Cancer immunotherapy responses persist after lymph node resection

Hengbo Zhou[1,2], James W. Baish[3], Meghan J. O'Melia[1], Laurel B. Darragh[4], Emma Specht[5], Juliane Czapla[5], Pin-ji Lei[1], Lutz Menzel[1], Johanna J. Rajotte[1], Mohammad R. Nikmaneshi[1], Mohammad S. Razavi[1], Matthew G. Vander Heiden[2,6], Jessalyn M. Ubellacker[7], Lance L. Munn[1], Genevieve M. Boland[5], Sonia Cohen[5], Sana D. Karam[4] and Timothy P. Padera[1]

1. Edwin Steele Laboratories, Department of Radiation Oncology, Massachusetts General Hospital

2. Koch Institute for Cancer Research and Department of Biology, Massachusetts Institute of Technology

3. Department of Biomedical Engineering, Bucknell University

4. Department of Radiation Oncology, University of Colorado Anschutz Medical Campus

5. Department of Surgery, Massachusetts General Hospital

6. Department of Medical Oncology, Dana-Farber Cancer Institute

7. Department of Molecular Metabolism, Harvard T.H. Chan School of Public Health

ABSTRACT:

Surgical removal of lymph nodes (LNs) to prevent metastatic recurrence, including sentinel lymph node biopsy (SLNB) and completion lymph node dissection (CLND), are performed in routine practice. However, it remains controversial whether removing LNs which are critical for adaptive immune responses impairs immune checkpoint blockade (ICB) efficacy. Here, our retrospective analysis demonstrated that stage III melanoma patients retain robust response to anti-PD1 inhibition after CLND. Using orthotopic murine mammary carcinoma and melanoma models, we show that responses to ICB persist in mice after TDLN resection. Mechanistically, after TDLN resection, antigen can be re-directed to distant LNs, which extends the

responsiveness to ICB. Strikingly, by evaluating head and neck cancer patients treated by

neoadjuvant durvalumab and irradiation, we show that distant LNs (metastases-free) remain

reactive in ICB responders after tumor and disease-related LN resection, hence, persistent anti-

cancer immune reactions in distant LNs. Additionally, after TDLN dissection in murine models,

ICB delivered to distant LNs generated greater survival benefit, compared to systemic

administration. In complete responders, anti-tumor immune memory induced by ICB was

systemic rather than confined within lymphoid organs. Based on these findings, we constructed a

computational model to predict free antigen trafficking in patients that will undergo LN

dissection.

INTRODUCTION:

Recent advances in understanding of the mechanisms of T cell activation and exhaustion led to

the identification of several immune checkpoints, such as programmed death 1 (PD-1)[1, 2] and

cytotoxic T lymphocytes antigen 4 (CTLA-4)[3, 4], which have been used as therapeutic

targets[5, 6]. Immune checkpoint blockade (ICB) has been approved to treat many cancers

including melanoma[7, 8], non-small cell lung cancer[9, 10], renal cell carcinoma[11], Hodgkin

lymphoma[12], hepatocellular carcinoma[13, 14], and gastric carcinoma[15]. However, an

improved understanding of ICB mechanisms *in vivo* is necessary for immunotherapy to benefit

more patients.

Lymph nodes (LNs) are secondary lymphoid organs that surveil tissue fluids and initiate

adaptive immunity[16]. Due to the direct drainage of interstitial fluid from tumor tissue in the

lymphatic basin (lymphosome), metastatic dissemination to tumor-draining lymph nodes

(TDLNs) occurs in the early stage of cancer growth[17]. Colonization in LNs can block nodal

entry of naïve lymphocytes(18), expand regulatory T cells (Tregs)(19, 20) and induce systemic

tolerance to favor distant metastasis of cancer cells(20). LN metastases can also further

disseminate to additional metastatic sites(21, 22). Therefore, LN metastatic burden is a strong

prognostic factor for patient outcome. Sentinel lymph node biopsy (SLNB) and completion

lymph node dissection (CLND) are commonly performed(23-27) to help stage disease and

reduce disease burden.

Seminal work has demonstrated that tumor-specific T cells and non-exhausted tumor-specific

memory cells are enriched in TDLNs, but not in non-TDLNs(28, 29). In addition, PD-1/PD-L1

interaction between conventional dendritic cells (DCs) (PD-L1+) and tumor-specific T cells (PD-

1+) is abundant in TDLNs(28). Intrapleural delivery of low-dose PD-L1 antibody to TDLNs can

induce anti-tumor immunity against AC29 tumors (mesothelioma)(28). Additional studies, using

B16F10 (melanoma), 4T1 (mammary carcinoma) and E0771(mammary carcinoma) tumors,

found selective administration of ICB to TDLNs can improve ICB potency, compared to

systemic administration(30, 31). These data suggest that removal of TDLNs could potentially

impair ICB outcome. Indeed, anti-PD-1 or anti-4-1BB efficacy can be abolished by TDLN

dissection in MC38 (colon adenocarcinoma) or CT26 (colon carcinoma) tumors ectopically

grafted in the skin(32, 33). Similarly, responses can be ablated by TDLN lymphadenectomy at

any point during anti-PD-L1 treatment in subcutaneously grafted B16F10 (melanoma) tumors

expressing lymphocytic choriomeningitis virus glycoprotein(29). However, in the phase III

clinical trial NCT00636168, completely resected stage III melanoma patients, from whom

sentinel LNs and metastatic LNs were removed, still responded and benefited from ipilimumab

(targeting CTLA-4), indicating that persistent presence of TDLNs may not be required for ICB

efficacy(34). Further, in the phase I trial NCT04274816, lymphatic basin administration of

tremelimumab (targeting CTLA4) after tumor resection led to a systemic reduction of Tregs and

activation of effector T cells. This response persisted up to 3 months after subsequent SLNB,

suggesting that the ICB-mediated immune response was not confined only within sentinel

LNs(35). Due to the important role of LNs in the adaptive immune response, it is imperative to

evaluate the effects of SLNB and CLND on ICB efficacy.

Here, through retrospective analysis, we found that regardless of the extent of LN surgery, stage

III melanoma patients—surprisingly even those with CLND—benefited from adjuvant anti-PD1

inhibition. By using orthotopic breast cancer and melanoma models in mice, we demonstrate that

ICB efficacy persists after TDLN dissection. Mechanistically, after TDLN dissection, antigen

can be transported to distant LNs through redirected lymph drainage, which contributes to the

residual responsiveness to ICB. This phenomenon is corroborated in head and neck cancer

patients—treated by neoadjuvant durvalumab and irradiation therapy followed by adjuvant

durvalumab—by the presence of reactive distant LNs after primary tumor resection and LN

dissection. Finally, compared to systemic administration, ICB delivered to reactive distant LNs

generates greater response after TDLN dissection.

RESULTS:

Stage III melanoma patients respond to ICB after CLND

Prior to the availability of effective systemic therapies for patients with melanoma, LN surgery

played a major role in the treatment of patients with locoregional disease. Any patient with

clinically evident LN metastases or a positive SLNB underwent CLND for disease control. In

2017 MSLT-II(36), a randomized trial of CLND vs observation in patients with positive SLNB,

demonstrated that CLND provided no melanoma-specific survival (MSS) benefit to patients with

melanoma identified within the SLN. Given the morbidity of CLND, this trial changed clinical

practice to favor observation after a positive SLNB, with CLND reserved for clinical disease

recurrence in the draining LN basin. Approximately 20% of patients would ultimately recur in

the draining nodal basin, sparing 80% of patients with a positive SLNB from the unnecessary

morbidity of CLND(36).

With the approval of effective systemic therapies, the role of LN surgery—other than for

staging—has been called into question. Given the importance of TDLNs for ICB response in

mouse models(29, 32, 33), we asked whether the extent of LN surgery would impact the

effectiveness of ICB treatment. To assess this, we analyzed a cohort of 66 patients who

underwent surgery for stage III melanoma followed by adjuvant treatment with at least one line

of anti-PD1 therapy (nivolumab or pembrolizumab) at Massachusetts General Hospital. Within

this adjuvant ICB cohort, 50 patients underwent SLNB alone while 16 patients underwent

CLND. Surprisingly, there was no statistically significant difference in MSS (**Figure 1 A**) or

recurrence-free survival (RFS) (**Figure 1 B**) between patients who underwent SLNB alone

versus those who underwent CLND. After further stratification, no difference was detected in

local (**Figure 1 C**) or distant (**Figure 1 D**) RFS either. These data demonstrate that response to

ICB persists in patients who have undergone CLND surgery, and that the extent of LN surgery

within the draining lymph node basin does not impact outcomes in the setting of ICB.

