TNFRSF14 (HVEM) is a novel immune checkpoint for cancer immunotherapy in humanized mice

Nicolas Aubert ^{1*}, Simon, Brunel ^{1*}, Daniel Olive ² and Gilles Marodon ¹

1 Sorbonne Universités, Inserm, CNRS, Centre d'immunologie et maladies infectieuses-Paris, Cimi-Paris, Paris 75013, France

2 Institut Paoli-Calmettes, Aix-Marseille Université, Inserm, CNRS, CRCM, Tumor Immunity Team, IBISA Immunomonitoring platform, Marseille, France (daniel.olive@inserm.fr)

* Equal contributions (nicolas.aubert@inserm.fr, simonbrunel@live.fr)

Running title: HVEM is a novel target for cancer immunotheraoy

Corresponding author: Gilles Marodon, gilles.marodon@inserm.fr, Sorbonne Université, Inserm, CNRS, Centre d'immunologie et maladies infectieuses-Paris (CIMI-PARIS), Paris 75013, France

Categorie: Immune Cell Therapies and Immune Cell Engineering

Word count: 4928

1 Abstract

2 Background: TNFRSF14 (herpes virus entry mediator (HVEM) delivers a negative signal to T cells through
3 the B and T Lymphocyte Attenuator (BTLA) molecule and has been associated with a worse prognosis in
4 numerous malignancies. A formal demonstration that the HVEM/BTLA axis can be targeted for cancer
5 immunotherapy is however still lacking.

6 Methods: We used immunodeficient NOD.SCID.gc-null mice reconstituted with human PBMC and grafted
7 with human tumor cell lines subcutaneously. Tumor growth was compared using linear and non linear
8 regression statistical modeling. The phenotype of tumor-infiltrating leukocytes was determined by flow
9 cytometry. Statistical testing between groups was performed by a non-parametric t test. Quantification of
10 mRNA in the tumor was performed using NanoString pre-designed panels. Bioinformatics analyses were

10 performed using Metascape, Gene Set Enrichment Analysis and Ingenuity Pathways Analysis with embedded
11 statistical testing.

12 Results: We showed that a murine monoclonal antibody to human HVEM significantly impacted the growth
13 of various HVEM-positive cancer cell lines in humanized NSG mice. Using CRISPR/cas9 mediated deletion
14 of HVEM, we showed that HVEM expression by the tumor was necessary and sufficient to observe the
15 therapeutic effect. Tumor cell killing by the mAb was dependent on innate immune cells still present in NSG
16 mice, as indicated by *in vivo* and *in vitro* assays. Mechanistically, tumor control by human T cells by the
17 mAb was dependent on CD8 T cells and was associated with an increase in the proliferation and number of
18 tumor-infiltrating leukocytes. Accordingly, the expression of genes belonging to T cell activation pathways,
19 such as JAK/STAT and NFkB were enriched in anti-HVEM-treated mice, whereas genes associated with
20 immuno-suppressive pathways were decreased. Finally, we developed a simple *in vivo* assay to directly
21 demonstrate that HVEM/BTLA is an immune checkpoint for T-cell mediated tumor control.

22 Conclusions: Our results show that targeting HVEM is a promising strategy for cancer immunotherapy.

Keywords

immune checkpoint; HVEM; BTLA; monoclonal antibody; cancer immunotherapy; humanized mice

23 Introduction

24 Immune escape by tumor is now considered a hallmark of cancer [1]. Many immune mechanisms are
25 involved to explain the loss of tumor control, including defective MHC function and expression, recruitment
26 of suppressive immune cells, and expression of co-inhibitory receptors such as PD-L1 [2]. In the last few
27 years, targeting co-inhibitory molecules with antibodies has shown impressive results in tumor regression
28 and overall survival, leading to the approval of anti-CTLA-4, anti-PD-1 and anti-PD-L1 in numerous cancers
29 [3]. However, the success of immune checkpoint inhibitors (ICI) is still partial and many patients fail to
30 respond. Limited tumor infiltrate (cold tumors) or low expression of the targeted molecule may explain the
31 relative inefficiency of ICI [4,5]. To overcome these limitations, it is necessary to explore other pathways
32 that might be involved in immune escape and that could complement actual therapies.

Recently, a new co-inhibitory pair has been highlighted in anti-tumor immune response: HVEM (Herpes Virus Entry Mediator, TNFRSF14) and BTLA (B and T lymphocyte attenuator) [6]. These two molecules can be expressed by many immune cells, including T-cells, in which signaling through BTLA is associated with inhibition of their activation [7,8]. Additionally, the HVEM network includes many additional partners, such as LIGHT, Herpes Simplex Virus-1 (HSV-1) glycoprotein D (gD), lymphotoxin α (LT α) or CD160 [6]. Like BTLA, binding of HVEM to CD160 on T-cells is associated with an inhibition of their activation [9]. In contrast, LIGHT is clearly a T-cell activator since transgenic expression of LIGHT in T cells leads to massive activation, especially in mucosal tissues [10]. On the other hand, stimulation of HVEM expressed by T-cells by any of its ligands is associated with proliferation, survival and production of inflammatory cytokines, such as IL-2 and IFN- γ [9,11]. Several clinical studies have shown that HVEM expression is upregulated in many types of cancers including colorectal cancers [12], melanomas [13], esophageal carcinomas [14], gastric cancers [15], hepatocarcinomas [16], breast cancers [17], lymphomas [18] or prostate cancer [19]. In these studies, high levels of HVEM expression by tumors were associated with a worse prognosis and lower survival. Moreover, HVEM expression by tumors was also associated with a reduction in the numbers of tumor-infiltrating leukocytes (TIL) [12,14,16].

Few studies have considered targeting the HVEM network to affect tumor growth. In fact, various strategies to inhibit HVEM expression or function lead to increased T cell proliferation and function in syngeneic tumor mouse models [14,20,21]. However, to our knowledge, no study to date has assessed the possibility to use a monoclonal antibody (mAb) to HVEM to favor the anti-tumor immune response in a humanized context *in vivo*. Herein, we investigated the therapeutic potential of a murine antibody targeting human HVEM in humanized mice grafted with various human tumor cell lines. To generate humanized mice, we used immuno-compromised NOD.SCID. γ C^{null} (NSG) mice, which are deprived of murine T-, B- and NK-cells but that retain functionally immature macrophages and granulocytes [22]. We reconstituted these mice with human PBMC, allowing the effect of blocking HVEM to be studied on both tumors, murine myeloid cells and human T-cells.

