL burden (Fig. 7B). Mitochondrial enzymes (MT-CO1 and MT-ND4) and

olfactory receptors (OR2T2, OR4A5, OR4C16, OR4K2, OR5J2, and OR7D4) were the

genes that were particularly high-yield in terms of neoepitopes.

R package implementation of immunogenicity prediction framework

We implemented the R package *Repitope* to maximize code reusability. *Repitope*

contains datasets used in this study, functions to calculate rTPCP and mrTPCP variables

for user-provided peptide datasets and reference TCR repertoire data, and the mrTPCP

SVM classifier developed in this study. Source codes are deposited for public use at

GitHub (https://github.com/masato-ogishi/Repitope/).

Discussion

In this work, the accurate classification of epitopes and non-immunogenic MHC-I

ligands was achieved by introducing the concept of repertoire-wide TCR-peptide contact

profiles. Considering that current concepts of CTL epitope prediction are mostly focused

on the peptide-MHC axis, it is of interest that our immunogenicity prediction model

incorporating the TCR-peptide axis showed improved predictive capability over previous

models.

We decided to use the dataset previously compiled by Chowell et al. for the

following reasons. First, we eschewed compiling peptide datasets from scrach to avoid

potential selection bias. Second, the dataset contains a sufficiently large number of human

peptide data from IEDB, the largest and least biased data source available. Finally, the

mutual exclusiveness of epitopes and MHCLs included in the dataset is ideal for model

training and evaluation; the immunogenic CTL epitopes included were defined by T cell

assays, and non-immunogenic MHCLs included were proven by MHC ligand elution

assays, with any potentially immunogenic eluted ligand associated with autoimmunity or

cancer being excluded. Consequently, the SVM classifier developed in this work

successfully classified epitopes and MHCLs with unprecedented accuracy (Figs. 2 and 4).

Moreover, our model also improved upon previous ones in that it employs smaller

number of variables(*19*, *22*) (fig. S3). Generally, ML classifiers using smaller numbers of

variables are preferable, since over-parametrization frequently causes ML algorithms to

"cheat", or to find variables distributed unevenly between the two classes in question just

because of stochastic fluctuation (with no generalizability for external data). Our

mrTPCP model employs only one AACP scale for parametrization, which resulted in 187

mrTPCP variables. This is a fairly small size when considering the number of input

peptides.

Our mrTPCP framework has two notable features: independence from HLA

specificity, and dependence on a reference TCR repertoire. First, pan-specific

immunogenicity prediction may be feasible, as it does not depend on HLA information.

We showed that our model worked with minimal performance reduction for at least five

major HLA supertypes (HLA-A1, A2, B15, B44, and B57), for which sufficient amount

of peptide data was available (Fig. 4B). This point could further be explored with more

immunogenicity data for various HLA alleles in the future. Second, the framework

requires reference TCR repertoire. The model discussed in this study relies on the pooled

TCR repertoire of German origin, which could be a source of bias. However,

immunogenicity could still be predicted with a minimal decrease in AUC, even when

using completely random sequences instead of TCR repertoire (Fig. 4C). Conversely,

manipulation of input peptide sequences resulted in a significant decrease in predictive

accuracy (Fig. 4C). These observations suggested that the mrTPCP framework is

primarily dependent on the inherent features of epitope sequence but not the reference

repertoire. Interestingly, peptide sequence permutation and randomization with relative

amino acid compositions retained led to moderately decreased AUC (0.68 and 0.64,

respectively), whereas completely random peptide sequences could not be classified

(AUC = 0.50). This is consistent with the previous research of Calis et al., in which an

AUC of 0.65 was obtained when residue-specific properties but not sequence-specific

properties were taken into consideration(*21*). Collectively, both amino acid composition

and sequence-specific features recapitulated by the mrTPCP framework are important in

determining peptide immunogenicity.

The regulatory mechanisms of CTL activation are asymmetric, and it is this

asymmetry that makes the construction of immunogenicity prediction models

complicated. The activation part is relatively simple; stable and strong interactions in the

TCR-peptide-MHC complex are the main driving force of T cell activation(*1*). In contrast,

there are several immunomodulatory systems outside the TCR-peptide-MHC axis

affecting the T cell activation process *in vivo*, including regulatory T cells (Tregs)(*35*),

CTL exhaustion mediated by chronic immune checkpoint signals, and the

immunosuppressive microenvironment engendered by solid tumors(*36, 37*). Considering

this asymmetry, immunogenicity prediction models based solely on peptide sequence

may in principle yield some false positives. Therefore, our results should be recognized as

preliminary, warranting prospective validation to evaluate their clinical applicability.