ICB response persists after TDLN dissection in mice

To experimentally test the impact of TDLN dissection on ICB efficacy in murine models, we

used orthotopic, syngeneic mouse melanoma (B16F10) and mammary carcinoma (E0771)

models. At first, we evaluated the metastatic status of TDLNs following timeline described in

recent studies (29, 32). After three doses of IgG or anti-PD1 treatment (starting from day 7 every

other day and ending on day 13 since tumor implantation), incidence of micro-metastases in LNs

was detected, especially, in IgG-treated mice (Supp **Figure 1A**). For LN surgery, SLNB was

modeled by removing the inguinal (IN) LN in C57BL6 mice, which drains the upper hindleg and

4th mammary fat pad of mice. Sham LN removal surgery was performed on all animals in control

groups. After 10 days of recovery, B16F10 or E0771 cells were introduced to the dermis on the

lower flank or 4th mammary fat pad, respectively. 7 days later, 3 doses of PD-1 blocking

antibody (10mg/kg) were administered intraperitoneally (every 2 days for B16F10 tumors or

every 3 days for E0771 tumors). Compared to IgG control treated mice, PD-1 inhibition

increased overall survival in both the sham and SLN removed (SLNB) mice. Interestingly, in

groups treated with anti-PD-1, there was no difference in overall survival between the sham

surgery mice and the SLNB counterparts (**Figure 2A**). To mimic CLND, a radical procedure that

is increasingly less common(36-39), ipsilateral IN, axillary (AX), and brachial (BR) LNs were

surgically removed, as each is in the region can receive lymphatic drainage from the tumor

site(33, 40). Similar to SLNB, response to PD-1 inhibition persists after CLND (**Figure 2B**).

Next, we measured whether anti-tumor immunity is retained solely in TDLNs after tumor

establishment. Thus, we tested the effects of SLNB and CLND after primary tumor implantation.

B16F10 or E0771 cells were orthotopically implanted 6 days prior to surgery. Sham, SLNB or

CLND was performed at day 6 and 3 doses of anti-PD-1 treatment was initiated at day 7 (every 2

days for B16F10 tumors or every 3 days for E0771 tumors). Similar to pre-emptive surgery,

response to PD-1 inhibition persists after SLNB or CLND (**Figure 2C**). Although there was no

significant decrease in survival after LN surgery, fewer mice remained tumor-free in the LN

dissection conditions (**Figure 2D)**. These findings are not consistent with recent investigations

using MC38 and CT26 tumor models grown ectopically in the subcutaneous setting(32, 33). To

determine whether implantation site can affect ICB outcome, E0771 cells were introduced to the

dermis and LN dissection was conducted either pre-emptively or after tumor establishment.

Intriguingly, aggressive CLND impaired anti-PD-1 efficacy in the ectopic setting (**Supp Figure**

1 B&C), indicating altered immune response can occur when tumor cells are introduced to an

ectopic site.

Remaining LNs are required for ICB response after TDLN dissection

Because of the surprising finding that benefit of ICB treatment persists in mice after LN

resection, we sought to examine whether LNs in general are essential for ICB response. To that

end, lymphotoxin alpha (Lta) knock out (KO) mice —Lta^{tm1Dch} (C57bl/6 background), referred to

throughout as *Lta* KO mice were used. These mice lack Peyer's patches and multiple LNs

including popliteal (PO), IN, BR and AX LNs, among other missing lymphoid tissues(41).

Although the splenic structure is disorganized by *Lta* deletion, the number of lymphocytes, the

composition of the types of lymphocytes and their homing and effector abilities are normal in

both the spleen and in peripheral blood(41-44). B16F10 or E0771 cells were orthotopically

implanted in *Lta KO* mice and 3 doses of PD-1 blocking antibody were administered starting 7

days after tumor implantation (every 3 days). Strikingly, compared to responses in wildtype

(WT) mice (sham animal survival curves from SLNB study, **Figure 2A**, were plotted for

comparison), slowed tumor growth and improved survival from PD-1 inhibition were abolished

in these mice lacking LNs (**Figure 2E**), suggesting adaptive immune responses generated in LNs

contribute to ICB response. Further, these results suggest that LN-dependent compensatory

mechanisms occur after TDLN dissection to maintain anti-PD-1 responses in wild-type mice.

158   **LN dissection alters lymph drainage and promotes antigen access to distant lymphoid**

159   **organs**

160   To interrogate the mechanism by which animals that have undergone LN surgery generate ICB-

161   induced immune responses, we first measured the local transport of surrogate antigens to

162   alternative draining lymph nodes (DLNs) after SLNB or CLND. 2 million Dalton (MD) FITC-

163   dextran and 4.4 kilodalton (kD) TRITC-dextran were used as surrogate biomolecules with

164   different sizes. The dextran mixture was introduced to the 4th mammary fat pad in animals that

165   had undergone sham surgery or dissection of the IN LN (SLNB) or the IN/AX/BR LNs (CLND).

166   After 6 hours, ipsilateral IN, AX, BR LNs remaining in the relevant groups as well as all

167   contralateral IN LNs were collected for microscopic examination. In LNs, the majority of 2 MD

168   dextran was found to be aggregated in the subcapsular sinus (SCS) region—showing transport by

169   the lymphatic system—while 4.4kD dextran was sparsely distributed throughout the LN (**Figure**

170   **3A**). Small biomolecules can enter LNs via the lymph or blood circulation[45]. However, our

171   data show that the large biomolecules rely heavily on the lymphatic system to arrive in the LN. 2

172   MD dextran abundance in AX LNs from SLNB animals is comparable to counterparts in IN or

173   AX LNs from sham animals (**Figure 3B**), indicating resection of IN LN does not disrupt the

174   drainage to the downstream AX LN. Interestingly, 2 MD dextran was also detected entering the

175   SCS of contralateral IN LNs in certain animals (**Figure 3C**). Compared to sham animals, there

176   was an increased incidence of 2 MD dextran drained to contralateral IN LNs of CLND animals

177   (**Figure 3B**). Inconsistent with a previous report[33], there was limited drainage from mammary

178   fat pad to BR LNs across conditions, suggesting BR LNs are not main DLNs (**Figure 3B**).

179   Nonetheless, because BR LNs are in axilla region, removing BR LN along with IN LN and AX

180   LN is a relevant approach to model CLND (basin dissection) which also removes non-DLNs(36,

39). Collectively, these data show that CLND disrupts the normal patterns of lymph drainage,

which results in lymph (and surrogate antigen) being transported to alternative LNs which can be

anatomically distant (**Figure 3D**).

Altogether, these findings are consistent with the clinical observation that breast cancer patients

who have undergone AX LN dissections are more likely to develop altered lymph drainage to

contralateral AX LNs(46). Similarly, radiation therapy can cause lymphatic drainage aberration

in breast cancer patients, which decreases flow to the ipsilateral axilla while increasing flow to

contralateral axilla(47).

To further test whether—beyond the mammary fat pad region—antigen access to distant LNs

can be enhanced when local lymphatic drainage is ablated, we performed sham surgery or

ipsilateral popliteal (PO), IN, AX and BR LN dissection on mice (ILND condition).

Subsequently, a mixture of 2MD and 4.4kD dextran was injected to the foot pad of those

animals. Due to this anatomic site, injection-induced antigen convection to distant sites was

minimized, and all LNs along the direct drainage path were absent. Similar to **Figure 3B**, we

discovered that 6 hours after injection, 2MD dextran was mainly located in ipsilateral PO, IN and

AX LNs when lymphatic drainage was intact, whereas ILND re-routed 2MD dextran transport to

contralateral IN and AX LNs (**Supp Figure 2**). The lack of 2MD dextran in contralateral PO

LNs suggests that, once taken up by lymphatic vessels of an adjacent lymphosome, the lymph

still follows the normal drainage patterns, and does not undergo retrograde flow or circulate

significantly through the blood in ILND mice (**Supp Figure 2**). In contrast, 4.4kD dextran, with

its smaller size was found in all remaining LNs (**Supp Figure 2**), suggesting transport through

the blood. The compensatory drainage phenomenon in the lower limb suggested by our data has

also been reported clinically. A recent indocyanine green fluorescence lymphography study

found that in patients with cancer treatment related lower limb lymphoedema, lower limb

interstitial fluid can be transported across the lower abdomen to the contralateral inguinal

region(48).

In addition to distant LNs, we found that 2MD dextran was also detectable in spleens from both

sham and ILND mice. 2MD dextran was more abundant in spleens of mice in the ILND

condition (**Figure 3E**). These large dextran molecules were mainly detected in the B cell

follicles and adjacent marginal zone macrophages, instead of residing in macrophage-rich red

pulp(49) (**Figure 3F**), indicating the potential for the generation of immune responses in the

spleen against antigen arising from distal tissue, compensating for the loss of DLNs.

TDLN dissection stimulates immune responses in distant LNs

Since distant LNs of CLND mice can be exposed to interstitial fluid from the primary tumor site,

we next examined whether tumor-specific immunity can be generated in these distant LNs.

B16F10 cells expressing ovalbumin (257-264: SIINFEKL) were implanted to sham surgery or

CLND mice and anti-PD-1 treatment started after 7 days. Subsequently, the spleen as well as any

ipsi- and contra-lateral LNs were collected for immunofluorescence and flow cytometry

analyses. CD8 T cell expansion was detected in ipsilateral LNs in sham surgery mice and

contralateral LNs in CLND mice (**Figure 4A**). Moreover, spleens in CLND animals contained an

equal percentage of CD8 T cells compared to the sham surgery counterparts (**Figure 4B**),

indicating that the immune reaction to the tumor was not confined within TDLNs. We also

measured the abundance of SIINFEKL-specific CD8 T cells (referred to throughout as OVA-T

cells) to assess tumor-specific immune responses (**Figure 4C**). Consistent with previous

investigations(28, 30), OVA-T cells were found to be predominantly enriched in sham surgery

ipsilateral LNs, whereas certain CLND contralateral LNs, but not cervical LNs, also harbored

high numbers of OVA-T cells (**Figure 4D**), indicating a directional spread of antigen consistent

with adjacent lymphosomes, instead of systemic spread . Additionally, the abundance of OVA-T

cells was comparable in spleens and blood of both sham and CLND mice (**Figure 4D**),

demonstrating that the generation of circulating tumor-specific T cells persists after LN surgery.