Methods

59 *Preparation of human peripheral mononuclear cells*

60 Human peripheral blood mononuclear cells were isolated on a density gradient (Biocoll). Cells were washed
61 in PBS 3% FCS and diluted at the appropriate concentration in 1X PBS before injection into mice.

62 *Humanized mice tumor model*

63 All animals used were NSG mice (stock #005557) purchased from the Jackson Laboratory (USA). To assess
64 therapeutic activity, 8–20-week-old NSG mice (males and females) were injected subcutaneously with 2×10^6
65 tumor cells. One week later, mice were irradiated (2 Gy) and grafted the same day with 2×10^6 huPBMC by
66 retro orbital injection. Four to 5 days after transplantation, the anti-huHVEM antibody or isotype control was
67 injected intra-peritoneally at 2 mg/kg. General state, body weight and survival of mice were monitored every
68 3-4 days to evaluate Graft-vs-Host-Disease (GVHD) progression. Mice were euthanized when exhibiting
69 signs of GVHD, such as hunched back, ruffled fur, and reduced mobility. For CD8 depletion, mice were
70 injected intra-peritoneally with 10mg/kg of the anti-CD8 MT807R1(Rhesus recombinant IgG1 provided by
71 the Nonhuman Primate Reagent Resource [23]) or the isotype control (clone DSPR1) the day following
72 humanization, as previously described [24].

73 *Antibodies*

74 The clone 18.10 has been described previously [25]. Briefly, 18.10 is a murine IgG1 anti-human HVEM
75 mAb and was produced as ascites and purified by protein A binding and elution with the Affi-gel Protein A
76 MAPS II Kit (Bio-rad). The mouse IgG1 isotype control (clone MOPC-21 clone), the rat IgG2b anti-Gr1
77 (clone RB6-8C5) and the isotype control rat IgG2b (clone LTF-2) were purchased from Bio X Cell (West
78 Lebanon, NH, USA).

79 *Cell lines*

80 PC3 (non-hormono-dependent human prostate cancer cells), Gerlach (human melanoma cells), MDA-MB-
81 231 (breast cancer cells), DU145 (prostate cancer cells) were grown in high glucose DMEM media
82 supplemented with 10% FCS, L-glutamine and antibiotics (Penicillin/Streptomycin). PC3 and MDA-MB-
83 231 were genetically authenticated before the initiation of the experiments (Eurofins). All cells were
84 confirmed to be free of mycoplasmas before injection into mice by the MycoAlert detection kit (Lonza).
85 Tumor growth was monitored using an electronic caliper and volumes were determined using the following

formula: $[(length * width^2) / 2]$. The PC3-GFP cell line was generated in the laboratory by lentiviral transduction (details available on request).

Generation of HVEM deficient PC3 clone using CRISPR-Cas9 technology

50,000 PC3 cells were seeded in a 24-well plate. Twenty-four hours later, cells were incubated with sgRNA complementary to exon 3 of HVEM (GCCAUUGAGGUGGGCAAUGU + Scaffold, TrueGuide Synthetic guide RNAs, Invitrogen™), Cas9 nuclease (TrueCut™ Cas9 Protein v2, Invitrogen™) and lipofectamine (Lipofectamine™ CRISPRMAX™ Cas9 Transfection Reagent, Invitrogen™) according to manufacturer instructions (TrueCut Cas9 protein v2 (27/09/2017)). After three days, efficiency was evaluated with GeneArt Genomic Cleavage Detection Kit (Invitrogen™) according to the manufacturer instructions. For this assay, DNA was amplified with the following primers: TGCGAAGTTCCCACTCTCTG (Forward) and GGATAAGGGTCAGTCGCCAA (Reverse). Cells were cloned by limiting dilution in 96-well plates. Clones were screened for HVEM expression by flow cytometry using anti-HVEM (clone 94801, BD) and were considered as negative if HVEM expression was undetectable for at least 3 subsequent measurements.

In vitro assays

PC3 cells were seeded in 96-wells plate at 7000 cells/well in RPMI medium. Cells were treated by the anti HVEM antibody or its isotype control MOPC21 coated at 10µg/ml. Cell death was evaluated by flow cytometry after 16 hours of incubation (37°C, 5% CO2) by 7-AAD staining. Macrophages from NSG mice were obtained by peritoneal wash. The target to effector ratio was 1:5 for apoptosis monitoring. For live cell imaging, apoptosis of the PC3 GFP cell line was assessed using the annexin V red (cat n°4641, Sartorius). Culture was monitored every hour during 16 hours by Incucyte and overlapping of GFP (green) and apoptosis staining (red) was quantified and reported as number of apoptotic cells/well.

Phenotypic analysis by flow cytometry

Tumors were digested with 0.84mg/mL of collagenase IV and 10µg/mL DNase I (Sigma Aldrich) for 40min at 37°C with an intermediate flushing of the tissue. Cells were passed through a 100µm-cell strainer and suspended in PBS 3% FCS. To eliminate dead cells and debris, tumor cell suspensions were isolated on a Biocoll gradient. Rings were collected, washed, and cell pellets were suspended in PBS 3% FCS before counting on LUNA™ Automated Cell counter (Logos Biosystems). Subsequently, up to 2.10⁶ live cells were stained with viability dye (eF506, Fixable Viability Dye, ThermoFisher) for 12 min. at 4°C, Fc receptor were

114 blocked with human FcR Blocking Reagent (120-000-442, Miltenyi Biotec) and anti-CD16/32 (clone 2.4G2)
 115 for 10 min. The followings antibodies were added for 35 min. at 4°C: hCD45-BUV805 (HI30, BD), hCD3-
 116 PECy7 (SK7, BD), hCD4-PerCP (RPA-T4, Biolegend), hCD8-APC-H7 (SK1, BD), hKi67-AF700 (B56,
 117 BD), hCD270-BV421 (cw10, BD), and mCD45-BUV395 (30-F11, BD) hGranzymeB-APC (GB11,
 118 eBioscience), hPerforin-PE (B-D48, Biolegend) and mCD45-BUV395 (30-F11, BD). For intracellular
 119 staining, Foxp3/Transcription Factor Staining (eBioscience) or Cytofix/Cytoperm (BD) buffer sets were
 120 used. Cells were washed with 1X PBS before acquisition on an X20 cytometer (Becton Dickinson (BD), San
 121 Jose, CA). The absolute count of different populations was determined by adding 50 µL of Cell Counting
 122 Beads (Bangs Laboratories) before acquisition. Data were analyzed using FlowJo software (TreeStar,
 123 Ashland, OR, USA).