That being said, however, eliminating candidates least likely to be immunogenic *in silico*

should greatly expedite research in targeted immunotherapy, and the findings in our

present study are indeed encouraging; epitopes of viral and tumor origin not included in

the training/testing dataset were successfully predicted with high sensitivity, whereas

predicted probabilities of MHCLs randomly retrieved from IEDB distributed almost

uniformly from 0 to 1 (Fig. 5 and Table 1). It is reasonable to assume a distribution of

levels of immunogenicity in the dataset of randomly selected MHCLs without T cell

assay-based annotation. Furthermore, we showed that the usefulness of neoepitope

burden as a biomarker for clinical outcome was not affected, or even slightly improved,

when candidate mutations were filtered using our prediction model (Fig. 6). One caveat to

be mentioned is its relatively low sensitivity in predicting HIV epitopes. In addition to the

"general" rules learned from the Chowell dataset which contains epitopes from various

sources, some additional rules may be critical for HIV-specific CTL immunity and could

be machine-learned with more data obtained specifically in the context of chronic HIV

infection.

Immune checkpoint inhibitors achieved revolutionary success in some types of

tumor including melanoma and non-small cell lung carcinoma (NSCLC)(*38–40*).

However, relatively few explanations have been proposed about the reason why these two

types of tumor are the most sensitive to checkpoint blockade. To address this, we

explored the entire TCGA cancer genome dataset(*34*). As anticipated, skin cutaneous

melanoma and NSCLC were most enriched with predicted MHCLs or neoepitopes (Fig.

7A). The ratio of predicted neoepitope to predicted MHCL significantly varied by

respective gene analyzed (Fig. 7B). Focusing on the high-yield genes such as

mitochondrial enzymes and olfactory receptors may expedite the development of

pan-cancer targeted immunotherapy.

Similarly to previous studies on immunogenicity prediction, this study has several

limitations. First, this is a retrospective observational study; no prospective identification

of novel epitopes is demonstrated. Thus, prospective validation is indispensable before

this model can be clinically applied. Second, the process of quantitative parametrization

of TCR-peptide interactions could further be optimized, as our window-based pairwise

interaction model might oversimplify the biophysicochemical nature of the

TCR-peptide-MHC interactions. In particular, the hypothesis that either a 4-mer or

5-mer window size is sufficient for recapitulating TCR-peptide interactions is not

experimentally verified, necessitating further exploration. Moreover, we limited our

modeling to TCR-Vβ, omitting TCR-Vα; this point could further be explored. Despite

these caveats, however, both the proposed framework of mrTPCP recapitulating the

biology of TCR-peptide interactions and the demonstrated robustness of

immunogenicity prediction represent noticeable progress toward fully unveiling the

mechanisms underlying CTL immunity, paving the way toward precision

immunotherapy against pathogens and cancer.

In conclusion, accurate epitope prediction was achieved through a machine

learning approach by incorporating TCR-peptide interactions parametrized using an

optimal amino acid pairwise contact potential scale. Unbiased prediction was

demonstrated for peptides coupled to multiple major HLA supertypes. The framework

was primarily reliant on the sequence-dependent features of the peptides, and only

minimally affected by the perturbation of the reference TCR repertoire. The resultant

classifier worked well for independent viral epitopes and tumor neoepitopes. These

findings not only provide valuable insights into the mechanisms underlying CTL

immunity, but could also bolster the ongoing precision immunotherapy initiatives. Code

reusability was maximized by publicly distributing the R package *Repitope*, in which

datasets and key scripts are bundled. Disease-specific, prospective cohort studies could

be conducted to evaluate clinical usefulness in the future.

Materials and Methods

Study design

Research objectives. The purpose of this study was to construct a sequence-based epitope

prediction model by incorporating TCR-peptide contact profiles.

Design. This is a retrospective, observational study. The entire analysis is exploratory; no

predetermined experimental protocol was applied *a priori*.

Data collection. Peptide sequences accompanied by annotations on immunogenicity and

other clinical profiles (if applicable) were manually retrieved from public database and

previously published articles by the authors.

Data size. The optimal sizes of the epitope and MHCL datasets are unknown, since we

hereby proposed a novel framework. Therefore, no statistical estimation was performed

to predetermine sample size.