To better recapitulate the clinical situation, ICB-induced tumor-specific T cell response was

tested in an adjuvant setting. Two weeks after tumor implantation in intact mice, primary tumor

removal was performed with or without CLND. After 3 days of recovery, mice were given anti-

PD-1 treatment. No difference was found in OVA-T cell abundance between sham ipsilateral

LNs and CLND contralateral LNs (**Figure 4E**), indicating, that even without the primary tumor

antigen source, distant LNs can generate tumor-specific immune response after the removal of

the initial TDLNs. To test whether tumor-specific T cells from distant LNs can infiltrate

recurrent tumors, B16F10-OVA tumors were implanted into Kaede mice(50), and the tumors

were resected with and without CLND; the mice were then treated with adjuvant anti-PD1

inhibition. After 14 days, these mice were implanted with B16F10-OVA tumors in the same

primary site—to model recurrence—followed by photoconversion of contralateral IN LNs.

Strikingly, Kaede red+ OVA-T cells were present in recurrent tumors, and the abundance was

greater in CLND mice, compared to mice that did not undergo LN surgery (**Figure 4F**),

suggesting that immune cells from distant LNs can be activated and traffic to recurrent tumors.

Antigen can disseminate by advection with interstitial fluid, but it can also be carried by antigen-

presenting cells (APCs), which may access distant LNs after primary DLN resection. To assess

the contribution of APCs, sham surgery or dissection of PO, IN, AX and BR LNs (ILND

condition) was conducted in cohorts of mice. After recovery from surgery, bone marrow-derived

DCs (BMDCs) from donor mice were loaded with OVA, stimulated with lipopolysaccharide

(LPS) and subsequently injected in the foot pad of sham or ILND mice. Intriguingly, we found

that OVA-T cells were significantly enriched in ipsilateral LNs of sham mice and contralateral

LNs of ILND mice, but not contralateral LNs of sham animals (**Figure 4G**). These results

suggest that antigen carrying-APCs also have greater access to distant LNs when lymphatic

drainage is disrupted.

In addition to tumor-specific responses in distant LNs, the status of tumor-infiltrating T cells in

B16F10 tumors after CLND was measured. Compared to sham condition, ICB-induced

proliferating, non-exhausted CD8 effector T cells (CD44+, PD1+, Tbet+, KLRG1-, Ki67+) in

tumor persist after CLND (**Figure 4H, Supp Figure 3A**). Moreover, in sham and CLND mice

treated by ICB, we measured memory T cell populations in remaining LNs after primary tumor

(B16F10) resection and subsequent tumor rechallenge. Strikingly, non-exhausted stem-like

central memory CD8 T cells (CD44+, PD1+, CD62L+, TCF1+, CD127+, KLRG1-, Tim3-,

Lag3-) were similarly abundant in ipsilateral LNs of sham mice and contralateral LNs of CLND

mice (**Figure 4I, Supp Figure 3B**). Taken together, ICB-mediated acute tumor-infiltrating T cell

response and memory T cell response in remaining LNs persist after LN resection.

As our data show that large dextran molecules are enriched in the spleen after CLND (**Figure 3**

E&F) and accompanied by CD8 T cell expansion (**Figure 4B**) and a tumor-specific T cell

response (**Figure 4D**), we next determined whether the spleen is essential for residual ICB

response in mice after CLND. To that end, sham surgery (SP+ condition) or splenectomy (SP-

condition) was performed 2 weeks prior to CLND, and E0771 tumors were implanted and treated

as described before. Unexpectedly, splenectomy did not significantly affect the overall survival

in anti-PD-1 treated mice. Complete responders were less frequent, but still present, in SP- mice

(**Supp Figure 4A**). Further, all complete responders (5/5) from the SP+ condition and 2 out of 3

of SP- counterparts could completely reject tumor rechallenge, (**Supp Figure 4B**). Altogether,

these data suggest that the spleen contributes, but only marginally, to the ICB response and long-

term immune memory formation in CLND mice.

Mathematical modeling of antigen access to adjacent lymphosomes via dermal interstitial

transport after TDLN dissection

Because our data show that antigen can access adjacent lymphosomes and activate distant LNs

(**Figure 3&4**), we next used mathematical modeling to help understand this process from a

pharmacokinetic perspective. To that end, we developed a multi-scale computational model of

transport of free antigen and imaging tracers (**Figure 5A&B**) that recapitulates our primary

experimental findings in mice and predicts how these results may translate to clinical practice in

humans (details of the model provided in **Supplemental Materials**).

Normally, a local equilibrium exists in which interstitial fluid pressure remains low—near or just

below atmospheric pressure—and little lateral movement of fluid occurs in the superficial tissue

layers. In contrast, **Figure 5C-F** shows how disabling various combinations of the IN, AX, BR,

and PO nodes in the mouse diverts flow to adjacent lymphosomes due to the lack of local

pressure minima provided by lymphatic drainage. In general, disabled collecting lymphatic

vessels lead to the accumulation of interstitial fluid and then its redirection to the next adjacent

lymphosome – even across the midline. This transport can occur through the tissue interstitial

space or through the non-valved, highly interconnected lymphatic capillary network. However,

the DLN(s) for the adjacent lymphosome might be relatively distal, helping to explain our in

vivo data in models of CLND. This computational model predicts that antigen can activate

immune responses in specific distal LNs in the body after LN resections.

Our results in a human model (**Figure 5G-I**) were qualitatively similar to those in mice, but

important differences arise because of the relative size of the lymphosomes, anatomical

connectivity of the vessels, and the degree of redundancy in the lymphatic networks. The

pressures in the skin obtained from the full, 3-D human model were compared to an analytical

result for a planar, circular lymphosome with the same surface area (**Figure 5J**) in **Figure 5K**.

To examine the size dependence of the lymphosome, we performed a parametric study of the

simplified model **(Figure 5L)**. Here, we found that larger lymphosomes, such as those present in

humans, generate more total fluid that must be drained and result in higher interstitial pressures

than expected in mice. This size difference alone may account for much of the relative difficulty

in creating experimental models of lymphedema in laboratory mice. An additional result of the

simplified model **(Figure 5M)** was that the mobility of the fluid (κ) in the network of initial

lymphatic vessels strongly affects the interstitial fluid pressure, but has little influence on the

total quantity of antigen-carrying fluid diverted elsewhere or its destination.

Administration of ICB to distant LNs enhances efficacy after TDLN dissection

Previous investigations demonstrated that directly delivering a low dose of ICB agents to TDLNs

can achieve robust anti-tumor responses(30, 31, 35). These findings highlight the potential of

LNs to be used as an ICB target site. Because distant LNs are more likely to be exposed to tumor

antigen after LN dissection (**Figure 3 & Supp Figure 2**), we assessed the importance of

contralateral LNs for low-dose ICB treatment in mice that have undergone CLND. Since anti-

CTLA4 and anti-PD-1 combination has shown efficacy in clinical settings(51), we delivered this

ICB combination at low dose (5mg/kg) by intradermal administration in a lymphatic basin that is

drained by ipsilateral LNs (tumor draining IN+AX) in sham LN surgery mice or contralateral

LNs in CLND mice. Compared to isotype IgG, we found ICB drastically increases the volume of

ipsilateral LNs in sham LN surgery mice and contralateral LNs in CLND mice (**Figure 6A**).

Additionally, these LNs share similar T cell composition (**Figure 6B**) and possess comparable

abundance of stem-like effector memory T cells (CD44+, PD-1+, TCF1+, CD39-, CD62L-)

which are key contributors to ICB response(52) (**Figure 6C**). Altogether, similar to TDLNs,

distant LNs can be activated by ICB in mice after CLND.

To directly test the potency of distant LNs during ICB treatment, we treated sham LN surgery

and CLND mice bearing E0771 tumors with anti-CTLA4 and anti-PD-1 antibodies (5mg/kg) by

intraperitoneal (IP) administration or intradermal administration to contralateral LNs (C.LNs).

Strikingly, compared to systemic delivery, combination ICB given to C.LNs provides greater

survival benefit and response rate in CLND mice, but not in sham LN surgery counterparts

(**Figure 6D**). These results provocatively suggest that delivering ICB therapeutics to downstream

or distant LNs may benefit patients that have undergone LN surgery.

Compared to adjuvant-only regimens, neoadjuvant-adjuvant ICB can provide better outcomes for

patients with advanced melanoma(53). To examine whether LN surgery compromises

neoadjuvant-adjuvant ICB efficacy, B16F10 tumors expressing Gaussia luciferase (B16F10-

Gluc) were treated with ICB delivered to the TDLN, and curative primary tumor resection with

or without LN surgery (SLNB or CLND) was performed (**Figure 6E**). Mice were monitored for

tumor recurrence and metastases (Gluc activity) for 100 days. After 100 days tumor-free mice

were rechallenged with B16F10-Gluc cells, and mice that developed tumors were treated with

adjuvant ICB delivered to the TDLN (IN LN in no LN surgery condition, AX LN in SLNB

condition and contralateral IN LN in CLND condition) (**Figure 6E**). Interestingly, after surgery,

ICB, but not IgG, induced vitiligo, especially, at the surgery sites of both primary tumor

resection and LN surgery (**Figure 6F**). The appearance of vitiligo indicates that the ICB-induced

immune response to antigens involved in melanin production disseminates beyond the primary

tumor location(54). After neoadjuvant treatment, only one mouse in the No LN surgery + ICB

condition had a spontaneous recurrent tumor and one mouse in the SLNB + ICB condition died

due to a cause unrelated to cancer (**Figure 6G**), demonstrating the potency of curative surgery.