124 *NanoString nCounter expression assay*

125 For Nanostring® experiment, 14 to 15 weeks-old NSG mice were humanized and treated with anti-HVEM
 126 or isotype. Day 28 post humanization, tumors were harvested and TIL were isolated as described above. To
 127 maximize mRNA recovery, TIL were pooled by treatment groups (4 mice in the anti-HVEM group and 5 in
 128 the isotype control group). Then, cells were stained with viability dye (eF506) and anti hCD45-APC (HI30,
 129 Biolegend). Live hCD45⁺ cells were sorted using Aria II cell sorter. After centrifugation, cells were
 130 suspended in RLT buffer (Qiagen®) before freezing at -80°C until analysis. Data were normalized through
 131 the use of NanoString's intrinsic negative and positive controls according to the normalization approach of
 132 the nSolver analysis software (Nanostring). For the analysis, 287 genes with raw count higher than 55 and an
 133 absolute fold-change of at least 20% were retained. Enrichment analysis was performed with Metascape
 134 [26], the GSEA desktop application [27] and Ingenuity Pathway Analysis (IPA) (Qiagen). For Metascape
 135 analysis, genes up or down regulated were analyzed separately whereas all genes were included in the GSEA
 136 or IPA analyses. For GSEA analysis, enrichment was performed using the Hallmark v7.2 or the Canonical
 137 Pathways v7.2 gene sets from the Broad Institute. With that workflow, a False Discovery Rate (FDR) or a
 138 Family Wise Error Rate (FWER) less than 0.25 is deemed “significant”.

139 *Statistical analysis*

140 All statistical tests were performed with Prism software (Graph Pad Inc, La Jolla, CA, USA). To compare
 141 ranks between two groups, the p-value was calculated with a non-parametric two-tailed Mann-Whitney t-test.

142 Statistical modeling of tumor growth was performed by linear and non-linear regression using the
143 exponential growth model. When necessary, the p-values of these tests are indicated on the figure panels.
144 Statistical power of the analyses (alpha) was arbitrarily set at 0.05. No test was performed *a priori* to
145 adequate the number of samples with statistical power.

146 **Results**

147 **Targeting HVEM with a mAb improves tumor control of HVEM+ cell lines in humanized mice**

148 We first determined whether HVEM could be targeted for therapy by the anti-HVEM 18.10 monoclonal
149 antibody. For that, we implanted various tumor cell lines in NSG mice and grafted human PBMCs few days
150 after. No differences in tumor growth were observed with mice grafted with the prostate cancer cell line
151 DU145 or with the triple-negative breast cancer cell line MDA-MB-231, which did not express HVEM
152 (Figure 1A-B). In contrast, a significant reduction of tumor growth was observed in mice grafted with the
153 HVEM-positive patient-derived melanoma cell line Gerlach and the PC3 prostate cancer cell line (Figure
154 1C-D). To rule out that the effect of the mAb on tumor growth was due to other differences than HVEM
155 expression, we generated an HVEM-deficient PC3 cell line (clone 1B11) using CRISPR-Cas9
156 ribonucleoprotein (RNP) transfection (Figure 1E). The treatment with the mAb was completely inefficient on
157 the 1B11 cell line in humanized mice (Figure 1E). Of note, the knock-down of HVEM impacted tumor
158 growth to the same extent than the mAb on HVEM⁺ PC3 cells (Figure 1D-E). Thus, HVEM expression on
159 the tumor was mandatory for the therapeutic efficacy of the mAb.

Figure 1: Targeting HVEM with a mAb improves tumor control of HVEM+ cell lines in humanized mice. HVEM expression and tumor growth of the prostate cancer cell line DU145 (A), the breast cancer cell line MDA-MB-231 (MDA) (B), the patient derived melanoma Gerlach (C), the prostate cancer cell line PC3 (D) and the HVEM-deficient PC3 clone 1B11. HVEM expression was determined by flow cytometry with the anti-HVEM mAb (clone 18.10) and a secondary antibody. Curves represent the mean tumor volume ($\pm$ SEM) from one experiment with DU145 and at least two for the others. Numbers of mice at the beginning of the experiments are indicated in brackets. Arrows indicate the time of the injections. The p value on the graphs indicate the probability that the slopes are equal using a linear regression model.

NSG myeloid cells are able to kill PC3 cells in presence of the anti-HVEM antibody

We next evaluated whether the mAb would mediate direct killing of tumor cells since HVEM has been linked to pro apoptotic signaling [28]. However, the anti-HVEM mAb was unable to induce tumor cell death *in vitro* (Figure 2A). In contrast, a significant reduction in tumor growth after mAb treatment was observed

for the parental PC3 cell line in non-humanized NSG mice (Figure 2B). Because NSG mice are on a NOD genetic background which is deficient for complement activity [22], we surmised that innate immunity of NSG mice might be involved in the activity of the mAb. Indeed, depletion of monocytes and neutrophils with an anti-Gr1 mAb completely reverted the effect of the treatment, but a high mortality of NSG mice was observed (Figure S1). We thus co cultured PC3 cells with macrophages obtained from peritoneal lavage of NSG mice (Figure S2). Using live imaging, we observed a progressive increased proportion of apoptotic cells in presence of the anti-HVEM mAb (Figure 2C). Furthermore, video microscopy of the co-cultures revealed that tumor cells were killed by a cell-contact dependent mechanism with no evidence for engulfment of tumor cells (Video S1). Thus, innate immunity of NSG mice is not passive during treatment and may participate in tumor killing following treatment with the mAb.

Figure 2: NSG myeloid cells are able to kill wild-type PC3 cells in presence of the anti-HVEM antibody.