Computational analysis

All in-house computational analyses were conducted using R ver. 3.4.0

(https://www.r-project.org/) (*42*). The latest versions of R packages were consistently

used. Key datasets and scripts were bundled as the R package *Repitope*, and publicly

distributed in GitHub (https://github.com/masato-ogishi/Repitope/). Other scripts are

available upon request.

Preparation of pooled human TCR repertoire dataset

TCR repertoire sequencing was carried out as previously described[43], except the

primers being used. Briefly, total RNA from CD8^{+} T cells collected from donated

peripheral blood of German origin was purchased (Miltenyi Biotec) and used as the

source of a pooled TCR repertoire. Primers for human TCR-Vβ were adopted from

previously published work[44]. All primers were synthesized by Life Technologies, and

a template-switching oligo (TSO) containing 5′ terminal unique molecular identifier

(UMI) and 3′ terminal guanidine locked nucleic acid (LNA) was synthesized by

Exiqon[45]. The sequences of the oligonucleotides utilized in this study are summarized

in table S4. Reverse transcription with template-switching and semi-nested step-out PCR

were performed using SMARTScribe (Clontech) and KAPA2G Fast Multiplex PCR

master mix (Kapa Biosystems)[46]. Amplified PCR products were gel-excised, repaired,

and re-purified. Paired-end libraries were prepared, and paired-end sequencing of 2 x 300

bp was performed using MiSeq (Illumina). UMI-guided de-multiplexing was performed

using MiGEC software in order to reduce the effect of PCR amplification bias[47]. CDR3

regions were identified using IMGT/HighV-QUEST[48]

(https://www.imgt.org/HighV-QUEST/).

Epitope/ligand dataset for training/testing immunogenicity prediction model

The dataset primarily utilized in this study is originated from the research led by

Chowell et al(*23*). Any peptide derived from a mouse experiment was removed to create

a human-specific immunogenicity dataset. No additional data filtering was performed to

avoid deliberate peptide selection.

Machine learning for immunogenicity prediction

Machine learning (ML) procedures were streamlined using the *caret* package in

R(*49*). The hold-out validation strategy was adopted; the input dataset was randomly split

into training and testing subdatasets in a ratio of 2:1. The training subdataset was

preprocessed (i.e., centered and scaled) using the *preProcess* function in *caret*. Ten-fold

cross-validations (CVs) were repeated ten times to train classifiers. Testing subdataset

was preprocessed using the preprocessing model generated from the training subdataset,

and immunogenicity was predicted. Unless otherwise noted, the performance metric in

each testing subdataset was reported. As any ML algorithm is designed to self-optimize

through CVs, the performance metric obtained in the process of CVs is an optimized

value for the input dataset. Our true interest is the performance of the trained classifier

when applied to an external dataset not involved in either model training or optimization.

Preliminary assessment suggested that the support vector machine (SVM) was the best

algorithm. SVM has a long history of providing state-of-the-art, well-generalizable

predictions in various biological contexts(*50*). Four SVM methods, namely, *svmLinear*,

svmPoly, *svmRadial*, and *svmRadialSigma*, were tested. We chose *svmPoly* as the best

algorithm on the basis of various factors including accuracy, AUC, balance between

sensitivity and specificity, and the smoothness of the calibration curve. Accuracy was

calculated using the *confusionMatrix* function implemented in *caret*, and AUC was

calculated using either the *classifierplots* function in the *classifierplots* package, or the

roc and *auc* functions implemented in the *pROC* package(*27*).

Epitope/ligand datasets for external validation

The hold-out validation strategy is by itself not sufficient for evaluating the

generalizability of the ML classifier for external datasets. The ML algorithm, after all,

mines hidden patterns applicable across the training dataset. When the hold-out

validation strategy is adopted, training and testing subdatasets derived from a single

data source lie in a single context, and consequently, patterns learned from the training

subdataset is highly likely applicable to the testing subdataset. Therefore, the trained

classifier should be tested and validated with other external datasets constructed in

different contexts. In this study, the trained classifier may be biased, since

autoimmunity- and cancer-associated immunogenic peptides were excluded from the

epitope data, and pathogen-derived MHCLs were excluded from the MHCL data in the

Chowell dataset.

