



Tumour-associated macrophages in hepatocellular carcinoma: Pressing the metabolic switch to prevent T cell responses

Joanne M. O'Rourke^{1,2}, Daniel A. Patten^{1,2}, Shishir Shetty^{1,2,*}

¹Centre for Liver and Gastrointestinal Research, Institute of Immunology and Immunotherapy, Medical School, University of Birmingham, Edgbaston, Birmingham, United Kingdom; ²NIHR Birmingham Biomedical Research Centre, University Hospitals Birmingham NHS Foundation Trust and University of Birmingham, Birmingham, United Kingdom

See Article, pages 333–343

Hepatocellular carcinoma (HCC) is one of the leading causes of global cancer-related deaths. The majority of patients present with advanced disease and current medical therapy only prolongs survival by a few months.¹ HCC occurs on the background of chronic liver disease in more than 90% of cases and is a paradigm for inflammation-induced cancer where the tumour microenvironment (TME) is characterised by ongoing metabolic stress and an immunosuppressive environment.² This has led to significant interest in assessing whether immunotherapy could be an effective approach to combat this cancer. Immune checkpoint inhibitors (ICIs) have been at the forefront of immunotherapeutics for cancer, with Food and Drug Administration approval for a range of tumours.³ These approved agents target CTLA-4 or the PD-1/PD-L1 axis; blockade of these receptors removes the constraints on T cell activation and can unleash tumour specific immune responses. The action of these immune checkpoints is thought to occur predominantly at different sites of T cell activation, with CTLA-4 playing a role in the lymph nodes and PD-1/PD-L1 inhibitory interactions occurring at the tumour site. Nevertheless, it is becoming clear that we need a better understanding of the biology and regulation of these molecules to improve therapeutic outcomes.⁴ This is highlighted in recent ICI trials in HCC, demonstrating efficacy signals but low overall responses of 20%.⁵

To improve the efficacy of ICIs, attention has shifted to the tumour microenvironment which contains a range of other cell types that are involved in cross talk with T cells including fibroblasts, endothelial cells and macrophages.⁶ Macrophages play essential roles in pathogen clearance and recognition of danger signals, as well as being important regulators of tissue remodelling – a significant body of work now confirms their role in mediating acute and chronic liver injury.⁷ The tissue-resident macrophages of the liver, Kupffer cells, act as sentinels for danger signals released by tissue injury, leading to recruitment of other monocyte-derived populations from the circulation by the CCL2/CCR2 axis. These populations have functional diversity in response to tissue microenvironmental signals, contributing

to both pro-inflammatory and fibrotic responses, as well as the resolution of inflammation and fibrosis regression.^{8–10} In addition to liver injury and fibrosis, macrophages have also been reported to make up a major component of tumour stroma in HCC.¹¹ The majority of tumour-associated macrophages (TAMs) appear to be derived from peripheral blood monocytes with only a small proportion having a tissue-resident origin.¹² Though macrophages have functional diversity, many studies suggest that TAMs play an important role in promoting tumour progression, including in models of HCC.¹³ There are several mechanisms by which macrophages may help tumour growth, involving tumour angiogenesis, and tumour cell invasion and metastasis.¹¹ In addition to supporting tumour growth, TAMs can also support tumour immune evasion via the promotion of an immunosuppressive phenotype, characterised by high levels of arginase 1, IL-10 and chemokines which promote the recruitment of regulatory T cells (e.g. CCL22).^{14,15} Previous work in HCC demonstrates that TAMs also express high levels of the checkpoint receptor PD-L1.¹⁶ To translate these findings to cancer therapy there is now an urgent need to understand and overcome these intrinsic macrophage regulatory pathways which promote the expression of these immunosuppressive molecules.

Immunometabolism has generated a great deal of interest as an approach to alter immune cell function. It is now clear that cellular metabolism can, not only through energy production and biosynthesis in immune cells but also through a process of metabolic reprogramming, alter the function of these cells via transcriptional and post-transcriptional pathways. Previous work has shown that this is highly relevant to macrophage phenotype and function with pro-inflammatory macrophages or M1 (generated by lipopolysaccharide or interferon- γ) having a different metabolic profile to alternatively activated M2 Macrophages (generated by IL-4).¹⁷ M1 macrophages are associated with a metabolic profile characterised by aerobic glycolysis, whereas M2 macrophages are characterised by oxidative phosphorylation (OxPhos) which is generally associated with most cells in normoxic conditions. The differences between the metabolic features in these macrophage subsets can be explained by altered levels of critical enzymes that drive these pathways, for example M1 macrophages have increased levels of u-PFK2, an isoform of phosphofructokinase-2 that is highly active,

* DOI of original article: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jhep.2019.04.007>.