(A) Frequencies of 7AAD⁺ cells on the parental cell line PC3 in culture with anti-HVEM or isotype control mAb were determined by flow cytometry. (B) Tumor growth of the parental PC3 cell line in non-humanized NSG mice treated with the anti-HVEM or Isotype control mAb. Data are cumulative of 3 independent experiments. (C) GFP-expressing wild-type PC3 cells were co-cultured with NSG peritoneal macrophages and an apoptosis staining reagent. Magnification is indicated. (D) Overlap of GFP (green) and apoptosis staining (red) was quantified and reported as number of apoptotic cells/well $\pm$ SEM of technical replicates. Depicted are the results from one experiment.

196 Treatment with the anti-HVEM mAb 18.10 results in an increase in TIL number and proliferation

197 To dig further into the mode of action of the mAb, we determined the relative frequencies of murine and
198 human CD45⁺ cells in the tumor by flow cytometry. Among all CD45⁺ cells, murine cells were very rare
199 compared to human cells. Human cells represented more than 90% of all CD45⁺ cells, in which CD3⁺CD4⁺
200 and CD8⁺ represented more than 95% (Figure 3A-C), showing that the tumor was mostly infiltrated by

human T-cells. These proportions were not changed by the treatment. In contrast, we observed an increase in CD4 T-cells numbers and a similar tendency for CD8 T-cells in the anti-HVEM-treated group (Figure 3D). Additionally, frequencies of cells expressing the proliferation marker Ki67 were significantly elevated in both CD4 and CD8 T-cells (Figures 3E).

Figure 3: Treatment with the anti-HVEM mAb 18.10 results in an increase in TIL number and proliferation. Frequencies of human CD45+ cells among all CD45+ cells (A), of human CD3+ among human CD45+ cells (B) and of CD4 and CD8 T cells among human CD3+ cells (C) in the PC3 tumor were determined by flow cytometry. (D) Total number of CD4⁺ and CD8⁺ T-cells in PC3 tumors from one representative experiment out of 2. (E) Frequencies of Ki67-expressing cells among CD4⁺ and CD8⁺ T-cells in the tumor. Data are cumulative of two independent experiments performed at D21 post-humanization. Each dot is a mouse. The p values on the graphs indicate the probability that the median values were equals using the Mann-Whitney non parametric t-test.

Tumor control is dependent on CD8⁺ T cells

To determine the contribution of CD8⁺ T cells to tumor control, we compared tumor growth in anti-HVEM-treated mice in mice depleted of their CD8⁺ T cells (Figure 4). Depletion of CD8 T-cells was clearly visible at the end of the experiment in the tumor (Figure 4A), showing that the depleting mAb had a long-lasting effect. Interestingly, depletion of CD8⁺ T cells before the initiation of the treatment reverted the effect of the anti-HVEM mAb on tumor growth (Figure 4B), showing that CD8 T cells were crucial for the therapeutic efficacy of the mAb. However, Granzyme B (GZMB) and Perforine 1 (PRF1) expression levels were not

220 elevated in CD8⁺ T cells of the tumor of treated mice (Figure 4C-D), indicating that tumor control was
221 dependent on CD8 T cell numbers rather than function.

Figure 4: Tumor control by the mAb is dependent on CD8⁺ T cells (A) Representative CD4/CD8 staining on human CD45+CD3+ T-cells in the tumor at the end of the experiment in a CD8-depleted (aCD8) or an isotype control treated mouse. (B) Growth of the PC3 cell line in humanized mice treated with anti-HVEM mAb and depleted or not of their CD8 T cells. CD8 T-cells were depleted on the day following humanization (blue arrow). Curves are the mean tumor volume ($\pm$ SEM) in the indicated number of mice. Black arrows indicate the time of anti-HVEM mAb injection. Data are cumulative of two independent experiments.

237 **Treatment with the anti-HVEM mAb does not increase GVHD nor number or proliferation of human**
238 **T cells**

239 One possibility to explain these observations would be that the mAb behave as an agonist, directly activating
240 human T cells *in vivo*, leading to better tumor control. Indeed, human T and B cells did express HVEM
241 before injection into mice (Figure 5A). However, we observed similar weight loss and mortality in anti-
242 HVEM or isotype control treated mice (Figure 5B-C), showing that GVHD induced by PBMC in NSG mice
243 was not exacerbated by the treatment. Furthermore, the number and the proliferation status of human T cells
244 in the spleens of treated animals were the same (Figure 5D-E). Our results show that anti-HVEM therapy in

humanized mice reduced the growth of HVEM⁺ tumors by a mechanism that was independent of any agonist effect of the mAb.

Figure 5: Treatment with the anti-HVEM mAb does not increase GVHD nor numbers or proliferation of human T cells. (A) HVEM expression in the indicated subsets was determined by flow cytometry on 3 different PBMC donors. Percentages of initial weight (B) and survival (C) of NSG mice following treatment by the anti-HVEM mAb or an isotype control are shown. Numbers (D) and frequencies of Ki67⁺ cells (E) in the indicated subsets.

mRNA enrichment analysis showed increased activation and decreased immunosuppression in TIL of anti-HVEM treated mice

In order to better characterize the anti-tumor immune response following mAb treatment, we established a list of differentially expressed genes (DEG) in sorted hCD45⁺ TIL using the Nanostring Cancer Immune panel. Among the 730 genes included in the panel, 145 were up-regulated (log2FC>0.26) and 142 were down-regulated (log2FC<-0.3) in TIL from HVEM-treated mice (Figure S3). Of note, GZMB and PRF1 were among the genes with the highest levels of expression but the difference between the groups was weak, confirming our flow cytometry observation (Figure 4C-D). Moreover, several interleukins genes were

266 enriched by the treatment, such as IL1A, IL7, IL22, EBI3, CSF2, and LTA, a ligand of HVEM. Likewise, the
 267 chemokines genes CCL5, CCL4, CCL1, CCL20 and others were enriched by the treatment. Finally, several
 268 members of the TNF super family were also enriched, such as TNFSF14 (LIGHT), another ligand of HVEM
 269 (Figure S3). Accordingly, unsupervised enrichment analysis revealed that up-regulated genes of the anti-
 270 HVEM group were enriched in members of several signatures related to interleukins/cytokines, and to
 271 activation signaling pathways, including the JAK-STAT, TNF-dependent NFkB and MAPK cascades (Figure
 272 6A). Accordingly, NFKB1 and RELA were putative regulators of many genes of the DEG signature (Figure
 273 S4A). In addition, Gene Set Enrichment Analysis (GSEA) identified the “JAK-STAT signaling pathway”
 274 signature as significantly and positively enriched in TIL of HVEM-treated mice (Figure 6B).