To independently assess the generalizability of the trained immunogenicity

prediction model, epitope datasets were collected from the following sources: (i)

hepatitis C virus (HCV) CTL epitopes

(https://hcv.lanl.gov/content/immuno/tables/ctl_summary.html), (ii) human

immunodeficiency virus type-I (HIV) CTL epitopes

(https://www.hiv.lanl.gov/content/immunology/tables/ctl_summary.html), (iii)

well-established tumor neoepitopes from multiple publications(*4, 10, 29–32*), (iv)

neoepitopes predicted to be the most stable MHC binders identified in the study by

Stronen et al.(*24*), and (v) all neoepitopes identified in the study by Stronen et al. For

comparison, we also obtained a human MHCL dataset from IEDB (http://www.iedb.org/).

Note that the MHCL data lacks T cell assay annotation, and thus the true ratio of 'epitopes'

to 'MHCLs' in the definitions discussed in this study is unknown. Moreover, we retrieved

the epitope/MHCL dataset originally reported by Calis et al(*21*). This dataset is suitable

for assessing the specificity of our immunogenicity prediction model, because it contains

experimentally validated non-immunogenic MHCLs, mostly originated from dengue

virus. Peptide sequences containing alphabetical characters other than those representing

20 authentic amino acid residues were removed. Any peptide contained in the Chowell

dataset was excluded. Datasets are available as supplementary data files (Data files

S1-S6).

Correlation with clinical outcomes in checkpoint inhibitor trials

463   Correlation between mutational landscapes and clinical outcome has been shown

464   in various tumor types in checkpoint inhibitor trials(*3–5*) To test the predictive

465   usefulness of neoepitope burden predicted through the proposed framework, we

466   re-analyzed mutational datasets from two studies(*3*, *5*). Datasets are available as

467   supplementary data files (Data files S7 and S8).

Neoepitope burden across TCGA tumor types

To assess the difference in neoepitope burden across tumor types, we analyzed

genomic datasets derived from The Cancer Genome Atlas project(*34*). For all advanced

stage (Stage III and Stage IV) tumors, mutation annotation format (MAF) files were

downloaded from the National Cancer Institute (NCI) Genomic Data Commons (GDC)

Data Portal (https://portal.gdc.cancer.gov/). Mutation data were parsed, and

nonapeptides harboring mutation were reconstructed by referencing the UniProt human

proteome (ID: UP000005640). HLA-A-02:01 is used as a representative allele, and the

binding stability of all nonapeptides were estimated using the *EpitopePrediction*

package(*28*). The dataset is available as a supplementary data file (Data file S9).

Statistical analysis

No variable distribution was assumed *a priori*, and data were presented as median

and interquartile range, unless otherwise stated. *P* values were reported unadjusted unless

otherwise stated. No accounting for missing data values is applicable. All statistical

analysis is exploratory; no predetermined experimental protocols were applied before

initiating the entire project. All statistical analyses were conducted in R.

Supplementary Materials

Supplementary Materials and Methods

Fig. S1. Clonotype rarefaction analysis in the reference TCR repertoire.

Fig. S2. Composition of the reference TCR repertoire..

Fig. S3. Exploration of AACP scales most important in the immunogenicity prediction

models trained using rTPCP variables.

Fig. S4. Variable importance analysis of the immunogenicity prediction model trained

using mrTPCP variables.

Table S1. AAIndex AACP scales used in this study.

Table S2. Performance evaluation of SVM classifiers with rTPCP variables from all

AAIndex AACP scales.

Table S3. Performance evaluation of SVM classifiers with rTPCP variables from

MIYS990106 AACP scale.

Table S4. Oligonucleotides used in this study.

Data file S1. HCV CTL epitopes.

Data file S2. HIV CTL epitopes.

Data file S3. Well-established tumor neoepitopes from multiple publications.

Data file S4. Best-predicted tumor neoepitopes reported by Stronen et al.

Data file S5. All neoepitopes reported by Stronen et al.

Data file S6. Pathogen-derived epitopes reported by Calis et al.

Data file S7. Tumor neoepitopes and clinical data reported by Rizvi et al.

Data file S8. Tumor neoepitopes and clinical data reported by van Allen et al.

Data file S9. Tumor neoepitope candidates identified from TCGA datasets.

References

1. M. G. Rudolph, R. L. Stanfield, I. A. Wilson, How TCRs bind MHCs, peptides, and coreceptors. *Annu. Rev. Immunol.* **24**, 419–66 (2006).

2. G. T. Gibney, L. M. Weiner, M. B. Atkins, Predictive biomarkers for checkpoint inhibitor-based immunotherapy. *Lancet Oncol.* **17**, e542–e551 (2016).

3. N. A. Rizvi *et al.*, Mutational landscape determines sensitivity to PD-1 blockade in non-small cell lung cancer. *Science (80-.).* **348**, 124–128 (2015).