Upon rechallenge, compared to naïve mice, all surgically treated mice exhibited immune

memory against the original tumors, while ICB-treated mice possessed greater immune memory

compared to IgG-treated counterparts (**Figure 6H**). At this sample size (~15 mice), the ICB-

induced immune memory and survival benefit persists after SLNB or CLND (**Figure 6H&I**).

Surprisingly, these results suggest that, in a TDLN targeted neoadjuvant-adjuvant ICB treatment

regimen, the formation of immune memory against cancer cells and improvement of overall

survival persist after LN surgery along with curative primary tumor resection.

LN-egressing immune cells are expendable for long-term anti-tumor immune memory

Complete responders emerged after ICB treatment in sham LN surgery and TDLN resected mice

(**Figure 2&6**). To evaluate the long-term immune memory, we re-introduced E0771 cells to the

original tumor sites of anti-PD1 treatment complete responders (**Figure 2**). Survivors in both

sham LN surgery and TDLNs removed conditions rejected tumor rechallenge (**Supp Figure 5A**).

To further test whether this immune memory is systemic, E0771 cells were introduced to both

ipsi- and contra-lateral sides of animals. Similarly, all survivors, regardless of the presence of

TDLNs, remained tumor-free (**Supp Figure 5B**). Finally, we determined that this immune

memory is tumor specific, as E0771-immune mice cannot reject B16F10 tumors implanted in

either mammary fat pad or dermis (**Supp Figure 5C**).

Lymphocytes use sphingosine 1-phosphate (S1P) signaling to exit lymphoid organs including

bone marrow, LNs and Peyer's patches(55-57). Indeed, FTY720, a potent inhibitor against

S1PR(58), treatment drastically reduced CD4, CD8 and central memory (CD44+/CD62L+) T

cells in the circulation ~90% (**Supp Figure 5D**), suggesting this treatment can block T cells

egress from lymphoid organs including LNs. We aimed to test whether central memory T cells

from LNs enter the circulation and greatly contribute to long-term immune memory in tumor-

free survivors. To that end, tumor naïve control mice or tumor-free survivors-implanted with

E0771 or B16F10-Gluc tumors-generated by ICB combo treatment studies (**Figure 6**) were fed

with water with or without FTY720 (2.5µg/ml). Subsequently, E0771 or B16F10-Gluc tumors

were orthotopically implanted to both the primary tumor location and the contralateral site for re-

challenge. Intriguingly, the vast majority of complete ICB responders remained tumor-free,

while there were fewer tumor-immune mice in survivors that were cured by surgery (No LN

Surgery IgG condition) (**Supp Figure 5E**). Like previous observations (**Supp Figure 5A&B**),

LN surgery status did not affect the immune memory (**Supp Figure 5E**). Strikingly, this anti-

tumor immune memory did not only reside within primary tumor tissues, as subsequent tumors

implanted in the ectopic sites (dermis for E0771 and mammary fat pad for B16F10-Gluc) of

these tumor-free survivors from the orthotopic rechallenge study were also rejected (**Supp**

Figure 5F). These findings suggest that ICB-induced anti-tumor immune memory cells spread

systemically in complete responders, and the contribution of immune cells egressing from

lymphoid organs is dispensable after memory responses have formed.

Distant LNs are reactive after resection of tumor and disease-related LNs in head and neck cancer patients treated by ICB

To test whether, after LN dissection, distant LNs contribute to ICB efficacy on suppressing cancer recurrence in patients, we investigated head and neck cancer patients treated by ICB that tend to have a high local recurrence rate(59). We examined a recent phase I/Ib trial (NCT03635164) in which HPV negative head and neck cancer patients that received neoadjuvant treatment to manage gross disease (primary and grossly involved nodes) consisting of combination hypofractionated radiotherapy and durvalumab (targeting PD-L1). Following a recovery time ranging from 5-6 weeks in the extension cohort, patients underwent surgical resection of the primary tumor and bilateral neck dissection per standard of care. Those with major pathological response or complete pathological response to neoadjuvant radiotherapy and durvalumab were classified as responders (response>95%). Under permission of multi-disciplinary tumor board, with the exception of four cycles of durvalumab, all other adjuvant therapy in the form of radiation or chemotherapy was omitted in responders(60). To date, no recurrent disease was detected in these responders during post-operative follow-up visits (>2 years). We compared CT and PET images at diagnosis to post-surgery follow-up examinations in the responder cohort. Strikingly, after removal of the tumor and initial TDLNs, enlargement of distant LNs was found in most responders, but not in non-responders (**Figure 7A**). Of note, no nodal disease was detected by radiology-guided biopsy, indicating these enlarged LNs were activated and immune-reactive. The reactive LNs were higher echelon LNs in areas that were now draining the original tumor site. For instance, in patients 01-013 and 01-015, lower neck LNs (posterior cervical) and upper neck LNs (submandibular and submental) were enlarged, respectively, at follow-up, which was not observed at diagnosis (**Figure 7B**). Similarly, in

405   patient 01-009, neck draining mediastinal LNs above the aortic arch were inflamed after tumor

406   and LN resection (**Figure 7C**). These data suggest that surgical removal of the primary tumor

407   and TDLNs can result in reactive distant LNs and extend ICB response in patients.

DISCUSSION:

TDLNs are exposed to high antigen burden, allowing them to readily generate adaptive immune

response against cancer cells(17). Recent reports using mouse tumor models advocate that

TDLNs are indispensable for ICB response(29, 32, 33, 61), likely due to unique tumor-specific T

cell memory populations(29). A phase II trial (NCT03698019) of patients with resectable stage

III or stage IV melanoma, neoadjuvant-adjuvant pembrolizumab treatment provided improved

event-free survival compared to adjuvant-only setting(53), indicating the presence of the primary

tumor and/or related LNs is important for optimal ICB response. However, clinical trials

involving patients with completely resected stage IIIb/c or stage IV melanoma, demonstrate that

patients still benefit from ICB treatment after sentinel LNs and bulky disease-related LNs

removal(62-64), arguing TDLNs are not necessary for ICB response. Further, retrospective

analysis of stage III melanoma patients demonstrates that patients benefited similarly from

adjuvant ICB, regardless of the extent of LN surgery. Recent work from our lab and others has

shown that metastatic TDLNs are immune suppressed and can impair systemic anti-cancer

immune responses(18-20). Ultimately, the metastatic burden in TDLNs may determine whether

SLNB or CLND has a positive, negative or neutral effect on disease recurrence and survival.

Because human LN chains are complex with multiple echelons(65), it is key to determine

immune activation or suppression status of LNs downstream of sentinel LNs. Identifying LNs

with sufficient exposure to antigen but not suppressive factors from tumor, may identify optimal

target sites for immunotherapy delivery.

In this study, we emphasize the dynamic and adaptive aspect of antigen transportation.

Disruption of normal lymphatic drainage drives the antigen-carrying fluid to flow to adjacent

lymphosomes and induces immune response in the LNs of that lymphosome. Often these LNs

could be quite distant (and thus non-intuitive) from the original TDLNs, which is corroborated

by clinical observations(46, 47). However, the maximal transport distance of interstitial antigens,

without being substantially diluted and degraded, remains to be determined. Further, limits of

active transport of APCs from the tumor site are also indeterminate. Understanding these spatial

limits can explain the anatomic distribution of LNs for regional immune surveillance.

Intriguingly, we found CLND induces tumor-specific T cells enrichment in distant LNs, when

performed along with primary tumor resection (adjuvant setting). The antigen source fueling the

tumor-specific T cell response in distant LNs is unknown. Conceivably, antigens were vastly

spread by the surgery, from residual cancer cells at the primary tumor site, or in occult metastatic

sites. Despite the importance of antigen trafficking to distant LNs, direct T cell priming in the

local tumor microenvironment(66) and tertiary lymphoid structures(67) may also contribute to

residual ICB response.

The finding that long-term anti-tumor immune memory is not predominantly reliant on the T cell

egress from LNs (**Supp Figure 5**), leads to critical unanswered questions. Do anti-tumor

immune memory cells disseminate from TDLNs immediately and accumulate systemically

during ICB? Or is systemic immune memory mainly formed after primary tumor clearance? Our

neoadjuvant-adjuvant ICB study (**Figure 6**) demonstrated that mice that underwent curative

surgery had systemic immune memory development, indicating immune reactions are present at

the time of tumor resection. This also suggests that adjuvant ICB may act through existing anti-

tumor tissue-resident immune memory cells at the time of treatment. One caveat of the FTY720

experiment to block T cell egress, including memory T cell egress, from LNs is that tissue-

resident memory cells can enter the circulation and reject tumor cells at distant sites(68). S1P

inhibition mainly blocks lymphocytes egress from LNs and bone marrow(55) not other tissues,

and circulating memory cells are still present in FTY720 treated mice. It is possible a small

number of cancer-specific memory clones are sufficient to suppress recurrence.