* Corresponding author. Address: 5th Floor Institute of Biomedical Research, Institute of Immunology and Immunotherapy, Medical School, University of Birmingham, Edgbaston, Birmingham, United Kingdom. Tel.: +44 121 4158500. E-mail address: s.shetty@bham.ac.uk (S. Shetty).



promoting glycolysis.¹⁸ In contrast, M2 macrophages express PFKFB1, an isoform that has limited effects in driving glycolysis.¹⁹ Furthermore, whilst nutrients and oxygen levels are the classical drivers of metabolic pathways, in macrophages and dendritic cells the ligation of pattern recognition receptors by binding danger signals in the microenvironment makes a major contribution to regulating metabolic pathways.¹⁷

In this issue, Chen *et al.* describe a new pathway involving recognition of danger signals by macrophages in the HCC microenvironment that regulates macrophage metabolism and has downstream effects on PD-L1 expression. Through a combination of gene expression analysis of glycolytic enzymes and Seahorse extracellular flux studies, they demonstrate that peritumoural TAMs from human HCC samples were skewed towards a glycolytic pathway compared to paired blood monocytes or non-tumour tissue populations. Previous studies from this group have shown that peritumoural TAMs in HCC upregulate the expression of PD-L1¹⁶ and in this current study they provide evidence for glycolysis being a key driver of PD-L1 upregulation. They further demonstrate *in vitro* that PD-L1 upregulation on monocytes by tumour supernatant can be prevented by 2-deoxyglucose, a well-known inhibitor of glycolysis. Guided by their gene expression analysis and using a range of specific inhibitors and siRNA knockdown, the authors show that PFKFB3 was the critical glycolytic enzyme in regulating PD-L1 expression. Interestingly, CD68⁺PFKFB3⁺PD-L1⁺ monocyte populations were detectable in the peritumoural stroma of human HCC samples. This leads to the question of what external factors in the tumour microenvironment support this metabolic reprogramming and, intrinsically, how does PFKFB3 drive a translational pathway that upregulates PDL1 expression? Chen *et al.* explore these questions by firstly identifying that the NF- κ B pathway is upregulated in their *in vitro* model and that inhibition of PFKFB3 abrogates the pathway by preventing p65 translocation to the nucleus leading to prevention of PD-L1 upregulation. They go on to find that hyaluronan fragments, a matrix protein which has been shown to be secreted by several tumours into the microenvironment and correlates with outcome,²⁰ is sensed by monocytes and upregulates the expression of PFKFB3 and PD-L1. It is important to point out that *in vivo* experiments in this study used a cell line tumour model with transfer of human monocytes, with or without inhibition of PFKFB3, combined with autologous T cells and more robust clinically relevant models are required to confirm the functional contribution of this subset of CD68⁺PFKFB3⁺PD-L1⁺TAMs in HCC progression.

Nevertheless, this study adds to the growing interest in targeting the metabolism of immune cells as a strategy for immunotherapy, but also highlights that macrophages cannot be clearly differentiated between anti-inflammatory and pro-inflammatory subtypes. TAMs are known to have immunosuppressive properties which are associated with alternatively activated (M2) macrophages that are characterised by the OxPhos pathway, yet in this study it is glycolysis which leads to high PD-L1 expression. Further work is required to assess if this CD68⁺PFKFB3⁺PD-L1⁺ subtype of macrophages is found in all types of HCC, as this study predominantly derived tissue from hepatitis B-associated HCC. From a therapeutic point of view, we also need a better understanding of how safe and specific it is to target these metabolic pathways as an approach to alter TAM function.

Financial support

JMO is supported by HUNTER funded through a partnership between Cancer Research UK, Fondazione AIRC and Fundación Científica de la Asociación Española Contra el Cáncer. DAP and SS receive funding from the Medical Research Council MR/R010013/1.

Conflicts of interest

SS receives consultancy fees from Faron Pharmaceuticals and equipment from Tosoh Bioscience outside of this submitted work.

Please refer to the accompanying ICMJE disclosure forms for further details.

Supplementary data

Supplementary data to this article can be found online at <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhep.2019.05.019>.