4. A. Snyder *et al.*, Genetic Basis for Clinical Response to CTLA-4 Blockade in Melanoma. *N. Engl. J. Med.*, 2189–2199 (2014).

5. E. M. Van Allen *et al.*, Genomic correlates of response to CTLA-4 blockade in metastatic melanoma. *Science (80-.).* **350**, 207–211 (2015).

6. L. M. Colli *et al.*, Burden of nonsynonymous mutations among TCGA cancers and candidate immune checkpoint inhibitor responses. *Cancer Res.* **76**, 3767–3772 (2016).

7. A. D. Skora *et al.*, PD-1 Blockade in Tumors with Mismatch-Repair Deficiency. *N. Engl. J. Med.*, 2509–2520 (2017).

8. K. Garber, Oncologists await historic first: a pan-tumor predictive marker, for immunotherapy. *Nat. Biotechnol.* **35**, 297–298 (2017).

9. M. M. Gubin *et al.*, Checkpoint blockade cancer immunotherapy targets

tumour-specific mutant antigens. *Nature*. **515**, 577–581 (2014).

10. N. van Rooij *et al.*, Tumor Exome Analysis Reveals Neoantigen-Specific T-Cell

Reactivity in an Ipilimumab-Responsive Melanoma. *J. Clin. Oncol.* **31**, e439–

e442 (2013).

11. A. Gros *et al.*, Prospective identification of neoantigen-specific lymphocytes in

the peripheral blood of melanoma patients. *Nat. Med.* (2016),

doi:10.1038/nm.4051.

12. S. D. Brown *et al.*, Neo-antigens predicted by tumor genome meta-analysis

correlate with increased patient survival. *Genome Res.* **24**, 743–750 (2014).

13. Editorial, The problem with neoantigen prediction. *Nat. Biotechnol.* **35**, 97–97

(2017).

14. M. Nielsen, C. Lundegaard, O. Lund, C. Keşmir, The role of the proteasome in

generating cytotoxic T-cell epitopes: insights obtained from improved predictions

of proteasomal cleavage. *Immunogenetics*. **57**, 33–41 (2005).

15. T. Stranzl, M. V. Larsen, C. Lundegaard, M. Nielsen, NetCTLpan: pan-specific

MHC class I pathway epitope predictions. *Immunogenetics*. **62**, 357–368 (2010).

16. M. Nielsen, M. Andreatta, NetMHCpan-3.0; improved prediction of binding to

MHC class I molecules integrating information from multiple receptor and

peptide length datasets. *Genome Med.* **8**, 33 (2016).

17.   M. Rasmussen *et al.*, Pan-Specific Prediction of Peptide–MHC Class I Complex

Stability, a Correlate of T Cell Immunogenicity. *J. Immunol.* **197**, 1517–1524

(2016).

18.   C. W. Tung, S. Y. Ho, POPI: Predicting immunogenicity of MHC class I binding

peptides by mining informative physicochemical properties. *Bioinformatics*. **23**,

942–949 (2007).

19.   C. W. Tung, M. Ziehm, A. Kamper, O. Kohlbacher, S. Y. Ho, POPISK: T-cell

reactivity prediction using support vector machines and string kernels. *BMC*

Bioinformatics. **12**, 446 (2011).

20.   T. Saethang *et al.*, PAAQD: Predicting immunogenicity of MHC class I binding

peptides using amino acid pairwise contact potentials and quantum topological

molecular similarity descriptors. *J. Immunol. Methods*. **387**, 293–302 (2013).

21.   J. J. A. Calis *et al.*, Properties of MHC Class I Presented Peptides That Enhance

Immunogenicity. *PLoS Comput. Biol.* **9** (2013),

doi:10.1371/journal.pcbi.1003266.

22.   W. Zhang *et al.*, Accurate prediction of immunogenic T-cell epitopes from

epitope sequences using the genetic algorithm-based ensemble learning. *PLoS*

One. **10**, e0128194 (2015).

23. D. Chowell *et al.*, TCR contact residue hydrophobicity is a hallmark of

immunogenic CD8 + T cell epitopes. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* **112**, E1754–E1762

(2015).

24. E. Strønen *et al.*, Targeting of cancer neoantigens with donor-derived T cell

receptor repertoires. *Science (80-.)*. **2288**, 1–11 (2016).

25. S. Kawashima *et al.*, AAindex: Amino acid index database, progress report 2008.

Nucleic Acids Res. **36**, 202–205 (2008).