Additional limitations are present in our preclinical model when used to address clinical

questions(69). In this work, surgery of skin LNs in mice was used to recapitulate SLNB and

CLND procedures. However, large scale and anatomical differences are present between humans

and mice. On one hand, the size of a mouse is comparable to a human axilla, thus, the murine

version of CLND used in this work may be similar to a SLNB scenario in patients. On the other

hand, compared to simple chains of a few LNs in mice, humans have more complex and

interconnected lymphatic networks as well as multiple LNs draining one common region(65);

hence, removing a single LN in mice may equate to CLND in human. Encouragingly, consistent

with our preclinical data, compensatory lymphatic drainage(46, 47), even in the presence of

lymphedema(48, 70), and distant LN activation are observed in cancer patients (**Figure 7**).

Further, it is important to investigate lymphatic drainage patterns after non-skin LN dissection as

ICB treatment increases survival in non-small cell lung cancer(71) and colorectal cancer(72)

patients. Finally, dissection is performed on SLNs and metastatic LNs which are

immunosuppressed(73) with disrupted CD8 T cell responses(74). Consequently, the net benefit

of removing these immune suppressive LNs is likely to outweigh the marginal decrease in

systemic response to ICB.

MATERIALS AND METHODS:

In Supplementary materials.

List of Supplemental Materials:

Materials and Methods.

Figure S1 to S4 for multiple supplementary figures.

References (75-85).

REFERENCES:

1. Ishida Y, Agata Y, Shibahara K, Honjo T. Induced expression of PD-1, a novel member of the immunoglobulin gene superfamily, upon programmed cell death. EMBO J. 1992;11(11):3887-95.
2. Iwai Y, Ishida M, Tanaka Y, Okazaki T, Honjo T, Minato N. Involvement of PD-L1 on tumor cells in the escape from host immune system and tumor immunotherapy by PD-L1 blockade. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A. 2002;99(19):12293-7.
3. Brunet JF, Denizot F, Luciani MF, Roux-Dosseto M, Suzan M, Mattei MG, et al. A new member of the immunoglobulin superfamily--CTLA-4. Nature. 1987;328(6127):267-70.
4. Leach DR, Krummel MF, Allison JP. Enhancement of antitumor immunity by CTLA-4 blockade. Science. 1996;271(5256):1734-6.
5. Hargadon KM, Johnson CE, Williams CJ. Immune checkpoint blockade therapy for cancer: An overview of FDA-approved immune checkpoint inhibitors. Int Immunopharmacol. 2018;62:29-39.
6. Wei SC, Duffy CR, Allison JP. Fundamental Mechanisms of Immune Checkpoint Blockade Therapy. Cancer Discov. 2018;8(9):1069-86.
7. Hodi FS, O'Day SJ, McDermott DF, Weber RW, Sosman JA, Haanen JB, et al. Improved survival with ipilimumab in patients with metastatic melanoma. N Engl J Med. 2010;363(8):711-23.
8. Robert C, Long GV, Brady B, Dutriaux C, Maio M, Mortier L, et al. Nivolumab in previously untreated melanoma without BRAF mutation. N Engl J Med. 2015;372(4):320-30.
9. Borghaei H, Paz-Ares L, Horn L, Spigel DR, Steins M, Ready NE, et al. Nivolumab versus Docetaxel in Advanced Nonsquamous Non-Small-Cell Lung Cancer. N Engl J Med. 2015;373(17):1627-39.
10. Brahmer J, Reckamp KL, Baas P, Crino L, Eberhardt WE, Poddubskaya E, et al. Nivolumab versus Docetaxel in Advanced Squamous-Cell Non-Small-Cell Lung Cancer. N Engl J Med. 2015;373(2):123-35.
11. Motzer RJ, Tannir NM, McDermott DF, Aren Frontera O, Melichar B, Choueiri TK, et al. Nivolumab plus Ipilimumab versus Sunitinib in Advanced Renal-Cell Carcinoma. N Engl J Med. 2018;378(14):1277-90.
12. Chen R, Zinzani PL, Fanale MA, Armand P, Johnson NA, Brice P, et al. Phase II Study of the Efficacy and Safety of Pembrolizumab for Relapsed/Refractory Classic Hodgkin Lymphoma. J Clin Oncol. 2017;35(19):2125-32.
13. El-Khoueiry AB, Sangro B, Yau T, Crocenzi TS, Kudo M, Hsu C, et al. Nivolumab in patients with advanced hepatocellular carcinoma (CheckMate 040): an open-label, non-comparative, phase 1/2 dose escalation and expansion trial. Lancet. 2017;389(10088):2492-502.
14. Duffy AG, Ulahannan SV, Makorova-Rusher O, Rahma O, Wedemeyer H, Pratt D, et al. Tremelimumab in combination with ablation in patients with advanced hepatocellular carcinoma. J Hepatol. 2017;66(3):545-51.
15. Janjigian YY, Shitara K, Moehler M, Garrido M, Salman P, Shen L, et al. First-line nivolumab plus chemotherapy versus chemotherapy alone for advanced gastric, gastro-oesophageal junction, and oesophageal adenocarcinoma (CheckMate 649): a randomised, open-label, phase 3 trial. Lancet. 2021;398(10294):27-40.
16. Padera TP, Meijer EF, Munn LL. The Lymphatic System in Disease Processes and Cancer Progression. Annu Rev Biomed Eng. 2016;18:125-58.

17.   Zhou H, Lei PJ, Padera TP. Progression of Metastasis through Lymphatic System. Cells. 2021;10(3).

18.   Jones D, Wang Z, Chen IX, Zhang S, Banerji R, Lei PJ, et al. Solid stress impairs lymphocyte infiltration into lymph-node metastases. Nat Biomed Eng. 2021;5(12):1426-36.

19.   Lei PJ, Pereira ER, Andersson P, Amoozgar Z, Van Wijnbergen JW, O'Melia MJ, et al. Cancer cell plasticity and MHC-II-mediated immune tolerance promote breast cancer metastasis to lymph nodes. J Exp Med. 2023;220(9).

20.   Reticker-Flynn NE, Zhang W, Belk JA, Basto PA, Escalante NK, Pilarowski GOW, et al. Lymph node colonization induces tumor-immune tolerance to promote distant metastasis. Cell. 2022;185(11):1924-42 e23.

21.   Brown M, Assen FP, Leithner A, Abe J, Schachner H, Asfour G, et al. Lymph node blood vessels provide exit routes for metastatic tumor cell dissemination in mice. Science. 2018;359(6382):1408-11.

22.   Pereira ER, Kedrin D, Seano G, Gautier O, Meijer EFJ, Jones D, et al. Lymph node metastases can invade local blood vessels, exit the node, and colonize distant organs in mice. Science. 2018;359(6382):1403-7.

23.   Alatengbaolide, Lin D, Li Y, Xu H, Chen J, Wang B, et al. Lymph node ratio is an independent prognostic factor in gastric cancer after curative resection (R0) regardless of the examined number of lymph nodes. Am J Clin Oncol. 2013;36(4):325-30.

24.   Aoyama T, Yamamoto N, Kamiya M, Murakawa M, Tamagawa H, Sawazaki S, et al. The Lymph Node Ratio Is an Independent Prognostic Factor in Pancreatic Cancer Patients Who Receive Curative Resection Followed by Adjuvant Chemotherapy. Anticancer Res. 2018;38(8):4877-82.

25.   Chen CC, Lin JC, Chen KW. Lymph node ratio as a prognostic factor in head and neck cancer patients. Radiat Oncol. 2015;10:181.

26.   Scoggins CR, Bowen AL, Martin RC, 2nd, Edwards MJ, Reintgen DS, Ross MI, et al. Prognostic information from sentinel lymph node biopsy in patients with thick melanoma. Arch Surg. 2010;145(7):622-7.

27.   Voordeckers M, Vinh-Hung V, Van de Steene J, Lamote J, Storme G. The lymph node ratio as prognostic factor in node-positive breast cancer. Radiother Oncol. 2004;70(3):225-30.

28.   Dammeijer F, van Gulijk M, Mulder EE, Lukkes M, Klaase L, van den Bosch T, et al. The PD-1/PD-L1-Checkpoint Restrains T cell Immunity in Tumor-Draining Lymph Nodes. Cancer Cell. 2020;38(5):685-700 e8.

29.   Huang Q, Wu X, Wang Z, Chen X, Wang L, Lu Y, et al. The primordial differentiation of tumor-specific memory CD8(+) T cells as bona fide responders to PD-1/PD-L1 blockade in draining lymph nodes. Cell. 2022.

30.   Francis DM, Manspeaker MP, Schudel A, Sestito LF, O'Melia MJ, Kissick HT, et al. Blockade of immune checkpoints in lymph nodes through locoregional delivery augments cancer immunotherapy. Sci Transl Med. 2020;12(563).

31.   O'Melia MJ, Manspeaker MP, Thomas SN. Tumor-draining lymph nodes are survival niches that support T cell priming against lymphatic transported tumor antigen and effects of immune checkpoint blockade in TNBC. Cancer Immunol Immunother. 2021;70(8):2179-95.

32.   Fransen MF, Schoonderwoerd M, Knopf P, Camps MG, Hawinkels LJ, Kneilling M, et al. Tumor-draining lymph nodes are pivotal in PD-1/PD-L1 checkpoint therapy. JCI Insight. 2018;3(23).