275 On the other hand, some genes belonging to immuno-suppressive pathways were clearly down-regulated in
 276 HVEM-treated TIL such as ENTPD1 (CD39), IL10 and the co-inhibitory receptors BTLA, TIGIT, LAG3
 277 and HAVCR2 (TIM3), as well as the “don’t eat me” receptor CD47 (Figure S3). Other cytokines/chemokines
 278 were also negatively affected by the treatment, such as IL21, IL13, CXCL13, TNFSF10 (TRAIL) or
 279 TNFSF113B (BAFF). Enrichment analysis of the genes down regulated in the anti-HVEM group using the
 280 DisGeNET database showed that the “Immunosuppression” signature was highly enriched in this gene set
 281 (Figure 6C). In addition, GSEA showed that genes belonging to the “immunoregulatory interactions between
 282 a lymphoid and a non lymphoid cell” signature was significantly depressed in the DEG signature (Figure
 283 6D). In addition, IPA identified several “adhesion and/or binding of lymphocytes/leukocytes” signatures
 284 dependent on CSF2 and IL4 as the most significant biological functions associated with the DEG signature
 285 (Figure S4B). Overall, anti-HVEM treatment was associated with profound modifications of TIL, with an
 286 increased expression of genes belonging to activation and proliferation signaling pathways and a decreased
 287 expression of genes signing an exhausted phenotype.

Figure 6: mRNA enrichment analysis show increased activation and decreased immunosuppression in TIL of anti-HVEM treated mice. Quantification of mRNA in CD45+ TIL of anti-HVEM or isotype-treated mice was performed with the Cancer Immune Nanostring panel in PC3-bearing humanized mice. (A) The first 20 terms significantly enriched in up regulated genes of CD45+ TIL of HVEM-treated mice are shown. (B) GSEA of the up-regulated genes identified the “JAK-STAT signaling pathway” signature as significantly enriched (p.val=0,01, q.val=0,26 (FDR), p.val=0,35 (FWER) in CD45+ TIL. (C) The first 20 terms significantly enriched in the genes down regulated by the anti-HVEM treatment are shown according to the DisGeNET database. (D) The “Immunoregulatory interaction between a lymphoid and a non lymphoid cell” signature was significantly enriched (p.val=0,002, q.val=0,148 (FDR), p.val=0,265 (FWER) in genes down modulated by the treatment.

HVEM is an immune checkpoint during anti-tumor T cell immune response in humanized mice

To formally demonstrate that HVEM expression by the tumor was indeed an immune checkpoint, we devised a simple *in vivo* assay. We implanted the HVEM-positive or the HVEM-negative PC3 cells in NSG mice, and compared tumor growth with or without human PBMCs (Figure 7). Both cell lines grew equally well in non-humanized NSG mice (Figure 7A), showing that HVEM-deficiency did not impacted *in vivo* tumor development *per se*. In contrast, tumor growth of the 1B11 clone was reduced compared to the parental PC3 cell line in humanized mice (Figure 7B), directly showing that the lack of HVEM improved tumor control by human T-cells.

Figure 7: HVEM is an immune checkpoint during anti-tumor T cell immune response in humanized mice.

Growth of the indicated PC3 cell lines (WT or 1B11) in non-humanized (A) or PBMC-humanized mice (B). Curves are the mean tumor volume ($\pm$ SEM) in the indicated number of mice. Data are cumulative of

at least two experiments. The p value on the graphs indicate the probability that the slopes are equal using a linear regression model.

Discussion

Here, we report for the first time that HVEM can be targeted by a mAb to improve tumor control by human T cells *in vivo*. Moreover, we deciphered the mode of action of the mAb *in vivo* using complementary technologies. Furthermore, we developed a simple *in vivo* assay for immune checkpoint discovery and validation. To our knowledge, this is the first report that combine CRISPR/Cas9-mediated deletion of putative checkpoints in the tumor with assessment of tumor growth in humanized mice. One limitation of the assay is that PBMC-humanized mice are mostly reconstituted with T cells, as shown herein, limiting the usefulness of the assay to T cell-specific immune checkpoints. Nevertheless, we believe that this simple *in vivo* assay will be of great help to investigate other candidates in more advanced models of humanized mice.

328 We show that the HVEM/BTLA checkpoint could be exploited for therapy in humanized mice using a mAb
329 to human HVEM. We found that HVEM expression by the tumor was necessary and sufficient to elicit tumor
330 control by the mAb, since the mAb had no effect on HVEM-negative cell lines and no agonist activity on
331 human T cells. Park *et al.* showed in a syngeneic mouse model that transfecting an agonist scFv anti-HVEM
332 in tumor cells resulted in increased T-cell proliferation, as well as improved IFN- γ and IL-2 production and
333 better tumor control [20]. Aside the species differences, the discrepancy with our results could be explained
334 by the fact that T-cells are strongly activated in huPBMC mice [29]. The down regulation of HVEM
335 expression upon activation [30] may have limited the binding of the anti-HVEM antibody on T-cells in our
336 model. Thus, it remains possible that the mAb would behave differently in humans. On the other hand,
337 BTLA is up regulated upon T-cell activation [31], increasing the susceptibility of T-cells to inhibition by
338 HVEM⁺ tumor cells [12,14,16,32]. We observed quite the opposite in the tumor micro environment
339 following treatment, with an increase in HVEM and a reduction of BTLA gene expression, with a
340 concomitant increase in LTA and LIGHT, two other ligands for HVEM. It is important to note that the
341 binding sites of LIGHT and BTLA differ on HVEM [33]. So, the anti-HVEM mAb might have limited
342 inhibition of activated T-cells through blockade of HVEM binding with BTLA but not with the other ligands
343 that are T-cell activators. An alternative possibility would be that LIGHT and LTA in their soluble forms
344 inhibit the interaction of HVEM with BTLA [34]. As of today, reciprocal regulation of HVEM and BTLA
345 has not been reported but our observation is reminiscent of earlier findings showing reciprocal regulation of
346 HVEM by LIGHT [30].