26. S. Miyazawa, R. L. Jernigan, Self-consistent estimation of inter-residue protein

contact energies based on an equilibrium mixture approximation of residues.

Proteins. **34**, 49–68 (1999).

27. X. Robin *et al.*, pROC: an open-source package for R and S+ to analyze and

compare ROC curves. *BMC Bioinformatics*. **12**, 77 (2011).

28. Y. Kim, J. Sidney, C. Pinilla, A. Sette, B. Peters, Derivation of an amino acid

similarity matrix for peptide:MHC binding and its application as a Bayesian prior.

BMC Bioinformatics. **10**, 394 (2009).

29. B. M. Carreno *et al.*, A dendritic cell vaccine increases the breadth and diversity

of melanoma neoantigen-specific T cells. *Science (80-.).* **348**, 803–808 (2015).

30.   E. Tran *et al.*, Immunogenicity of somatic mutations in human gastrointestinal

cancers. *Science (80-.).* **350**, 1387–1390 (2015).

31.   L. Kong *et al.*, Structural basis of hepatitis C virus neutralization by broadly

neutralizing antibody HCV1. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* **109**, 9499–9504

(2012).

32.   P. F. Robbins *et al.*, Mining exomic sequencing data to identify mutated antigens

recognized by adoptively transferred tumor-reactive T cells. *Nat. Med.* **19**, 747–

752 (2013).

33.   B. Diedenhofen, J. Musch, Cocor: A comprehensive solution for the statistical

comparison of correlations. *PLoS One.* **10** (2015),

doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0121945.

34.   K. Chang *et al.*, The Cancer Genome Atlas Pan-Cancer analysis project. *Nat.*

Genet. **45**, 1113–1120 (2013).

35.   L. Wojciech *et al.*, The same self-peptide selects conventional and regulatory

CD4+ T cells with identical antigen receptors. *Nat. Commun.* **5**, 5061 (2014).

36.   R. Eil *et al.*, Ionic immune suppression within the tumour microenvironment

limits T cell effector function. *Nature.* **537**, 539–543 (2016).

37.   C. H. Chang *et al.*, Metabolic Competition in the Tumor Microenvironment Is a

600   Driver of Cancer Progression. *Cell*. **162**, 1229–1241 (2015).

601   38.   J. D. Wolchok *et al.*, Nivolumab plus ipilimumab in advanced melanoma. *N.*

602   *Engl. J. Med.* **369**, 122–33 (2013).

603   39.   M. A. Postow *et al.*, Nivolumab and Ipilimumab versus Ipilimumab in Untreated

604   Melanoma. *N. Engl. J. Med.* **372**, 2006–2017 (2015).

605   40.   H. Borghaei *et al.*, Nivolumab versus Docetaxel in Advanced Nonsquamous

606   Non-Small-Cell Lung Cancer. *N. Engl. J. Med.* **373**, 1627–39 (2015).

607   41.   M. Yadav *et al.*, Predicting immunogenic tumour mutations by combining mass

608   spectrometry and exome sequencing. *Nature*. **515**, 572–6 (2014).

609   42.   R Core Team, R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing

610   (2016), , doi:ISBN 3-900051-07-0.

611   43.   M. Ogishi, H. Yotsuyanagi, K. Moriya, K. Koike, Delineation of autoantibody

612   repertoire through differential proteogenomics in hepatitis C virus-induced

613   cryoglobulinemia. *Sci. Rep.* **6**, 29532 (2016).

614   44.   J. D. Freeman, R. L. Warren, J. R. Webb, B. H. Nelson, R. A. Holt, Profiling the

615   T-cell receptor beta-chain repertoire by massively parallel sequencing. *Genome*

616   *Res.* **19**, 1817–24 (2009).

45.   S. Picelli *et al.*, Smart-seq2 for sensitive full-length transcriptome profiling in

single cells. *Nat. Methods*. **10**, 1096–1098 (2013).

46.   M. Matz *et al.*, Amplification of cDNA ends based on template-switching effect

and step-out PCR. *Nucleic Acids Res.* **27**, 1558–1560 (1999).

47.   M. Shugay *et al.*, Towards error-free profiling of immune repertoires. *Nat.*

Methods. **11**, 653–655 (2014).

48.   S. Li *et al.*, IMGT/HighV QUEST paradigm for T cell receptor IMGT clonotype

diversity and next generation repertoire immunoprofiling. *Nat. Commun.* **4**, 2333

(2013).