33.   Zhao X, Kassaye B, Wangmo D, Lou E, Subramanian S. Chemotherapy but Not the
Tumor Draining Lymph Nodes Determine the Immunotherapy Response in Secondary Tumors.
iScience. 2020;23(5):101056.

34.   Eggermont AM, Chiarion-Sileni V, Grob JJ, Dummer R, Wolchok JD, Schmidt H, et al.
Adjuvant ipilimumab versus placebo after complete resection of high-risk stage III melanoma
(EORTC 18071): a randomised, double-blind, phase 3 trial. Lancet Oncol. 2015;16(5):522-30.

35.   van Pul KM, Notohardjo JCL, Fransen MF, Koster BD, Stam AGM, Chondronasiou D, et
al. Local delivery of low-dose anti-CTLA-4 to the melanoma lymphatic basin leads to systemic
Treg reduction and effector T cell activation. Sci Immunol. 2022;7(73):eabn8097.

36.   Faries MB, Thompson JF, Cochran AJ, Andtbacka RH, Mozzillo N, Zager JS, et al.
Completion Dissection or Observation for Sentinel-Node Metastasis in Melanoma. N Engl J
Med. 2017;376(23):2211-22.

37.   Cheng A, Lang J. Survival Analysis of Lymph Node Resection in Ovarian Cancer: A
Population-Based Study. Front Oncol. 2020;10:355.

38.   Gortzak-Uzan L, Jimenez W, Nofech-Mozes S, Ismiil N, Khalifa MA, Dube V, et al.
Sentinel lymph node biopsy vs. pelvic lymphadenectomy in early stage cervical cancer: is it time
to change the gold standard? Gynecol Oncol. 2010;116(1):28-32.

39.   Veronesi U, Paganelli G, Viale G, Luini A, Zurrida S, Galimberti V, et al. A randomized
comparison of sentinel-node biopsy with routine axillary dissection in breast cancer. N Engl J
Med. 2003;349(6):546-53.

40.   Nakajima Y, Asano K, Mukai K, Urai T, Okuwa M, Sugama J, et al. Near-Infrared
Fluorescence Imaging Directly Visualizes Lymphatic Drainage Pathways and Connections
between Superficial and Deep Lymphatic Systems in the Mouse Hindlimb. Sci Rep.
2018;8(1):7078.

41.   De Togni P, Goellner J, Ruddle NH, Streeter PR, Fick A, Mariathasan S, et al. Abnormal
development of peripheral lymphoid organs in mice deficient in lymphotoxin. Science.
1994;264(5159):703-7.

42.   Banks TA, Rouse BT, Kerley MK, Blair PJ, Godfrey VL, Kuklin NA, et al.
Lymphotoxin-alpha-deficient mice. Effects on secondary lymphoid organ development and
humoral immune responsiveness. J Immunol. 1995;155(4):1685-93.

43.   Mariathasan S, Matsumoto M, Baranyay F, Nahm MH, Kanagawa O, Chaplin DD.
Absence of lymph nodes in lymphotoxin-alpha(LT alpha)-deficient mice is due to abnormal
organ development, not defective lymphocyte migration. J Inflamm. 1995;45(1):72-8.

44.   Davis IA, Rouse BT. Immune responsiveness of lymphotoxin-alpha-deficient mice: two
reconstitution models. Cell Immunol. 1998;189(2):116-24.

45.   Meijer EFJ, Blatter C, Chen IX, Bouta E, Jones D, Pereira ER, et al. Lymph node
effective vascular permeability and chemotherapy uptake. Microcirculation. 2017;24(6).

46.   Maaskant-Braat AJ, de Bruijn SZ, Woensdregt K, Pijpers H, Voogd AC, Nieuwenhuijzen
GA. Lymphatic mapping after previous breast surgery. Breast. 2012;21(4):444-8.

47.   Sato A, Sakai T, Iwase T, Kano F, Kimura K, Ogiya A, et al. Altered lymphatic drainage
patterns in re-operative sentinel lymph node biopsy for ipsilateral breast tumor recurrence.
Radiat Oncol. 2019;14(1):159.

48.   Suami H, Thompson B, Mackie H, Blackwell R, Heydon-White A, Blake FT, et al. A
new indocyanine green fluorescence lymphography protocol for diagnostic assessment of lower
limb lymphoedema. J Plast Reconstr Aesthet Surg. 2022.

49.	Bronte V, Pittet MJ. The spleen in local and systemic regulation of immunity. Immunity. 2013;39(5):806-18.

50.	Tomura M, Yoshida N, Tanaka J, Karasawa S, Miwa Y, Miyawaki A, et al. Monitoring cellular movement in vivo with photoconvertible fluorescence protein "Kaede" transgenic mice. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A. 2008;105(31):10871-6.

51.	Wolchok JD, Chiarion-Sileni V, Gonzalez R, Grob JJ, Rutkowski P, Lao CD, et al. Long-Term Outcomes With Nivolumab Plus Ipilimumab or Nivolumab Alone Versus Ipilimumab in Patients With Advanced Melanoma. J Clin Oncol. 2022;40(2):127-37.

52.	Siddiqui I, Schaeuble K, Chennupati V, Fuertes Marraco SA, Calderon-Copete S, Pais Ferreira D, et al. Intratumoral Tcf1(+)PD-1(+)CD8(+) T Cells with Stem-like Properties Promote Tumor Control in Response to Vaccination and Checkpoint Blockade Immunotherapy. Immunity. 2019;50(1):195-211 e10.

53.	Patel SP, Othus M, Chen Y, Wright GP, Jr., Yost KJ, Hyngstrom JR, et al. Neoadjuvant-Adjuvant or Adjuvant-Only Pembrolizumab in Advanced Melanoma. N Engl J Med. 2023;388(9):813-23.

54.	Lo JA, Kawakubo M, Juneja VR, Su MY, Erlich TH, LaFleur MW, et al. Epitope spreading toward wild-type melanocyte-lineage antigens rescues suboptimal immune checkpoint blockade responses. Sci Transl Med. 2021;13(581).

55.	Baeyens A, Fang V, Chen C, Schwab SR. Exit Strategies: S1P Signaling and T Cell Migration. Trends Immunol. 2015;36(12):778-87.

56.	Cyster JG, Schwab SR. Sphingosine-1-phosphate and lymphocyte egress from lymphoid organs. Annu Rev Immunol. 2012;30:69-94.

57.	Girard JP, Moussion C, Forster R. HEVs, lymphatics and homeostatic immune cell trafficking in lymph nodes. Nat Rev Immunol. 2012;12(11):762-73.

58.	Brinkmann V, Cyster JG, Hla T. FTY720: sphingosine 1-phosphate receptor-1 in the control of lymphocyte egress and endothelial barrier function. Am J Transplant. 2004;4(7):1019-25.

59.	Borsetto D, Sethi M, Polesel J, Tomasoni M, Deganello A, Nicolai P, et al. The risk of recurrence in surgically treated head and neck squamous cell carcinomas: a conditional probability approach. Acta Oncol. 2021;60(7):942-7.

60.	Darragh LB, Knitz MM, Hu J, Clambey ET, Backus J, Dumit A, et al. A phase I/Ib trial and biological correlate analysis of neoadjuvant SBRT with single-dose durvalumab in HPV-unrelated locally advanced HNSCC. Nat Cancer. 2022;3(11):1300-17.

61.	Saddawi-Konefka R, O'Farrell A, Faraji F, Clubb L, Allevato MM, Jensen SM, et al. Lymphatic-preserving treatment sequencing with immune checkpoint inhibition unleashes cDC1-dependent antitumor immunity in HNSCC. Nat Commun. 2022;13(1):4298.

62.	Weber J, Mandala M, Del Vecchio M, Gogas HJ, Arance AM, Cowey CL, et al. Adjuvant Nivolumab versus Ipilimumab in Resected Stage III or IV Melanoma. N Engl J Med. 2017;377(19):1824-35.

63.	Ascierto PA, Del Vecchio M, Mandala M, Gogas H, Arance AM, Dalle S, et al. Adjuvant nivolumab versus ipilimumab in resected stage IIIB-C and stage IV melanoma (CheckMate 238): 4-year results from a multicentre, double-blind, randomised, controlled, phase 3 trial. Lancet Oncol. 2020;21(11):1465-77.

64.	Weber JS, Schadendorf D, Del Vecchio M, Larkin J, Atkinson V, Schenker M, et al. Adjuvant Therapy of Nivolumab Combined With Ipilimumab Versus Nivolumab Alone in

Patients With Resected Stage IIIB-D or Stage IV Melanoma (CheckMate 915). J Clin Oncol. 2022:JCO2200533.

65.	Haley PJ. The lymphoid system: a review of species differences. J Toxicol Pathol. 2017;30(2):111-23.

66.	Fu C, Jiang A. Dendritic Cells and CD8 T Cell Immunity in Tumor Microenvironment. Front Immunol. 2018;9:3059.

67.	Bery AI, Shepherd HM, Li W, Krupnick AS, Gelman AE, Kreisel D. Role of tertiary lymphoid organs in the regulation of immune responses in the periphery. Cellular and molecular life sciences : CMLS. 2022;79(7):359.