347 Previous studies in mice also showed that inhibiting HVEM expression on the tumor or its interaction with
348 its ligands has a positive effect on T cells. Injection of a plasmid encoding a soluble form of BTLA (to
349 compete with endogenous BTLA for HVEM) was associated with an increase in inflammatory cytokines
350 production by TIL and a decrease in anti-inflammatory cytokines at the RNA level [21]. In the same line,
351 vaccination to a tumor-associated antigen was more efficient if HVEM interactions with its ligands were
352 blocked by HSV-1 gD, allowing regression of large tumor mass [35]. Moreover, silencing HVEM expression
353 in the tumor with siRNA was also associated with an increase in CD8 T cells and inflammatory cytokine
354 production in a murine colon carcinoma model [14]. In addition, use of siRNA to HVEM on ovarian cancer
355 *in vitro* promoted T-cells proliferation and TNF- α and IFN- γ production [36]. Numerous results from our

study also support increased T cell activation in the absence of HVEM/BTLA signaling: TIL from mice treated with anti-HVEM expressed higher levels of JAK-STAT, NFkB and MAPK signaling pathways that are well known inducers of proliferation, differentiation, migration and apoptosis. However, increase in TIL absolute numbers might not be enough to allow tumor rejection. Comparison between TILs from mice treated with the anti-HVEM or isotype control mAb also highlighted decreased expression of many co-inhibitory receptors genes (BTLA, TIGIT, LAG3 and TIM3 [37,38]) or with immunosuppressive functions (CD39 and IL10), suggesting a lower exhaustion status. Overall, we propose that the treatment with the anti-HVEM mAb allows better control of tumor growth by increasing the number of cytotoxic CD8 T-cells with a less exhausted phenotype. Our analysis also suggests that this may primarily impacts adhesion and binding in the tumor.

We also identified the impact of myeloid cells of NSG mice during immunotherapy, an overlooked issue when using the model. Our results are in line with published observations relating the crucial role of myeloid cells in tumor control upon immune checkpoints inhibitors treatment in syngeneic mouse models [39–41]. Because of the murine nature of the mAb, binding to murine Fc-receptors present on myeloid cells of NSG might have propelled the therapeutic efficacy of the mAb. In our setting, we used IgG1, that is reported to bind to CD16 (FcγRIII) and CD32 (FcγRIIB), activating and inhibitory receptors, respectively [42]. However, NOD background has been associated with a strong decrease in FcγRIIB expression by macrophages [43]. Consequently, activating FcγRIII might be the main receptor involved in FcR-dependent activity of murine myeloid cells in NSG mice. Several possibilities exist to explain tumor killing by myeloid cells, through antibody-dependent cellular phagocytosis (ADCP), local secretion of cytokines or free radicals, expression of FasL and many others [44,45]. We did not see evidence for ADCP on the video microscopy collected during the course of this study, which rather indicated that cell killing was mediated by a cell-contact dependent mechanism, the nature of which remains to be determined. Overall, our data suggest the following model to explain the anti-tumor activity of our anti-HVEM antibody in NSG mice: binding of the mAb on HVEM expressed by the tumor would activate tumor immunogenic cell death by murine myeloid cells, which together with blockade of the HVEM inhibitory network, would limit exhaustion and enhance proliferation and retention/migration of cytotoxic human T-cells. The recent success of ICI for cancer immunotherapy (anti-CTLA-4, anti-PD-1/PD-L1) has confirmed the hypothesis that the immune

384 system can control many cancers. In light of the promising results reported herein, anti-HVEM therapy might
385 be combined with ICI and/or chemotherapy to further enhance anti-tumor immunity.

386 **Abbreviations**

387 HVEM, Herpes Virus Entry Mediator; BTLA, B and T Lymphocyte Attenuator; TIL, Tumor-Infiltrating
388 Leukocytes; TNFSF, Tumor Necrosis Factor Superfamily; NSG, NOD.SCID. γ c^{null}; ADCP, Antibody
389 Dependent Cellular Phagocytosis; ICI, Immune Checkpoint Inhibitors; RNP, ribonucleoproteins; DEG,
390 Differentially Expressed Genes; GVHD, Graft-Vs-Host-Disease; IPA, Ingenuity Pathway Analysis; GSEA,
391 Gene Set Enrichment Analysis

392 **Declarations**

393 ***Ethics approval and consent to participate***

394 Human peripheral blood mononuclear cells were collected by Etablissement Français du Sang from healthy
395 adult volunteers after informed consent in accordance with the Declaration of Helsinki. Mice were bred in
396 our animal facility under specific pathogen-free conditions in accordance with current European legislation.
397 All protocols were approved by the Ethics Committee for Animal Experimentation Charles Darwin
398 (Ce5/2012/025).

399 ***Consent for publication:*** All authors concur with the submission of the article in its present form

400

401 ***Availability of data and materials:*** Reagents and datasets are available from the corresponding author on
402 reasonable request.

403 ***Competing interests:*** DO declares competing interests as being the co-founder and shareholder of
404 Imcheck Therapeutics, Alderaan Biotechnology and Emergence Therapeutics and has research
405 funds from Imcheck Therapeutics, Alderaan Biotechnology, Collectis and Emergence Therapeutics.

406 ***Funding***

407 This study was supported by INSERM Transfert, Cancéropôle Île-de-France and Association pour la
 408 recherche sur les tumeurs de la prostate (ARTP). The funders play no role in the design of the study and
 409 collection, nor in the analysis or interpretation of the data. S.B. was supported by a doctoral fellowship from
 410 the French Ministère de l'Education Supérieure et de la Recherche. N.A. is supported by a doctoral
 411 fellowship from the Fondation ARC pour la recherche sur le cancer. D.O.'s team was supported by the grant
 412 "Equipe FRM DEQ201802339209". D.O. is Senior Scholar of the Institut Universitaire de France.

413 ***Authors' contributions***

414 SB and NA performed the experiments, analyzed the data and contributed to the writing of the manuscript,
 415 DO provided essential reagents and edited the manuscript, GM designed the study, analyzed the data and
 416 wrote the manuscript.

417 ***Acknowledgments***

418 The authors would like to thank Olivier Bregerie and Doriane Foret for taking care of our mice, Dr Pukar KC
 419 for technical help, Sylvaine Just-Landi for preparing the 18.10 mAb, Dr Armanda Casrouge and Claude
 420 Baillou for cell sorting, and Dr Benoit Salomon for critical reading of the manuscript.