49.   M. Kuhn, Building Predictive Models in *R* Using the caret Package. *J. Stat. Softw.*

28, 1–26 (2008).

50.   W. S. Noble, Support vector machine applications in computational biology.

Kernel Methods Comput. Biol., 71–92 (2004).

51.   T. C. Hsieh, K. H. Ma, A. Chao, iNEXT: an R package for rarefaction and

extrapolation of species diversity (Hill numbers). *Methods Ecol. Evol.* **7**, 1451–

1456 (2016).

52.   D. V. Bagaev *et al.*, VDJviz: a versatile browser for immunogenomics data. *BMC*

Genomics. **17**, 453 (2016).

Acknowledgments: We thank Dr. Takahashi of Leavanest, Inc. for technical assistance in

MiSeq sequencing. We are also grateful to Dr. Couture-Cossette and Dr. Ueno for

thoughtful advices. **Funding**: This work was supported by a Grant-in-Aid for Scientific

Research (No. 30251234) from the Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and

Technology, Japan, and by a Grant-in-Aid (No. HIV 28) from the Ministry of Health,

Labor and Welfare, Japan. **Author contributions**: M.O. and H.Y. designed the study;

M.O. performed computational analyses, prepared the figures and tables, and drafted the

manuscript; M.O. and H.Y. wrote the manuscript. All authors critically discussed the

results and their implications, and reviewed and approved the final version of the

manuscript. **Competing interests**: The authors declare no competing financial interests.

Data and materials availability: The TCR sequence dataset was deposited in the DDBJ

Sequence Read Archive (DRA) under accession number DRA005827. The datasets used

in this study, the trained immunogenicity prediction model, and key codes were bundled

and publicly distributed as the R package *Repitope* on GitHub

(https://github.com/masato-ogishi/Repitope/).

Figures

Figure 1. Schematic diagram of repertoire-wide TCR-peptide contact profile

(rTPCP). Sequence-based modeling of TCR-peptide interactions is proposed. The

interaction is restricted to a "window" of a fixed size, on the basis of the hypothesis that

not all residues in the MHC-loaded peptide and TCR CDR3 are necessarily involved in

the interactions. The energetic stability of the interactions is approximated as the summed

amino acid pairwise contact potential (AACP). (A) TCR-peptide contact profile (TPCP)

at a single TCR level. Both a peptide and a TCR CDR3 sequence are "windowed" in a

sliding manner. Each fragment is paired, and the summed contact potential is calculated.

TPCP is expressed as a set of representative statistics (e.g. median, maximum, minimum)

of the set of inter-fragment contact potentials. (B) Repertoire-wide TPCP (rTPCP).

664 TPCPs were calculated against multiple TCR CDR3 sequences, and rTPCP is expressed

665 as a set of representative statistics of TPCPs.

Figure 2. Immunogenicity prediction through rTPCP. (A) Representative ROC and

calibration plots of the SVM classifier trained using rTPCP variables from all AACP

scales. A total of 900 HLA-A2-restricted peptides (450 epitopes and 450 MHCLs) were

randomly selected from the Chowell dataset, and split into training and testing

subdatasets. The performance in the hold-out testing subdataset is shown. The AACP

scales used are listed in table S1. (B) Representative ROC and calibration plots of the

673 SVM classifier trained using rTPCP variables from AAIndex MIYS990106. A full set of

674 peptides in the Chowell dataset were used for model training and validation. Graphics

675 were generated using the *classifierplots* package in R.

Figure 3. Schematic diagram of modified rTPCP (mrTPCP). All TCR sequences in

the reference repertoire are fragmented according to the fixed window size. A

position-specific peptide-derived fragment was matched against a set of TCR-derived

fragments. Representative statistics were calculated both in a position-specific and

position-blind (i.e., pooled) manner. Owing to the position-dependent nature of the

analysis, only nonapeptides (=9-mers) were considered in the subsequent analysis.

Figure 4. Improved immunogenicity prediction using mrTPCP. (A) ROC and

calibration plots of the SVM classifier trained using mrTPCP variables derived from

MIYS990106. See the legend of Fig. 2B and method sections for further details. (B)

HLA-stratified ROC analysis. The entire Chowell dataset was sorted according to their

HLA restriction, and six most data-rich HLA supertypes were selected for visualization.