References

Author names in bold designate shared co-first authorship

- [1] Forner A, Reig M, Bruix J. Hepatocellular carcinoma. *Lancet* 2018.
- [2] Hernandez-Gea V, Toffanin S, Friedman SL, Llovet JM. Role of the microenvironment in the pathogenesis and treatment of hepatocellular carcinoma. *Gastroenterology* 2013;144:512–527.
- [3] La-Beck NM, Jean GW, Huynh C, Alzghari SK, Lowe DB. Immune checkpoint inhibitors: new insights and current place in cancer therapy. *Pharmacotherapy* 2015;35:963–976.
- [4] Wei SC, Duffy CR, Allison JP. Fundamental mechanisms of immune checkpoint blockade therapy. *Cancer Discov* 2018;8:1069–1086.
- [5] El-Khoueiry AB, Sangro B, Yau T, Crocenzi TS, Kudo M, Hsu C, et al. Nivolumab in patients with advanced hepatocellular carcinoma (Check-Mate 040): an open-label, non-comparative, phase 1/2 dose escalation and expansion trial. *Lancet* 2017;389:2492–2502.
- [6] Salmon H, Remark R, Gnjatic S, Merad M. Host tissue determinants of tumour immunity. *Nat Rev Cancer* 2019;19:215–227.
- [7] Tacke F, Zimmermann HW. Macrophage heterogeneity in liver injury and fibrosis. *J Hepatol* 2014;60:1090–1096.
- [8] Karlmark KR, Weiskirchen R, Zimmermann HW, Gassler N, Ginhoux F, Weber C, et al. Hepatic recruitment of the inflammatory Gr1⁺ monocyte subset upon liver injury promotes hepatic fibrosis. *Hepatology* 2009;50:261–274.
- [9] Ramachandran P, Pellicoro A, Vernon MA, Boulter L, Aucott RL, Ali A, et al. Differential Ly-6C expression identifies the recruited macrophage phenotype, which orchestrates the regression of murine liver fibrosis. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 2012;109:E3186–3195.
- [10] **Rantakari P, Patten DA**, Valtonen J, Karikoski M, Gerke H, Dawes H, et al. Stabilin-1 expression defines a subset of macrophages that mediate tissue homeostasis and prevent fibrosis in chronic liver injury. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 2016;113:9298–9303.
- [11] Poh AR, Ernst M. Targeting macrophages in cancer: from bench to bedside. *Front Oncol* 2018;8:49.
- [12] Franklin RA, Liao W, Sarkar A, Kim MV, Bivona MR, Liu K, et al. The cellular and molecular origin of tumor-associated macrophages. *Science* 2014;344:921–925.
- [13] Yeung OW, Lo CM, Ling CC, Qi X, Geng W, Li CX, et al. Alternatively activated (M2) macrophages promote tumour growth and invasiveness in hepatocellular carcinoma. *J Hepatol* 2015;62:607–616.
- [14] Curiel TJ, Coukos G, Zou L, Alvarez X, Cheng P, Mottram P, et al. Specific recruitment of regulatory T cells in ovarian carcinoma fosters immune privilege and predicts reduced survival. *Nat Med* 2004;10:942–949.
- [15] Biswas SK, Gangi L, Paul S, Schioppa T, Saccani A, Sironi M, et al. A distinct and unique transcriptional program expressed by tumor-associated macrophages (defective NF- κ B and enhanced IRF-3/STAT1 activation). *Blood* 2006;107:2112–2122.

- [16] Kuang DM, Zhao Q, Peng C, Xu J, Zhang JP, Wu C, et al. Activated monocytes in peritumoral stroma of hepatocellular carcinoma foster immune privilege and disease progression through PD-L1. *J Exp Med* 2009;206:1327–1337.
- [17] O'Neill LA, Pearce EJ. Immunometabolism governs dendritic cell and macrophage function. *J Exp Med* 2016;213:15–23.
- [18] Rodriguez-Prados JC, Traves PG, Cuenca J, Rico D, Aragoes J, Martin-Sanz P, et al. Substrate fate in activated macrophages: a comparison between innate, classic, and alternative activation. *J Immunol* 2010;185:605–614.
- [19] Kelly B, O'Neill LA. Metabolic reprogramming in macrophages and dendritic cells in innate immunity. *Cell Res* 2015;25:771–784.
- [20] Nikitovic D, Tzardi M, Berdiaki A, Tsatsakis A, Tzanakakis GN. Cancer microenvironment and inflammation: role of hyaluronan. *Front Immunol* 2015;6:169.