421 References

- 422 1. Hanahan D, Weinberg RA. Hallmarks of cancer: The next generation. *Cell*. 2011;144:646–74.
- 423 2. Mittal D, Gubin MM, Schreiber RD, et al. New insights into cancer immunoediting and its three
424 component phases-elimination, equilibrium and escape. *Curr Opin Immunol*. 2014;27:16–25.
- 425 3. Hargadon KM, Johnson CE, Williams CJ. Immune checkpoint blockade therapy for cancer: An
426 overview of FDA-approved immune checkpoint inhibitors. *Int Immunopharmacol*. 2018;62:29–39.
- 427 4. Havel JJ, Chowell D, Chan TA. The evolving landscape of biomarkers for checkpoint inhibitor
428 immunotherapy. *Nat Rev Cancer*. 2019;19:133.
- 429 5. Park Y-J, Kuen D-S, Chung Y. Future prospects of immune checkpoint blockade in cancer: from
430 response prediction to overcoming resistance. *Exp Mol Med*. 2018;50:109.
- 431 6. Pasero C, Speiser DE, Derré L, et al. The HVEM network: new directions in targeting novel
432 costimulatory/co-inhibitory molecules for cancer therapy. *Curr Opin Pharmacol*. 2012;12:478–85.
- 433 7. Cai G, Anumanthan A, Brown J a, et al. CD160 inhibits activation of human CD4+ T cells
434 through interaction with herpesvirus entry mediator. *Nat Immunol*. 2008;9:176–85.
- 435 8. Sedy JR, Gavrieli M, Potter KG, et al. B and T lymphocyte attenuator regulates T cell activation
436 through interaction with herpesvirus entry mediator. *Nat Immunol*. 2005;6:90–8.
- 437 9. Cheung TC, Steinberg MW, Osborne LM, et al. Unconventional ligand activation of herpesvirus
438 entry mediator signals cell survival. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A*. 2009;106:6244–9.
- 439 10. Shaikh RB, Santee S, Granger SW, et al. Constitutive Expression of LIGHT on T Cells Leads to
440 Lymphocyte Activation, Inflammation, and Tissue Destruction. *J Immunol*. 2001;167:6330–7.
- 441 11. Harrop JA, McDonnell PC, Brigham-Burke M, et al. Herpesvirus entry mediator ligand
442 (HVEM-L), a novel ligand for HVEM/TR2, stimulates proliferation of T cells and inhibits HT29
443 cell growth. *J Biol Chem*. 1998;273:27548–56.
- 444 12. Inoue T, Sho M, Yasuda S, et al. HVEM Expression Contributes to Tumor Progression and
445 Prognosis in Human Colorectal Cancer. *Anticancer Res*. 2015;35:1361–7.
- 446 13. Malissen N, Macagno N, Granjeaud S, et al. HVEM has a broader expression than PD-L1 and
447 constitutes a negative prognostic marker and potential treatment target for melanoma.
448 *Oncoimmunology*. 2019;8.
- 449 14. Migita K, Sho M, Shimada K, et al. Significant involvement of herpesvirus entry mediator in
450 human esophageal squamous cell carcinoma. *Cancer*. 2014;120:808–17.
- 451 15. Lan X, Li S, Gao H, et al. Increased BTLA and HVEM in gastric cancer are associated with
452 progression and poor prognosis. *Onco Targets Ther*. 2017;10:919–26.

453 16. Hokuto D, Sho M, Yamato I, et al. Clinical impact of herpesvirus entry mediator expression in
454 human hepatocellular carcinoma. *Eur J Cancer*. 2015;51:157–65.

455 17. Tsang JYS, Chan K-W, Ni Y-B, et al. Expression and Clinical Significance of Herpes Virus
456 Entry Mediator (HVEM) in Breast Cancer. *Ann Surg Oncol*. 2017;24:4042–50.

457 18. M’Hidi H, Thibult ML, Chetaille B, et al. High expression of the inhibitory receptor BTLA in T-
458 follicular helper cells and in B-cell small lymphocytic lymphoma/chronic lymphocytic leukemia.
459 *Am J Clin Pathol*. 2009;132:589–96.

460 19. Wang Q, Ye Y, Yu H, et al. Immune checkpoint-related serum proteins and genetic variants
461 predict outcomes of localized prostate cancer, a cohort study. *Cancer Immunol Immunother*. 2020;

462 20. Park J-J, Anand S, Zhao Y, et al. Expression of anti-HVEM single-chain antibody on tumor cells
463 induces tumor-specific immunity with long-term memory. *Cancer Immunol Immunother*.
464 2012;61:203–14.

465 21. Han L, Wang W, Fang Y, et al. Soluble B and T Lymphocyte Attenuator Possesses Antitumor
466 Effects and Facilitates Heat Shock Protein 70 Vaccine-Triggered Antitumor Immunity against a
467 Murine TC-1 Cervical Cancer Model In Vivo. *J Immunol*. 2009;183:7842–50.

468 22. Shultz LD, Schweitzer PA, Christianson SW, et al. Multiple defects in innate and adaptive
469 immunologic function in NOD/LtSz-scid mice. *J Immunol*. 1995;154:180–91.

470 23. Schmitz JE, Simon MA, Kuroda MJ, et al. A nonhuman primate model for the selective
471 elimination of CD8⁺ lymphocytes using a mouse-human chimeric monoclonal antibody. *Am J*
472 *Pathol*. 1999/06/11. 1999;154:1923–32.

473 24. Petit NY, Lambert-Niclot S, Marcelin A-G, et al. HIV Replication Is Not Controlled by CD8⁺ T
474 Cells during the Acute Phase of the Infection in Humanized Mice. *PLoS One*. 2015;10:e0138420.

475 25. Gertner-Dardenne J, Fauriat C, Orlanducci F, et al. The co-receptor BTLA negatively regulates
476 human Vg9Vd2 T-cell proliferation: A potential way of immune escape for lymphoma cells. *Blood*.
477 2013;122:922–31.

478 26. Zhou Y, Zhou B, Pache L, et al. Metascape provides a biologist-oriented resource for the
479 analysis of systems-level datasets. *Nat Commun*. 2019;10.