(C) Sequence manipulation analysis. Either the input peptide sequences or the reference

TCR repertoire sequences were manipulated, and mrTPCP variables were calculated. The

authentically trained SVM classifier was applied. Inv, inversion of the sequence; Perm,

permutation of the sequence; Syns, randomly synthesized sequences with relative amino

acid frequencies retained. For peptides, amino acid frequencies of immunogenic and

non-immunogenic peptides were separately considered; Random, completely random

sequences. (B-C) AUC was calculated and graphics were generated using *pROC* and

plotROC packages in R, respectively.

Figure 5. Immunogenicity prediction of independent datasets of viral epitopes and

tumor neoepitopes. Peptide data were collected from various sources. Any peptide

overlapping with those in the Chowell dataset was excluded. The probability of

immunogenicity was estimated by applying the mrTPCP-based SVM classifier (Fig. 4A).

(A) A metadataset of viral epitopes and tumor neoepitopes(*4*, *10*, *24*, *29–32*). Dots and

bars represent the median and interquartile range, respectively. ***: $p < 0.001$, **: p

<0.01. *P* values were determined using Wilcoxon's rank sum test. NE, neoepitopes. (B)

Epitope/ligand data originally reported by Calis et al.(*21*). The probability threshold was

set to be 0.80.

Figure 6. Correlation between predicted neoepitope burden and clinical outcome in

checkpoint inhibitor trials. The mrTPCP-based SVM classifier (Fig. 4A) was applied to

external datasets of tumor mutational landscapes obtained from checkpoint inhibitor

trials. We set the threshold of immunogenicity to be above 0.80, on the basis of the

observation that most of the well-established tumor neoepitopes exhibited probabilities of

higher than 0.80 (Fig. 5A) (A) Progression-free survival (PFS) correlated with mutational

burden/predicted neoepitope burden in non-small cell lung carcinoma (NSCLC) patients

treated with pembrolizumab(*3*). The three patients were labeled, for which scaled fitting

residuals decreased by more than 1 when the predicted neoepitope burden was used as a

correlate. Adjusted correlation coefficient (R^2_{adj}) was calculated using the *stat_poly_eq*

package.(B) Clinical benefit (CB) was associated with heavier mutational

burden/predicted neoepitope burden in melanoma patients treated with ipilimumab(*5*).

CB was defined as in the original paper(*5*). NCB, no clinical benefit.

Figure 7. Neoepitope burdens in TCGA datasets. Mutation data were retrieved from

all advanced stage tumors in The Cancer Genome Atlas (TCGA)(*34*). For the 105959

HLA-A-02:01-restricted nonapeptides predicted to be stable MHC binders,

immunogenicity prediction was carried out. (A) Predicted neoepitope burden was

visualized for the 21 tumor types registered in TCGA. SKCM, Skin Cutaneous

Melanoma; LUAD, Lung adenocarcinoma; LUSC, Lung squamous cell carcinoma. For a

complete set of abbreviation used in TCGA, visit the NCI Genomic Data Commons

(https://gdc.cancer.gov/resources-tcga-users/tcga-code-tables/tcga-study-abbreviations).

(B) The correlation between predicted MHCL burden and neoepitope burden per gene.

HUGO symbols were depicted for genes enriched with neoepitopes. Enrichment was

defined as fitting residuals being larger than 10 for the purpose of tidy visualization.

Adjusted correlation coefficient was calculated using the *stat_poly_eq* package.

Tables

Table 1. Prediction results on datasets independent from training/validation data.

Immunogenicity was predicted using the mrTPCP-based SVM classifier (Fig. 4A). Note that any peptide contained in the Chowell dataset was excluded. Unadjusted p values were calculated against the IEDB MHCL data as the negative control using the *prop.test* function implemented in R with continuity correction. N.A., not applicable.

Dataset	Predicted Epitope	*P* value	Data Source
HCV CTL epitopes [n = 11]	10 (90.9%)	< 0.01	HCV immunology database (https://hcv.lanl.gov/content/immuno/tables/ctl_summary.html)
HIV CTL epitopes [n = 867]	545 (62.9%)	< 0.001	HIV molecular immunology database (https://www.hiv.lanl.gov/content/immunology/tables/ctl_summary.html)
Well-established tumor neoepitopes [n = 20]	18 (90.0%)	< 0.001	(*4, 10, 29–32*)
Tumor neoepitopes (Best) [n = 35]	34 (97.1%)	< 0.001	(*24*)
Tumor neoepitopes (All) [n = 492]	382 (77.6%)	< 0.001	(*24*)
IEDB MHC-I ligands [10,000 randomly selected]	5412 (54.1%)	N.A.	IEDB (http://www.iedb.org/)