68.	Wijeyesinghe S, Beura LK, Pierson MJ, Stolley JM, Adam OA, Ruscher R, et al. Expansible residence decentralizes immune homeostasis. Nature. 2021;592(7854):457-62.

69.	Perlman RL. Mouse models of human disease: An evolutionary perspective. Evol Med Public Health. 2016;2016(1):170-6.

70.	Heydon-White A, Suami H, Boyages J, Koelmeyer L, Peebles KC. Assessing breast lymphoedema following breast cancer treatment using indocyanine green lymphography. Breast Cancer Res Treat. 2020;181(3):635-44.

71.	Onoi K, Chihara Y, Uchino J, Shimamoto T, Morimoto Y, Iwasaku M, et al. Immune Checkpoint Inhibitors for Lung Cancer Treatment: A Review. J Clin Med. 2020;9(5).

72.	Boukouris AE, Theochari M, Stefanou D, Papalambros A, Felekouras E, Gogas H, et al. Latest evidence on immune checkpoint inhibitors in metastatic colorectal cancer: A 2022 update. Crit Rev Oncol Hematol. 2022;173:103663.

73.	Jones D, Pereira ER, Padera TP. Growth and Immune Evasion of Lymph Node Metastasis. Front Oncol. 2018;8:36.

74.	Rahim MK, Okholm TLH, Jones KB, McCarthy EE, Liu CC, Yee JL, et al. Dynamic CD8(+) T cell responses to cancer immunotherapy in human regional lymph nodes are disrupted in metastatic lymph nodes. Cell. 2023;186(6):1127-43 e18.

75.	CoreTeam R. R: A language and environment for statistical computing. R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria 2021.

76.	Wurdinger T, Badr C, Pike L, de Kleine R, Weissleder R, Breakefield XO, et al. A secreted luciferase for ex vivo monitoring of in vivo processes. Nat Methods. 2008;5(2):171-3.

77.	Savinkov R, Grebennikov D, Puchkova D, Chereshnev V, Sazonov I, Bocharov G. Graph Theory for Modeling and Analysis of the Human Lymphatic System. Mathematics. 2020;8(12):2236.

78.	Grebennikov D, Savinkov R, Zelenova E, Lobov G, Bocharov G. Network Modeling of Murine Lymphatic System. Algorithms. 2023;16(3):168.

79.	Kawashima Y, Sugimura M, Hwang Y-C, Kudo N. THE LYMPH SYSTEM IN MICE. Japanese Journal of Veterinary Research. 1964;12(4):69-78.

80.	Van den Broeck W, Derore A, Simoens P. Anatomy and nomenclature of murine lymph nodes: Descriptive study and nomenclatory standardization in BALB/cAnNCrl mice. J Immunol Methods. 2006;312(1-2):12-9.

81.	Harrell MI, Iritani BM, Ruddell A. Lymph node mapping in the mouse. J Immunol Methods. 2008;332(1-2):170-4.

82.	Suami H, Scaglioni MF. Lymphatic Territories (Lymphosomes) in the Rat: An Anatomical Study for Future Lymphatic Research. Plast Reconstr Surg. 2017;140(5):945-51.

83.	Truskey GA, Yuan F, Katz DF. Transport phenomena in biological systems. 2nd edition ed: Pearson Prentice Hall; 2009.

704 84. Baxter LT, Jain RK. Transport of fluid and macromolecules in tumors. I. Role of
705 interstitial pressure and convection. Microvasc Res. 1989;37(1):77-104.
706 85. Swartz MA, Kaipainen A, Netti PA, Brekken C, Boucher Y, Grodzinsky AJ, et al.
707 Mechanics of interstitial-lymphatic fluid transport: theoretical foundation and experimental
708 validation. J Biomech. 1999;32(12):1297-307.
709

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

Funding:

National Institutes of Health grant K00CA234940 (H.Z.)

National Institutes of Health grant R21AI097745 (T.P.P.)

National Institutes of Health grant R01CA214913 (T.P.P.)

National Institutes of Health grant R01HL128168 (T.P.P.)

National Institutes of Health grant R01CA284372 (T.P.P.)

National Institutes of Health grant R01CA284603 (T.P.P., L.L.M. and J.W.B.)

National Institutes of Health grant R01DE028529 (S.D.K.)

National Institutes of Health grant R01DE028282 (S.D.K.)

National Institutes of Health grant R01DE028529 (S.D.K.)

National Institutes of Health grant P50CA261605 (S.D.K.)

National Institutes of Health grant R35CA242379 (M.G.V.H.)

The Rullo Family MGH Research Scholar Award (T.P.P.; G.M.B.)

The Patricia K. Donahoe Award from the Huiying Foundation (G.M.B.)

The Adelson Medical Research Foundation (G.M.B.),

The Ludwig Center at MIT (M.G.V.H.)

The MIT Center for Precision Cancer Medicine (M.G.V.H.)

The Breast Cancer Alliance (J.M.U.)

The Melanoma Research Foundation (J.M.U.).

Competing Interests:

H.Z. acknowledges that he is a scientific advisor for AOA dx. M.G.V.H. acknowledges that he is a scientific advisor for Agios Pharmaceuticals, iTeos Therapeutics, Sage Therapeutics, Pretzel Therapeutics, Lime Therapeutics, Auron Therapeutics, and Droia Ventures. G.M.B has sponsored research agreements through her institution with: Olink Proteomics, Teiko Bio, InterVenn Biosciences, Palleon Pharmaceuticals. She served on advisory boards for: Iovance, Merck, Nektar Therapeutics, Novartis, and Ankyra Therapeutics. She consults for: Merck, InterVenn Biosciences, Iovance, and Ankyra Therapeutics. She holds equity in Ankyra Therapeutics. The Phase I/Ib clinical trial NCT03635164 was funded by AstraZeneca, S.D.K also received clinical trial funding from Genentech and preclinical funding from Roche.

Author Contributions:

Conceptualization: H.Z., J.W.B., M.G.V.H., L.L.M., G.M.B., S.C., S.D.K., T.P.P.

Methodology: H.Z., J.W.B., M.G.V.H., L.L.M., G.M.B., S.C., S.D.K., T.P.P.

Data acquisition: H.Z., J.W.B., M.J.O., L.B.D., E.S., J.C., P.J.L., L.M., J.J.R.

Intellectual input: H.Z., J.W.B., M.J.O., P.J.L., L.M., M.R.N., M.S.R., M.G.V.H., J.M.U., L.L.M., G.M.B., S.C., S.D.K., T.P.P.

Project administration: H.Z., T.P.P.

Supervision: G.M.B., S.C., S.D.K., M.G.V.H., T.P.P.

Writing: H.Z., J.W.B., M.J.O., P.J.L., L.M., M.G.V.H., J.M.U., L.L.M., G.M.B., S.C., S.D.K., T.P.P.

Data and materials availability:

751   The data generated in this study are available within the article and its supplementary data files.

752   The raw clinical imaging data and other clinical data, beyond what is presented in the figures in

753   this study, are not publicly available due to the need to protect patient information.

756
757 **Figure 1. Adjuvant ICB response persists in stage III melanoma patients after LN surgery.**

758 Retrospective analysis was performed on a cohort of cutaneous stage III melanoma patients who

759 underwent SLNB or CLND, and were treated by adjuvant nivolumab or pembrolizumab at

760 Massachusetts General Hospital. (**A**) Melanoma-specific survival, (**B**) recurrence-free survival,

761 (**C**) local recurrence-free survival and (**D**) distant recurrence-free survival are plotted.

Figure 2. ICB response persists after LN dissection. (A) Sham surgery or SLNB was

performed on C57Bl6 mice (day -10) prior to orthotopic tumor implantation (day 1). Mice were

treated by rat IgG control or anti-PD1 antibody (day 7) three times (every 2 days for B16F10 or

every 3 days for E0771, 10mg/kg). Tumor volume (*left & middle*) and overall survival (*right*)

were plotted for mice bearing orthotopic B16F10 (*top*) or E0771 (*bottom*) tumors, respectively.