480 27. Subramanian A, Kuehn H, Gould J, et al. GSEA-P: A desktop application for gene set
481 enrichment analysis. *Bioinformatics*. 2007;23:3251–3.

482 28. Pasero C, Barbarat B, Just-Landi S, et al. A role for HVEM, but not lymphotoxin- β receptor, in
483 LIGHT-induced tumor cell death and chemokine production. *Eur J Immunol*. 2009;39:2502–14.

484 29. Ali N, Flutter B, Rodriguez RS, et al. Xenogeneic Graft-versus-Host-Disease in NOD-scid IL-
485 2Rcnul Mice Display a T-Effector Memory Phenotype. *PLoS One*. 2012;7:10.

486 30. Morel Y, Schiano de Colella J-M, Harrop J, et al. Reciprocal Expression of the TNF Family
487 Receptor Herpes Virus Entry Mediator and Its Ligand LIGHT on Activated T Cells: LIGHT Down-
488 Regulates Its Own Receptor. *J Immunol*. 2000;165:4397–404.

489 31. Murphy KM, Nelson CA, Šedý JR. Balancing co-stimulation and inhibition with BTLA and
490 HVEM. *Nat Rev Immunol*. 2006;6:671–81.

491 32. Sasaki Y, Hokuto D, Inoue T, et al. Significance of Herpesvirus Entry Mediator Expression in
492 Human Colorectal Liver Metastasis. *Ann Surg Oncol*. 2019;26:3982–9.

493 33. Compaan DM, Gonzalez LC, Tom I, et al. Attenuating lymphocyte activity: The crystal
494 structure of the BTLA-HVEM complex. *J Biol Chem*. 2005;280:39553–61.

495 34. Steinberg MW, Cheung TC, Ware CF. The signaling networks of the herpesvirus entry mediator
496 (TNFRSF14) in immune regulation. *Immunol Rev*. 2011;244:169–87.

497 35. Lasaro MO, Sazanovich M, Giles-Davis W, et al. Active Immunotherapy Combined With
498 Blockade of a Coinhibitory Pathway Achieves Regression of Large Tumor Masses in Cancer-prone
499 Mice. *Mol Ther*. 2011;19:1727–36.

500 36. Zhang T, Ye L, Han L, et al. Knockdown of HVEM, a Lymphocyte Regulator Gene, in Ovarian
501 Cancer Cells Increases Sensitivity to Activated T Cells. *Oncol Res Featur Preclin Clin Cancer*
502 *Ther*. 2016;24:189–96.

503 37. Anderson AC, Joller N, Kuchroo VK. Lag-3, Tim-3, and TIGIT: Co-inhibitory Receptors with
504 Specialized Functions in Immune Regulation. *Immunity*. 2016;44:989–1004.

505 38. De Sousa Linhares A, Leitner J, Grabmeier-Pfistershammer K, et al. Not All Immune
506 Checkpoints Are Created Equal. *Front Immunol*. 2018;9.

507 39. Dhupkar P, Gordon N, Stewart J, et al. Anti-PD-1 therapy redirects macrophages from an M2 to
508 an M1 phenotype inducing regression of OS lung metastases. *Cancer Med*. 2018;7:2654–64.

509 40. Gordon SR, Maute RL, Dulken BW, et al. PD-1 expression by tumour-associated macrophages
510 inhibits phagocytosis and tumour immunity. *Nature*. 2017;545:495–9.

511 41. Gubin MM, Esaulova E, Ward JP, et al. High-Dimensional Analysis Delineates Myeloid and
512 Lymphoid Compartment Remodeling during Successful Immune-Checkpoint Cancer Therapy. *Cell*.
513 2018;175:1014–1030.e19.

514 42. Bruhns P. Properties of mouse and human IgG receptors and their contribution to disease
515 models. *Blood*. 2012;119:5640–9.

516 43. Luan JJ, Monteiro RC, Sautès C, et al. Defective Fc gamma RII gene expression in
517 macrophages of NOD mice: genetic linkage with up-regulation of IgG1 and IgG2b in serum. *J*
518 *Immunol*. 1996;157:4707–16.

519 44. Furness AJS, Vargas FA, Peggs KS, et al. Impact of tumour microenvironment and Fc receptors
520 on the activity of immunomodulatory antibodies. *Trends Immunol*. 2014;35:290–8.

521 45. Gül N, Van Egmond M. Antibody-dependent phagocytosis of tumor cells by Macrophages: A
522 Potent effector mechanism of monoclonal antibody therapy of cancer. *Cancer Res*. 2015;75:5008–
523 13.

Supplementary Figures

Figure S1: Depletion of Gr1⁺ cells reverted the effect of the anti-HVEM mAb in non humanized NSG mice. (A) Tumor growth of wild-type PC3 grafted in NSG mice treated with anti-HVEM (arrows) and anti-Gr1 (100µg) or isotype control twice a week. (B) Mice survival after treatment with anti-Gr1 mAb. Mice were treated with various doses of two different batches of anti-Gr1. Data are cumulative from 3 independent experiments.

Figure S2: Co-cultures of GFP-PC3 cell line and cells from peritoneal lavage of NSG mice. Cells were stained with anti-CD11b and F4/80-specific mAb and analyzed by flow cytometry at the initiation of the co-culture.

534 **Figure S3: MA-plot comparing gene expression between TIL from aHVEM and isotype treated mice.**
535 Represented are the fold-change in the expression of a given gene between anti-HVEM- or isotype-treated
536 mice (log2FC, y axis) vs the mean absolute count after normalization (log2count). Some notable genes are
537 highlighted according to their biological functions by the indicated color code.

Figure S4: Enrichment analysis of DEG in TIL of anti-HVEM-treated mice (A) Putative regulators of DEG were determined with Metascape and the TRRUST database (B) Representation of the most significant biological features from the DEG of anti-HVEM treated mice. The network was generated using the Graphical Summary algorithm of the Ingenuity Pathway Analysis software (Qiagen).

Video S1: NSG macrophages are able to kill PC3 cell in presence of anti-HVEM by a cell-contact dependent mechanism. GFP-expressing PC3 cells were incubating with NSG peritoneal macrophages and anti-HVEM or its isotype. Co-culture was followed by video microscopy overnight.