(**B**) To evaluate the impact of more aggressive surgery, sham surgery or CLND was performed

followed by tumor implantation and subsequent anti-PD1 inhibition using the same regimen

described above. Tumor volume (*left*) and overall survival (*right*) were plotted for mice bearing

B16F10 (*top*) or E0771 (*bottom*) tumors, respectively. (**C**) In contrast with pre-emptive

approach, impact of post-tumor implantation LN dissection was also assessed. After tumor

implantation (day 1), sham surgery, SLNB or CLND was performed on C57Bl6 mice (day 6)

right before anti-PD1 treatment (day 7). Tumor volume (*left*) and overall survival (*right*) were

plotted for mice bearing B16F10 (*top*) and E0771 (*bottom*) tumors. (**D**) Frequency of complete

responders from pre-emptive and post-tumor TDLN removal studies were plotted. Fisher's exact

test was used for statistical analysis. (**E**) B16F10 (*top*) or E0771 (*bottom*) tumor response to anti-

PD1 treatment was tested in *Lta^{tm1Dc}* mice. ICB response of wildtype (WT) sham mice from (**A**)

SLNB study was plotted in dashed lines for comparison. Tumor volume (*left*) and overall

survival (*right*) were plotted. In all animal studies, "(n)" indicates number of mice used. Log-

rank test with Bonferroni test was used for statistical analysis of survival data. *$p<0.05$,

****$p<0.0001$.

Figure 3. DLN dissection alters lymph drainage and promotes antigen access to distant lymphoid organs. FITC-conjugated 2 million Dalton (FITC-2MD) and TRITC-conjugated 4.4 kilodalton (TRITC-4.4kD) dextran were injected to the mammary fat pad of mice that underwent sham surgery, SLNB or CLND. (**A**) Representative immunofluorescence images of mouse with sham surgery demonstrate intranodal dextran distribution. (**B**) Dextran distribution in ipsilateral inguinal (IN), axillary (AX), brachial (BR) LNs as well as contralateral IN LNs in animals that underwent sham, SLNB or CLND. (**C**) Greater magnification image shows that large dextran molecules enter subcapsular sinus of contralateral IN LN in CLND mice, suggesting transport through lymphatic vessels. (**D**) Diagram shows lymph flow pattern in various surgery settings. (**E**) FITC-2MD dextran distribution in spleens from mice that underwent sham surgery or ipsilateral LN dissection (ILND). (**F**) Representative immunofluorescence images demonstrate

796 FITC-2MD dextran location in spleen from ILND mice relative to B cells (B220) and

797 macrophages (F4/80). In this figure, fluorescence signal quantification was calculated by the

798 occupied area, while DAPI was used to normalize LN area. Two tailed student t test (two

799 conditions) and one way ANOVA with Tukey post analysis (more than two conditions) were

800 used for statistical analysis. $*p<0.05$, $**p<0.01$, $****p<0.0001$.

Figure 4. TDLN dissection stimulates immune responses in distant LNs. To assess the

tumor-specific T cell response, B16-F10 tumors overexpressing ovabulmin$_{257-264}$ (OVA) were

implanted to sham and CLND mice followed by anti-PD1 inhibition. (**A**) In ipsilateral and

contralateral LNs as well as (**B**) spleens, CD8 T cell expansion is shown by immunofluorescence

images. (**C**) Additionally, OVA-specific CD8 T cells in ipsilateral, contralateral and cervical

LNs, spleens and blood were determined by tetramer staining using flow cytometry analysis. (**D**)

Abundance of OVA-specific CD8 T cells (CD8+, Tetramer+) is plotted for various LNs, blood

and spleens collected from sham and CLND mice; each dot represents data from a single mouse.

(**E**) OVA-specific CD8 T cell response in ipsilateral and contralateral LNs is shown in an

adjuvant setting where primary tumor resection was performed with or without CLND before

anti-PD1 inhibition. (**F**) Similar to **E**, Kaede mice bearing B16F10-OVA tumors were treated by

adjuvant anti-PD1 inhibition, followed by tumor rechallenge to primary site. Once recurrent

tumor formed, contralateral inguinal LNs were photoconverted prior to tissue harvesting for flow

analysis. Abundance of Kaede red+ tumor infiltrating OVA-specific CD8 T cells is plotted. (**G**)

To assess antigen-presenting cell-mediated T cell response after LN dissection, BMDCs were

pulsed with OVA and LPS for 1 day, and injected to the footpad of mice that underwent sham

surgery or ILND. OVA-specific CD8 T cells in ipsilateral and contralateral LNs are plotted. (**H**)

Abundance of tumor-infiltrating proliferating, non-exhausted CD8 effector T cell (CD44+,

PD1+, Tbet+, KLRG1-, Ki67+) in sham and CLND mice bearing B16F10 tumors treated by ICB

is shown. (**I**) Primary tumor resection was performed in sham and CLND mice treated by ICB,

and mice were rechallenged with B16F10 tumors subsequently. Abundance of non-exhausted

stem-like central memory CD8 T cells (CD44+, PD1+, CD62L+, TCF1+, CD127+, KLRG1-,

Tim3-, Lag3-) in remaining LNs is shown. In this figure, fluorescence signal quantification is

calculated by the occupied area, while DAPI is used to normalize. Two tailed student t test (two

conditions) and one way ANOVA with Tukey post analysis (more than two conditions) were

used for statistical analysis. *$p<0.05$, **$p<0.01$, ****$p<0.0001$.

Modeling of interstitial fluid transport in mouse after LN dissection

Modeling of interstitial fluid transport in human after LN dissection

Simplified model for lymphosome drainage

Active lymphosomes
Disabled lymphosome

830
Figure 5. Mathematical modeling of antigen access to adjacent lymphosomes via dermal

network after node dissection. (**A**) Mouse model with network of collecting lymphatic vessels

(black), collecting points (blue) and lymph nodes (red). (**B**) Computational mesh for network of

initial lymphatic vessels in the skin. (**C-F**) Drainage basins (red) with disabled nodes (black *),

four most active compensatory nodes (black o) for (**C**) inguinal node resection, (**D**) inguinal and

axillary node resection, (**E**) popliteal, inguinal, axillary and brachial node resection, and (**F**)

inguinal and axillary node resection with severed midline model (intact **C**-**E**). (**G**) Human male

model with network of collecting lymphatic vessels (black), collecting points (blue) and lymph

nodes (red). (**H**) Computational mesh for network of initial lymphatic vessels in the skin. (**I**)

Drainage basin (red) with disabled axillary node (black *), four most active compensatory nodes

(black o). (**J**) Planar geometry for analytical model with a circular disabled lymphosome (red)

surrounded by tissue with active lymph clearance (blue). (**K**) Interstitial pressure inside and

outside of the disabled lymphosome from the full, 3D human model compared to an analytical

result for the planar geometry in (**J**) with the same surface area. (**L**) Dependence of interstitial

pressure on radius of disabled lymphosome (arrows) showing how small lymphosomes produce

little increase in interstitial pressure. (**M**) Dependence of interstitial pressure and fluid velocity u

at the periphery of the disabled lymphosome on tissue permeability (radius 50 mm) showing how

changes in tissue permeability can alter the interstitial pressure, but barely affects the rate of

fluid/antigen flow to compensatory lymphosomes (u).

Figure 6. Distant LNs can be targeted to improve ICB response. Sham surgery or CLNB was

performed on C57Bl6 mice (day -10) prior to orthotopic E0771 tumor implantation (day 1). IgG

control or combination of anti-PD1 and anti-CTLA4 antibodies were intradermally delivered to

ipsilateral TDLNs or contralateral LNs in sham and CLND conditions, respectively (day 7) for

three doses at 5mg/kg. LNs exposed to treatment were harvested for flow cytometry analysis

measuring CD45, TCR-beta, CD4, CD8, CD44, PD-1, TCF-1, CD39 and CD62L. Non-tumor

bearing naïve mice are used as control. (**A**) LN Volume of naïve mice or mice treated by IgG or

ICB combination is plotted. (**B**) Principle component analysis is performed on naïve or

treatment-exposed LNs, using the abundance of antigen-experienced T cells (CD44+, PD-1+),

memory T cells (CD44+, PD-1+, TCF1+), central memory T cells (CD44+, PD-1+, TCF1+,

CD62L+), effector memory T cells (CD44+, PD-1+, TCF1+, CD62L-), stem-like effector

memory T cells (CD44+, PD-1+, TCF1+, CD62L-, CD39-) and their CD4/CD8 subsets. (**C**) The

percentage of stem-like effector memory T cells to total T cells is plotted. (**D**) Using the same

surgery, tumor implantation and treatment procedure, ICB was given intraperitoneally or

intradermally to the lymphatic basin of contralateral inguinal LN (day 7) for three times at

5mg/kg in sham and CLND mice. Tumor volume (*left*) and overall survival (*right*) were plotted.

(**E**) Timeline for neoadjuvant-adjuvant treatment and tumor rechallenge. (**F**) Representative

images of vitiligo (arrows) that developed in mice after neoadjuvant treatment (*left*). Percentage

of mice with local, distant or local & distant vitiligo across conditions (*right*). (**G**) Overall

survival of mice treated by neoadjuvant ICB with various LN surgery status. (**H**) Tumor-free

survival of mice previously treated by neoadjuvant ICB after tumor rechallenge. Naïve mice

were used as control. (**I**) Overall survival of mice previously treated by neoadjuvant-adjuvant

ICB after tumor rechallenge. Of note, only mice that developed tumors after rechallenge were

given adjuvant treatment. In all studies, "(n)" indicates the number of mice used. One way

ANOVA with Tukey post analysis (comparing more than two conditions) and Log-rank test with

Bonferroni test (survival) were used for statistical analysis. $*p<0.05$, $**p<0.01$, $***p<0.001$,

$****p<0.0001$.

880
Figure 7. Distant LNs are inflamed after resection of tumor and related LNs in cancer

patients. (**A**) *Left*, from phase I trial NCT03635164, response rate and reactive status of

remaining LNs after neck dissection are shown. *Right*, percentage of patients that have enlarged

or reactive LNs in more distal LN basins are plotted in non-responder and responder cohorts.

Fisher's exact test 2x2 is used to evaluate statistical significance, *$p<0.05$. (**B**) CT images of

patient 01-013's and 01-015's neck at diagnosis and 2-year post-surgery follow-up scan are

demonstrated. Arrows indicate enlarged neck LNs (posterior cervical LNs in patient 01-013;

submandibular and submental LNs in patient 01-015). (**C**) CT and PET images of patient 01-009

at diagnosis and 7-month post-surgery follow-up scan. Arrows indicate reactive cervical

(diagnosis) and apex mediastinal LNs (follow up).